



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/23/3315219

194 Barrow Road, Sileby, Leicestershire, LE12 7LR

- 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 Elliott Hickey against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/21/2660/2, dated 1 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is to raise roof of existing bungalow, two storey rear extension and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of numbers 192 and 196 Barrow Road, with regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow, which faces Barrow Road. It is within a primarily residential area, which is predominantly characterised by two storey dwellings. In that respect, the single storey scale of the appeal property appears different.
4. The proposal is as described in the banner heading above. The raising of the roof height with front facing dormers, together with the two storey rear extension would create additional bedroom, bathroom and study space at first-floor level. On the ground floor, the extensions would provide a family room at the rear and an enlarged hallway and guest bedroom.
5. Policy CS2 of the adopted Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2028 seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of high quality that respects the character of the area. This is also a requirement of Saved Policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 1991-2006. Furthermore, Policy G2 of the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan states (amongst other things) that new development should reinforce and enhance local distinctiveness and character. These policies accord with

paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which contains similar provisions.

6. In reaching my decision, I have also considered the relevant contents of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Design 2020. This advises that extensions should be designed so that the main property remains the dominant building.
7. The Council considers that the proposed development would not be sympathetic to the existing dwelling, because of its overall scale, mass and materials. It also considers the proposed dormers to be an alien feature in the streetscene. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan and the associated design guidance.
8. I accept that the appeal proposal would have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the existing property and it could not be described as a subservient addition. However, the existing bungalow appears at odds in the streetscene due to its single storey scale and, therefore, the extension to the roof and creation of a first-floor would not be out of keeping. Whilst there are no other front facing dormers along this section of Barrow Road, they would be relatively small structures and would not be unduly harmful to the appearance of the area.
9. For the above reasons, I do not find against the proposal on this issue.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed two storey rear extension would project out some 5.7m (maximum) from the existing main rear wall of the dwelling. It would be positioned close to the shared side rear garden boundaries of numbers 192 and 196 Barrow Road (numbers 192 and 196).
11. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that new developments protect the amenity of people who live nearby. This is also a requirement of Saved Policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 1991-2006. Furthermore, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Design 2020, comments that house extensions can impact on the daylight and sunlight of neighbours.
12. During my site visit, I viewed the proposed relationship between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwellings. I also viewed it from the rear garden of number 196.
13. Although the appellant states that the proposal has been designed with the neighbours in mind, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful impact. The length, height, overall mass and position of the rear extension, close to the side boundaries, would result in a development that would be physically over dominant and overbearing on the adjoining properties. It would also result in the loss of some natural light to the nearest rear ground floor window and patio area of number 196, due its position of the extension on the southern side of that dwelling. The proposal would, therefore conflict with the relevant policies of the Development Plan, as referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above in respect of the effect on the living conditions of numbers 192 and 196, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR