
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2430/D/19/3229834

3 New Road Burton Lazars LE14 2UU

- 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 Simon Pickworth against the decision of Melton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00166/FULHH, dated 9 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on a corner plot at the junction of New Road and Church Lea, which is the access road to a relatively modern small housing development. A feature stone wall encloses the plot to Church Lea, leaving a small gap between the property and the wall. On the opposite side of the junction, lies a neighbouring property with a similar feature stone wall and resulting gap. These feature stone walls and the resulting set back of the flank walls of both properties away from the junction of New Road/Church Lea enhance the street scene and give the entrance to the housing development at Church Lea a spacious character and appearance. Given that they break up the pattern of built development on this part of New Road, they are a prominent feature which make a positive contribution to the character of the area.
4. The proposed extension would be a full two stories in height to reflect the existing house and would occupy most of the existing gap between the side of the dwelling and the stone wall. By occupying the width of the appeal site and squaring off the proposed extension at the front to a pinch point on the corner, the extension would result in a cramped appearance to the appeal property when viewed from both New Road and Church Lea.
5. The resulting extension adjacent to the grass verge would be visually prominent and would significantly erode the open character and appearance of

the area. The bulk of the proposed extension forming the boundary at this location would be a discordant addition to the streetscene and would introduce a sense of enclosure at the entrance of the housing development. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would not narrow the road in this location. However, it would narrow the visual gap between the two properties at the entrance to Church Lea detracting from the open spacious feel at this location. In particular it would detract from the appearance of balance with the property at the opposite side of the junction of New Road/Church Lea and remove the symmetry between the two properties.

6. The proposal would involve alterations to the feature stone wall, including the loss of part, through the construction of the extension. I appreciate that the proposal would see the reinstatement of part of the stone wall and the incorporation of matching stone into the lower part of the extension. However, this would not overcome the adverse effect I have identified. As such, the loss of the feature stone wall in its current form would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding the level of development on this part of New Road, the area retains an essentially rural character.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy D1(a) and (c) of the Melton Borough Local Plan 2011-2036 which requires the siting and layout of development proposals to be sympathetic to the character of the area and for development to reflect the wider context of the local area and respect the local vernacular. The proposed development would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages good design and seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

8. I note also the appellant's reference to the Council's handling of the application but this is not a matter before me nor does it alter my findings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR