



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/20/3249827
66 Mayflower Road, Leicester LE5 5QD

- 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 M Materia against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20192337, dated 10 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is reconfiguration of the rear elevation; the reduction in height of the dwelling including the reconfiguration of the roof and removal of the rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application has been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a double fronted detached dwelling with a crown roof design and a canopy and pillars to front. There is some variety in the style and design of roofs along Mayflower Road and Evington Drive which have roof alterations and extensions. However, properties are largely semi-detached with hipped roofs.
5. Notwithstanding the size of the dwelling and its height and neighbouring extensions, the crown roof design is unduly bulky and dominant. It is clearly visible from sections of both roads and neighbouring rear gardens and its design variance is clearly noticeable and appears as an incongruous feature within the area.
6. I appreciate that the appellant has attempted to overcome the concerns previously raised but the amendments still result in a proposal that harms the character and appearance of the area.

7. I conclude that the development adversely affects the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy CS3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy (2014) which, amongst other things, requires development to contribute positively to an area's character and appearance in terms of scale, height, high quality architecture and massing.
8. It would also be contrary to paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve; developments should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR