
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2021

by G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/D/21/3281736

1 Primrose Close, Narborough, Leicester LE19 3FW

- 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 Michelle Brookes against the decision of Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1433/HH, dated 13 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a '2 storey side and 1.5 storey front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I noted from my site visit that the property is undergoing alteration following the planning permission granted in November 2020. The appeal proposal seeks to amend this partly implemented scheme to increase the height of the front extension and incorporate two dormers on the roof slope above the garage.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a detached two storey dwelling occupying a visually prominent corner plot within a reasonably modern residential estate, fronting on to Primrose Close. It is clearly visible from The Pastures, one of the main roads through the area. Surrounding buildings are a mix of two storey dwellings and bungalows of varied character. Where properties have been extended, such additions are generally designed to be subordinate to the host property.
5. Whilst the front extension under construction is a subordinate addition, with the ridge sitting below the first-floor window sills, the increased height of the appeal proposal would substantially add to the visual bulk, scale and massing of the addition, making it more dominant and restricting views of the front of the dwelling from the eastern approach along The Pastures. The unifying of the roofline with the lean-to addition on the gable would also add to the visual massing and dominance of the appeal proposal, as would the addition of dormers to facilitate the enlarged first floor. The appellant has commented that the existing boundary hedge would provide an effective screen for the

extension, but this would not assist in mitigating the impact of the additional height and massing from raising the roof.

6. The appeal scheme would be a disproportionate and dominating addition to the front elevation of this prominent building, to the detriment of both its design and the character and appearance of the area generally. The proposed development would therefore have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy CS2 of the Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2013) and Policy DM1 of the Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document (2019) which seek, amongst other things, to improve the design quality of all new development. It would also be contrary to the high-quality design expectations of section 12 of the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has identified properties within the surrounding area which have dormers to prominent elevations. Whilst I acknowledge that dormers feature on several other local buildings, I have already commented above that in this case the dormers would add to the visual massing and dominance of the front extension, contributing to the harm, rather than the presence of the dormers themselves. The appellant has also commented that the ground levels would make the front extension more like a single storey extension but having viewed the partly implemented scheme and reviewed the appeal proposals I have already taken these ground levels into account in reaching my conclusion.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR

