



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/19/3241607

420 Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford, LE6 0HA

- 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 Wicken against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/19/1799/2, dated 23 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations to create additional habitable space with a front facing glazed roof feature and balustrade. Roof to be replaced with grey slate tiles. New Side facing dormer. New front door. Revised scheme to previous approval P/19/0948/2.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a modest detached bungalow with an existing rear extension, set along the southern side of Bradgate Road. There is a range of house designs and sizes along the street, with many properties having been previously extended. However, the appeal property is within a group of five bungalows which have a similar, simple design and hipped roofs. Whilst there are some differences in the detailed design of each property, the uniformity in the form and modest appearance of the bungalows defines the character of the group.
5. Planning permission¹ exists for a roof extension with a side dormer, alterations to the fenestration to provide a habitable room in the first floor, and for an inset balcony to be provided in the front elevation. A hipped roof has been approved that is in keeping with the character and appearance of the group of

¹ Planning application ref P/19/0948/2

bungalows. The appeal scheme seeks to raise the roof by the same amount as has already been approved, but to alter the front elevation to include a cantilevered gable with a feature window and balcony at the first-floor level.

6. While there is a range of designs along the street, some of which include gables and first floor balconies to the front elevations, the proposed gable would be out of character and appearance with the hipped roofs of the group of bungalows. I acknowledge that the previously approved increase in ridge height will make the building different from others in the group. However, the cantilevered roof with its oversailing eaves and substantial area of glazing would increase the prominence of the extension and would highlight the difference between the appeal proposal and the other bungalows of the group. Moreover, the proposal would not respect the modest appearance of the host dwelling or its neighbours and would thereby detract from the character and appearance of the group of bungalows.
7. From all I have read, I have no reason to consider that the approved scheme would not be built if this appeal fails. It is therefore a realistic fallback position. I acknowledge the appellant's contention that a gabled frontage may reflect the proposed gable at the rear of the property. However, whilst the building may be glimpsed as a whole from, albeit limited, public vantage points, the treatment of the frontage would be read in the context of the adjacent bungalows which have hipped roofs. As set out above, the oversailing cantilevered roof would reflect neither the form or appearance of the host building or its immediate neighbours. I am unconvinced therefore that the roof form would be 'better balanced' as a result of this proposal. Similarly, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the proposal constitutes a 'higher quality design'. Rather, because of its scale, form and appearance, the proposal would dominate and thereby detract from the host dwelling. Accordingly, the fallback position would cause less harm to the character and appearance of the building and wider group, and does not therefore persuade me that permission should be granted.
8. I note that several other extensions in the street have been granted planning permission for extensions or have been altered in some way, including a hip to gable roof extension at No. 442 and a gabled extension at No 478. However, these properties do not appear to have been part of a group of similar properties and therefore any variations in design would have contributed positively towards the character of the street scene. Moreover, the detailed design and form of these developments, and their relationship with their host properties, is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Consequently, these developments do not justify the proposal before me.
9. I acknowledge that the proposal would modernise the interior of the dwelling and its external appearance. However, it seems to me that the Council does not object to the principle of modernisation. Moreover, the approved scheme would also achieve this aim.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy (2015) and Policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan (2004). These policies all seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are of a design, scale and mass compatible with the locality; respect and enhance the character and

appearance of the area and that residential extensions do not appear as incongruous features in the street scene.

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

D Ellis

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 the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR