



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/25/3367745

Grange Barn, Loddington Road, Tilton-on-the-Hill, LE7 9DE

- 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 Adam Holt against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00456/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a converted former agricultural building with an existing rear extension, which is situated in a large plot within a cluster of development in the countryside, beyond Tilton-on-the Hill. Open countryside adjoins the site at the rear and on its eastern side, with a neighbouring dwelling and its garden on the opposite side. A public footpath through the field runs parallel to the eastern boundary of the site.
4. The original building is a relatively small single storey structure and it retains its former agricultural character and appearance. The existing extension is relatively large in comparison to the original building, but it sits comfortably at the rear of the property and does not adversely affect its character or appearance.
5. The proposal is to further extend the property at the rear to provide three bedrooms with en-suites, storage and dressing areas. The proposed extension would be set back from the front of the original building, but it would project out beyond the side of the property. The Council Officer's report refers to a projection beyond the existing of some 13m.
6. Policy GD3 (h) of the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP), which relates to development in the countryside, allows for minor extensions to existing buildings, provided they are subordinate in scale and appearance to the existing building. I note that it refers to the 'existing building' and not to the original. Notwithstanding, I consider that the appeal proposal would be a significant enlargement of the

property, both in terms of its floorspace and visual impact. Consequently, I share the Council's view that the proposal cannot be considered a minor extension.

7. Policy GD8 (a) and (d) of the LP require development to respect and enhance local character and to respect the context and characteristics of the site and ensure that it is integrated into the existing built form. Further detailed guidance is given in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (SPD). The provisions of the SPD are that extensions should be subordinate, harmonious and follow the traditional form in relation to the existing/original building. These policies accord with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), which requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.
8. The Council's decision notice also refers to Policies HL5 and HL7 of the High Leicestershire Neighbourhood Plan. However, I consider the policies of the LP to be more relevant to the appeal proposal.
9. The proposed extension would be a significant addition to the property in terms of both floorspace and footprint. In size alone, it would conflict with Policy GD3 (h) of the LP and with the guidance contained in the SPD.
10. I acknowledge that the extension would not be visible from Loddington Road and that it would only be partially seen from limited points on the public footpath. Furthermore, it would be screened from the neighbouring dwelling by an existing conifer hedge. However, whilst this is a material consideration, the lack of visibility does not mean that a proposal is acceptable.
11. Notwithstanding the difference in ground levels between the site of the extension and the existing building and its lower roof heights, I consider that the proposal would appear as an overly dominant addition that would be out of scale and detract from the relatively plain and simple form of the original building. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy GD3 (a)(d) of the LP and with the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR