

<b>PLANNING INSPECTORATE APPEAL DECISIONS</b>		
<b>20198014A</b>	<b>42 GUTHRIDGE CRESCENT</b>	
Proposal:	<b>TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE; SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT, SIDE AND REAR OF HOUSE (CLASS C3) (AMENDED 19.02.19)</b>	
Appellant:	MR SUKHWANT SINGH	
Appeal type:	Planning Householder Appeal	
Appeal received:	12 April 2019	
Appeal decision:	Dismissed	
Appeal dec date:	17 June 2019	
TEI	AREA: W	WARD: Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields



©Crown Copyright Reserved. Leicester City Council Licence 100019264(2019). Ordnance Survey mapping does not imply any ownership boundaries and does not always denote the exact ground features.

### Summary

- An application for the installation of a two storey extension at the front, side and rear of house was refused in March 2019.
- The appeal was dismissed.

### Location and Site Description

The application relates to a semi-detached property in a primarily residential part of the city.

## **The Proposal**

The proposal was for a two storey extension to the side and a single storey extension to the front, side and rear of the house. It was refused as the scale of the two storey extension to the side and the forward protrusion of the single storey extension to the front would appear overly dominant in relation to the existing property, out of proportion in relation to the host property and its immediate neighbour and not in keeping with the general design principles characteristic of Guthridge Crescent and Valance Road.

## **The Appeal Decision**

The appeal was dismissed.

## **Commentary**

The inspectorate's decision concluded that the extension would result in a dominant, prominent feature which would detract from the appearance of the host property and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings.

The decision also concluded that the proposal would introduce an incongruous feature into an established residential area.

The two storey side and single storey front extension were considered harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part. The proposal would significantly diminish the contribution they make to the quality of the locality and the character and appearance of the area would be harmed as a result.

Though the decision noted the presence of a medium size tree in the side garden of number 44 that would soften the appearance of the extension when viewed from the north it added that this tree was not in the control of the applicant and could be removed at any time.