



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by S Crossen BA (Hons) PgCert PgDip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/22/3308679

30 Strathmore Avenue, Leicester LE4 7HA

- 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 Dimple Rawji against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20221221, dated 9 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a single storey extension at front and rear; two storey side and rear extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal house is semi-detached on an estate of similar houses which have hipped or gable roof designs and projecting bay window features, either single or two storey.
4. The appeal house is within a row of semi-detached buildings and is the only house which has a different main roof design to the adjoining house, having a gable where the attached house is hipped. Within this row are a pair of gable roof designed houses with ground floor bay projecting windows, which have an additional mono-pitched front canopy above. One house has a projecting porch with mono-pitched roof and there is an example nearby of a side extension with mono-pitched roof wrapping around and above the front door to provide a canopy.
5. Although the appeal house has a different roof design to the attached house it shares some similarities including a two storey front projecting bay window and arched brick detail above the doorway.
6. The proposed side extensions would include a front projecting canopy extending from the proposed mono-pitched roof of the ground floor side extension. This canopy would cut across the front of the appeal house, partly obscuring the brick arch detail around the front door, projecting forward of the feature gable, the focal point of the original design. Also proposed are thick columns which would appear unduly prominent due to their size and projection forward of the front elevation. None of these features are seen on the adjoining house or at any of the houses within this row. These features would not

integrate with and would significantly unbalance, the appearance of a pair of semi-detached houses resulting in significant harm to the character of the surrounding area.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other extensions at nearby properties, some of which it is stated were previously approved by the Council. However, none of these include the same combination of additions proposed by this scheme. The examples of canopies provided in the appellants statement do not include an example where a canopy cuts across a two-storey bay window. In any case even if such an example existed, this would not be reason by itself to support further incongruous development.
8. The rear extensions when viewed against existing additions would be varied and eclectic because of the mix of projections and roof shapes. At my site visit, I could also see a mix of roof shapes present at nearby outbuildings, roof extensions and two storey rear extensions at other properties which included flat, gable and hipped roof designs many of which are not seen from the public realm. In this context the rear elements of the proposed extensions would not result in any significant harm to the character or appearance of the building or the area.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such the development would be contrary to Policy CS03 of the Leicester City Council Core Strategy adopted July 2014 and contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development responds positively to its surroundings, and is appropriate to the local setting and context.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to page 22 of the adopted Local Plan identifying that the proposal meets the objective of Leicester City Council to make efficient use of land. Although a copy of the policy has not been provided, I am satisfied that any benefits to making efficient use of land in this case would be outweighed by the harm I find above.
11. I have had regard to the appellants statement that where families are not able to access new housing development to suit their future need's, they need to extend their houses. However, I am not convinced that a suitable extension could not be achieved here with an alternative design which better integrates with the host building and wider area.

Conclusion

12. As set out above, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Whilst it would provide additional living space for the appellant's family and would be in an accessible location, on a previously developed site, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Crossen

INSPECTOR