



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/22/3301571
30 Threadgold Close, Leicester LE4 1BY

- 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 K Bharadia against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20213027 dated 10 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey extensions at front, side and rear of bungalow; alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey side extension in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 20213027 dated 10 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2021/12/341/A, identified as pages 2 of 8 (floor plan), 3 of 8 (roof plan), 4 of 8 (front and rear elevations), 5 of 8 (side elevations), 6 of 8 (site plan and section).
 - 3) Materials: No development above ground level shall take place unless and until trade descriptions or samples of materials to be used in the facing of wall and the surfaces of roof have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the proposed development differs between the application form and that appearing on the Council's decision notice which more accurately reflects what appears on the submitted drawings. I have therefore used the latter description without harm to the interests of any party.

Main issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and
 - whether occupiers would enjoy satisfactory access to daylight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Thirty Threadgold Close (No.30) is a modest single storey detached dwelling adjacent to one of similar design located within an area of mixed housing laid to a typical late twentieth-century suburban layout. The appeal site is located at the end of a short, shared, access drive and abuts the perimeter of the housing area (Threadgold Close) defined by a close-boarded fence along the back of pavement to Bennion Road, a main thoroughfare in the locality.
5. The proposal would significantly change the appearance of No.30. Although the proposal would result in a much larger dwelling of significantly different appearance to that of the adjacent dwelling (No.29), Threadgold Close incorporates a mix of housing types and sizes, apparently due to its incremental development over several years. Consequently the degree of change represented by the proposal would not be obtrusive within the variety of housing types found nearby. The resulting dwelling would not be consistent with its neighbour, No.29, however these dwellings differ in form and character from, and are therefore inconsistent with, the majority of nearby dwellings.
6. Policy CS03 of the City of Leicester Core Strategy 2014 (core strategy) requires development to pursue urban design objectives in a positive manner. The design proposed is an architecturally cogent proposal which would add to the existing diversity of residential forms and appearance in the local area whilst retaining a 'bungalow' character in terms of height and general form.
7. Overall I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the objectives for good design found in the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) or with Policy CS03 of the core strategy.

Living Conditions

8. The Council suggest that habitable rooms found in the proposal would not have access to adequate natural light and feel unduly enclosed. It is far from clear what has led to this conclusion given that the submitted plans show that both bedrooms, the living room and kitchen-diner benefit from dual aspect with windows on different elevations. Whilst significantly larger than any room in the existing dwelling the kitchen-diner is also provided with several rooflights. Compared to the existing dwelling, where all main habitable rooms are single aspect, and notwithstanding the proximity of the proposed multiple-windowed north-western elevation to perimeter fencing, upon a fair reading of the submitted plans I find little to substantiate this second refusal reason. I therefore conclude there is no conflict with saved Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan (2006) which seeks to ensure the provision of a quality living environment, nor with guidance set out in the Framework.
9. In conclusion, and having regard to all matters raised, my reasoning on both main issues directs that the proposal does not conflict with the development plan as a whole and that, in consequence, the appeal should succeed, subject to the usual time and plans condition.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR