
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: 17th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/22/3296582

4 Lubenham Hill, Market Harborough LE16 9DQ

- 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 Robert Gilbert against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02079/FUL, dated 29 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2022.
 - The development is the erection of an extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I have dealt with another appeal¹ on this site. That appeal will be the subject of a separate decision.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached 2-storey house that occupies a prominent plot facing Lubenham Hill within a predominantly residential area wherein buildings vary in size, age and style. Consequently, there is considerable variety to the appearance of the existing built form in the street scene and the local area to which No 4 belongs.
5. The proposal is to enlarge No 4 with a single storey side extension. It has been carefully designed to reflect the distinctive flat roof style of the existing dwelling with matching fenestration and external materials. The ground floor side projection, which contributes little positively to the appearance and character of the existing dwelling would also be demolished and removed.
6. The proposal would, however, be a sizeable addition. It would significantly increase the footprint of the existing dwelling and noticeably add to its scale and mass. Part of the new extension would comfortably exceed the width of the host building, extending the house across almost the entire width of the

¹ Ref APP/F2415/D/22/3295266

- plot. The depth of the new addition along the shared boundary with the adjacent property would also exceed that of the main dwelling.
7. To my mind, the proposal would be disproportionate in scale and bulk to the host building even taking into account the built form and site coverage of the outbuildings to be removed. In other words, a side extension that is longer, in part, and wider, in part, than the main house, would be so large that its intrinsic character would be spoiled.
 8. I appreciate that the appeal scheme makes efficient use of the land available within the site. The proposed layout has also been influenced by the splayed shape of the site, which has a relatively wide highway frontage that narrows towards the rear boundary. In addition, the length of the new flank wall and the full extent of the proposed rear projection would not be readily evident in any public view. However, the proposal would be visible from in the front of the site and along the road given that the upper section of the completed front elevation would project above the boundary fence.
 9. From this direction, the principal elevation of the appeal scheme would continue from the main front wall of No 4 and then angle away from the road towards the site's side boundary. This arrangement would visually 'break down' the new built form to some extent. The boundary treatment to the highway frontage of the site and the position of the dwelling set back from the highway would also partially screen and subdue the presence of the appeal scheme when viewed from public vantage points. Even so, it would still draw the eye given the scale of the proposal and its uneasy relationship to the size and proportions of the existing dwelling.
 10. For these reasons, the proposed extension would not be subordinate to nor be in harmony with the existing building to which the Council's Development Management Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) refers. To my mind, it would unduly compromise the form and architectural integrity of the host building and be an unwelcome addition to the local area. Furthermore, by introducing significant new built form to one side of No 4, the proposal would disrupt the broad symmetry with its attached counterpart as a broadly matching pair by unbalancing their front elevations.
 11. On the 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 Policy GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011–2031. This policy aims to ensure that development respects the context and characteristics of the site, the street scene and the local environment.
 12. It would also fail to adhere to the guidance within the SPD and be at odds with several policies of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies aim to ensure that new development is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

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

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR