



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/D/23/3330104

1 Kensington Drive, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 1JS

- 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 Makhan Singh Kandola against the decision of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00298/FUL, dated 27 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to the side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey extension to the side at 1 Kensington Drive, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 1JS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/00298/FUL, dated 27 July 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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: location plan PP-12346384v1, block plan 002, existing/as built 003, as built ground floor 004, proposed first floor 005, proposed/as built elevations 006, proposed/as built elevations 007 and Jubizol Brick Slip & Effect Brochure received 19 September 2023.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 1 Kensington Drive is a two storey house on a corner plot at Kensington Drive and Grangeway Road, in an established residential area. The boundary with the street at the corner is open with hardstanding adjacent to both streets. The house is characteristic of development in the area in its brick construction with tiled roof.

4. The single storey extension has already been built. It extends from level with the front elevation of the existing house which faces Kensington Drive, for most of the depth of the existing house along the side elevation which faces No. 3 Kensington Drive. It is approximately 3m wide and constructed of white UPVC cladding on a timber frame. The development the subject of this appeal is for a revised scheme, substituting brick slip cladding for the UPVC cladding.
5. The policies relevant in this case include policy 6 of the Borough of Oadby and Wigston Local Plan 2011-2031, which requires, among other things, high standards of design and materials. Policy 44 relates mainly to the conservation of distinctive landscape. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Development* 2019 (the SPD) sets out specific guidance on aspects of residential related development, including massing and materials.
6. I consider that the size and scale of the extension are appropriate to a side extension in this location, sited as it is between the two neighbouring properties, Nos. 1 and 3 Kensington Drive. The existing white UPVC cladding is not strictly in keeping with the predominantly brick construction of the existing building and the surrounding area and the appellant proposes the use of brick slips to clad the exterior as shown on the submitted plans.
7. The extension is partially visible in views from a short distance to the north along Kensington Drive and to the southwest along Grangeway Road, beyond which it is obscured by the other houses. Its full height is partially screened by the timber fence between the garden and the hardstanding adjacent to Kensington Drive. It is not visible from the east along Grangeway Road.
8. I saw during my visit that there are numerous examples nearby of garages with white doors, some with white fascias, which stand out in the street scene among the brick houses. There is also a strikingly modern single storey extension further along the street on a prominent corner site in white render and timber cladding which contrast with the brick. However, on balance, I consider that the expanse of white cladding in this case is excessive and creates a discordance feature in the street scene.
9. The Council has raised some reservations regarding the use of brick slips as cladding, but I consider that, although it may be difficult to find a close match to either of the brick colours in the existing house, there are subtle differences in the brick colours of houses in the surrounding area which mean that it should be possible to find a colour which harmonises with if not exactly matches that of the existing house. Brick slips may not be a preferred material in terms of quality, but as I find that the scale, size and siting of the extension are acceptable and it is visible from a limited number of viewpoints, I consider that it would be unreasonable to dismiss this appeal and consequently require the demolition of the extension on the basis of the materials. The use of brick slips would minimise any harmful impact and render the extension acceptable in terms of its appearance both in relation to the house and the street scene.
10. I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and that it is not in conflict with local plan policies 6 and 44 and the guidance in the SPD.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR