



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Monday 20 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/21/3282738

5 Cloud Lea, Mountsorrel, Loughborough LE12 7DX

- 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 Darren Millward against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/21/1086/2, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front and side extension. Minor internal alterations to existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed single storey extension to front and side of dwelling at 5 Cloud Lea, Mountsorrel, Loughborough LE12 7DX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/21/1086/2, dated 12 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:
 - i) Phase 2 Extension – Planning (rev B)(1)
 - ii) Phase 2 Extension – Planning (rev B)
 - iii) Location Plan – Neighbouring Properties

Preliminary Matters

2. Charnwood Borough Council's Decision Notice sets out the description of the proposal as "Proposed single storey extension to front and side of dwelling". This description more accurately describes the proposal and I have therefore dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The application (P/21/1086/2) is a resubmission and is identical to a previously refused planning application referenced P/20/0093/2.
4. Following the refusal of the application the revised National Planning Policy Framework (2021) has been published. The parties have had the opportunity to comment on this as part of their appeal submissions. There have been no fundamental changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to its compatibility to the host dwelling.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling at No 5 Cloud Lea and is located within an established residential area. The surrounding area is generally characterised by detached two storey properties. Although there is some variation to style, the properties have been built in similar design and materials to the appeal site dwelling. In the immediate area there are examples of dwellings with single storey front and side extensions.
7. In my judgement, the proposed extension would not protrude above the existing roof lines and would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The new roof would be a flat roof extending from the existing garage to the principal elevation but would then change to a pitched roof above the porch and garage entrance. Although there would be a variation in roof line, this new pitched roof above the porch and garage entrance would visually integrate the new addition with the host dwelling. Taken together with the external materials to match the existing dwelling, the proposal would relate well to the host dwelling and would not be detrimental to its appearance. The extension would therefore be compatible in design with the original dwelling and in accordance with Charnwood Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Document for Design SPD (2020). Amongst other things, the SPD advises that extensions should be designed so the main property is still the dominant building and the roof and eave lines should be lower than the existing house. The roofline and front elevation of the proposed extension would be similar in scale to neighbouring extensions and therefore would not dominate the street-scene or undermine the rhythm of the street frontage. Consequently, the proposed extension would not be incongruous or out of keeping with the street-scene, but instead would politely integrate with the prevailing character of the area.
8. I note the Council considered that similar nearby extensions to that proposed tend to be screened by flanking dwellings but from my observations this would also be true to the appeal site. Some of these existing extensions are in a more prominent location on Cloud Lea than the appeal site. As the bulk of the proposed extension is positioned on the side of the dwelling facing north, it would not be intrusive when entering into Cloud Lea (off Walton Way) and heading north towards the appeal property. The front part of the extension would be visible from the public realm, but this would not look too dissimilar to the neighbouring properties nearby and No 5 is set back from the road with a front garden.
9. Overall, for the reasons above, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and be compatible in design with the host dwelling. Accordingly, it complies with Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011-2028 Core Strategy (adopted 2015), which amongst other things, seeks to ensure new development responds positively to their context and respect and enhance the character of the area, having regard to scale, density, massing, height and materials. Furthermore, I find the proposal to comply with saved policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 1991-2006 (adopted 2004). Policy EV/1 seeks to ensure new development is of a design, layout, scale and

mass compatible with the locality and neighbouring buildings. Saved policy H/17 seeks to ensure new development remains compatible with the original dwelling and does not appear as an intrusive or incongruous feature in the street-scene.

10. For the same reasons, the proposal would adhere with the National Planning Policy Framework (para 130), which emphasises the importance of securing good design and states that development should respond to local character and add to the overall qualities of the area.

Conditions

11. I have assessed the conditions put forward by the Council against the National Planning Policy Framework (para 56), and I am satisfied that these conditions meet the tests. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition is imposed to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, by requiring the external materials match those of the existing building. For reasons of certainty, a condition is imposed to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the NPPF, and taken account of all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR