The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/19/3228184
7 Cadeby Court, Sutton Lane, Cadeby CV13 0AR

- 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 & Mrs Jones against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 18/01259/HOU, dated 12 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2019.
- The development proposed is extension and alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is a relatively new build residential property which forms an integral part of a wider courtyard development that has been set out to resemble a farmhouse with agricultural buildings. The layout and design incorporate characteristic features of rural and agricultural conversions, such as simple footprints, repetition of design features and wide glazed openings

4. The appeal site and No. 6 Cadeby Court have been designed as a coherent well-balanced block within the courtyard development with the frontage of No.6 being a mirror image of that at the appeal site. A central projecting gable between the properties forms a key visible feature and the site integrates well with the overall design approach of the courtyard.

5. The proposed development includes the addition of a porch to the front elevation and a single storey extension to the rear. The frontage to the appeal site has a simplistic horizontal emphasis with wide openings and is reflective of a barn conversion. Although gables are present on the site these are significantly different in form and character to the proposed porch which would be more domestic in its design and appearance.

6. The proposed porch whilst not being visible from the wider surrounding area would nonetheless be a prominent feature on the entrance into the courtyard development. It would be at odds with the established character of the site frontage, interrupting the simple horizontal emphasis and repetition within the

openings, and is not reflective of the design of the wider courtyard development.

7. Furthermore, it would unbalance and detract from the development block of which it forms part, and which is a prominent and important element of the wider courtyard development.

8. The central gable feature follows through to the rear elevation and whilst there are some more domestic features, such as the dormer windows visible here, there is still a clear, simple repetition to the rear elevation. Again, this is mirrored at No.6, and is in keeping with the rural character and appearance of the surrounding area.

9. The rear extension due to its size and design would be an incongruous addition. It would result in a contrived roof arrangement, wrapping around existing dormers obscuring them from view. Furthermore, due to its size, design and proximity it would compete with the existing central gable projection which is a key feature of the site and wider development of which it forms an intrinsic part. The existing boundary hedge to the rear may restrict wider views though I do not consider this would be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

10. Whilst both the proposed porch and rear extension may have characteristics of rural and agricultural buildings they do not relate well to the existing property and would harm its existing character and appearance and that of the wider courtyard development.

11. I note the appellant's submission that they consider the proposals would improve the function of the building and provide for their future needs. However, I do not consider that this would be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposals would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and host dwelling. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies DM4 and DM10 of the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD which seek to ensure that developments complement and enhance the character of the surrounding area, with regard to scale, layout, design, materials and architectural features.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR