



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/21/3276592

57 Forest Rise, Thurnby, Leicester LE7 9PG

- 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 H Singh against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00532/FUL, dated 19 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable conversion with an extension of rear box dormer to the side and to the rear of the property, new front porch and annexe in the rear garden space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the adjoining semi-detached property of which it forms a part and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached extended bungalow located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties of similar form with hipped and gabled roofs set back from the road. No. 57 Forest Rise has a hipped tiled roof with a distinctive off-centre gabled extension projecting from the front of the property that matches the adjoining semi-detached property of which it forms a part.
4. The proposal would entail the construction of a hipped to gabled roof extension/loft conversion and flat roof dormer extension to the side and rear. A new flat roofed porch extension is proposed at the front and a detached outbuilding/annexe at the rear of the property.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 on Extensions to Dwellings 2003 states that extensions should be in keeping with and subservient to the original building in terms of scale, mass and design. It states that pitched roofs will be encouraged on all extensions for visual amenity and good building design reasons.
6. The proposed gabled roof extension would result in a material alteration to the property's hipped roof, which currently makes a positive contribution on the

roofscape of the host building. The proposed roof alteration would result in additional bulk at the side of the main dwelling that would be very much at odds with the more modest form and appearance of the host building and the adjoining semi-detached property of which it forms a part.

7. Whilst the new front porch would not project significantly forward, it would be directly linked to the gabled extension projecting from the front of the property. The lack of clear separation coupled with the flat roof design over the new porch would result in a material alteration to the property's gabled frontage, which currently makes a positive contribution to the host building.
8. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the proposal's position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Forest Rise. The proposed gabled roof extension and new front porch, by virtue of their scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed extensions would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property, adjoining semi-detached property and the area.
9. I have considered the appellant's arguments regarding the design and layout of the proposed extensions have been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the other roof designs in the area. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposed extensions with the host property, these aspects again do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed gabled roof extension and new front porch would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached property 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. This policy, amongst other things, seeks 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, street scene and environment to ensure it is integrated into the existing built form. The proposal would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 126) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 130).

Other Matters

11. I have considered the appellant's comments regarding the family's personal circumstances and the benefits arising from the additional disabled persons accommodation proposed. I have considerable sympathy for the appellant's circumstances. However, the courts have generally taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. Although personal circumstances can sometimes justify a personal or temporary permission, that would not be appropriate here where a permanent structure is intended. There is insufficient justification for the scale and form of the extensions proposed.
12. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant's. However, the examples of residential properties in the surrounding area have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.

13. I have considered the appellant's arguments regarding the type of extensions that can be built on a dwellinghouse under General Permitted Development Rights and prior approval process. 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.
14. I have noted the issues raised by the appellant regarding the way in which the application was processed by the Council. However, these are a material consideration to which I can attach only limited weight in making this decision.
15. 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

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR