



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/19/3243531

28 Hall Lane, Witherley, Atherstone, Warwickshire CV9 3LT

- 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 Leigh Jones against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00929/HOU, dated 8 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension to front, side and rear of existing dwelling. Two storey and single storey.
-

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 property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property comprises a detached two-storey dwelling located within a small cul-de-sac in Hall Lane. There are a range of dwelling types and designs in the street, however the properties in the immediate surroundings of the appeal site are detached bungalows and two-storey properties which have similar roof forms and fenestration detailing, and are finished with matching materials. The consistent appearance of the properties forms a distinct character which contributes positively to the area. The proposal seeks to add single storey front and rear extensions, and two-storey front, side and rear extensions.
 5. The Council raises no objection to the single storey front and rear extensions. Based on my observations on site and the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree.
 6. The proposed two-storey side extension has a ridge height that would be set down from the existing roof. However, the roofs of the proposed front and side two-storey extensions would project further forwards than the existing roof,
-

- and, given the step down in ridge height of the side extension, this would create three different eaves heights at the first-floor level. This would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties, which have one eaves level at the first-floor level, and would result in an awkward and busy appearance that would be overly obtrusive in the street scene
7. The proposed front and side two-storey extensions each include a wall dormer, which would be flush with the proposed front elevations and project above the roof planes. Small front gable features are not uncommon in this part of the street, including at the neighbouring property, however these do not contain windows. The proposed wall dormers would contain windows, and the dormer to the side extension would be considerably larger than the existing front gable features in the street.
 8. Furthermore, the existing windows in the appeal property and surrounding dwellings are modest in size and generally align with the other windows in each property. The proposed window in the front extension would be substantially taller than the existing first-floor windows in the immediate street scene and would not align with the other proposed and existing first-floor windows in the appeal property, with the window sill being at a lower height.
 9. The proposal would result in a blank expanse of brickwork in between the top of garage doors and the first-floor window of the side extension. However, this would not be dissimilar to the expanse of brickwork between the ground floor and first-floor windows at the neighbouring property. However, for the reasons above, the proposed two-storey front and side extensions would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties, forming a discordant feature in the cul-de-sac and when viewed from the street. As a result, it would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
 10. I therefore conclude that the two-storey front and side extensions would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding properties and area, and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM10 of the Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan 2006-2026: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016). This policy requires development to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area.
 11. My attention has been drawn to photographs of extensions that are under construction and an example of a property with front dormers. No details of the extensions, including the location of the property, or any planning permission has been submitted, so I am unable to assess whether this extension is comparable to the proposal before me. Similarly, no details have been submitted regarding the front dormers as to whether they are original features or have been added after the original dwelling was constructed. In any case I have considered this appeal on its own merits.
 12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR