



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/D/19/3236368
20 The Croft, Measham DE12 7NL

- 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 Statham against the decision of North West Leicestershire District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01038/FUL, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor extension above existing extension to front and rear elevations.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The Croft is characterised by similarly designed two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Many of the dwellings have single storey projections or open porch canopies to their front elevation. No 20 The Croft is consistent with this character and has a single storey front projection with a mono-pitched roof. This matches a front projection on the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 19 The Croft.
4. The projection of the front extension forward of the first-floor front elevation would alter the appearance of the house to the point that its shared characteristics with neighbouring dwellings would be unduly diminished. The development would also unbalance the appearance of the dwelling with the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling at No 19, emphasising its incongruity within the street scene. Matching materials are proposed but this would not be enough to reduce the prominence of the development so as to mitigate the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appellant contends that they have attempted to minimise the scale of the proposal whilst also seeking to cater for the needs of their family. My attention has also been drawn to a lack of objection to the proposals from third-parties. Even so, these matters do not overcome the fact that the front extension would be at odds with the well-defined characteristics of the street.

6. My attention has been drawn to the design of a more recently constructed dwelling at end of The Croft. Having seen this dwelling during my site visit, its position at the end of the row of properties means it is visually distinct from the appeal dwelling. I do not find that this example represents the prevailing character of dwellings on The Croft which predominantly do not have first floor front projections. I am therefore not persuaded that this comparison justifies the proposal, nor would it assist in assimilating the development into the street scene.
7. I note the Council did not raise concerns with regards to the impact of the proposed rear extension. From what I saw on site, I find no reason to disagree with this conclusion. However, this does not overcome the harm that would be caused by the front extension.
8. To conclude, the first-floor front extension would be an incongruous feature within the street scene and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy D1 (Design of New Development) of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan (2017) which amongst other things states that developments must offer a good standard of design. The development would also conflict with the Good Design for North West Leicestershire Supplementary Planning Document for new developments which amongst other things states that extensions should appear as sympathetic additions and help to maintain the original appearance of a house and the wider area.
9. The proposal would conflict with Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states amongst other things that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and should be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR