



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref. APP/L2440/D/25/3365340

89 Aylestone Lane, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 1AB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Laura Docherty against the decision of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/00058/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. Even though the Council's decision notice contains 2 reasons for refusal, there is a degree of overlap between them. The relevant considerations can be gathered under one main issue, that being the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling, the site and the surroundings.

Reasons

3. Paired with no. 87, no. 89 is a semi-detached, 2-storey dwelling on a corner plot, at the junction between Aylestone Lane and Carlton Drive. Due to its corner location, the site is prominent within this predominately residential area. Despite fencing enclosing much of the site on the roadside boundary with Carlton Drive and the previous extensions that have created a 2-storey side wing to the original dwelling, the remaining gap between the house and the footway along Carlton Drive maintains an appropriate setting for the house and offers a welcome degree of openness within the context of the surrounding area, including at the junction between the 2 roads.
 4. The Council's Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) says that there is a limit to the number of extensions which can be added to a property or to a site. What constitutes overdevelopment will vary from site to site, as each set of circumstances is unique. So, even though the appeal extension would increase the existing footprint of the house by no more than 27% using the appellant's stated measurements and the 2-storey side wing was given permission by the Council in 2 separate applications, the Council was entitled to look at the combined impacts of the existing and proposed enlargements to the original building.
-

5. Attached to and considered in conjunction with the previous 2-storey side extension, the appeal extension would result in the ground floor area of the resulting dwelling being more than double that of the original dwelling. In itself, it would also significantly exceed the depth of the existing and original dwelling and present a very long elevation to Carlton Drive, reaching almost 4m high at the top of its mono-pitched roof. I share the Council's concern that when the appeal extension is looked at cumulatively with the earlier side enlargement, the resulting dwelling would appear overly large and out of scale with the original semi-detached dwelling. Furthermore, I consider that just as the previous 2-storey side extension exhibits design flaws, as it was not set back from the front elevation or set down from the main roof ridge, the appeal extension would be flush with the existing principal front elevation such that the form of the original dwelling would become even less distinct and the semi-detached pair of dwellings would be further unbalanced to an unacceptable extent.
6. The appeal extension would not sit comfortably within the space available; rather it would come exceedingly close to the footway along Carlton Drive. The boundary fencing is not annotated on the proposed ground floor plan to be retained. Even if it could be retained, the extension would be far higher than the fence and I am in little doubt that the development would be perceived to be shoehorned into the available space. The scheme would cause a general loss of spaciousness and a narrowing of the streetscape in a variety of public views from Aylestone Lane and Carlton Drive.
7. As a consequence of the corner location of the appeal site and as the proposed extension would project significantly towards Carlton Drive, even further forward of the prevailing and clearly defined building line of properties fronting this road, it would appear as a dominant and intrusive addition within the street scene. Furthermore, when viewing from the rear on Carlton Drive, the mono-pitched roof design of the subject extension would appear unresolved and awkward where it overlaps the rear elevation. This would add to its disruptive visual impact and fail to reflect the character of the original dwelling.
8. The scheme eschews various design criteria within the SPD relating to the design and overall appearance of development, roof design and the impact of side extensions to corner plots on the street scene. In particular, the SPD says that extensions on such plots are deemed unacceptable unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise and existing building lines of development should be respected in all instances.
9. There are examples of other dwellings on corner or end plots in the borough, which have had side extensions thereto, including some 2-storey side extensions. The appellant has submitted photographs, without exact addresses, of 6 allegedly comparable developments.
10. Following the order in which the photographs have been presented, I have taken them to be of 287 Leicester Road (not Welford Road), 87 Roehampton Drive, 59 Aylestone Lane, 91 Aylestone Lane, 269 Leicester Road and 53 Brambling Way.
11. With the exception of 91 Aylestone Lane, all of them are some distance away from the appeal site. The situation at 91 Aylestone Lane is not identical to the appeal property. Only the brick-faced part of the side extension there is fully visible and this part does not reach across the whole depth of the dwelling. It is an established planning principle that each case is considered on its own merits against the

prevailing development plan policies and guidelines. No planning history of these other cases has been put before me and the Council does not have an opportunity to comment upon them under the format of householder planning appeals. It may well be that those other extensions were approved under a different development plan context. Moreover, they are not particularly good examples to follow.

12. It is the case that most proposals to extend residential properties will reflect some of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) when read as a whole. However, good design is a cornerstone of the Framework and a key aspect of sustainable development. I consider that the appeal proposal is ill-judged in design terms and would not achieve a well-designed place.
13. Drawing the above threads together, I find on the main issue that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, the site and the surroundings. Policies 6 and 44 of the Borough of Oadby and Wigston Local Plan 2019 require, amongst other things, development proposals to create a distinctive environment by respecting the existing local character and ensuring high architectural quality and development proposals to be in keeping with the area in which they are situated. The proposal would not meet the expectations of these development plan policies.

Concluding comments

14. The scheme would evidently utilize matching bricks and tiles and enlarge and enhance the ground floor living accommodation, no local residents objected to the application and the Council raised no objections in relation to neighbouring residential amenities, parking and highway safety. Whilst I give weight to these considerations, I have come to the view that they are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have described. My finding on the main issue is decisive to the outcome of this appeal. There is conflict with the development plan. The harm cannot be mitigated by the imposition of planning conditions and it is not outweighed by other material considerations.
15. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR