



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3376561

10 Tredgold Close, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9BT

- 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 Mrs Helen Gordon against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/05055/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Change of existing brickwork to the building. To render to all walls as existing wall/brick in a poor condition and porous.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for render to all walls, at 10 Tredgold Close, Leeds, LS16 9BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/05055/FU and the plans submitted with it.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: site location plan; drg.no. 003/02/2024/d; 'Site Plan'

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form confirms that the development has been completed, and I was able to see this during my site visit. I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. I have taken the description of development from the application form. In my decision I have omitted wording, both for clarity and to remove elements that do not describe acts of development.
4. There is dispute between the main parties relating to the requirements and interpretation of a condition attached to a planning permission¹. This required the external walling and roofing materials to match those existing. Even so, the appeal before me seeks planning permission for the rendering of the entire house and I have dealt with it on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is within a residential area of two-storey dwellings and bungalows. It sits at a junction between Tredgold Close and Tredgold Avenue and is viewed within the context of both streets. To the west of the appeal site on Tredgold

¹ 24/05242/FUL

Avenue, houses are predominantly brick. To the east, a large proportion of dwellings are white rendered, including bungalows, and another bungalow on Tredgold Close. The bungalows either side of the Tredgold Close road junction, incorporate a material palette of brick, white render and pebble-dash render. Overall, the street scene presents a mix of render and brick materials.

7. The appeal bungalow contributes to the character and appearance of the area by respecting the siting, scale, eaves and ridge height of adjoining and surrounding bungalows. This is the case, even with extensions, as these are largely subservient to the host dwelling, and set well back within the garden.
8. The walls of the dwelling have been finished with white render. This does not match the finish of the adjoining bungalow. However, balanced pairings of bungalows featuring matching materials, is not a dominant feature of the street scene. As such, the mismatch between the appeal site and adjoining bungalow is not visually discordant. The render also has a sympathetic external appearance when viewed within the wider street scene, where this material finish is prevalent. It conforms with the guidance contained within Policy HDG1 of the Household Design Guide², which requires alterations to respect the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
9. The Council's stance is that the render finish of no 9 Tredgold Close to the north of the appeal site is not approved by them. But in the absence of any evidence of enforcement action having been taken, I consider that it forms part of the context of the appeal site and on that basis, its finish is relevant to my consideration.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, and saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, Volume 1³, and saved Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, Volume 2⁴. Together they require good design appropriate to the original building and location, having regard to any relevant guidance amongst other things.

Other Matters

11. Interested parties raise concerns in respect of the extensions to the bungalow, including in relation to access and parking. However this falls outside the scope of this appeal.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the list of approved plans condition, in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR

² Householder Design Guide, Leeds Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, April 2012

³ Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), Volume 1: Written Statement, Leeds UDP Review

⁴ Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), Volume 2: Appendices, Leeds UDP Review