



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/D/19/3236988

6 Ringwood Close, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 3JL

- 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 and Mrs D Kremner against the decision of Oadby & Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00195/FUL, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension (revised scheme), front porch and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and rear extension (revised scheme), front porch and internal alterations at 6 Ringwood Close, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 3JL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00195/FUL, dated 25 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 4212/DAK/5; 4121/DAK/6 and 4121/DAK/7.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling with driveway to the front and a private garden to the rear. The site is located to the end of Ringwood Close, which is a small residential cul-de sac. Adjacent to one side of the appeal site is an area of open space and a bungalow is located to the other side. The wider area comprises a residential estate.

4. The proposed development would involve the addition of a two storey side and rear extension and front porch, with internal alterations to the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is a chalet style property with an asymmetrical roof pitch. This is the only dwelling of this design in Ringwood Close, however there are other similar examples to the rear on Newbury Close. The proposed extension would replicate the offset gable design to the front elevation and would have a hipped roof to the rear. The rear part of the extension would project into the garden beyond the existing rear elevation.
5. Whilst there are no examples of properties with double gables within the immediate surroundings, the area is reasonably varied in the designs and appearances of the properties. The area is reasonably cohesive, despite the varied designs, however a number of properties appear to have been extended.
6. Furthermore, the existing property is unique in design within Ringwood Close which is the context in which it is viewed. Consequently, whilst the proposed extension would result in a dwelling design which is not commonly found in the surroundings, it would not appear any more different in appearance than the existing asymmetrical property does. It would still form a uniquely designed property within Ringwood Close.
7. The proposal would result in a reasonably lengthy flank wall, running alongside the boundary with No 7 Ringwood Close. Nevertheless, a significant proportion of the ground floor and some of the first floor would be largely screened from public view by the intervening building, No 7. This would ensure that the proposed extension would not appear harmfully dominant or overbearing in the context of its surroundings.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area for the above reasons. It would therefore comply with Policies 1, 6 and 44 of the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (2019) (Local Plan). Collectively, these seek to ensure that development reflects the prevailing quality, character and features, is in keeping with the area in which it is situated and is of a high architectural quality, amongst other things.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed development would include a rear projection which would extend beyond the existing rear elevation by around 3.35 metres. It would be two storeys in height and the roof of the extension would slope away from the rear boundary. No windows are proposed in the rear elevation facing Newbury Close but rather would be located on the side projection facing toward the adjacent public land.
10. No 3 Newbury Close is located to the rear of the appeal site, with its rear elevation and rear garden facing the host property. The proposed extension would project closer to No 3 than the existing rear elevation. The proposed rear extension would be of a depth that would comply with the required minimum separation distance of 22 metres between facing windows of two storey houses, as detailed within the Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD). Furthermore, the submitted plans demonstrate that it would also comply with the 25-degree rule highlighted within the SPD.

11. In terms of the outlook from No 3, although the proposed extension would be closer to the shared rear boundary and the garden, the modest width of the extension across the rear elevation, coupled with the proposed hipped roof angled away from the rear boundary, would ensure that the extension would not be of a scale or proximity that would result in harm to the living conditions of the adjacent occupiers in relation to their garden or dwelling. Given the proposal meets the requirements of the SPD in terms of height and proximity, I have been presented with limited evidence to demonstrate that it would be harmful to the occupiers of this property.
12. Adjacent to the side extension is No 7 Ringwood Close, which is a modest bungalow. The proposed side extension would sit at first floor level above the ground floor of the existing property and would therefore not encroach closer to the side boundary than the existing dwelling. No 7 has a single storey garage which runs along the side boundary, resulting in the dwelling itself being set away from No 6. There are windows facing the side boundary of the appeal site however, as a result of their distance from the appeal property, the living conditions of the occupiers of No 7 would not be unduly harmed as a result of the introduction of a first floor to the side of the existing dwelling.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and as such complies with Policies 1 and 6 of the Local Plan. These seek to ensure that development contributes to a better quality of life for residents, and protects local amenity including loss of light or overlooking, amongst other things.

Other Matters

14. The Council have not raised concerns over the proposed porch, and I have little before me that would lead me to disagree with this view.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have not included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building as this is already shown on the approved plans. The Council have requested no additional conditions and I consider none to be necessary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR