



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20th December 2023

by Alison Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/23/3334260

4 Went Road, Birstall, Leicestershire LE4 3BG

- 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 S. Lee against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/23/1713/2, dated 19 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two and single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issues

2. The neighbouring property, 2 Went Road has an extant planning permission for a two-storey side extension¹. There is no evidence that its implementation is not going to occur within the lifetime of the permission (17/11/2025). This is a material consideration. The effect of the approved extension at 2 Went Road has been taken into account in reaching my decision.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated on 19 December 2023. In this instance I have not sought comments as the paragraph that the Council refers to in the reason for refusal remains, albeit with different numbering.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. 4 Went Road is a semi-detached dwelling in an elevated position set back from the road in a row of similar properties. Went Road retains a strong pattern and "rhythm" formed by well-balanced semi-detached houses and the space in between them. The consequent spacious character and appearance of the

¹ P/22/1123/2 (the extant planning permission)

rhythm of the street scene remains substantially intact in both Went Road and other streets in the local area. The appeal property and the attached 6 Wentworth Road are of a similar design with small narrow two storey extensions set a large distance from the front of the house. In addition, both are sited some distance from their side boundaries, albeit No 4 has a small car port at ground level. Nevertheless, the building form and siting contributes positively to the open character and appearance.

6. The two-storey extension by reason of its width, form, large mass and scale, would significantly unbalance the two attached houses, given it would be considerably larger than the extension at No 6 and would extend up to the boundary with No 2. As a result, it would detrimentally affect the symmetry of the semi-detached dwelling (4&6 Went Road). Such symmetry is a recognisable and dominant feature of the character of the dwellings on Went Road.
7. At the front, the regular gaps between the buildings are important to the character of the area in maintaining the rhythm of the street scene and the characteristic open character. If the proposals under the extant planning permission were to be built, the appeal proposal would result in the loss of the important gap between 2 and 4 Went Road. Even though No 4 is set forward of No 2, this would disrupt the pattern of development in the street scape, eroding openness, and create a terraced effect causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, while the Design Supplementary Planning Document adopted in 2020 (the SPD) advocates setting back an extension to avoid terracing effects, the example shown shows a large gap between the properties and differing roof forms which would not be the case here.
8. I acknowledge that the extension under the extant permission would be similar to that proposed here. However, in that instance the adjoined property also had a large side extension and so the building as a whole was not materially unbalanced. Furthermore, a gap would have been maintained to No 4 retaining the characteristic openness.
9. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011-2028 Core Strategy, saved policies EV/1 and H17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan (2004), emerging Policy DS5 of the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2021-2037, the SPD and paragraph 139 of the Framework. Together these require that development is of high design quality which responds positively to its context and surroundings by respecting and enhancing the character of the area having regard to, amongst other things, massing, scale and layout. Furthermore, new extensions should remain compatible in scale, mass and design with the original dwelling.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to Goscote Hall a listed building Grade II sited to the rear of the appeal site. They conclude that the proposal causes no harm to the significance of the building. From my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree. While it would block the occasional glimpse of the Hall from Went Road, this view does not contribute in any great way to the significance of the building.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. I hereby dismiss the appeal.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR