



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/19/3229307

122 Ashby Road, Hinckley LE10 1SN

- 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 O'Sullivan against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00174/HOU, dated 9 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2019.
 - The development is a 7 metre x 3 metre lean-to, pitched roofed, timber carport to the front side elevation carparking area of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The car port has been erected on site and I was able to see it at the time of my visit.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated at the corner of Ashby Road and Barwell Lane and is highly visible from the street. The surrounding area is residential in character, formed of detached and semi-detached houses set back from the pavement with frontage areas incorporating a combination of garden and hard surfacing enclosed by mature tree and hedge planting. Taken together these stated features make a significantly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene.
5. A low fence and a significant mature Copper Beech tree separate the area of the proposed carport from the pavement and a similarly sized fence marks the boundary with 124 Ashby Road. The ground level of the site is also slightly lower than the frontage of No 124.
6. Whilst the constructed carport is a light weight structure incorporating slender vertical columns to support its roof, due to its position forward of the dwelling, it is highly visible across the site frontage above the fencing and planting. It is therefore prominent and intrusive within the street scene and is incongruous with the area's soft landscaped character. I note the appellants' comments that

further landscaping could help to screen the carport but I have not been provided with any convincing details to demonstrate how this could be achieved and it is unlikely that the structure could be fully screened as it needs to allow vehicles in.

7. The appellants have referred to other properties nearby in Ashby Road in order to demonstrate the presence of car ports in the street. Whilst the locations are not clear, the examples of development to which I have been referred would not be comparable with the appeal scheme. Moreover, they do not project forward to the extent of the appeal scheme or are situated to the side of the properties. In any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.
8. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed carport would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Hence, the proposals would not therefore accord with Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016). This policy suggests that development will be permitted providing that its design and layout complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area. The proposals would also conflict with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which suggests that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

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

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR