
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/25/3366042

Dover Court, 185 Ratcliffe Road, Leicester LE2 3TE

- 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 & Mrs Banning against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application ref is 20240559.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension at side to dwelling house (Class C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant suggest that the appeal site is not within a conservation area. However, the boundaries of the Knighton Village Conservation Area were extended in October 2024 and now incorporate the appeal site. This is also set out in the Council's officer report and the reason for refusal on its decision notice references the conservation area. Thus, when considering this appeal, I am required by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area and I have defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Knighton Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a mid-C19 double pile detached house situated at the junction of Ratcliffe Road and Knighton Road. At the time of my site visit, the appeal site was undergoing approved works to provide extensions to the side and rear of the property. However, the side elevation facing Knighton Road retains its original design and is one of the most visually accessible. It features dual gables which provide a strong roofline. The fenestration detail to this elevation is asymmetrical with a single canted bay to the left of the ground floor elevation and a two-storey canted bay window to the right of this. Even so, their alignment within an otherwise

flush elevation contribute to a vertical emphasis. The elevation also features diamond and quatrefoil motifs which are repeated on the other elevations. The high chimneys are a point of interest in the skyline. Overall, this elevation exhibits a distinctive architectural quality which together with the dwelling's garden setting make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. This section of Ratcliffe Road has a varied building line, owing to the varying building styles present; slightly further up the road from the appeal site is a school, which is set back from the road beyond the playground.
7. The Knighton Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2024) (CAA) states that Knighton has origins as a settlement recorded in the Domesday Book and later developed into a predominantly agricultural settlement until the mid-C19 as industrialisation necessitated the expansion of the city centre, resulting in an increase in population and building density. The area has a rich variety in architectural style, representing its evolution from an agricultural village, a small hall and estate, and latterly a residential suburb.
8. Knighton Road sits beyond the village core, forming the north-east portion of the CA and is dominated by Edwardian dwellings. The CAA identifies that 185 Knighton Road, 'although physically separated from the other properties, terminates the view along Knighton Road and forms an interesting and historic feature within the street scene'.
9. The proposed development, when considered alongside the approved works, would see the original footprint of the appeal site largely subsumed by extensions. More particularly, due to its projection forward and the interjection of its roof across this elevation, the single-storey extension would introduce a horizontal emphasis to the façade. Even accounting for the matching materials, this would unacceptably disrupt the rhythm of the original design, drawing attention away from the original features including the previously uninterrupted two storey canted bay and the vertical emphasis of this elevation. This is particularly the case given the ability to appreciate this elevation from the street.
10. I have had regard to Appendix G of the Leicester City Council Residential Amenity – Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which includes general guidance in respect of house extensions on corner sites and 'screening/enclosure' considerations. However, despite the positioning of the appeal site behind hedging and trees, the density of this coverage would vary throughout the seasons, and the upper parts of the extension would be visible above the hedge line regardless of season. Together with the extension's close proximity to the site boundary, this means the erosion of the dwelling's distinctive original form would be discernible from the street and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
11. Given the scale of the proposal, the harm to the significance of the CA would be towards the lower end of less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, I must attach considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the CA. Whilst enhanced living accommodation would be provided, in the context of a single dwelling this would not amount to public benefits sufficient to outweigh the identified harm to the CA.

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of extensions added to corner plots within the adjacent Stoneygate Conservation Area. Whilst I have been provided with planning permission references and excerpts from officer's reports, the information is limited. Therefore, I cannot be certain of the exact material circumstances and context under which they were approved. In any case, they do not justify the appeal proposal, which for the site-specific reasons described above would be harmful to the CA.
13. Taking all the above into consideration, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Knighton Village Conservation Area. Consequently, it would conflict with CS Policy 3 and CS Policy 18 of the Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2014) which require that developments protect the character and setting of heritage assets and are well-designed that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local built environment. It is also contrary to the provisions in the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matter

14. The appellant suggests that the eaves and overall roof height of the proposal are within permitted development rights. However, I have considered the appeal on the basis that planning permission has been applied for and is required. Therefore, this does not alter my conclusion under the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR