
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/20/3249025
711 Welford Road, Leicester LE2 6HX

- 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 Patel against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20200001, dated 1 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension with part double part single rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 2 storey semi detached house finished in a mix of brick and render on a residential road of similarly styled semi-detached and detached properties, some of which have been subject to extension and alteration.
4. There is some variation in the design and in the colour and finish of dwellings in the vicinity. However, they are not so different as to have a jarring impact. This would not be the case for the proposed scheme which would be finished in grey tiles in the street facing part of the extension and a mix of grey tiles and timber battens to the rear.
5. I do not consider the design or choice of materials to be innovative or outstanding and the development would not create positive visual interest. Whilst the hipped roof design of the extension would mirror the proportions of the main dwelling, this would be insufficient to overcome the extent to which the extension would be an incongruous addition as a consequence of the choice of materials. The development would fail to assimilate with either the existing property or its surroundings. The appellant's claim that over time the materials would add tonal and textual qualities would do little to mitigate the dissonant appearance. The fact that the site is not located in a Conservation Area does not make the poor design acceptable.

6. Whilst there may have been amendments to the original scheme along with the incorporation of the requests of neighbours, this is not sufficient to overcome the harm that would be created by the development.
7. The appellant has referred to other properties granted planning permission with the use of timber boarding, cladding and tiles. I have limited details about the circumstances of the approval but in any event I consider it to be different by virtue of a different use of materials and therefore not directly comparable to the scheme before me. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment has been based on the information before me.
8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the part of CS Policy 3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy which requires new development to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area in terms of amongst other things materials. It would also conflict with the part of the Residential Amenity Supplementary Planning Document which advises that new development should fit into the fabric of the existing environment and that well designed extensions should match the original appearance of the housing materials and should not adversely affect the quality and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Similarly, the development would conflict with the parts of paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which identifies that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and that development should not be supported where it is of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's reasons for the extension to the property and that it would utilise land available within the plot. I also acknowledge the identified absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR