



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: 28 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/23/3322443

Willow Cottage, Main Street, Skeffington, Leicester, LE7 9YB

- 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 Mark Newby against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00165/FUL dated 27 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2023.
 - The development is described as proposed single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of existing property and the Conservation Area in general.

Reasons

3. The site is modest single storey property converted from an agricultural building to residential in a predominantly residential area within a small village. The site lies within the Skeffington Conservation Area.
4. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
5. Properties in Skeffington are dispersed predominantly along Main Street which winds through the village, clusters of properties are at the east end of the village and by the junction with Rolleston Road. The buildings are varied in terms of materials; however they comprise a traditional palette. Coherence of features on properties is evident for instance simple windows, doors and elevations. The harmony of the built form adds to the significance of the area.
6. The appeal site retains a modest form with features typical of a converted agricultural building. Whilst there is a porch to the front of the property this does not detract from the linear form of the property.
7. The proposed development would introduce two gable elevations to the front of the property which would alter the simple form of the building. The proposed

development would not be subordinate to the existing property dominating the frontage and would be incongruous to the area in general.

8. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification based on Framework paragraph 200.
9. I find that the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm of the significance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I find that there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development.
10. The proposed development would be unsympathetic to the existing property. I find that the proposed development would diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the conservation area and would be out of keeping with the existing property itself.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and conservation area in general. There is conflict with Policies GD3, GD8 and HC1 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031 (2019) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which respects the design of the original property and preserves or enhances character and appearance of the conservation area.
12. There is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings and that the historic environment is protected.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR