



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/23/3332328
397 Saffron Lane, Leicester, LE2 6UF

- 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 Firoj Lamba against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20231113, dated 8 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a porch and canopy at front of house and external rendering.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The Council's decision notice and the appeal form refer to the proposal being retrospective. However, the appellant states that the proposal is not to retain what has been built, but to gain permission for a smaller scheme.
2. It has been pointed out to me that the plans that were determined by the Council were incorrect, as they did not accurately show the position of the garage that is attached to the property. The appeal submission included amended plans and these were also forwarded to the Council. Given the minor difference, I have decided to determine the appeal on the basis of the revised plans, as they do not affect the main issue.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a porch and canopy at front of house and external rendering at 397 Saffron Lane, Leicester, LE2 6UF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20231113, dated 8 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 plans: HP SH – 01 Elevations; HP SH – 02 Plans; and HP SH – 03 Roof Plans, all dated November 2023.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling with an attached garage which is situated on the corner of Saffron Lane and Robin Close. The property

is set-back from Saffron Lane by a relatively wide tree lined verge and footpath. The area is heavily built-up and is characterised by two-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings.

6. The proposal is to erect a front porch with a canopy across the front of the attached garage and the front door. A canopy and porch has already been built, but the canopy that exists covers the full width of the dwelling. The appeal proposal is for a smaller porch and canopy.
7. Policy CS03 of the Council's Core Strategy 2014 (CS) requires the design of new developments to be of high quality that contribute positively to the built environment. I consider this policy to accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which contains similar provisions.
8. The Council contends that the proposal would appear as an innocuous addition, because of its position beyond the front of the terrace of 6 properties. It considers that it represents poor design and would be harmful to the appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene.
9. Although the porch and canopy would be visually prominent, I am not persuaded that it's scale and design, as detailed on the amended plans, would be unduly harmful. Whilst there are no other porches or canopies on the other properties along the terrace, the appeal property is at the end of the row and the proposal would not appear as disruptive or incongruous as it may have been on the other dwellings. It also appears differently from the rest of the terrace, because of the attached garage and it's spatial relationship with Robin Close.
10. Regarding the rendering to the dwelling, I noted at my site visit that this has already been carried out. The Council does not appear to object to this part of the proposal and whilst the external walls of the other properties in the terrace are largely brick, render is used on the bay windows and there is also evidence of painted brickwork. Consequently, I find this element of the proposal to be acceptable.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. In addition to the standard 3-year commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is required. As the rendering has already been carried out, there is no need to impose a materials condition.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR