



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 January 2021

by Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) DMS MCIEH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/20/3261668

1 Salisbury Close, Desford, Leicestershire LE9 9HJ

- 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 Mrs H Johnson against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00762/HOU, dated 27 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension including internal reconfiguration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Salisbury Close is a residential cul-de-sac on a large housing estate characterised by a mixture of regularly spaced semi-detached houses and detached dwellings. An important feature which creates a pleasant sense of spaciousness on the estate and helps to offset the density of development is the presence of open corners, particularly at first floor level. The semi-detached house at 1 Salisbury Close, which is on a corner plot, is an example in point.
4. The proposed side extension would occupy almost the full width of the open corner at No 1 and result in the loss of its openness. At more than half the width of the house, and set level with its front elevation and roof ridge, it would also dominate the dwelling and unbalance the semi-detached pair of houses of which it forms a part.
5. Reference has been made to two other flush side extensions along Parkstone Road. These extensions though are too few in number and too widely separated to have changed the character and appearance of the estate to the extent that the appeal proposal would fit in. A side extension to a house on St Martins' Drive has also been referred to. However, as its extension is set well back from the side of its plot the openness of the street corner has been retained. Reference to these other extensions therefore has not altered my findings in relation to the proposal and are not a consideration of material weight in favour of the appeal.

6. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document which, amongst other matters, seeks to prevent such harm.

Other Matters

7. In order to put into practice the appellant's beliefs and cater for a family, larger accommodation is sought and the proposed extension would address this. However, given the degree of harm caused, and that it is probable that the extension would remain long after such personal circumstances cease to be material, I find that this consideration is insufficient to outweigh the conflict that would occur with the development plan.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector