



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3366645

9 Ringway, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1BJ

- 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 Ms Julia Scholes against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06675/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as *'There is a garden wall around the garden and I have replaced a part of that wall around the property for security and privacy purposes.'*
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 9 December 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a wall to front at 9 Ringway, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1BJ in accordance with the application Ref 24/06675/FU, subject to the following condition:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan dated 3/12/2024; side elevation photograph.

Preliminary matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application form.
3. The Council's decision notice describes the proposal as 'Retention of wall to front' but as planning permission cannot be granted for the retention of a development I have omitted that word from the formal decision, whilst noting that the development has already been carried out.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene;
 - highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached bungalow on a corner plot within a suburban residential area of similar properties on modestly sized plots. Whilst there are a few exceptions, most of those have front boundaries of low dwarf walls and low planting that contribute positively to the spacious, open character of the street scene.
6. The proposed development, which I have noted has already been carried out, consists of a stone wall with two fence panels above along part of the side boundary facing onto Knightsway and three fence panels to form a boundary with the drive at the rear of the plot. Materials are sandstone blocks and horizontal slatted fence panels which are of a high quality and complement the existing dwarf wall.
7. At just over 1.5m in height, the boundary is not excessively high and it is lower than the height of the eaves of the bungalow. At 4m in length, it forms only a small section of the side boundary and most of the existing dwarf wall along both the side and front boundaries has been retained. Although the bungalow occupies a fairly prominent position, at my visit I noted that the ground level rises gently from Ringway up Knightsway and this mitigates the impact of the new boundary when seen from both of those roads with the adjacent bungalow at 40 Knightsway appearing more prominent in the street scene. Furthermore, on the opposite corner there is a 6m high conifer hedge along the whole of the side boundary which forms a more dominant feature in the street scene. As such, the new boundary sits comfortably within its setting and does not appear overly dominant or unduly enclosing. The open character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene is maintained.
8. I have noted that the adjacent bungalow at 40 Knightsway has a front boundary fence and gates of a similar height at some 1.4m but as the Council says it does not benefit from planning permission, I have not given it significant weight in determining this proposal.
9. Nonetheless, I conclude that for the reasons given, this is a small scale proposal that does not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the street scene. It accords, therefore, with development plan policies P10 of the Council's Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (CS) and GP5 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDP) which together seek to ensure that development protects the visual amenity of the area with high quality design. It would also accord with the Council's guidance in policy HDG1 in its Householder Design Guide SPD (2012) and national guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which both have a similar objective.

Highway safety

10. The boundary has been erected adjacent to the appellant's short, single width drive accessed from Knightsway which also provides pedestrian access into the rear garden. The Council is concerned that the height and solidity of the new boundary results in a lack of inter-visibility between vehicles exiting the drive and other road users and pedestrians.

11. Knightsway is a cul-de-sac of bungalows which have off-street parking. There is a single yellow line parking restriction outside the appeal site and double yellow line restriction around the junction. The road is gently sloping and straight with good visibility. At the time of my visit I saw no on-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site and the road was very quiet.
12. Even if drivers reverse out of the drive, they are unlikely to be doing so at speed given the short length of the drive. This is not a new access and other road users and pedestrians will be aware of its presence. This, together with the quiet nature of the road and clear visibility along the road, means that the proposed boundary is unlikely to result in conflict with other road users or pedestrians. In any case, there is no reason why vehicles cannot not reverse into the drive given the low volume of traffic and that would improve visibility.
13. I am satisfied, therefore, that the proposal provides an acceptable level of visibility and does not result in a significant danger to the highway safety of road users or pedestrians. It accords, therefore, with development plan policies T2 of the CS and GP5 of the UDP which seek to ensure safe access and highway safety in developments.

Conditions

14. As the boundary has already been erected, the standard commencement and materials conditions are unnecessary. A condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR