
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: 13th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/19/3230056
153 Scraftoft Lane Leicester LE5 2FF

- 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 A Singh against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20190523, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single and two storey rear extension to create a swimming pool, and a rear dormer extension to create storage (Amendments to 20181048).
-

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 a substantial detached dwelling, which has previously been extended. This extension, which has a lower ridge height to the original dwelling, is well assimilated and is sympathetic to the design of the original dwelling. I do not consider that the width of the existing roof as extended creates an unbalanced appearance nor makes the roof appear incomplete. In my view, it ensures that the extension is subservient to the dwelling, which retains its former character and appearance.
4. The extent of the extensions proposed would be sizeable additions to the dwelling. Together they would appear disproportionate and unsympathetic and add considerably to the overall bulk and scale of the dwelling. The bulk of the front and rear extensions would be discordant features in the street scene. In particular the lack of articulation in the form of the roof and walls of the two storey side extension and the continuation of the ridge line across the whole length of the dwelling would be poorly integrated and dominant features.
5. There is variety in the style and design of properties along Scraftoft Lane and in the immediate area. Notwithstanding the different designs of roof forms, there is generally a clear sense of balance and harmony amongst them. On my site visit I did not see any of the proposed type of ridge line design in close

proximity or in similar circumstances to that proposed. The proposed extensions and in particular the elongated ridge line would appear out of place in public views and would be a discordant feature when viewed from both Scraptoft Lane and the immediate area.

6. I appreciate that the appeal property is set back from the road and in a sizeable plot with generous car parking. Nonetheless, these are not matters which outweigh the harm I have identified. The effect of the proposal would be to diminish unacceptably the character and appearance and integrity of the host dwelling with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. The appellants refer to other dwellings within the locality being of a larger scale to that proposed in height, size and length. I acknowledge that there are large detached properties on Scraptoft Lane and in the general locality. However, I do not have details of the schemes referred to nor the circumstances in which these developments have been approved and so cannot make direct comparisons with the current appeal proposal. In any event the existence of other development does not justify development which would otherwise be unacceptable.
8. I note that whilst the Council expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed extension in relation to the separation distance with the adjoining property, they have not referred to it within the reason for refusal. Although I acknowledge that the proposal would not impact significantly in this regard, this factor, in itself, does not weigh in the proposal's favour.
9. 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 CS Policy 3 which requires development to contribute positively to an area's character and appearance in terms of massing and scale and to Saved Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan (2006) which requires development to take into account the visual quality of the area. The proposed development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character. It would also be contrary to the Leicester City Council Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Amenity which requires, amongst other matters, house extensions to match the original appearance of the housing roof form and scale and not to adversely affect the quality and appearance of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. I appreciate that there is a current permission obtained by the appellants for various extensions to the property and the volume this would add. However, whilst this demonstrates that there is no policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, this appeal turns on the effect of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area as a result of the current proposal. I have therefore determined the appeal on its own merits.
11. The appellants have asked that I consider a split decision in relation to specific elements of the proposal, but given my conclusions as to the harm caused, a split decision would not be appropriate. The Council do not appear to object to the single storey rear extension, but as this element is not physically and

functionally severable, I do not consider that a split decision is appropriate in respect of this particular element of the proposal either.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR