



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/20/3258153

2 Langdale Avenue, Loughborough LE11 3RP

- 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 Andrew Ellis against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/20/0772/2, dated 29 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2020.
 - The development is a proposed single storey side extension with first floor within hipped roof space.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises a single storey side extension. A first floor is not proposed within the roof space. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 2 relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a gable roof. Although the address of the property is Langdale Avenue, the front elevation of the dwelling faces onto Keswick Avenue. The driveway to the side of the property is also accessed from that road. The attached dwelling at No. 4 is essentially set at right angles and the matching front gable of that property faces onto Langdale Avenue such that the two properties effectively 'turn the corner' between the two residential roads.

6. The existing dwelling has a simple rectangular floorplan and is situated centrally within the plot, with the garden to one side and the garage and shed to the other. The simplicity in the floorplan is replicated in the external appearance with a well-balanced front elevation with a modest porch, a degree of symmetry in the window arrangement and a simple front gable to the roof. Some variety is introduced through brick detailing and the contrast between buff coloured brick on the upper floor and red brick elsewhere. The result is a well-proportioned yet simple dwelling which sits comfortably within the plot.
7. The extension would be marginally set back from the principal elevation and there would be a gap to the side boundary. The existing dwelling is comparatively narrow in relation to its depth. In contrast, the extension would be set at right angles to the main house and its width would be greater than that of the existing dwelling. It would result in an elongated appearance which would unbalance the front façade and give the dwelling a lop-sided appearance. The use of a hipped roof would add further contrast to the simple gable of the present dwelling. As a result, due to its width and design, the extension would appear unsympathetic to the proportions of the original property.
8. The scheme would have a greater visual impact than the existing garage and shed. There is currently a gap between the dwelling and the outbuildings. The shed is also stepped back significantly from the building line. The outbuildings read as subordinate ancillary buildings whereas the scheme would be more dominant due to its scale and massing.
9. There are a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings within the surrounding area which display various styles and designs, including pitched and hipped roofs. The appellant has drawn my attention to extensions within the local area. These include extensions which have a different roof form to the original property. However, I do not know the circumstances of those cases in terms of when planning permission was granted or the local policy position at that time.
10. Notwithstanding that there may be some historic examples of less than sympathetic extensions within the local area, I observed on my site visit that generally extensions respect the proportions and design of the host property, even though the individual characteristics of dwellings vary. The extensions highlighted do not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site and each application must be determined on its individual merits. Although the extension would be largely screened by the host property when approaching from the south, it would be conspicuous from the north. The width of the extension would appear out of character. Accordingly, the scheme would compromise the character and appearance of the host property and area on account of its design, scale and massing.
11. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policy CS 2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028: Core Strategy (2015), Policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 1991-2006 (2004), the Design Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design which is in keeping with the original property and the surrounding area.

Other Considerations

12. The appellant states that the extension is required to accommodate the needs of a family member which cannot be met within the existing dwelling. However, little information is before me as to the precise nature of those needs. In any event, personal circumstances can change over time and the development would remain long after such circumstances have ceased to be relevant. Based on the evidence presented, I do not consider that the personal circumstances in this case are sufficient to outweigh the conflict with local and national planning policy and the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area.
13. I acknowledge that the scheme would be acceptable in terms of parking provision, private amenity space and its effect upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR