



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2023

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/22/3310314

57 Briarfield Drive Leicester LE5 1RG

- 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 Mrs P Murray against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20221107, dated 23 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey extension to front, side and rear of house (Class C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in relation to the construction of a single storey extension to the front and side of the house. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 57 Briarfield Drive Leicester LE5 1RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20221107, dated 23 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, but only in so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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 plan: 3797-02 Rev A.
 - 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 building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the applicant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have used the Council's description as this provides a more accurate description of the development.
3. The development, the subject of the appeal, consists of a number of elements. The Council has indicated it has no objection to the single storey rear

extension. Accordingly, I shall direct my assessment to the extensions to the front and side of the house.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, No 57 Briarfield Drive, (No 57), is one of a pair of semi detached properties, with a front to back roof slope and side gable, located in a residential area. The street has a generally consistent character of semi detached/terraced dwellings, set back from the road behind front gardens, some with modest flat roof front porches or canopy features. As a result of the bend in the road as it rises to the north, the dwelling on the corner plot adjacent to No 57 faces a different orientation and is at a higher level.
6. The addition of the proposed wrap around side and front gable extension with side to side pitched roofs would add bulk and be at odds with the roof design of the host dwelling. It would be overly dominant to the pair of the semi-detached dwellings and in particular the introduction of the large front gable extension would change the appearance of the front of the house significantly increasing its visual impact. It would be an alien feature within the streetscene and would disrupt the regularity of the front additions found generally in this location. As such it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
7. The proposed front extension would be forward of the building line. However it is a relatively minor projection and well set back from the road. I acknowledge that the orientation of the adjacent property, No 55 Briarfield Drive and the rising land in this location means that in many views the side and front extension would be seen against the backdrop of No 55. Nonetheless, the gable element of the scheme would be overly prominent and would harm the simple appearance of the existing dwelling and area. Whilst the design would incorporate pitched roofs, in this instance they would be side to side with a front gable end, rather than reflect the slope of the main roof of the host property. As such it would be at odds generally with the scale of the pitched roofs found on small porches and canopies in the area. Accordingly, the design and style would fail to be consistent with that of the original dwelling, contrary to guidance contained within Appendix G of the Council's Residential Amenity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such it would be contrary to CS Policy 3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy (adopted 2014) which requires development to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local built environment in terms amongst other things scale, height, and massing. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

9. As the single storey rear extension is both physically and functionally severable from the other elements of the proposal, I find that a split decision would be

appropriate in this instance. Accordingly, the appeal should succeed in relation only to the single storey rear extension.

Conditions

10. In respect of that part of the development hereby approved, I have attached the standard time condition and a plans condition to ensure certainty. I have also attached a condition relating to materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given and having taken all matters into account, the appeal is dismissed in relation to the single storey side and front extensions to the house. The element of the proposal which relates to the single storey rear extension is allowed in accordance with my formal decision given above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR