



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/21/3276792

24 Lutterworth Road, Walcote LE17 4JU

- 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 Amanda Hall against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00249/FUL, dated 8 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension with part single storey rear extension with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of the application, the Council has advised that the Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (NP) has been made and now forms part of the development plan for the district. I have therefore considered the proposed development against the relevant policies of the new NP.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the adjoining terrace of properties of which it forms a part and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey end-terrace dwelling located within a row of terraced properties set back from the road within the village of Walcote.
5. The row of traditional terraced properties are of comparable scale and form, with highly decorative red brickwork with distinctive diaper pattern brickwork, porches, chimneys and dormer windows. The end terrace properties have a small brick porch and dormers on the side elevation and a distinctive front projecting gable that creates an attractive book-end feature to the row of terraced properties. The uniform architectural character of the terraced properties makes a positive contribution to the character of this part of the Village and is identified as a locally valued non-designated heritage asset in the

- NP¹. The significance of these buildings can be readily appreciated within the immediate vicinity of the site.
6. The proposal would entail the construction of a two storey side extension that would extend across the full width of the house and project out about 3.8m from the side elevation of the property with a new front porch and front dormer. The proposed extension would be set back from the front projecting gable and constructed with a dual pitched gabled roof that would be stepped down below the ridge height of the host property and adjoining terrace. The proposal would also involve the construction of a single storey pitched roofed rear extension with external horizontal timber cladding.
 7. Although the proposed extensions would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size, the scale and form of the proposed two storey side extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. Whilst it would be set back and stepped down, the proposed two storey extension would result in substantial bulk at the side and over the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest traditional form and appearance of the host building and result in the loss of the distinctive features including the small porch and dormers along the side of the building.
 8. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, where the proposed side extension would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Lutterworth Road. The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from its architectural integrity. As such, I consider that the proposed side extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property, the adjoining terrace of properties of which it forms a part and the area.
 9. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed side extension has been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the previously approved scheme at the site² and to minimise any impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
 10. Given the location of the proposed development attached to a locally valued heritage asset, Policy ENV4 of the NP states that the benefits of a development proposal should be judged against their significance as heritage assets either individually or as part of a coherent group. This policy is consistent with the aims of paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) that requires a balanced approach to assess the effect on the locally listed buildings as non-designated heritage assets.
 11. I consider that the proposed two storey extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would have a negative material impact and would harm the locally valued heritage asset. Given the modest scale of the development, the harm would be less than substantial. I note the appellant's desire is to provide additional living accommodation and secure its optimum viable use. However,

¹ Policy ENV4 and Appendix 8 of the Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan 2021

² 04/00057/FUL

I find insufficient public benefit arising from this proposal to offset the identified harm to which I attach significant weight.

12. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property, the adjoining terrace of properties of which it forms a part and the area. It is contrary to the overall aims of Policy GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2019 and Policies ENV4 and HBE6 of the NP, which I consider are relevant to this case. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design that respect and enhance the local character and characteristics of the individual site and area and the significance of locally valued heritage assets and their important contribution to the area.
13. The proposal would also not accord with the Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 126), that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 130) and the desirability of conserving and enhancing the significance of non-designated heritage assets (paragraph 203).

Other Matters

14. I have noted the other developments drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the two storey side extension and alterations granted at the appeal property in 2004³ are of a different scale and form and were approved in a different policy context. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with this case.
15. I have considered the appellant's arguments regarding the type of extensions that can be built on a dwellinghouse under General Permitted Development Rights. Whilst this may be so, this does not set a precedent for such an inappropriate development in this location for the reasons set out above.
16. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design and to create additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR

³ 04/00057/FUL