
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2016

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/16/3154127

30 Primrose Drive, Burbage, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 2SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael John Gregory against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00428/HOU, dated 10 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2016.
 - The development proposed was originally described as to create a two storey extension to the front of the property in line with and up to the existing integral garage. This is approximately two thirds of the front aspect (4.7m). The ground floor internal wall between lounge and dining room to be moved. The first floor front master bedroom is enlarged to create an en suite facility with velux opaque glazed window to roof, a further window to the south west elevation to provide natural light to a dressing area, a further window on this elevation to give natural light to the extended loft area for additional storage. The extension extends by 2.5 metres from the original building footprint circa 1971.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension to the front of the property in line with and up to the existing integral garage; a velux opaque glazed window to the roof and two new windows to the south west elevation at 30 Primrose Drive, Burbage, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 2SL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00428/HOU, dated 10 May 2016, 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 the following approved plans: B1, B2 & B3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision notice refers to Policy BE1 of the Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan (LP) and also to Policy DM10 of the emerging Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADMP). Following the determination of the application by the Council, the
-

SADMP was adopted and replaced the LP. As such in reaching my decision I have had regard to and given full weight to Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

3. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However in allowing the appeal I have amended the description to leave out superfluous description including of works not requiring planning permission.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey dwelling located within a residential housing estate. It is of a relatively modern construction and appearance and is located within a row of seven similar properties along the same side of Primrose Drive. The dwellings are set back from the road and the three central dwellings within the row have a staggered position relative to the road and to their neighbours. However, the forward projection of the properties at 32 & 34 Primrose Drive relative to the existing dwelling together with the curve in the road means that unlike some other properties along the road, the stagger is not easily discernible when viewed from Primrose Drive.
6. The immediate surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of varying height, design and materials with a number of examples of front extensions and infill development of different scales and design along Primrose Drive and the surrounding roads within the estate.
7. The proposed two storey front extension would not extend any further forward than the existing ground floor integral garage and would not extend beyond the front elevation of the adjacent dwelling at No 32. Although asymmetrical it retains a front gable feature which is common to the row and to a number of properties on the road and in the vicinity. Consequently though none of the other properties within the row have two storey front extensions and whilst the extension would alter the stagger between the properties and result in some loss of uniformity, I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to the visual appearance and character of the streetscene.
8. Taking the above matters into account, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore accords with Policy DM10 of the SADMP which requires, amongst other things, that development complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR