



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/25/3373914

16 Leeds Road, Ossett, West Yorkshire WF5 9QA

- 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 Krenar Coku against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00796/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Proposed sliding gate to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached house on the corner of Leeds Road and Royds Avenue. The house is set back from the road behind a front garden and drive with an approximately 1m high brick wall along the pavement edge. The boundary along Royds Avenue comprises a brick wall with horizontal anthracite grey panels above it and a sliding gate and side door at the end, which is similar in design and colour to the proposed gate.
5. The appellants statement of case (SOC) includes a photograph of the front of the appeal site at which time the boundary comprised a brick wall with a hedge above it and a narrow pedestrian front gate. At the time of my visit, the hedge had been removed along with a substantial section of the brick wall, corresponding approximately with the width of the dropped kerb in front of it.
6. According to the appellant, the proposed gate would extend across approximately half the width of the front boundary. It would have a sliding mechanism and be constructed of powder coated metal with an anthracite finish. The SOC refers to the

brick wall and hedging at the front to be retained, although the proposed plans variously indicate that there would be no hedge above the boundary wall, or that there would be horizontal boards similar to those on the side wall.

7. Low brick walls with a gap enabling vehicular access to garages or off-road parking are common boundary features along Leeds Road close to the appeal site, most of which have railings, close board wooden fences or hedges above them. Accesses vary, with some left open to the street and others with wooden or metal gates. However, none that I saw, or any of the examples provided by the appellant, had sliding gates extending across half the frontage. It would have a somewhat solid and bulky appearance, because of its width and close horizontal metal panel construction. It would appear over engineered and out of character with gates elsewhere, which mainly comprise wooden panels, with a softer more natural appearance and a vertical emphasis, or metal gates with slender vertical bars more in keeping with the metal railings described and which have a more domestic appearance than the proposed gate.
8. I appreciate that the design would be similar to the existing gate along the side boundary. However, that gate is less prominent than the proposed development which would be on the frontage of a relatively busy road and therefore be much more obtrusive. Overall, I conclude that the proposed gate would harm the character of the site and surrounding area and thus conflict with policy LP57 of the Local Plan 2036 (2024) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which require high quality development that does not harm the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the appeal decision referred to by the appellant¹ for a boundary fence and gates at 63 Wakefield Road, in which the Inspector found that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area. I have not been provided with the details of that scheme. Nonetheless, I note that the proposal related to a side boundary fence which the council had confirmed was permitted development and in the context of which the Inspector found that the gate would not have appeared out of keeping. The example is not therefore comparable to the appeal proposal which would extend across a significant section of the front boundary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Decision APP/X4725/D/24/3348064