

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 September 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/21/3275841

21 Cradock Drive, Quorn, Loughborough LE12 8ER

- 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 Luke Marriott against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/21/0514/2, dated 12 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed new side extension to create a new ground floor utility room, first floor study and a new staircase extension to the existing roof which it is proposed to convert to create two bedrooms and a shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication and any comments received have been addressed in this decision.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Although variously extended and altered, the dwellings along the same side of Cradock Drive as No 21 are similar in scale and character with some variation in the detailed appearance of each dwelling. These detached and semi-detached dwellings typically have a projecting two-storey bay window feature and have hipped roofs with relatively large chimneys, which give the street scene a consistent rhythm. The dwellings on the opposite side of Cradock Drive vary in appearance but mostly have hipped roofs which is a consistent characteristic of the dwellings locally. The spacious gaps between the properties, particularly at roof level, contribute positively to the suburban character of the area.

6. The proposed side extension would continue the ridge height and pitch of the existing dwelling but together with the roof extension to the other side would significantly increase the scale and bulk of the roof. This larger roof would dominate the scale of the dwelling and erode the prominence of the two-storey projecting bay window as an important feature which characterises the dwellings in this stretch of road. By extending the roof to both sides and introducing half-hipped ends, the proposal would significantly and harmfully alter its form and close the gap between No 21 and its neighbours. Consequently, the roof form would appear distinctly out of character in this street scene, where hipped roofs and gaps between dwellings give a sense of spaciousness at roof level and contribute to the suburban character of the area.
7. The proposed porch would extend forward of the main part of the house and while set behind the bay window, it would start to compete with it in prominence on the front elevation, particularly given the extent of glazing proposed. While I appreciate the desire to re-use an existing decorative window, the large stairwell window proposed in an dormer breaking the eaves would be out of scale and alignment with the existing first floor windows and the other proposed front dormer, appearing as an incongruous feature.
8. The other proposed front dormer would be built in-line with the windows below it and would appear proportionate to the roof slope. The rooflights would have limited impact given their small scale and high positioning. However, the three rear dormer windows proposed would be of a significantly greater scale and as a group they would dominate the rear roof slope and appear overscaled in relation to it. Additionally, two would be wider than the windows below, and out of line with them. As a result, they would be contrary to the advice within the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2020), which identifies that dormers should match the window style and roof pitch of the existing property.
9. The proposed side extension would be screened by the bay window when approaching the dwelling along Cradock Drive, however the enlargement of the roof would be readily appreciated, as shown by the appellant's streetscape drawing. For the reasons set out above, the extensions would significantly and harmfully alter the character and appearance of the dwelling when seen from that road and the resulting dwelling would appear as an alien and incongruous alteration to the street scene.
10. The proposed enlargement of the roof and rear dormer windows would also be clearly visible from Beacon Avenue to the rear. From that viewpoint the incongruous scale and appearance of the roof would harm the character and appearance of both the dwelling and the street scene.
11. While the chimney on the flank wall of the bay window would be retained and matching materials would be used, this would not be sufficient to overcome the harm resulting from the design, scale and massing of the proposed extensions.
12. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy S2 of the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2036 (made 2019), Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy (adopted 2015) and Saved Policy EV/1 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 1991 – 2006 (adopted 2004). Together these require development to respect and enhance the character or appearance of the area, having regard to, amongst other things, scale and massing; and to be of a

design, layout, scale and mass that is compatible with the locality and neighbouring buildings and spaces.

13. Although not mentioned in the Council's reason for refusal, both the Council's officer report and the appellant's evidence refer to Saved Policy H/17 of the Local Plan and I have been provided with a copy of it. Relating specifically to extensions to dwellings it sets out four criteria to be met for permission to be granted. While the proposal would not harm the amenities of neighbours or result in the loss of landscaping, for the reasons set out above it would not remain compatible in scale, mass or design with the original dwelling and would appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene. Therefore, it would not meet all four criteria and would not be supported by that Policy.
14. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to the advice contained within the SPD and would not accord with the Framework which states that development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

15. Whilst I note the need for a larger family home, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed scheme would be the only scheme that could deliver this benefit, which would be a private benefit for the appellant and their family. The appellant suggests that loft conversions can be permitted development, however it has not been demonstrated that a similarly scale of development could be carried out as permitted development. Therefore, I afford these matters very little weight.
16. Other properties in the street have been extended in various ways, however they have not significantly altered its character and the largely consistent roof forms. Therefore, these other extensions do not justify the harm that would result from the appeal proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. There are no material considerations that indicate that the proposal would be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not accord with the development plan as a whole and, having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

L McKay

INSPECTOR