



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: W2465/D/24/3346171

325 Narborough Road, Leicester, LE3 2RD

- 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 Ms June Quinn against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application reference is 20240315.
 - The development proposed is for a front elevation porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal is made retrospectively for development already constructed.
3. On 30 July 2024 the Government began consultations upon reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework 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 issues in this appeal, it has not been necessary for me to consult the main parties upon it.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid terrace house located in a residential area. It forms part of a number of properties arranged in the form of a crescent.
6. The properties are included upon the local list of buildings (i.e. non-designated heritage assets) of interest and an Article 4 Direction applies to them, dated November 2016, and which removes permitted development rights including extensions and porches.
7. The significance of the crescent of buildings relates to the general pattern of the development as a whole and the design synergy afforded to the properties

in terms of matching building materials (i.e, brick and rendered walls) and the general uniformity afforded to the building line that forms the crescent appearance when experienced by passers-by, even accounting for the existence of another porch elsewhere within the terrace with its less imposing mono-pitched roof. There is a porch elsewhere within the terrace with a double pitch roof, but the evidence from a previous Inspector's decision is that it is unauthorised and is under consideration by the Council.

8. The local planning authority (LPA) states, in its officer report, that the reasons for the addition of the properties to the local list are as follows: -

'A crescent of 20 inter-war Council houses, split into 5 distinct blocks, which were developed in the late 1920s by the Council and were designed following the garden city and arts & crafts movements. These movements sought the introduction of vernacular materials and the creation of homes set within pleasant green environments, moving away from the high density terraces of the earlier centuries. They formed the showpiece of the development across South Braunstone.'

9. The porch, albeit with a proposed mono-pitch roof, has been the subject of an earlier appeal decision¹ and where the Inspector commented as follows upon the porch as currently constructed:-

'I consider that the porch as constructed has a somewhat dominant and incongruous appearance in the context of the group of houses because of its gabled roof and heavy grey fascia boards which break through and interrupt the strong line between the ground floor brick elevation and the rendered upper floor in this part of the terrace'.

10. I do not disagree with the Inspector's findings above, and also agree that the porch is appropriate in terms of its footprint, height to the eaves and the design and appearance of the front door.
11. The point of contention concerns the double pitch to the roof. The host property, together with the majority of other properties in the crescent, have simple, front elevations. While there are a number of bay and oriel windows and door canopies, these form minor visual additions which do not dominate or stand out from the front elevations when viewed as a whole.
12. In contrast to the above, the porch to the host property, by its pitched roof, introduces a visually more dominant and intrusive feature which contrasts and detracts unacceptably from the simple design of most of the elevations and to the overall significance of the crescent of properties when considered collectively as non-designated heritage assets. The existence of a possibly unlawful double pitched roof to a porch elsewhere does not alter my finding in this regard and, furthermore, the existence of a porch with a mono-pitched roof elsewhere within the terrace is not directly analogous in so far that it is not appreciated as being as dominant or imposing in the street-scene.
13. Therefore, while I acknowledge the existence of an existing porch with a mono-pitched roof within the crescent, I find that the appeal porch with its double pitched roof fundamentally and unacceptably alters the significance of the characterful crescent of buildings with simple, unobtrusive facades, given its

¹ App/W2465/D/23/3332487

overall bulky and dominant impact. While I do not know with certainty the current planning status of the double pitched roof porch elsewhere within the crescent, I do not, in any event, find that this constitutes good design or, if it is now considered to be lawful, that it justifies harming the overall significance of the host property when it is experienced amongst the crescent of non-designated heritage asset buildings as a whole.

14. For the above reasons, I find that the development does not accord with policy CS03 of the Leicester City Core Strategy 2014 (CS) which requires high quality designs which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local environment, or with policy CS18 of the CS which aims to protect and enhance the historic environment. It would not comply with chapter 12 of the Framework which aims to create well designed and beautiful places. On balance, I conclude that the development does not accord with paragraph 209 of the Framework, given the scale of the harm that has been caused to the host property and to the crescent of non-designated heritage assets when assessed as a whole.
15. In reaching the above conclusion, I have considered the appellant's comment that the porch and door is needed for security reasons. The door is acceptable in design terms and the evidence indicates that there is a planning permission in place for a porch with a mono-pitched roof. Therefore, I find that security requirements could be achieved by opting for a more sensitive design solution in the form of the implementation of the planning permission that exists for the appeal site.

Conclusion

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

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR