
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3363118

1 Dales Drive, Guiseley LS20 8HR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K Newbould against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05810/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective stone wall to front and both sides of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The main issue in regard to which is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Tranmere Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal property is a large, detached dwelling of an Arts and Crafts design. The area comprises similarly low-density dwellings set on substantial plots, featuring generous front gardens set back from grassy verges, notably lacking pavements and man-made boundary treatments. Front boundaries are predominantly defined by shrubs, hedges and trees collectively establishing an open green cohesive and verdant streetscape. These soft landscape elements enhance the consistency and quality of the street scene and contribute positively to the significance of the CA.
4. The walls' run and height have a significant hard, man-made, enclosing effect on the plot, which jars unacceptably with the surrounding area's open and landscaped nature, despite the stepped design feature and materials used. This is compounded by the significant amount of hardstanding that occupies the former front garden. These elements combined erode and considerably harm the verdant and spacious qualities of the street scene and surrounding area.
5. Other examples of brick built boundaries and garden paraphernalia cited are predominantly smaller and for the most part visually softer due to the incorporation of landscaping that reinforces the green and open characteristics of the street scene and CA. They do not sufficiently justify the walls in this case.
6. As a result of the above, the development harms the significance of the CA and consequently neither preserves or enhances its character or appearance. This

harm, owing to its localised effect, is less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable weight and importance. In such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

7. The principal benefit would be a private one and there are no other public benefits before me. Being as the scheme is retrospective, any further benefits to the public would be of very limited effect. They would not attract sufficient weight, in this case, to acceptably outweigh the harm I have identified to the CA.
8. As such, the development conflicts with the requirements of Policies P10 and P11 of the Core Strategy Selective Review Leeds Local Plan 2019, Policies GP5 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (UDP) and guidance contained in the Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and are acceptable for the historic environment.
9. The Council has also identified conflict with Policy BD6 of the UDP. However, this policy relates to alterations and extensions specific to buildings. As this proposal is for a detached boundary wall, the policy is not applicable in this instance. The aforementioned policies are sufficient to base a decision on in this particular case.

Other Matters

10. I have assessed the proposal on the basis that planning permission is required and was applied for in this instance. Whilst the apparent lack of engagement from the Council has caused frustration, these matters are between the parties and do not affect the consideration of the main issues. Likewise, letters of support are owing to a perceived lack of harm which would be a neutral factor in my overall consideration and do not change my findings as set out above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR