
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/17/3170101
31 Northdene Road, Leicester LE2 6FJ

- 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 Paul Thompson & Dr Sara Lemos Thompson against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20162004, dated 10 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has previously granted planning permission, in June and October 2016, for two different schemes for a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with a dormer window and a hipped roof. The officer's report confirms that the only matter in dispute is the hip to gable extension to the roof and this is the only matter referred to in the council's decision notice. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is within an established residential street. The immediate vicinity is characterised predominately by semi-detached houses with hipped roofs, although properties with gable roofs are apparent in the wider area. The roofscape at the appeal site and immediate vicinity has a regular pattern and rhythm of hipped roofs which I find to be a principal characteristic of the area. The property has been extended to the side with a two storey extension and a hipped roof that follows the form of the main dwelling. The proposed gable extension would replace the hipped roof to the main dwelling and the existing two storey side extension.
5. Whilst there is no objection to the principle of a roof extension, the proposed alterations to create a gable would, due to its scale and bulk, appear as an incongruous feature that would dominate the host property. The development would alter and interrupt the regular pattern and rhythm of the roofscape along

this part of Northdene Road, resulting in material harm to the established character and appearance of the area.

6. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to other properties in the area that have already been extended in a similar manner to that proposed and I saw these during my site visit. However, these are very much in the minority and, in any case, the existence of development elsewhere does not represent an appropriate reason to find in favour of a proposal that would cause harm or lead me to alter my findings on this issue.
7. I have also taken into account the appellants' opinion that the appeal proposal is not materially different from the previous permissions granted by the Council. However, both the approved schemes do not propose a hip to gable extension which is the principal matter before me.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with policy CS3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy (adopted November 2010) and policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan (adopted January 2006) which seek, among other matters, to ensure that developments take account of the visual qualities of the area and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local built environment. The proposal would also not meet the similar aims of the Leicester City Residential Amenity Supplementary Planning Document (adopted February 2008).

Other Matters

9. I note the appellants' desire for a larger house to support their growing family. However, whilst acknowledging the benefits that would result in this respect, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. Reference has also been made to the potential to carry out elements of the scheme as 'permitted development'. However, whether or not planning permission is required for the proposal is not a matter that is before me as part of this appeal, as other mechanisms exist to resolve such issues. Consequently, I have determined this appeal on its merits and in light of all representations made.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR