



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/D/25/3366263

10 Ashbourne Road, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 1FD

- 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 Mr Adnan Abdulali against the decision of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00494/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for single and double storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single and double storey rear extensions at 10 Ashbourne Road, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 1FD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00494/FUL, 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: 10AR/SLP(1), 10AR/A4 and 10AR/B3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the planning application the subject of the appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to national planning policy in respect of householder appeals, therefore I considered that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached house located to the north-east of the junction of Ashbourne Road with Castleton Road, in an area comprising predominantly detached and semi-detached houses, many of which have been altered and extended over time.

5. The host dwelling has already had a two storey side extension constructed to its flank elevation which appears appropriately subordinate due to a significant set-back from the principal elevation and a set-down from its main ridgeline. The proposal would build off the rear of this, with a staggered flat roof extension to be constructed across the whole of the rear elevation (existing and proposed to be extended).
6. Being a corner plot, no10 has a quite substantial rear garden which tapers outwards along the boundary of Castleton Road; and whilst the cumulative footprint of the dwelling as proposed to be extended would be significant, a good degree of garden would remain and I consider the plot would not be overdeveloped as a result.
7. In the main, the principal visual effects of the proposal from the public realm would be of the first floor element of the two storey extension to the rear, with a set-down to its ridge; it would also appear subordinate in form and provide a greater degree of articulation to the rear elevation than the existing situation which in many ways would improve its design.
8. I acknowledge that the proposal would further imbalance the pair of semi-detached properties of which it forms part, but the location, size and shape of the plot is relatively unique and I consider that when viewing the appeal site and its adjoining neighbour face on, there would be no material change to its appearance than the existing situation. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge that the extensions would quite clearly add additional mass to the host dwelling, I consider they would not be over-dominant or give rise to an incongruous feature in the street scene.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would not give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the area and complies with Policy 6 of the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan which requires the highest standards of inclusive design, requiring proposals to respect the existing local character, ensuring patterns of development are sympathetic to their surroundings, amongst other things. As Policy 44 is concerned with landscape character, I consider that it is not wholly relevant to the proposal in hand. Further, I find no material conflict with the guidance set out within the Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (2019) which reflects the above sentiments and highlights in paragraph 3.3 that residential extensions and enlargements should be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling to be extended as well as the wider local area.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. Other than the standard time limit condition the Council has suggested that conditions be imposed that require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the materials of the proposed extensions match those used on the existing building. I consider these conditions to be necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR