



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3359943

373 Bradford Road, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 7HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Asad Mehmood against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06522/FU.
 - The development proposed is wall and gate to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the above banner heading has been taken from the Council's decision notice as this accurately and concisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to No 373 Bradford Road, Stanningley, Pudsey which is a semi-detached dwelling located on a main arterial route from Leeds to Bradford. The road is a busy stretch of highway with housing on both sides.
5. The proposed development seeks planning permission for a 1.8 metre tall stone wall with black iron railing along the front section of the site to the western boundary and partially along the front with a 1.8 metre high wrought iron sliding electric gate.
6. Boundary treatments along this section of Bradford Road include stone walling, some with metal gates and some with in-plot planting. The walling tends to be relatively low and does not appear overly stark or visually dominating within the street scene. In plot planting presents a verdant feature against the boundaries.
7. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, design and height would result in an enclosure to the front which would stand out when viewed against other boundaries and would have a greater visual impact appearing as an overly stark/uncharacteristic feature in this context. It would therefore erode the established character of this section of Bradford Road to its detriment.

8. I am aware of the appellant's comments regarding security and safety. However, this would not justify harmful development nor be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. There is also no evidence before me to suggest that such matters could not be achieved by a scheme that would be less harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and saved Policies N25, GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) which together, amongst other matters, explain that boundaries of sites should be designed in a positive manner, using walls, hedges, or railings where appropriate to the character of the area. All paving materials should accord with the character of adjacent buildings and surrounding areas. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide, 2012 which relates to design and appearance and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that would outweigh the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR