
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/22/3296085

18 Baldwin Road, Leicester LE2 6HA

- 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 C Dosanjh against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20220102, dated 20 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension, 2-storey side and rear extension, external rendering and alteration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development firstly, on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area; and secondly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of 16 Baldwin Road with particular regard to outlook and visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house that addresses Baldwin Road in a mainly residential area. Along Baldwin Road in the vicinity of the site semi-detached pairs predominate and I saw that some dwellings have been altered and extended and that some pairs differ to others in their general style. Consequently, there is some variety to the existing built form in the local street scene to which No 18 belongs.
4. The new ground floor side and rear extension would extend across almost the full width of the plot and therefore exceed the width of the existing house. It would also project outwards from the main rear wall for a considerable depth into the back garden of No 18. The proposed 2-storey component would also be a sizeable addition, wrapping around a rear corner of the host building. Together, these extensions would elongate the built form of No 18, significantly enlarge its footprint, alter its shape and noticeably add to its size and mass.
5. Given their considerable scale and depth, the new extensions would be disproportionate additions to the host building even considering the built form and site coverage of the existing garage to be demolished and removed. The main outcome would be that the side and rear façades of the host dwelling

would be overwhelmed. In other words, new built form that would be wider and longer than the main 2-storey house would be so large that the intrinsic character of the dwelling would be spoiled.

6. There would also be an awkward transition between the new side extension and the host building mainly because the top of the proposed roof would be set well below the apex of the gable wall. When seen from the road, this part of the proposal would draw the eye as an awkward 'add-on' to the existing house.
7. When taken together, the proposed changes are of a scale and design that would unduly compromise the form of the host building and have a deleterious effect on the character and qualities of the local area. In reaching this finding I have taken into account the proposed materials, which would be appropriate.
8. The appellant places some reliance on the extensions to other properties along Baldwin Road, notably at Nos 9 and 22. Having spent some time looking at properties particularly along this highway, I agree that there are examples of sizeable extensions to properties, many of which are evident from the road.
9. To my mind, the side and rear extensions that I saw, including Nos 9 and 22, have blended into the character of the local area and respected the appearance of the host building with varying degrees of success. The presence of these existing extensions clearly demonstrates that changes made to a property can have a significant impact on its appearance and the character of the area to which it belongs. Having carefully considered the examples cited by the appellant and those that I observed, and also noted the appellant's view that the extensions at Nos 9 and 22 have been granted planning permission, they do not justify an unsympathetic form of development, as sought.
10. The appellant considers that the proposal would complement the existing dormer extension on the rear roof slope of No 18, which appears to be wider than that shown on the submitted drawings. However, when seen together with the dormer extension, the size and design of the proposal would result in a cumbersome enlargement of the appeal dwelling.
11. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it conflicts with CS Policy 3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy. This policy expects new development to be high quality, well designed and to add to the character and appearance of the local environment. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Living conditions

12. The proposal would introduce a new sidewall up to and parallel with the shared rear boundary between the appeal dwelling and its attached counterpart, which is 16 Baldwin Road. From what I saw, No 16 has a ground floor rear window that would be close to the new sidewall, which appears to allow access to the patio. According to the Council, this window serves a lounge and dining room.
13. While the height and depth of the new wall along this common boundary would be significant, views of it from the lounge and dining room window of No 16 would be at an oblique angle with the new 2-storey element further away. The

main direction of outlook from this window across the back garden of No 16 would not be significantly affected by the new built form.

14. On balance, I find that, while clearly visible from the ground floor rear window of No 16, the proposal would not visually dominate outlook nor be so imposing as to overbear on the occupiers of this neighbouring property. Consequently, the proposal would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16. As such, the proposal does not conflict with Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan 1996-2016 or the Framework insofar they aim to safeguard residential amenity. My finding on this matter does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the first main issue.

Other matters

15. I appreciate that progressing planning applications and subsequent appeals can be a costly exercise and that living and building material costs are increasing. However, these matters are insufficient to permit what would be unacceptable development.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR