



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/D/25/3368978

Annexe, 12 Buckinghams Way, Sharnford, Leicestershire L10 3PX

- 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 Ellen McCarthy against the decision of Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 24/0755/HH.
 - The development proposed is a new pitched roof and dormer extension to the existing annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of Nos. 10 and 14 Buckinghams Way as regards outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

3. The Officer's Report explains that the flat-roofed single storey annexe in the rear garden of No. 12 was granted permission in 2014 and comprises a bedroom, a living room, kitchen, bathroom, dining room and study. The permission was subject to a condition restricting the use to residential accommodation ancillary to the existing dwelling.
4. The appeal scheme seeks to erect a new pitched roof above the annexe to provide two bedrooms and a bathroom, with the ground floor re-arranged to provide a lounge, study, and kitchen.
5. On the first issue, as the existing annexe is single storey and flat roofed it is relatively discreet and from the head of the cul-de-sac in Buckinghams Way only the eaves can be seen over the access gate in the gap between Nos. 10 and 12. However, in the appeal scheme the existing height of 2.5m would more than double to 5.7m. And although this is the ridge height and narrow at this point, the appearance of the dormers with their flat roofs positioned only slightly lower would add bulk to the appearance of the building.
6. As the Officer's Report points out, a residential annexe is typically single storey in height. And as a two-storey building to the rear of the host dwelling, the proposal would comprise a harmfully incongruous addition to the street scene of Buckinghams Way. Furthermore, this incongruity would also potentially apply to the impact on the streetscene of Aston Lane if the existing hedge is reduced in size or

removed as part of the proposal or at some time in the future. In that event, the extended building's proximity to No. 10 Buckinghams Way would be visually intrusive and appear as a congested development out of keeping with the appearance of the area.

7. I have considered the appellant's representations on this issue in the grounds of appeal but am still not persuaded that a first-floor addition to this rearward building close to No. 10 would sit comfortably within the plot. Accordingly, on this issue I find that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with Policy CS2 of the Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) DPD 2013; Policy DM1 of the Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) DPD 2019 ('the 2019 Local Plan'); Policy FV6 of the Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2029, and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024 ('the Framework').
8. Turning to the second issue of the effect on the neighbours to either side, the dormer windows would cause some overlooking of the rear garden of No. 14 with a resulting loss of privacy for the occupiers. This is disputed in the appellant's grounds of appeal but from my site inspection I am satisfied that the two dormers that serve the proposed double bedrooms would have this adverse effect.
9. As regards the impact on No. 10, the Officer's Report considered that there would not be an unacceptably adverse effect on the privacy or outlook for these neighbours. However, the annexe sits on the boundary with No. 10 and indeed is slightly closer to that property than to No. 12 itself. And the application consultation reply from the occupiers of No. 10 helps to make it clear that the proposed development would have a material effect.
10. This is because the upper window in the rear gable of the extension would have views over the rearward patio of No. 10, which although angled would introduce overlooking at close quarters and a loss of privacy, with the gable itself also somewhat overbearing in the outlook. The addition of the extra storey would also affect the light to, and outlook from, the front patio and a living room window of No. 10, whilst the first-floor front gable would overlook the frontward patio, again with a loss of privacy.
11. Overall, on this issue I conclude that the appeal scheme would harmfully affect the living conditions of neighbours to each side. This would conflict with Policy DM19 of the 2019 Local Plan; Policy FV6 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and paragraph 135f) of the Framework.

Other Matter

12. The grounds of appeal explain the appellant's view of a need for more space for a family member's future health and well-being and I have taken this into account. However, given the substantial amount of floorspace in the existing dwelling and annexe combined, I am not convinced that this need cannot be achieved from an internal re-organisation and improvement within the existing built form.
13. The principle of an addition to form a two-storey building beyond the rear building line of bungalows is a proposal that goes against the grain of the existing development pattern and almost inevitably raises issues with a Local Planning Authority in terms of both a harmful effect on character and appearance and an

impact on the living conditions for the immediate neighbours. This indeed would be the situation here and although I have had regard to the other matters raised, I endorse the Council's appraisal of the application and the reasons for refusal.

Conclusion

14. On both main issues I have therefore concluded that the proposal would cause harm and conflict with the Council's adopted policies. Furthermore, this harm would not be outweighed by the circumstances of the appellant.
15. The appeal therefore fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR