The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:4TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/22/3293042
6 The Tithings, Kibworth Beauchamp LE8 0PU

- 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 S Burrows against the decision of Harborough District Council.
- The application Ref 21/01904/FUL, dated 28 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
- The development proposed is erection of one-and-a-half storey side extension and erection of a boundary wall.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey extension to the side and a detached garage to the front located in a modern well-established residential area. The Tithings is characterised by detached properties of varied styles and design set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. Where garages and other extensions exist to the side of the residential properties, these are low, clearly subsidiary, and have little impact upon the sense of space and openness in the area.

5. The proposal would entail the construction of a one-and-a-half storey side extension that would extend across the full width of the house and project out about 9.1m from the side elevation perpendicular to the main front elevation of the main house. The proposed extension would be set back about 0.3m from the front elevation and constructed with a dual pitched hipped roof that would be stepped down below the ridge height of the host property with a small rear

dormer window. The extension would be predominantly built in red brick to match the existing property, with buff brick and a timber beam framework used along the top third of the extension. A new 2m high wall would also be constructed along the front boundary of the site.

6. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The scale and form of the proposed side extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. As such, although set back from the front elevation and stepped down at roof level, the proposed extension would result in substantial bulk at the side of the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest form and appearance of the host building and would compromise the sense of space and openness in the area.

7. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, where the proposed side extension would be visible from a number of public vantage points along The Tithings. The contrasting use of buff brick and timber beam materials contribute to the overall scale of the side extension, giving it particular prominence in relation to its surroundings. The proposed side extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from its architectural integrity. As such, I consider that the proposed side extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.

8. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed extension have been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and to minimise any impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.

9. Given the location of the appeal site adjacent to the Kibworth Beauchamp Conservation Area (CA) immediately to the south of the site, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area and its setting. Due to the separation distance and the intervening buildings and boundary treatment between the appeal site and the CA, there is only limited inter-visibility. The development has a neutral material impact on the setting of the CA. The setting is therefore preserved.

10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed side extension would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to the overall aims of Policy GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2019 and Policy H4 of the Kibworth Villages Neighbourhood Development Plan. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design that respect and enhance the local character and characteristics of the individual site, street scene and environment to ensure it is integrated into the existing built form and does not adversely impact on the visual amenity of the street scene.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the various garages and extensions on the properties within the surrounding area have different development characteristics to the

appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.

12. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design and to create additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR