



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2025

**by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/25/3368286**

**114 Lutterworth Road, Leicester City LE2 8PG**

- 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 Mr Max Raja against the decision of Leicester City Council.
  - The application reference is 20242236.
  - The development proposed is described on the Application form as the 'Extension to existing single garage.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding locality.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located along Lutterworth Road which contains a number of large plots and detached dwellings. The way that the dwellings have been designed and placed along Lutterworth Road emphasise status with large front gardens with dwellings set back from the road. Many of the front and rear gardens are well vegetated with mature trees, with grass verges and hedgerows to the front of plots which allows vegetation to dominate and gives a very leafy and green townscape. There is an emphasis on spaciousness with undeveloped gaps in and around dwellings which also contribute to the experience and local distinctiveness of the locality. There are a handful of dwellings that have completely paved their front garden or have solid boundary treatments and buildings in the front garden, however these elements are not a dominant characteristic, but which do detract from the positive qualities that make up the character and appearance of the locality.
4. The appeal site contains elements which reflects some of the positive qualities that contribute to character and appearance of the locality, such as having a large front garden area (albeit much is paved), with hedgerows and large mature trees located along the boundary. The dwelling is set back well into the plot which emphasises the important undeveloped spaces in and around the dwelling. The existing dwelling does contain a small outbuilding to the front which is set closer to the dwelling.
5. In assessing new development, the Leicester City Council Core Strategy (CS) Policy CS03 is a design led policy which has a number of design criteria to adhere

to such as being high quality, well designed, respond positively to the character of the area in terms of materials, height, scale, and massing, amongst others.

6. The proposed garage would be very large in size at 7 metres x 7 metres x 3 metres tall and would be placed very close to the front boundary. Whilst I agree with the Appellant's Statement of Case (SoC) that the garage would be seen in the context of the mature trees and vegetation, it is not a modest building and this is why the development is problematic, given that it interferes with the undeveloped and open spaces which allow vegetation to dominate, rather than built form. I can also appreciate that there is already an outbuilding to the front of the existing dwelling however this is much closer to the dwelling itself and quite small in size, when compared to the proposed garage.
7. I note reference in the appeal documents with regards to an approved appeal decision<sup>1</sup> for a garage to the front boundary on the adjacent property at No.116 Lutterworth Road. This decision was undertaken 9 years ago and on my site visit, the resulting impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene is quite evident, which may not have been foreseen years ago. The neighbouring garage is very prominent and encloses the frontage within the street scene, which is not assisted by the close boarded fence, gates, hardstanding and quite developed and somewhat defensive frontage. Whilst I agree that there are a handful of dwellings that have garages to their frontage along this road, these are setback within the site towards the main dwelling, and do not have as much prominence as the neighbouring dwelling at No.116. The existing garage at No.116, does however illustrate how dominant these types of buildings can be to the street scene which in turn interferes with the character and appearance of the street scene. The presence of this garage at No.116 does not provide adequate justification for further detrimental elements to be situated on the appeal site.
8. That said and in conclusion of this matter, the proposed garage would dominate the front of the dwelling and detract from the positive qualities of the locality, causing harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposed scheme would therefore be contrary to CS Policy CS03 as described previously.

## **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*J Somers*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D15/3141505, 116 Lutterworth Road, Dated 01 June 2016