



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 08 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/21/3280792

49, Alderton Close, Leicester LE4 7RN

- 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 & Mrs K Kanabar against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20211255, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terraced dwelling located on the corner of Alderton Close. The surrounding area consists of two-storey terraced dwellings that have been built in similar design and materials to the appeal site dwelling.
4. The existing garage and front porch of 49 Alderton Close are set forward of the main building and has been designed as a hooked shape on the side facing the neighbour's property at 48 Alderton Close. The hooked shape creates a gap between the porch/garage of No 49 and the garage wall of No 48. This hooked shape design is an original feature that still exists in most properties on Alderton Close. Although it is noted that some properties have lost this feature due to extensions, according to the Council the last permission granted for a front extension was approved some time ago and local and national planning policy has since changed with a firm emphasis on design. It is also my opinion that these existing extensions visually detract from the street-scene due to their mass and the loss of the hooked feature that forms part of the design and uniformity of the original estate layout.
5. No 49 is located on a corner plot of Alderton Close. This is a prominent location on the close and would therefore make the proposed extension highly visible from the street-scene. As a result of its prominent location, the proposed extension would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature and would not contribute positively to the wider street-scene. In addition, the loss of the hooked feature would not maintain the sense of separation between dwelling frontages and would erode the established uniformity of the street. This is

because the hooked feature is a design feature that contributes to the estate's layout and uniformity which characterises the area.

6. In addition, the proposal would extend to the side of the neighbour's garage at No 48. The proposal would have a single storey pitched roof; this would sit next to the single storey flat roof garage at No 48. This change in roofline from pitched to flat roof would interrupt the roof profile of this group of dwellings and detract from the street-scene. Combined with the loss of the hooked feature and gap between the dwellings, this would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.
7. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings. The proposal would fail to accord with Policy CS03 of the Leicester City Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2014). Amongst other things, this policy requires high quality, well designed developments that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with saved policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan 1996 – 2016 (adopted 2006), which amongst other things, considers the ability of the area to assimilate development.
8. In addition, the proposal would fail to accord to the National Planning Policy Framework (para 130) where it seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout and are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I have seen the letter submitted by the appellant and note their personal circumstances, but these factors do not outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR