
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

by D M Young JP BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/20/3246586
50 Dovedale Road, Leicester LE2 2DJ

- 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 R Parkes against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20191779, dated 13 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first floor extension at front above existing garage; construction of two and single storey extension at rear of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the construction of a first floor extension at front above existing garage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the construction of two and single storey extension at rear of house at 50 Dovedale Road, Leicester LE2 2DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20191779, dated 13 September 2019, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with plan reference 511/P01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice and the Appellant's Appeal Form rather than the version given on the Application Form.
3. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposed front extension to be unacceptable. However, there is no dispute between the parties that the rear extensions would be acceptable, and I see no reason to take a contrary view. As the rear extensions are clearly severable both physically and functionally from the front extension, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the rear extensions only.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the Dovedale Road street scene.

Reasons

5. Dovedale Road serves residential properties along its length which generally lack a consistent architectural approach. Nonetheless, dwellings tend to be two-storeys in height, of traditional appearance and set back from the roadside behind open-fronted gardens and/or paved driveways. The width of Dovedale Road and the presence of established street trees lend the area a spacious and pleasant suburban character.
6. The appeal property is set-back more than most and has an attached garage to the front of the property which unusually in the context of Dovedale Road is positioned perpendicular to the main house obscuring part of the façade.
7. The proposed front extension would sit on top of the existing garage obscuring almost half of the property when viewed from Dovedale Road. The additional bulk and mass would represent a highly conspicuous addition to the property reinforcing the existing sense of imbalance and incongruence. The additional roof height in particular would result in the building appearing confused, further harming the legibility of the core building. As a result, the front extension would be a particularly grievous and eye-drawing feature which would jar with the simple and straightforward character of its surroundings.
8. Based on the foregoing and notwithstanding the Appellant's wish to provide additional living accommodation for his family, I conclude that the front extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the Dovedale Road street scene contrary to Policy CS03 of the "*Leicester City Core Strategy 2014*" which seeks high quality design that responds positively to its surroundings. In coming to that view, I have noted examples of other developments on Dovedale Road that the Appellant has drawn my attention to. However, none of these would be comparable to the scheme before me and in any event, I have assessed the appeal on its individual merits with regard to the particular circumstances of this case.

Conclusion

9. Based on the foregoing and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the front extension and allowed in terms of the rear extensions.

D. M. Young

Inspector