



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/20/3264134

3 Market Place, Billesdon, Leicester LE7 9AJ

- 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 Whitehouse against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01114/FUL, dated 27 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extensions, front porch extension and alterations to front facade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling in an area of mixed development types. The property has the benefit of an extant approval for a single storey extension.
4. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey extension to the side of the dwelling, a first-floor extension over the approved extension, and various other improvement works.
5. The appeal site is located within a Conservation Area, and within the locality of a number of Listed Buildings.
6. Billesdon Conservation Area has two important focal spaces, being Market Place and the Green near the church. The closeness of the buildings, groupings around the marketplace, the mixture of building materials and cottages with larger houses and farmhouses gives Billesdon its particular character, according to the Conservation Area Description.
7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area
8. The proposals would make the dwelling appear dominant within the locality, and from my site visit, I consider that the extensions would overwhelm the existing dwelling and not respect the scale and proportions of the original dwelling.

9. The combination of what would be effectively two storey extensions to each side of the original dwelling would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which in that locality has properties that demonstrate relatively simple proportions and designs.
10. It must be accepted that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which consists of three dimensions.
11. In regard to the economic role, some small benefits would be accrued in the construction works required to facilitate the extensions and improvements, while the social role is covered by the provision of additional living accommodation. Notwithstanding this, the environmental role is key, I have found that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the Conservation Area, this harm is significant in that when taking the three dimensions together, the development would not constitute sustainable development.
12. Whilst I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. In accordance with Paragraph 196 of the Framework, less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. The appellant has forwarded a number of personal circumstances as to why the development is suitable, but these cannot be considered to be wider public benefits and therefore do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the Conservation Area.
14. In conclusion on this issue, I therefore find the proposals are contrary to Policies GD8 and HC1 of the Harborough Local Plan and policy BP7 of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Development Plan which, amongst other matters, expect development to enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the settlement concerned and reflect the special characteristics of the Conservation Area. In addition to this, the proposals do not meet the heritage aspects of the Framework.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to the letters of support of the proposals, but I find the harm to the Conservation Area outweighs the positives from what the supporters consider to be design improvements in the wider context.

Conclusion

16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR