The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/W/21/3268512
40 & 42 Ivydale Road, Thurmaston, Leicester LE4 8NE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Joshi against Charnwood Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/20/1028/2 is dated 10 July 2020.
- The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey front porch extension and loft conversion including raising ridge height and installation of rear dormers together with the erection of rear granny annex.

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 host dwelling and the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is two semi-detached properties, which are not merged into one, located in a predominately residential area.

4. The appeal seeks approval for a two-storey side extension, porch extension, and a rear outbuilding to form a 'granny annex'. It would also include raising the roof of both properties in order to allow for a dormer across the roof, and a loft conversion.

5. I find that the multiple alterations proposed to the dwellings are considerable additions to the planning unit, when seen in the context of two properties. Whilst I have no issue with the side extension and porch extension individually, as well as the outbuilding at the rear, they would represent a cumulative effect when seen as a whole.

6. However, I find the greatest harm in the raising of the roof, in order to accommodate the loft conversion and the rear dormer. The raising of the roof would make the properties appear at odds with the majority of the surrounding dwellings when added to the dormer on the side extension, I consider that this makes the overall design appear discordant and incongruous within the street scene, and the added height of the proposed roof increases the sense of domination within its surroundings to the detriment of the host dwellings and the character and appearance of the area as a whole.

7. I also have concerns regarding the size of the rear dormer, but as this would not be easily visible within the street scene or the wider area, I find that on a fine balance, it would be acceptable, despite the design and impact as a result of its size.

8. The proposed development would lead to no harm being caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of any nearby property. However, the lack of harm in this regard is a neutral factor that is not a benefit of the scheme.

9. In summary, the introduction of the extensions and the raising of the roof height would disrupt the general uniformity in terms of the nearby properties. It would be a clearly obtrusive feature in the street, visible in long views along the road, and this would disrupt the area. The discordancy in the settled street scene would be heightened by elements of the design.

10. As a result, I find the proposals are contrary to Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy (2015) and policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Charnwood Local Plan (2004) which, amongst other matters, expect development to respect and enhance the character of the area, function well and add to the quality of an area, should be of a design and scale that is compatible with the locality and not appear as an intrusive or incongruous feature in the street scene to the detriment of visual amenity.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR