



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3301072

8A Firthfields, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2HD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Wilkinson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00982/FU, dated 8 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed alterations to existing unauthorised boundary treatment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is an extended two storey detached dwelling in a predominantly residential area. The street comprises of a mix of housing types and materials with predominantly low boundary walls and landscaping to the rear of the footway. On the opposite side of the road is a community centre and open space. Together, this creates an open and verdant character to the local area.
5. The existing unauthorised boundary treatment was recently dismissed at appeal¹. The current proposal seeks to modify the existing wall by reducing the height of the pillars to around 1.65 metres, replace the solid gates with an open railing design, replace the solid fence panels with open railings, together with introducing planting behind the wall.
6. Even with these alterations to the boundary treatment, the appeal proposal would still appear as a predominant and incongruous feature in the streetscene due in part to the materials used which are at odds with those used on the host dwelling and other boundary treatments in the vicinity of the site. This was

¹ Reference APP/N4720/D/19/3242586

particularly evident at my site visit where I saw that the majority of the boundary treatments in the area are low redbrick or rendered walls or hedges.

7. In coming to that view, I accept that the iron railings and lower pillars would lessen the impact of the boundary treatment on the streetscene, and that there are examples locally of the use of such railings. However, this would not be sufficient to mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has also proposed some landscaping to the rear of the boundary treatment, although very little detail as to what this would consist of has been provided. Notwithstanding that, the sliding electric gates are located close to the wall leaving only limited space for any planting. This space would appear to be insufficient to allow any proposed landscaping to mature. I am also conscious that this planting would not screen the harsh appearance of the wall from the streetscene. With the above factors in mind, the proposed landscaping would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the harm I have identified.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (2019) and Policies GP5 and N25 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with Policy HDG1 of Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which states that additions should respect the character and appearance of the locality particularly boundary treatments and materials. It would also be at odds with the overarching design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR