
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2ND March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/D/22/3290448
106 Leicester Road, Glen Parva LE2 9HF

- 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 Russ Raybould against the decision of Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0616/HH, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of oak framed timber carport to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. At the site visit, there was an open timber framed structure in place at the front of the main house. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the proposal as it is shown on the plans and detailed in the evidence because it was on that basis that the Council refused planning permission.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposed carport would be a substantial detached building at the front of 106 Leicester Road, which is a 2-storey detached house within a predominantly residential area. This arrangement would be at odds with other properties along Leicester Road in the vicinity of the site that, like No 106, are set back from the highway and have deep front gardens and driveways that are largely free of any significant freestanding buildings. It is this pattern that creates a spacious feel to the local street scene, which would be significantly eroded by the introduction of new built form, as proposed.
5. That the new addition would be set at a noticeably lower level than the highway due to the difference in local ground levels would shield the proposal from public view to some extent. Over time, the planting along the highway frontage of the site would grow to also screen and visually soften the proposal when seen from the road. However, it would still be evident from vantage points near to the access driveway of No 106, and from the front of the properties on either side of the site. From these vantage points, the proposed

carport would draw the eye as an obtrusive and discordant element in the street scene and as an uncharacteristic feature within the local area.

6. In reaching this conclusion, I agree that the open fronted style of the new carport would clearly distinguish it from a garage and note that its ridge height has been kept to a minimum. I also saw that some properties in the local area have detached buildings towards their highway frontage, including the garage to which the appellant has referred. However, it is within row of dwellings along Leicester Road to which No 106 belongs, which are generally free of detached frontage buildings, that the proposal would be visually 'read'. Consequently, these examples do not lend support to the appellant's case.
7. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it is contrary to Policy CS2 of the Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document insofar as it requires new development to respect local character and for its design to be appropriate to the context. It also conflicts with Policy DM1 of the Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document, which aims to ensure that new development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
8. The Council has referred to the planning history of the site and to other historic appeals for detached garages at properties further along Leicester Road with some background details provided. While I have had regard to this evidence, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits and find it to be objectionable for the reasons given.
9. The carport would provide covered parking for 2 vehicles together with the opportunity for electric charging. In this way, the appellant says that the condition and performance of the battery for the vehicle would be significantly improved than if the car were parked and charged outside. However, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR