

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/17/3173254

21 Hardwick Crescent, Syston, Leicester LE7 1NY

- 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 Richard Brown against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17/0154/2, dated 20 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of existing single side storey extension and side garden wall. To be replaced with a two storey side extension and new side fence along the edge of the garden'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an extended two-storey end of terrace house located at the corner of Hardwick Crescent and Chatsworth Drive. The terrace contains 9 properties in total arranged in groups of 3, with the middle 3 properties in the terrace set back. The estate is predominantly open plan, with grassed/hard landscaped areas to the side of rear gardens which front onto the highway. These features contribute to the spacious character of the area.
 4. I have carefully considered the appellant's representations relating to the design of the two-storey side extension, in particular the proposed relationship to the block of three properties and the use of matching materials. However, the proposal would not be set back from the front elevation of the terrace or set down from the ridge line of the roof. Therefore, this would result in a development that would not be subordinate to the host dwelling, resulting in a scheme that fails to respect and reflect the architectural rhythm and symmetry of the terrace as a whole. Furthermore, the extension would due to its overall width and proposed location at a prominent corner would fail to respect the prevailing pattern of development in the locality and therefore materially harm the spacious appearance of the street scene.
 5. In relation to the proposed fence I accept that it would not block a direct line of sight. However, its proposed location at the back of the footpath with no
-

hard/soft landscaping would appear at odds with the prevailing open plan character of the area and therefore fail to reinforce the distinctiveness of the area.

6. Having come to the conclusions above, it follows that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area and would therefore conflict with Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy (2006 to 2028) and Policies EV/1 and H17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan. These seek amongst other things to ensure that development respects and complements the appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Borough of Charnwood Residential Extensions Supplementary Design Guide.

Other matters

7. The appellant refers to a number of other extensions in the area and cites these as setting a precedent for their proposal. However, I have limited information about their histories, but inevitably their contexts would differ to that of the scheme before me, and so they do not lead me to a different view in this case.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, and having carefully considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR