



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3370935

22 Beechwood, Woodlesford, Leeds LS26 8PQ

- 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 Carl Horsley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01903/FU.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for boundary fence, with two gates, to front and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

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, and I have dealt with the proposal accordingly.
3. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. The appellant confirms the revised description is more accurate than that previously proposed. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached property situated on a corner plot within a predominantly residential area. Front residential boundary treatments in the immediate area generally comprise low brick wall, some with landscaping. Whilst there are slight variations of boundary treatments, there is a commonality in form and materials which adds to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The development comprises a low stone wall with close boarded timber fence between composite posts and on top of composite kickboards. Due to the material, height, and design on this prominent corner plot, the boundary treatment is a dominant feature which is incongruous to the area.
7. The appeal site's garden wraps around the front, side and rear of the property. Due to the topography of the area, the appeal site is located near the bottom of an

incline, and at some public vantage points views are provided into the garden area. The appellant contends that the development would provide a degree of private amenity space for the occupiers of the property; whilst this may be the case, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to confirm the development before me is the only way to achieve private amenity space. I give this limited weight.

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to boundary treatments within the immediate area. I observed during my site visit that there are a limited number of boundary treatments, which had low walls and high hedging/landscaping, behind which formed a high boundary treatment, some of which were on corner plots. I also observed a fence with hedging without a low wall. Notwithstanding this, these are visibly different to the proposal before me; the landscaping softens the effect of the scale of these boundaries, whereas the solid timber/composite fencing is imposing and stark in comparison.
9. During my site visit, I observed other boundary treatments, including a low wall with fencing topped with trellis, close to the appeal site (No. 20 Beechwood). I understand from the Council this boundary treatment is unauthorised. Whilst unauthorised development can contribute to the character and appearance of an area, given the difference in design and that this is not a common boundary feature, I give the existence of this boundary treatment limited weight in terms of its contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal before me.
10. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds 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), and Policy DBE1 of the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are of good design and appropriate to character of the area.
11. 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

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR