



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/19/3230669

19 Mickleton Drive, Leicester LE5 6GE

- 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 and Mrs Hossain against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20190572, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of single storey extension at front; two storey extension at side and rear; single storey extension at side and rear of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The dwelling is a two storey semi-detached property and the other properties on the street follow a similar pattern and scale, although there is some variation in the design and materials used. The dwelling is located opposite the junction between Mickleton Drive and Susan Avenue. The dwellings on the street are typically set back from the roadside with decent sized front gardens. Many of the properties have single storey garages to the side of the property which helps to maintain the open suburban character of the street scene.
5. A hip to gable roof extension has been completed on the dwelling but not the connected property and as a result the balance between the two properties has been harmed. Despite this the two properties retain a similar appearance.
6. The first-floor extension to the rear of the property would not include any windows on either side of it albeit a large window is proposed on the rear projection. Nevertheless, the occupiers would have limited opportunities to overlook the gardens of the neighbouring properties or appear overbearing and as a result the rear extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. The rear extension would not extend beyond the rear of the existing ground floor extension and would not extend the full width of the host property. Consequently, it would appear subordinate to the host

dwelling. The ground floor rear extension, which would connect to the two-storey side extension and would, in effect, be a small porch and this would be subordinate to the host dwelling, due to its size and appearance.

7. The front elevation of the side extension would mimic the existing property by adding another projection with bay windows on both floors. This would create some symmetry with the host building but would further unbalance the semi-detached dwellings. The extension would also not be set back from the front of the host dwelling and as a result the extension would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The size, scale and appearance of the dwelling would dominate the host dwelling
8. The side extension would extend almost the full width of the plot and would not retain a 1 metre gap from the edge of the boundary. This would be contrary to the design guidance set out in the Residential Amenity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). By extending almost the full width of the plot and the inclusion of the bay windows on both floors, the extension would have a terracing effect on the street scene and would not follow the prevailing pattern of development in the street. The dwelling is in a prominent location and as such the site and the immediate street scene is more sensitive to overdevelopment.
9. The single storey extension on the front of the property would add a porch to the dwelling, which would not necessarily be uncommon in the area, although it would appear significantly larger and more prominent than other porches within the street scene. The inclusion of a balcony on the first floor on top of this porch would appear out of context for the street scene. Whilst there is a property within the street with a first-floor balcony, that dwelling is a 1.5 storey detached building that does not follow the prevailing pattern of development. Furthermore, the large glazed area above the porch would be unsympathetic with the existing design of the dwelling and would harm its appearance and the appearance of the street scene.
10. The proposed development would visually unbalance the properties, because the side extension would not be subordinate to the host dwelling and would, combined with the porch, dominate the host property. I find that the redesign of the external appearance of the dwelling would result in significant adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policy CS03 of the Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted July 2014 (CS) and with saved Policy CS10 of The City of Leicester Local Plan Saved Policies Version (2006) (LP). It would also be contrary to the advice set out in the SPD.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR