



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2024

by S. Hartley BA(Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/24/3345998

40 Park Rise, Leicester, LE3 6SH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - The appeal is made by Mary Hall against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application reference is 20232389
 - The proposal is for a new front dormer, conservatory and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a new front dormer, conservatory and garage at 40 Park Rise, Leicester, LE3 6SH in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 20232389 subject to the following conditions: -
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: 2023/9394/01 (Existing plans and elevations including existing and proposed site plans) and 2023/9394/02 (proposed plans and elevations).
 - (3) The brickwork to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, and the roofing material for the dormer and garage hereby permitted, shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. On 30 July 2024 the Government began consultations upon reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and which will close on 24 September 2024. The reforms are draft and may be subject to change and therefore I afford the draft changes only limited weight in the decision-making process. As there are no proposed reforms which are pertinent to the main issue in this appeal, it has not been necessary for me to consult the main parties upon it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within a residential area and is a detached, two storey, brick-built dwelling on a corner plot with its blank gable facing the main estate road and its front elevation facing other properties across an access pathway.
5. It has a double pitched roof plus a catslide addition to one side of the front elevation upon which it is proposed to include a dormer window with a double pitched roof. On my site visit, I was able to note similar roof designs to dwellings in the area, some of which contained dormers to their cat-slide roofs.
6. The dwelling includes amenity space to the side and rear, contained within close boarded wooden fencing of approximately 2 metres high, within which the proposal is to erect an attached single storey garage to the side and a single storey conservatory to the rear.
7. The appellant has referred to other dwellings in the vicinity which include dormer windows. While not all are of the same design, on my site visit I was able to note that the dormer window at No. 76 Park Rise, being located upon an asymmetrical roof, has similarities to the appeal proposal. However, while the quoted examples provide useful comparisons, I have determined the appeal upon its individual merits.
8. I consider that the proposed dormer window, by its siting and design, would assimilate well with the character and appearance of the host property and would not be a cumbersome or disproportionate addition. Moreover, on my site visit, I was able to note that the adjoining dwelling has a higher roof line than the catslide roof of the host property, such that the proposed dormer would not appear as an overly prominent addition in the street scene and where other dwellings include such a feature.
9. The proposed single storey attached side garage would have a double pitched roof, and while its pitch would differ from that of the host property, by the limited size of the proposed garage, it would not have an unacceptably adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property or that of the area. The same would apply to the rear, attached single storey conservatory in terms of the acceptability of its design and roof.
10. For the above reasons, and when the proposed additions are taken as a whole, I consider that they would have an acceptable impact both upon the host property and that of the character and appearance of the area.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the development accords with Policy CS3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy 2014 and with chapter 12 of the Framework, both of which stress the need for high quality design which contributes to the character and appearance of the built environment.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time condition, and a condition to ensure that the development is in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of good design, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials.

Conclusion

13. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR