
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/24/3338812

45 Highway Road, Thurmaston, Leicester LE4 8FR

- 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 Kulvinder Singh against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/23/1697/2, dated 16 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is 1.5 storey extensions to rear and side, single storey rear extension, garage, dormers to front roof and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, No 45, is a bungalow standing in a row of similar bungalows, with some having a different roof form. The road also contains two-storey houses of varying designs, including those opposite the site. Therefore, in the part of Highway Road containing No 45 are a range of property types with different frontage depths and building heights. However, hipped or gabled roofs are predominant. Although there is no distinctive local character, I observed no developments or mansard roofs resembling the appeal proposal in the locality.
4. The proposed development would introduce a mansard roof with front dormer windows. The extended property would occupy much of the plot width. In combination, the height, bulk and massing of the bungalow would be significantly increased. Due in part to the much larger, altered roof, the proposed development would not appear subservient to the host dwelling and its characteristic hipped, 'pyramid' type roof would be lost entirely. The mansard roof would have an alien, dominating appearance and the overall design of the proposal would be incongruous with the appearance of the host property and the bungalows which form its immediate context. The development would interrupt the rhythm of the bungalows which stand in similar sized plots, adding further detriment to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. There have been previous planning applications for extensions at No 45 and the appeal proposal is for development of a comparatively reduced scale. Nonetheless, I am required to determine the appeal proposal based upon its own merits. It appears to me that there is ample scope to meet the appellant's requirements for additional family accommodation in a manner that respects the design of the host dwelling and the character of its surroundings.
6. The comments of objectors about the impact of the proposed development on their living conditions are noted. However, having regard to the separation distances, the orientation of the buildings and the location and design of the existing windows in neighbouring properties, I agree with the Council that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of light, harm the outlook or privacy of the neighbouring properties or otherwise harm their living conditions.
7. For the reasons I have set out, I conclude that the scale, mass and overall design of the proposed development would result in extensions that are not subservient to or in keeping with the character of the host bungalow. Furthermore, the development would not respect the characteristics of the bungalows in its immediate vicinity and would be an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the street scene. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the design objectives of Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan (2011-2028) Core Strategy, saved Policy EV1 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan and saved Policy DS5 of the Draft Charnwood Local Plan (2021-2037). Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR