



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/23/3332487
325 Narborough Road, Leicester, LE3 2RD

- 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 Ms June Quinn against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref. 20230946, dated 19 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is front elevation porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of front elevation porch at 325 Narborough Road, Leicester, LE3 2RD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 20230946, dated 19 May 2023, and the plan submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 230403/P001 RevA.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 325 Narborough Road is a two storey mid terrace house in an established residential area. It is one of a number of houses forming a crescent constructed in the interwar period to an Arts and Crafts design. The predominant materials are brick and painted render, with some timber framing features and tiled roofs.
4. The group of houses as a whole, Nos 317-355, is subject to an Article 4 Direction issued in 2016 which removed permitted development rights for alterations, including extensions, to the properties. It is on the local heritage asset register.
5. A porch has already been constructed without planning permission and the development the subject of this appeal is for a revised scheme, altering the roof from a pitched and tiled gable roof to a monopitch roof.

6. The policies relevant in this case include CS03 and CS18 of the Leicester Core Strategy 2014 (the Core Strategy), which require high quality design and, among other things, expect development to be appropriate to the local setting and to protect the character and setting of designated and other heritage assets.
7. I consider that the porch as constructed has a somewhat dominant and incongruous appearance in the context of the group of houses because of its gabled roof and heavy grey fascia boards which break through and interrupt the strong line between the ground floor brick elevation and the rendered upper floor in this part of the terrace.
8. In terms of its footprint and height to the eaves, I consider that the porch is acceptable and in proportion to the house itself and this part of the terrace. The proposed substitution of a monopitch roof would reduce its impact and although it would also break through the line between the brick ground floor and rendered upper floor, the resultant simpler form of the porch would be less obtrusive and relate better to other features along the terrace, including an existing porch with a monopitch roof nearby at No. 321. Other projecting features along the crescent as a whole, from No. 317 to No. 355, include a number of bay and oriel windows and door canopies. There is a porch similar to that built at No.325 which I understand is unauthorised and under consideration by the Council.
9. The porch as constructed includes a grey composite security door installed to provide enhanced safety for the occupant following a number of burglaries. It is evident that several of the original entrance doors along the whole crescent have been replaced or altered and there is now a wide variety of door styles with more or less glazing ranging from full glazing to almost solid with an oval window. The replaced door shown on the 2016 Google image had a single relatively small vertical window and, as stated by the Council, was itself a replacement of the original.
10. The original door would have been constructed of timber in accordance with the Arts and Crafts style. I consider that, although the replacement door is of a composite material, its design is restrained and simple, with a vertical emphasis reflecting the vertical boarding of some of the secondary doors at the entrances to some of the passageways which provide access to the rear of the houses. The small diamond window is in keeping with this simple design.
11. I conclude that the size and bulk of the porch with the revised roof form proposed would not appear unduly prominent in the context of the house itself and the wider terrace and would not cause harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. It would enhance the safety and security of the occupier of the property in accordance with the social objective of providing, among other things, safe places to live as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and it would not be in conflict with Core Strategy policies CS03 and CS18.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plan is necessary

to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plan and for the avoidance of doubt. I have imposed the statutory condition requiring commencement of the development as it involves necessary construction works.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR