



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2ND September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/D/22/3300533

98 Seaton Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2BZ

- 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 D and Mrs Garrard against the decision of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00060/FUL, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side and single-storey front extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, which is situated within a modern residential estate. The dwellings in the area vary in terms of their design and appearance. The appeal property is set-back from Seaton Road, with one of the neighbouring dwellings, at number 100 Seaton Road, positioned further forward. Number 100 also has an attached side garage and front entrance porch that project in front of the main wall of that dwelling.
4. The proposal is to construct two-storey side and single-storey front extensions. They would provide an additional bedroom and enlarged bathroom on the first floor and an enlarged kitchen, utility room, wc and garage on the ground floor. The proposed garage would project some 5.7m from the front of the proposed porch and wc and it would be marginally in front of the neighbouring garage at number 100.
5. Policy 6 of the adopted Borough of Oadby and Wigston Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP) seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of new development is of high quality. Policy 44 is also quoted by the Council, although this appears to be more concerned with the impact of development on the landscape.
6. In reaching my decision, I have also taken into account the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Development 2019 (SPD). Amongst other things, the SPD advises that residential extensions should be in

keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling to be extended as well as the wider local area.

7. The Council states that the single-storey element of the proposal would be harmful to both the appearance of the existing house and the streetscene, because of its prominence and bulk. It also states that it would disrupt the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties. However, there is no objection to the two-storey side extension and I have no reason to differ in that regard.
8. With regard to the effect of the single-storey projection on the streetscene, I am not persuaded that it would be unacceptably harmful. Although it would not be a typical feature of the local area, the proposed garage would be largely screened by the neighbouring garage when approaching the appeal property from that side and it would be seen against the neighbouring garage when approaching from the other side. Consequently, I do not find against the proposal for this reason. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the symmetry of the pair of semis would be unacceptably harmed given that the number 96 has previously had a two-storey side extension.
9. However, when viewed in the context of the existing dwelling, I consider that the proposed garage would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property. It would be an overly dominant feature, due to its length and it would appear at odds and out of context when viewed against the existing building. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policy 6 of the LP and with the advice contained in the Council's SPD.

Other Matter

10. I have given consideration to the appellant's statement regarding the personal circumstances that have given rise to the proposal, in respect of health and safety. However, my decision does not prevent the creation of a ground-floor wc, which would partly address the applicant's needs (subject to a new planning application). I accept that the need for a garage and its possible conversion to a bedroom at a later date would not be satisfied. However, in its submitted form I find the proposal to be unacceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR