



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/W/25/3370651

2 Overton Road, Leicester LE5 0JA

- 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 Sidat against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application reference is 20241394.
 - The development proposed is the render of all elevations and the installation of 1.8m high metal railings to forecourt of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the installation of 1.8m high metal railings to the forecourt of property.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the render of all elevations at 2 Overton Road, Leicester in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 20241394, insofar as the details relate to the render of all elevations only, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The rendering of the building shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The rendering of the building hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A3-001_SITE Rev A, A3-002_PLANS Rev A, A3-003_PLANS Rev A, A3-004 ELEVATIONS Rev A and A3-005 ELEVATIONS Rev A, notwithstanding that the details of the proposed railings and advertisements are not approved by this permission.
 - 3) The render to be used shall match the colour used on the existing building unless an alternative colour scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The rendering shall be carried out only in accordance with the current render colour; or the approved alternative colour details.

Main Issue

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

Procedural Matters

4. The application form relates to the rendering of the entire building and the provision of advertisements. As advertisements are dealt with under separate regulations, they were not considered by the council to form part of the application. The appeal statement also makes reference to advertisements but as these cannot be

considered under this appeal procedure, the matter of the advertisements is not considered as part of this appeal. I have not included the advertisements within the description of development.

5. Although not included within the description of development, the application form and plans include details of railings to be constructed around the forecourt of the building. I have included the railings within the description of development as set out in the decision notice and the appellant's statement of case. The rendering of the building is included in the description of development and is shown on the plans. As no evidence has been submitted to indicate that formal consent is not required, I have assessed the proposal as submitted.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The council has raised no concerns with regard to the rendering of the building. The building is already part rendered and extending this to the remaining areas of the building would improve the appearance of the property. I have allowed this element of the proposal, subject to a condition that requires that the colour of the render match that of the existing; or be of a colour agreed with the local planning authority.
7. The proposed fence would extend from the front corners of the building and follow the alignment of the public footpath, enclosing the large paved forecourt. The forecourt area is currently partly bounded by low level railings but these provide relatively unrestricted access to the forecourt from the surrounding pavements. The forecourt itself extends a significant distance from the front of the building towards the road junction. The public area beyond the forecourt is made up of a wide pavement along Overton Road and a much wider pavement area along Houghton Street and at the junction with Overton Road.
8. At present the area is characterised by the large expanses of highway and road infrastructure, including pedestrian islands and crossing and the low-level railings to both this site and opposite on Uppingham Road. The park opposite also has low level railings. Properties are generally built-up to the pavements but where there are properties with forecourts, such as along Overton Road, Houghton Street, Humberstone Road and Uppingham Road, physical boundaries where they exist, are for the most part ,of brick and/or railings and are relatively modest in height.
9. There are exceptions to the west, along the south of Humberstone Road. There is high security fencing outside a car sales garage and further along that road, there is an area enclosed by high hoardings and advertisements. Whilst these are negative elements within the street scene, as they generally follow the alignment of the straight road and/or are within the building lines of properties to each side, their prominence and wider impact is limited to a certain extent. I have not been informed whether either benefit from planning permission.
10. The railings proposed would extend well forward of the building and would be viewed and experienced as a significant intrusion into the public domain. The isolated corner position, together with the proposed height of the railings, would substantially increase the prominence of this enclosure. The secondary nature of Overton Road and Houghton Street, compared to Humberstone Road (A47) which is a major throughfare, would make the assimilation of such infrastructure more

difficult. The proposed fencing would represent a particularly dominant, uncharacteristic and intrusive addition to the street scene.

11. The installation of such high railings around this large and exposed projecting forecourt would undoubtedly detract significantly from the character and appearance of this area. It would therefore be contrary to the design objectives of CS Policy 3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy 2014 (CS); and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Other matters

12. The appellant sets out that the building provides essential community support including a food bank and the provision of education and mental health services. These services are described as being offered to over a thousand vulnerable service users a month including to children, disabled and other protected groups. The centre is said to provide over £120,000 in food support and debt relief to over 500 families. It accommodates between 60 to 100 students per week and offers a supervised family contact centre for separated families; and daily workshops for vulnerable adults seeking employment. It also provides sports and youth engagement programs.
13. The appellant advises that the Home Office has assessed the premises under their Protective Security for Places of Worship Scheme, conducting a comprehensive on-site assessment and specifically recommending the 1.8m high security railings as being necessary. This assessment has not been provided but I have no reason to doubt the conclusions stated.
14. The appellant advises that concern with regard to safety results from documented incidents including multiple drug use occurrences directly outside the premises, including the discovery of used needles and drug paraphernalia; alcohol consumption and littering of bottles; littering generally; verbal harassment and aggressive behaviour toward staff and service users, including the supervised family contact sessions, vulnerable children and those seeking debt relief services. Despite the use of CCTV, individuals have attempted unauthorised access and there has been theft of property, including educational equipment. It is also described that there was a serious incident involving 30-35 youths at 2am requiring police intervention. I am mindful of the awards referred to which reflect on the positive record of the Raedan Institute.
15. The appellant sets out statutory duties with regard to welfare provisions; safeguarding duties; vulnerable adult protection; the requirement for reasonable adjustments for protected groups; and the requirement to maintain safe premises. These are contained within the Children Act 2004, the Education Act 2002; the Care Act 2014, the Family Law Act 1996, the Equality Act 2010 and the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. I have had full regard to the legislative provisions.
16. Reference has also been made to the Core Strategy and I note particularly the ambition to reduce crime and the fear of crime and to promote public safety, together with the objective of meeting the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion, as set out within CS Policy 3 and CS Policy 8. Reference has been made to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. I have had full regard to the similar updated requirements within the 2024 Framework.

Conclusions

17. I find considerable weight in favour of improving the security of the building and the safety of its users, including local and national policy support. I am also mindful of the legislative requirements. However, the inclusion of all of the large forecourt, which extends a significant distance from the frontage of the building, would result in considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
18. It has not been made clear whether the forecourt would be used in association with the activities within the building. As there is no suggestion of such a use, I have considered the purpose of the proposed railings to act as increased security for those accessing and immediately outside the building; and as an enhanced first line of defence against intrusions and anti-social and threatening behaviour. In these circumstances and on the basis of the evidence before me, I am not satisfied that it would be essential that the entirety of the forecourt be enclosed with such high fencing.
19. The visual harm would increase with the distance of high fencing from the frontage, with the furthest extent of the enclosure, having the greatest impact on the appearance of the area. I am not persuaded that the proposal has been carefully considered having regard to the overall appearance of the area and the potential to reduce or minimise the impact whilst achieving similar benefits to security. I do consider it reasonable that the security of the area of forecourt closest to the building and the entrance to the property be enhanced but I am not persuaded, without any evidence with regard to the use of the enclosed area of forecourt, that this proposal represents the most suitable solution or a satisfactory design.
20. The appellant has put forward a number of matters that support the need for this proposal and there is local and national policy support, in addition to the legislative requirements. I must weigh these matters against the concern for the character and appearance of the area and the clear policy conflict in that regard. Given my reservations with regard to the scale of the works proposed, particularly the area to be enclosed, I conclude that the concerns raised outweigh the benefits of the proposal. I therefore dismiss the appeal with regard to the proposed alignment of the railings.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR