



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2024

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/24/3347099

Fair View, Kibworth Road, Three Gates, Illston On The Hill, Leicestershire LE7 9EQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Liam Burgess against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00188/FUL.
The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension and single storey front extension, installation of a rear dormer extension and front dormer extensions, and external alterations including installation of a gable roof over re-sited front entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The dormer windows are not correctly shown on the first-floor plan as, to align with the elevations, these should be recessed back from the front and rear elevations. Notwithstanding these discrepancies, I have assessed the effect of the scheme based on the details shown on the elevation drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a modest dormer bungalow set in the open countryside. The building stands within a relatively spacious plot and is at the end of a short row of properties, within an open and prominent position. Due to its subdued form, the building makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The proposed side extension would replace a car port that is largely visually open with a lightweight roof, which is subservient feature when compared to the main dwelling. In contrast, the side extension would be a sizeable addition of solid form. It would be flush with the front elevation and include a shallow pitched roof that would distinguish it from the current dwelling. Consequently, the side extension would appear as a wide and dominant feature that would conflict with the simple and understated form of the existing dwelling.

6. The proposed double garage would project toward the highway, with a shallow pitched roof. This would present a prominent addition that would possess largely blank side and rear elevations from distant views along the highway. Therefore, in combination with the side extension, the scale and design of the garage and the absence of visual interest, would create a poor juxtaposition of forms. Consequently, these additions would neither respect the design characteristics of, nor would they be subordinate to, the existing dwelling.
7. The front dormers would include shallow pitched roof components that would appear weak in design terms adding little to the interest of the roof. However, alone these would not have a material deleterious effect on the appearance of the dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed porch would introduce a gable feature, with a triangular first-floor window and eaves that match the main dwelling. This would align with the roof style of the main house and add interest to the frontage. The use of larch and render cladding would introduce contemporary materials that would be appropriate in consideration of the variety of materials used in the area. However, the positive effect of these elements would not outweigh the harm found.
8. The appellant asserts that Permitted Development (PD) rights exist as a fall-back position for a side extension. This references Class A1(J), of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the General Permitted Development Order [2015] for side extensions. This requires side extensions to be no higher than 4 metres, be single storey and have a width less than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. However, a Certificate of Lawful Development has not been submitted to confirm that such rights exist. Furthermore, even if the side extension were PD, this would represent only a part of the proposed scheme. Accordingly, a PD extension would not therefore be of greater visual impact than the proposal, presenting a potential fall-back position of limited weight.
9. Accordingly, whilst finding that the porch and dormers would complement the dwelling, the visual effect of the proposed extensions would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy GD8, of the Harborough Local Plan, the Council's Development Management SPD [2021] and the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, among other matters, for development to be sympathetic to local vernacular and to respect the context and characteristics of the site and the streetscene.
10. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR