



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/25/3365820

8 Stackley Road, Great Glen, Leicestershire, LE8 9FZ

- 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 Ms Simarpreet Kaur Badyal against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00223/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey extensions to an existing detached bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I have noted that in the appellant's statement the proposal is referred to in the singular rather than the plural as in the application form and the Council's decision notice. I have, in any case, determined the proposal on the basis of the plans before me which indicate a single storey wraparound extension to the front, side and rear elevations of the dwelling.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 10 Stackley Road in regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a small, detached two bedroom bungalow with a detached garage. The proposed development would remove the existing garage, alter the existing layout and extend the dwelling to the front, side and rear to provide a utility room, fitness and shower rooms, and a replacement bedroom and garage.
5. On the front elevation, the proposal would extend forwards by some 3.7m with a gabled roof that would continue the ridgeline of the existing bungalow at a height of just under 4.5m. It would be sited directly in front of and only some 2m or so from a kitchen window in the side elevation of the adjacent dwelling at no 10 from which I viewed the appeal site at my visit. The height and proximity of the proposed extension would result in it being unduly dominant and overbearing when seen from that window. I saw that the kitchen forms part of a larger family room that has patio windows and a glazed door and window on its rear elevation. However, the window referred to is the only one in the side elevation and the main one to the kitchen area, being sited directly above the sink and providing the main outlook from there. Despite the limited screening afforded by the fence and trellis along the

boundary, it currently has a mainly open, broadly southerly aspect across the front garden and drive of the appeal site. The significant change and harm to the outlook from that window would have a serious impact on the neighbours' living conditions despite the presence of other windows with a different aspect.

6. Even if a higher fence of up to 1.8m were built along the side boundary as permitted development, the impact would be much less than from this proposal due to the difference in height and that argument does not alter my findings.
7. The appellant's Daylight and Sunlight Study concludes that daylight to the neighbouring occupiers would not be negatively impacted by the proposal. Its findings regarding sunlight are less clear to me and from what I have seen it is likely that there would be some loss of sunlight to the kitchen of no 10. However, even if the proposal would not lead to a significant loss of sunlight and daylight, my findings in regard to outlook are significant and overriding.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to development plan policy GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031 (adopted 2019) which requires that new development does not have significant adverse effect on the living conditions of existing and new residents through overbearing impact.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR