



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21st December 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/D/23/3332776

20 Coombe Place, Oadby, Leicestershire, LE2 5TH

- 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 Singh against the decision of Oadby & Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00332/FUL, dated 21 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of side and rear extension, loft conversion, alterations to main roof, external rendering and alterations (revised scheme 23/00127/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the parties' appeal submissions were made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, it was not necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a bungalow situated in a prominent position at the corner of the junction to the cul-de-sac, Coombe Place. Whilst there are some two storey dwellings adjacent to the appeal site and in the vicinity, the existing character of the surrounding area predominantly features bungalows of uniform design and low proportion, with open plan style frontages - most do not appear to have had any significant alteration or extension. The two storey dwellings in the area do not share the same uniformity of design provided by the bungalows.
5. The appeal property currently shares the uniform design and low proportion of the extensive number of bungalows that contribute to the existing character of

the area. The proposal will increase the height of the appeal property to a one and half storey dwelling, significantly changing the roof scape, character and design. The design by reason of its large scale will be out of keeping with the host dwelling and appear incongruous on a prominent corner plot in an area characterised by many other bungalows of uniform design.

6. This is contrary to the aims and objectives of both Policy 6 and Policy 44 of the Oadby & Wigston Local Plan (2019) (LP) which seek development that amongst other things respect the existing local character within the area in which it is to be situated and utilise inclusive design principles such as scale, orientation and streetscape. The proposal also conflicts with the Residential Development SPD (SPD) in relation to the design and overall appearance of the dwelling. The proposals should be visually subordinate to the host dwelling. In this case, the height and scale of the proposal fail to meet this element of the SPD. The large scale changes to the roofscape dominate the proportions of the existing building. It also fails to conform to the Framework, which seeks good design that is sympathetic to local character.
7. The appellant proposes a substantial amount of render. This would be at odds with the other bungalows in the area where larger areas of brickwork are evident. The proposed use of render conflicts with the aims of Policy 6 of the LP that high quality design should be paramount in ensuring that development creates attractive buildings in character within the locale they are set, as well as the local streetscape and local building materials. Whilst reduced render and more suitable materials could be required by condition, this alone would not overcome the fundamental harm I find caused by the proposal to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area as set out above.
8. I conclude that the proposed design would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area for the above reasons and thus conflicts with Policy 6 and Policy 44 of the LP, the SPD and paragraph 135(c) of the Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to the development plan when taken as a whole and that there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh the conflict. The appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR