



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by J Symmons BSc (Hons) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/24/3348688

23 Thurnview Road, Leicester LE5 6HL

- 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 Abdul Rauf against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application reference is 20240311.
 - The development proposed is the installation of pitched roof over existing first floor flat roof, extension of existing dormer to the rear and velux windows to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of pitched roof over existing first floor flat roof, extension of existing dormer to the rear and velux windows to the front at 23 Thurnview Road, Leicester LE5 6HL in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 20240311 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Drawing 002 - Proposed Block Plan;
 - Drawing 005 - Proposed First Floor Plan;
 - Drawing 006 - Proposed Loft Plan;
 - Drawing 007 - Proposed Roof Plan;
 - Drawing 008 - Existing and Proposed Front and Side Elevations; and
 - Drawing 009 - Existing and Proposed Rear and Side Elevations.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the development description shown on the application form as no evidence has been presented to show a change to this had been agreed.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2024. Insofar as it is directly relevant to the appeal, there are no substantive changes. As a result, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the information provided and the parties have not been prejudiced by this.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the determination of the appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a large two-storey semi-detached property with hip roof. It has a two-storey side extension with flat roof and a rear dormer extension. The property is well set back from the road by a paved drive and parking area, and it has a good size rear garden. The surrounding area is typically a mix of large semi-detached and detached properties of various architectural styles and forms. The area's roofscape is not homogeneous with some significant roof variation and designs. Even with this mix of houses and roofs, with their good plot sizes and set back frontages, the street scene has a wide and pleasant appearance.
6. The proposal would consist of a pitched roof with loft conversion over the flat roofed side extension and a rear dormer extension to the existing dormer.
7. With its use of similar materials, roof pitch and ridge line height, the proposed roof extension would appear as a consistent and matching addition to the host property and its semi-detached neighbour. Indeed, it would amount to a clear improvement on the appearance of the existing flat roof and side extension.
8. While it would be a sizable addition, its mass and scale would relate acceptably to the existing roof and it would not overly dominate the property. It would also be a modest change within the mix of roof designs that exist within the wider street scene. It would not appear as an incongruous addition or detract from the existing residential frontage.
9. I appreciate the end of the proposal's pitch roof would not mirror the hip roofs on the neighbouring properties. However, with the separation that exists between these, it would not appear at odds with them or unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. Nor would it appear as a cramped addition in the context of the appeal site's large plot size. As I observed during my visit there are similar roof examples, such as 14 Thurnview Road which shows how pitched roofs can sit comfortably on host properties and against different roof types in the street scene without harming the area's character and appearance.
10. In relation to the proposed rear dormer extension, this would be a smaller and, with its rear position and front screening, more visually discrete addition. In conjunction with its use of similar materials and matching architectural style, it would not significantly alter the existing dormer's visual relationship to the host property or neighbouring properties. It would not, either on its own or in combination with the proposed pitch roof, be overly dominating or an incongruous addition. It would sit comfortably in the house plot and would not unacceptably affect the existing balance of the semi-detached properties.
11. For the above reasons, the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would comply with Policy CS03 of Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2014 and Paragraphs 135, 139 and 140 of the Framework which seek, amongst other matters, for new development to be well designed and to a high quality that

contributes positively to the character and appearance of the local natural and built environment.

Conditions

12. The Council's suggested conditions have been considered. I have imposed the standard condition in respect of time limitation and a plans condition in the interests of certainty. To protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition is needed to secure the appropriate use of materials.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, having taken account of the development plan as a whole and other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Symmons

INSPECTOR