



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/22/3308454
61 Kitchener Road, Leicester, LE5 4AU

- 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 Sarfraj Navgaza against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20220927, dated 26 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is internal alteration and double storey extension at front and extended first floor at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the description of the development stated in the Council's decision notice differs to that given on both the planning application and appeal forms. There is no evidence showing that the appellant has agreed to the change and the normal convention is to use the description given on the planning application form, unless it is inaccurate or misleading. That is not the case, in my opinion, and I have, therefore, used the description given by the appellant in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, which is situated in a residential area. Dwellings in the vicinity of the site are mixed in terms of their age and appearance. However, the appeal dwelling is one of a group of properties that are largely unaltered at the front. They are of a distinctive design due to the staggered frontages and the set-back of part of the main elevation. These provide a degree of uniformity, interest and character to this part of the streetscene.
5. The proposal is to extend the dwelling at the front and rear with two storey and first floor enlargements. It would provide a new entrance porch and first floor shower room at the front and an enlarged bedroom at the rear.
6. Policy CS03 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new developments contribute positively to the area. I consider that this policy

accords with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021(The Framework), which requires (amongst other things) high quality development and a high standard of amenity.

7. The Council's decision notice also refers to Saved Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan 2006, which lists factors that will be considered when assessing proposals for new development. Although these relate mainly to residential amenity, one of the factors is the ability of new development to assimilate into the area.
8. I have also considered the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Amenity 2008 (SPD). This includes, at Appendix G, guidance relating to the design of house extensions. Amongst other things, the SPD seeks to ensure that extensions do not dominate the existing house and that they maintain the common design characteristics of the row or street within which the property is located.
9. I consider that the proposed extension would appear as a dominant addition to the dwelling, which would detract from its existing character and appearance, because of its forward position, height and overall bulk. In addition, it would also disrupt the largely uniform appearance to this part of Kitchener Road and the group of dwellings, of which the appeal property forms a part. In that regard, it would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene.
10. Therefore, for the above reasons, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the relevant policies and provisions of the Development Plan, The Framework and the Council's SPD, as referred to above.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a comparable extension that has recently been constructed at a nearby dwelling on French Road. Whilst the extension is similar in design and scale, the character of the streetscene is different insofar that the property on French Road, does not appear as part of a cohesive group. Consequently, the impact of the appeal proposal on the appearance of the streetscene would be materially different.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR