
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2022

by Chris Forreth BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/D/22/3294589

22 Main Street, Oakthorpe, Leicestershire DE12 7RB

- 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 Bernard Hough against the decision of North West Leicestershire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01585/FUL, dated 9 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor extension to the front elevation at 22 Main Street, Oakthorpe, Leicestershire DE12 7RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01585/FUL, dated 9 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 249/MS/3 Rev A and 249/MS/4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the village of Oakthorpe where there is a variety of differing designs of residential properties. Main Street itself contains several properties which feature front gable walls. This includes a recently constructed dwelling on the corner of Main Street and Redfern Road which features a prominent gable end.
4. The appeal property itself is one of four similar properties which form two pairs of link-detached dwellings. A feature of these dwellings are the single storey lean-to style forward projections from the main front walls, which also span the garages between each pair.

5. The appeal proposal seeks to add a first floor above this front lean-to projection with a front gable wall which would be the full width of the main part of the dwelling.
6. Whilst the front extension would significantly change the appearance of the appeal property, given the wide variety of differing property designs in the area it would not look out of place in the streetscene. This is particularly the case given that the surrounding properties are not uniform in their distance away from the road and also feature gable ends to the street frontage.
7. In coming to this view, I acknowledge that many of the other front gable walls do not span the whole width of the host dwellings. However, in this case, I consider that this would not give rise to an overly dominant form of development especially as the roof line of the extension would be set at a lower height than the ridge line of the main roof. This also helps in giving the extension an element of subserviency to the host dwelling.
8. In addition to the above, I have also considered the group value of the four similarly designed properties. Whilst these do present some uniformity, to my mind, these properties stand out as an anomaly in an otherwise varied streetscene. Furthermore, they do not present such an important feature which would warrant their retention in their current form.
9. For the above reasons the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area as a whole. It would therefore accord with Policy D1 of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan (2021) and the Good Design Supplementary Planning Document which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that proposals offer a good standard of design and that extensions should normally be subservient to their host dwelling. It would also be consistent with the overarching aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The site lies within the catchment area of the River Mease Special Area of Conservation (SAC) where the discharge from the sewage treatment works within the SAC catchment area is a major contributor to the phosphate levels in the river. The Council consider that the appeal proposal would not adversely affect the SAC and, given the nature of the proposal, I agree.

Conditions

11. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions on their appeal questionnaire that it considers would be appropriate. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to matching materials is also necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR