
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3362971

465 Otley Road, Adel, Leeds LS16 6AJ

- 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 Saverio Armenise against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06512/FU.
 - The development is the erection of new boundary 1.5m fence and gate to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling set back within a prominent corner plot at the junction of Otley Road and Farrar Lane.
5. It's indicated that prior to the development taking place, the front site boundary to Otley Road was formed by a modest stone wall and metal gate, immediately behind which remains a mature hedge. This wall continued around the curved corner of the junction before stopping, whereas the hedge extends along the full side boundary to Farrar Lane. The taller replacement metal fence and gate has been erected in the same position and to the same length as the previous wall, and therefore primarily fronts Otley Road.
6. At the time of my visit, I observed front boundary treatments along this section of Otley Road as predominantly taking the form of mature trees and hedges, often positioned behind unobtrusive low stone walls and wooden fences. The collective soft and natural appearance of residential property frontages along this arterial route contributes significantly to the well-established, verdant suburban character of the street scene. Owing to its metallic form and appearance, and its considerable height, the replacement fence and gate's appearance is fundamentally at odds with this key positive feature of the locality, thereby detracting from its character through its inappropriate design.

7. I appreciate that the development has been painted dark green and has been topped with a trellis, but these interventions do not sufficiently soften the appearance of the replacement enclosure, which possesses an essentially modern and hard aesthetic that is unsympathetic to the age and character of the host dwelling and its environs. The harmful incompatibility of the development to its locality is furthermore compounded by its highly conspicuous positioning at the traffic light controlled junction with Farrer Lane, and in doing so draws attention to it as an incongruous feature within the street scene.
8. On this basis, I conclude that the fence and gate have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. The development conflicts with Policies GP5 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 and Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (as amended 2019). These policies together set out that new development, including site boundary treatments, should be of a high-quality design that respects the character and quality of streets according to the distinctiveness of the local area.
9. Furthermore, the development would fail to comply with the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which sets out that the height, material and style of new or replacement front boundary treatments should reflect local character.

Other Matters

10. The appellant's evidence refers to the recent erection of a metal fence at a commercial premises opposite to the appeal site and also includes numerous examples of fences and gates on Farrar Lane and nearby Whinfield and Broomfield. Due to differences in appearance and location, I find that none of these developments replicates the specific circumstances of the appeal site and therefore provide a justification for the appeal scheme, which has been assessed on its own merits with regard to its effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the Otley Road street scene, to which it principally faces.
11. I also note the appellant's comments regarding damage to the previous wall from car accidents and the reduced likelihood of injury from impact with a fence. However, I see no reason why such a potential benefit could be achieved through an alternative enclosure which does not cause the harm identified above. Furthermore, whether or not there may have been a degree of local support for the scheme, this does not weigh in support of the appeal, the determination of which must be based on an assessment of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR