



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/D/20/3252644

2 Southside Road, Braunstone Town LE3 2YZ

- 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 Kalpesh Patel against the decision of Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/1520/HH, dated 14 November 2019 was refused by notice dated 25 February 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a "loft extension to existing 4 bedroom detached property. Provision of additional 2 bedrooms and a wet room in the Loft space to address the needs of the family. The extension tables the design as dormer extension on the rear, and a small dormer and rooflight to the Front elevation. The design will require the ridgeline to be raised by to (*sic*) allow for sufficient internal headroom."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. During the course of the application, amended plans were submitted that replaced the proposed front dormer with a rooflight and made alterations to the rear roof extension to incorporate pitched roof elements. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached 2 storey dwelling that is located on the corner of Southside Road and Shipman Road. The external materials are mainly buff brickwork and grey concrete tiles. Adjacent to a front gable projecting element is a single modest sized steeply pitched roof dormer that also extends beneath a low eaves level. The result of the eaves arrangement is that the side wall facing Shipman Road has an asymmetrical appearance. The rear roof plane is undisturbed and with the gap to the neighbouring property on Shipman Road, it is visible for some distance along this road.
5. The broader area consists of a modern housing estate. It exhibits a planned layout with a number of uniform house types. Where dormers are found on

these houses, they are of the same, or a similar, form to that found on the front of the appeal property.

6. The proposed roof extension would take the form of a large box like dormer that would extend across much of the rear roof plane. It would take somewhat of an unusual form in that it would consist of three elements with slightly pitched roofs that would be connected together. When this uncharacteristic design is considered with its scale and massing, and the use of standing seam cladding as one of the external materials, it would be an incongruous element on the more conventional appearance of the property. It would also result in the property having more of a vertical alignment, including when the window positions are considered. This would be out of keeping with the more balanced proportions of the existing property.
7. In addition, the proposed roof extension would bear little resemblance to the dormer or the gable feature on the front roof plane because it would be of a wholly different form and with a markedly different roof pitch. It would not sit comfortably with the asymmetrical side wall, but would imbalance the roof areas of the property with its raised elevation.
8. Its prominence on the rear roof plane would reinforce that the proposed roof extension would appear as a visually discordant feature on Shipman Road. As this road leads towards the site, attention would be drawn to that it would appear stark in these surroundings. A slender tree on Shipman Road would provide limited shielding and the neighbouring property would only afford screening some distance from the site.
9. With the difference in style from the smaller dormers that are found on the estate, it would introduce a noticeable degree of divergence from how the estate was planned, in terms of its design. That it would not be viewed from other roads in the area would not address that it would be out of place when seen from Shipman Road.
10. In relation to other extensions in the area, the rear extension at 63 Shipman Road is not easily visible from the streetscene and is viewed across the rear of other properties' gardens. The roof extension on 14 Riddington Road lies outside of the estate and it is also not as visible to the same degree as the appeal property because, again, it is viewed across other properties. Other designed roof extensions that I have been referred to are not apparent in the vicinity of the site. The site circumstances are sufficiently different so as to not change my views.
11. The strategic objectives set out with Policy DM1 of the Council's Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document (2019) (Delivery DPD) refer to housing mix and quantity, and crime prevention related matters. However, the strategic objectives and the policy itself seek to improve design quality and for a proposal to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, amidst other design related matters. With the harm that arises, Policy DM1 as a whole counts against the proposal.
12. I am not unsympathetic concerning the need for more accommodation and no doubt it is a pleasant community to live in. These are largely personal benefits, though, and would not outweigh the harm that would arise. The same applies by way of the costs and design challenge of a proposal that may be more agreeable to the Council.

13. I have also been referred to 'permitted development rights'. The raising of the main roof ridge would, though, be required to facilitate the introduction of the proposed roof extension, based on the evidence before me. As a fallback position, it does not therefore alter my conclusion. That the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties simply attracts neutral weight.
14. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would not comply with Policy DM1 of the Delivery DPD for the reasons that I have set out and with Policy CS2 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2013) where it states that all new development should respect distinctive local character and that design should be appropriate in its context, amongst other considerations.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR