



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3368917

42 Ring Road, Middleton, Leeds LS104AX

- 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 R Mustafa against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01531/FU.
 - The development proposed is for fence with gate to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively, the proposed development was in place at the time of my site visit I have dealt with the proposal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property situated on busy road. Front residential boundary treatments in the immediate area generally comprise low brick wall some with metal railings, whilst there are slight variations of boundary treatments there is a commonality in form and materials.
5. The front boundary treatment is separated by a wide verge from the Ring Road. The fence is a contemporary black metal slat fence, despite the set back due to the material, height and design the fence is a dominant feature which is incongruous to the area.
6. There is a similar fence to the front of the adjacent property No. 40 Ring Road, I understand from the Council this is unauthorised. Whilst unauthorised development can contribute to the character and appearance of an area, this fence appears relatively new I have no substantive evidence before me that the Council are not progressing enforcement action against this development. I give the existence of this adjacent fence limited weight in terms of its contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

7. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan, Policies GP5, BD6 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of good design and appropriate to character of the area.
8. There is conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which seeks to ensure development respects the locality.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR