



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/23/3319831

1 Scarborough Road, Leicester LE4 6PG

- 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 Zaheer Zaffaron against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 2022174 dated 16 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is Construction of additional storey to bungalow; two storey extension at front; installation of 1.8m high sliding gate at front; construction of vehicular access at front; alterations to house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the non-designated heritage asset; and (ii) the living conditions of future occupiers of the appeal property.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The site is a large bungalow on a modest rectangular plot on the junction of Scarborough Road and Harrison Road. To the south of the site (rear of the bungalow) is the Carey Hall Baptist Church which is a large detached building and a non-designated heritage asset. To the north across Scarborough Road is St Patrick's Catholic School which is a part single/part two storey building. Neighbouring residential properties in the area comprise predominantly two storey terraced buildings.
5. The proposed development would substantially increase the mass and bulk of the existing property, and whilst there are large commercial buildings within the immediate area the proposed development would be disproportionate in

scale to the existing property and would be stark and incongruous in the streetscene.

6. The proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition to the area dominating the constrained plot and would be at odds with the existing residential character.
7. The proposed development would be prominent on this corner plot, due to the proposed overbearing scale and design the development would harm the setting of Carey Hall Baptist Church.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. There is conflict with Policies CS03 and CS18 of the Leicester City Core Strategy (2014) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which contributes to the surrounding area, whilst protecting the historic environment including the character and setting of designated and other heritage assets.
9. There is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design which adds to the overall quality of an area and that non-designated heritage assets are protected as appropriate.

Living Conditions

10. The Appellant contends that the amount of activity within the family home would remain unchanged despite the increase from 2 bedrooms to 6, and that the proposed development would improve the quality of life for the Appellant.
11. The proposed development would increase occupation capacity and due to the constrained plot future occupiers of the property would have the same restricted amenity space as the existing 2 bedroom property. This level of external amenity space would be limited for a property of the proposed size.
12. Whilst additional living accommodation would be provided internally, I am not persuaded that this would compensate for the lack of external amenity space which one would reasonably expect from a property of this scale. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the future occupiers of appeal property.
13. There is conflict with saved Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan 1996-2016 (2006) which amongst other things seek to protect the amenities of future occupiers of properties. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments have high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR