



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/21/3270023

11 Anthony Drive, Thurnby, Leicestershire LE7 9RA

- 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 Milovan Scepanovic against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/201662/FUL, dated 19 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension, single storey extension and rear 'box' dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear 'box' dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Anthony Drive ('the road') slopes down towards the appeal site, on approach from Herrick Drive. This section of Anthony Drive is comprised of understated bungalows set consistently in modest, regularly arranged plots behind small front drives and gardens. Many of the bungalows are of a similar form and are positioned relatively close to one another, likely being laid out originally around the same era. The rhythm of the repeating form of the gable roofs is a defining and consistent feature of the local character.
4. Due to this slope in the road and the orientation of the appeal building on the turn in the road, its roof profile and that of the neighbouring bungalow are visible on approach from Herrick Drive. In this view they appear as a continuation of the style of houses along Anthony Drive being single storey with a front to rear gable roof, and are therefore consistent with the prevailing character.
5. There is, however, a change in the character of the road in the vicinity of the site where two storey houses are the predominant form. That occurs southwards from No 9, and westwards from No 24. Due to the presence of two storey properties in the area, the two storey nature of the proposal would not be out of character with its immediate context.
6. However, the proposed rear dormer would create the appearance of a three storey building with rear facing windows at roof level. Although not visible from the entirety of the road, it would be seen from a reasonable distance on

approach from Herrick Drive. From this direction the box dormer would appear as an incongruous feature and unduly dominant in the street scene. This would be emphasised by its proximity to the neighbouring single storey bungalow. I note the two storey extension to No 9 which includes some form of dormer, however that relates to an existing two storey semi-detached building. Together with its location set back from the turn in Anthony Drive, this means the rear dormer at No 9 is far less visible and consequently much less dominant in views from the road.

7. Given the visibility of the rear elevation of No 11 from the road, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would naturally draw the eye and appear discordant rather than integrating suitably with the prevailing character of its surroundings. Whilst I note that the Council does not raise concerns in respect of the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties, the absence of harm in that respect does not justify allowing the appeal.
8. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policy GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 (April 2019) which seeks to ensure a high standard of design that, amongst other matters, respects local character. For the above reasons the proposal would be contrary to the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, including paragraph 127 which supports development that is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. Whilst I accept that the proposal would be beneficial to the occupants of No 11, there are nevertheless, no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR