



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/25/3360172

120 Spencefield Lane, Leicester LE5 6HF

- 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 Vijay Odedra against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 20241289.
 - The development proposed is construction of single storey extension at front of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider an amended version of that description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself.

Reasons

5. The site is within a predominantly residential area characterised by two-storey properties which vary in design. Notwithstanding this semi-detached properties in the area, such as the appeal site, share common features and have a form of symmetry forming a harmonious built form.
6. The development does not complement the existing architecture of the property and unbalances the symmetry of the semi-detached properties. The glazed box design projecting from the lean-to addition create a jarring feature incongruous to the existing property and area in general.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the approval¹ of an addition to the property and highlights that the lean-to structure element of the appeal proposal is similar.

¹ Ref: 20230838

Whilst this maybe the case I have not been provided with substantive details to confirm this. Nevertheless, the proposal before me would not be comparable given the glazed porch element, I have therefore reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal before me.

8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself. There is conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the Leicester City local development framework, Core Strategy (2014) which seeks amongst other things to ensure development is of high quality well designed which responds positively to the character and context of an area.
9. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR