



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023 by T Bennett BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/23/3323030

25 Berry Close, Great Bowden, Market Harborough LE16 7ES

- 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 M Johal and Ms McDonal against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00173/FUL, dated 1 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site forms part of a row of well-proportioned, recently constructed detached properties along part of Berry Close with views out to the open countryside on the opposite side of the road. Whilst the properties vary in style and form, there is a repetition of features and a shared sense of scale and proportion giving the area an attractive consistency. A common feature is the presence of a single, two-storey projecting front gable, with several properties having a forward projecting double garage similar to the appeal property.
5. The proposed first-floor extension above the existing garage would introduce an additional two-storey gable to the host property. This alteration would lead to a distinct departure in frontage design, at odds with the built form along this part of Berry Close. It would accordingly reduce the quality of the area's consistency. Due to the width and forward projection of the garage, which extends beyond the existing two storey gable, the proposed extension would compete with the existing gable, creating a dominant addition to the front elevation. As such, this would result in an incongruous and unduly prominent addition, detracting from the existing well-proportioned scale and appearance of the host property and the wider street-scene.

6. The provisions of the Development Management Supplementary Planning Document (2021) are guidance only and indicates an element of discretion can be exercised. Whilst the use of matching materials and a hipped roof form would assist in some harmonising, the mass and bulk of the proposed first-floor extension would not be subordinate and thus harmful to the character and appearance of the area in the above terms.
7. Consequently, the proposals would not accord with Policy GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 (2019) and Policy H6 of the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan Review (2020). Together these seek to ensure that development respects the context and characteristics of the individual site, the street scene and the local environment. These principles underpin the guidance within the Council's Development management Supplementary Planning Document, with which the development conflicts.

Other Matters

8. Whilst the appeal scheme is smaller than the development at No 18, the positioning of No 18 is less prominent than the appeal property. No 18 is located at the end of a row of houses, set further back within the development and away from the public footpath that is located in the open countryside. Thus, it is not as readily visible as the appeal property. This example does not therefore change my conclusions.
9. I do not have the full details of the case at No 4 Sherrard Road before me, and so cannot be sure of the reasons that led to its approval. Whilst I appreciate the need for consistency in decision making, the approval of 4 Sherrard Road is not a sufficient reason for allowing this extension, which I have found on its own merits would harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. Concerns on how the Council dealt with the planning application should be taken up with them directly. They are not a matter for this appeal which focusses on the planning merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There is nothing sufficiently compelling to indicate a decision to the contrary. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR