



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3373601

6 Sussex Green, Hunslet, Leeds LS10 2LB

- 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 James Bailey against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02920/FU.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for 1.9m close boarded timber fence with gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I observed that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey end terraced property situated on a corner plot at the junction of Sussex Avenue and Sussex Approach. Boundary treatments in the area vary, however I observed during my site visit there were many examples of close boarded timber fencing similar to the proposal before me.
5. The proposed boundary treatment contains vehicular gates located on the corner of the junction. Double yellow lines restrict on-street parking outside the appeal site, notwithstanding this, drivers of vehicles leaving the appeal site would have limited visibility splay. Whilst there is a 20mph speed limit in the area due to the location of the gates combined with the height and solid design the development reduces the visibility between Sussex Avenue and Sussex Approach, creating conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.
6. The development creates off-street parking nevertheless the development has the potential to obstruct the highway through opening and closing of the gates which are not set back to accommodate a waiting vehicle.

7. I find that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the access would not harm highway safety. There is conflict with Policies P10 and T2 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan and Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of a good design and do not create or add to problems of highway safety.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR