



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/24/3354400

15 Barry Drive, Syston, Leicestershire LE7 1LX

- 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 Mrs Cassandra Greensmith against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/24/1076/2.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The decision notice cites Policy DS5 of the emerging Charnwood Local Plan 2021-2037. Although I have taken this policy into account as a material consideration, it is almost identical to Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011-2028 Core Strategy (2015) (CLP). In light of this, the direction of emerging policy is not a significant determining factor in this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is set on a corner plot and comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The properties in the street are built largely to the same simple design, although some have been extended. Nevertheless, the consistent design of the dwellings contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Paragraphs 3.37 and 3.38 of the Charnwood Design Supplementary Planning Document (2020) state that extensions should respect the basic shape, size and proportions of the existing property and that the main property should remain the dominant building. While the proposed extension would be slightly set back from the existing front elevation and the ridge line would be marginally lower than that of the main property, the eaves height would be the same. Furthermore, the width of the extension would approach that of the existing house. As a result, and despite the changes made after a previous refusal of planning permission¹, the extension would not appear subservient and the main property would not remain as the dominant building.

¹ Planning application ref. P/24/0373/2

6. Overall, the proposal would not respect the size and proportions of the existing property and, while the attached dwelling at 13 Barry Drive has a single-storey garage to the side, the considerable bulk and massing of the proposed extension at the first-floor level would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Whilst any side extension has the potential to unbalance the semi-detached pair, it is the excessive scale and lack of subordination of this particular proposal that would result in a harmful effect.
7. Some other properties in the street have two-storey side extensions, including Nos 11 and 28 Barry Drive. However, these extensions are significantly narrower than the proposed extension and consequently they respect the size and proportions of the original properties. A large two-storey extension was granted planning permission at 19 Parkstone Road (No 19). However, I have not been provided with the officer's report for this permission so I am unable to make any meaningful comparison between the reasons why the extension at No 19 was granted whereas the appeal scheme was refused. Nevertheless, No 19 is a detached dwelling and as such the approved extension does not unbalance a pair of semi-detached properties. As such these other extensions are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme and do not justify it. In any event, this appeal has been determined on its own merits.
8. Overall, the proposed extension would be a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the dwelling as a result of its bulk, scale and width and, consequently, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with CLP Policy CS2 and Policies EV/1 and H/17 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 1991-2006 Written Statement (2004). Amongst other things, these policies require a development to respect and enhance the character, and to be compatible with regards to scale and mass with the original dwelling and the area.

Other Matters

9. I have taken account of the appellant's need for additional habitable accommodation, but that in itself does not justify the harm that would arise from the design of the appeal scheme.
10. I acknowledge that no objections were received during the original planning application and that the Council raises no concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, these are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
11. Economic benefits would arise from the construction of the extension, although these would be temporary and limited by the nature of the scheme. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the enlarged dwelling would result in an increase in Council Tax. I therefore attach limited weight to these matters.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis INSPECTOR