
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1st September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/D/17/3178896
25 Abbott Drive, Stoney Stanton LE9 4AB

- 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 Mrs Melina Hall against the decision of Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0272/HH, dated 22 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey side and rear extension and alterations to boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension and alterations to boundary wall at 25 Abbott Drive, Stoney Stanton LE9 4AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/0272/HH, dated 22 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: AVD-250-ESH-PL01 and AVD-250-ESH-PL02 Rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling that occupies a corner position at the end of a row of similar detached properties within a new residential estate. The property is set back from the main estate road running along the side of the property behind a footpath/grass verge and comprises a small rear garden enclosed by a 2m high boundary wall with a detached garage beyond fronting onto the main road. A number of the dwellings on the estate are built close to the highway and have single storey extensions and garages attached at the side that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the main house.

4. The proposal would entail the construction of a single storey extension that would wrap around the north-west corner of the house. The extension would be set back from the front elevation and extend out by about 2.6m from the rear and side of the property in line with the existing boundary wall. It would have a pitched roof with a maximum eaves height of about 2.7m and a maximum ridge height of about 6.1m.
5. Whilst the proposed extension would be located in a prominent position, the scale, form and pitched roof design of the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the existing buildings on the estate built close to the highway and the built form in the area including pitched roof garage attached to the side of the adjacent property at No. 27 Abbott Drive. The single storey form of the proposed extension, set back behind the front elevation and from the main estate road together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. This would allow the proposal to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the main property and limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
6. I therefore consider that the overall scale, design and appearance of the proposed extension would not significantly detract from the streetscene and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be consistent with the overall local character and design aims of Policy CS2 of the Blaby District Council Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 and Saved Policy R1 of the Blaby District Local Plan 1999. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that all new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects distinctive local character, would be of a satisfactory layout, design and external appearance and would not be significantly out of keeping with the character or appearance of the area.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plan as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR