



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: 19.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/23/3330156

25 Millfield Close, Anstey, Leicestershire, LE7 7TE

- 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 Mrs Angela Stacey against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/23/0798/2, dated 10 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is double storey front extension with associated internal modifications.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. 25 Millfield Close is a semi-detached house, part of four pairs of a similar dormer bungalow design with first floor accommodation in the roof and flat-roofed dormer windows running almost the full width of the building at front and back. It is in an established residential area and Millfield Close is mainly characterised by two storey semi-detached and detached houses of brick and tile hanging and some render.
4. The relevant policies in this case include CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011-2028 Core Strategy (the Core Strategy), EV/1 and H/17 of the Local Plan (2004) (the local plan) and DS5 of the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2021-2037 (the emerging local plan). These relate to the design of development, including extensions to dwellings, in terms of matters including scale and mass and appearance in the street scene.
5. I consider that the form, height and forward projection of the proposed two storey extension would unbalance the symmetry of the existing pair of semis, particularly at roof level and would consequently appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene. Although the ground floor footprint would be relatively small and the roof would be lower than the main ridge of the existing house, the extension would be a dominant feature at the front of the building because of the deep projection from the existing roof. It would be incompatible

with the design and form of the dormer bungalow style and with the larger two storey houses which typically present straight front elevations to the street with no forward projecting gabled elements. It would be clearly visible along the street, particularly because of the staggered building line.

6. Other properties along the street have been extended, many with single or two storey side extensions, including the other one of this pair of semis. These do not project forward and are more in keeping with the overall form and style of the host dwellings and the wider street scene. I have considered the examples put forward by the appellant of two storey front extensions elsewhere in the surrounding area. I have no information as to the individual circumstances of each of these, but they are different in that they are at two storey houses of different styles to the appeal property. For example, although the forward gabled projection of the front extension in Falcon Road appears prominent in relation to the house, the other houses on the same side of the street all have prominent gabled frontages and the extension appears more in keeping with those.
7. I have taken account of the appellant's wish to provide additional facilities to meet her particular needs. However, although I consider that the building is capable of being extended to accommodate these facilities, I am not persuaded that this is an appropriate solution.
8. I conclude that the siting, scale and design of the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene, contrary to policies CS2 of the Core Strategy, EV/1 and H/17 of the local plan and DS5 of the emerging local plan.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTORx