



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2026

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3375112

4 Holmwood Grove, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4NQ

- 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 Dr Joanna Brown against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/04115/FU.
 - The development proposed is insulated render to front, side and rear walls, new first floor window to side and replacement of rear window with a sliding door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for insulated render to front, side and rear walls, new first floor window to side and replacement of rear window with a sliding door at 4 Holmwood Grove, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/04115/FU subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no's: Location Plan (PL)001 and Existing & Proposed Elevations (PL)002.
 - 3) Prior to the installation of the insulated render, details of the colour of the render shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have utilised the description of the development from the decision notice as this more accurately describes the different elements of the proposal subject of this appeal than the description on the application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on i) the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and ii) the living conditions of the neighbouring residential occupiers at 2 Holmwood Grove, with regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow situated on a short cul-de-sac. The surrounding area comprises of buildings of varying designs, but which are formed of brick walling material, that in some cases combine with a render or pebble dash finish. This built form together with established planting within garden areas and the presence of grass verges, provides for a pleasant, verdant residential character to the area.
5. As there are examples of render being utilised on properties in the area, albeit brick being the predominant walling material in the immediate cul-de-sac, I do not consider the render material finish would appear incongruous. The depth of the insulated render would result in it protruding beyond the front wall of the neighbouring semi-detached house. However, as a bungalow property with a low eaves height, the extent of the wall that would have a stepped appearance would be limited. I was also able to see a downpipe on the front elevation that would make this difference less pronounced and as such, this pair of properties would not be visually imbalanced to a harmful extent.
6. Even in closer views, the setback position of the properties behind garden areas would ensure the overall cohesiveness and verdant character of the area is not harmed by the insulated render proposed.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, it would comply with Policies P10 and P12 of the Council's Core Strategy (Core Strategy) and Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which seek, amongst other matters, development that is appropriate to its context and respects character. It would also be compliant with Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seek alterations to respect character and appearance.

Living conditions

8. The proposal would introduce a first-floor side-facing window which would face the neighbouring property at No. 2. Although it would be positioned close the boundary and in an elevated position, the views from it would not be dissimilar to the existing window on this same elevation, particularly given the elevated position of the appeal property in relation to No. 2.
9. As such, and even if the room served by this new window is used as a habitable room, given the existing levels of mutual overlooking that are present, the proposed first floor window would not give rise to harmful privacy impacts.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers at 2 Holmwood Grove regarding privacy. As such, it would be compliant with Core Strategy Policy P10, Saved Policy GP5 of the UDP and Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, to protect residential amenity, including privacy. Although the proposed window would not meet the traditional minimum guide distances set

out in the SPD, these are intended as a guide, and the proposal would not conflict with Policy HDG2 of the SPD as it would not harm the existing residential amenity of neighbours.

Other Matter

11. No concerns have been raised in relation to the patio doors to the rear and having regard to the size and position of the doors, I have no reason to disagree.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. This includes a materials condition which is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would comply with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR