The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made 4 July 2011

by Richard High BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 July 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/11/2152937
64 Barrie Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 0QX

- 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 Ms Dawn Stevens, against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 11/00010, dated 10 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2011.
- The development proposed is a roof extension to form additional bedroom.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 64 Barrie Road is one of a pair of hip-roofed semi-detached houses in a row of nine pairs of similar dwellings. The proposed development would facilitate a loft conversion to create an additional bedroom by changing the roof profile to a half hipped roof and creating a dormer window in the roof to the rear. None of the other houses in this row of semi-detached houses has an extension which alters the hipped roof profile. While there are examples of gable ended properties in Barrie Road they are gable ended at both ends.

4. The different roof profile of the proposed extension would remove the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses and would stand out awkwardly from its neighbours. It would be an incongruous feature which would disrupt the harmony of the street scene. For this reason it would fail to comply with Saved Policy BE1 of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan 2001 which requires new development to be of a high standard of design and to complement the character of the surrounding area.

5. I accept that the proposal would not increase the height of the dwelling and note that the proposal is an amendment of a previous proposal which aims to

address the concerns of the local planning authority. However these factors do not remove the harm I have found.

6. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed half hipped roof would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. On my visit I viewed the examples of similar development referred to by the appellant. At 82 Netherley Road the extension confirmed my view that the development would be harmful to the street scene and I note that it was permitted some time ago when the policy context was different. The example at 224 Hinckley Road, Earl Shilton is some distance away and relates to a detached house rather than a semi-detached house and is therefore not entirely comparable with the appeal proposal.

8. My visit was undertaken on an unaccompanied basis without entering the site, as agreed by both parties; I was therefore unable to fully assess the effect of the proposed second floor dormer window to the rear. While the effect of the dormer is not referred to in the reason for refusal it is referred to in the officer's report as being large and dominant in the rear roof plane. Because I have reached a clear view on harm caused by the proposed change to the roof profile to the side, I have been able to determine the appeal without considering the proposed dormer.

9. I have taken into account the desirability of the efficient use of land and the contribution that the extension would make to addressing the shortage in the 5 year supply of housing. However, these benefits would be too slight to outweigh the harm I have found.

10. For the reasons I have given and having considered all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard High

INSPECTOR