



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/25/3367398

2 Cloughton Road, Leicester LE5 1GR

- 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 Nilesh Patel against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application ref is 20250320.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 2 Cloughton Road, Leicester LE5 1GR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20250320, 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 plan: NP1-25-A2.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Cloughton Road and 23 Barlow Road, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. 2 Cloughton Road is a large, detached, two-storey dwelling which is set back from the highway behind a low hedge and driveway. Its main roof is hipped. The front elevation of the property is rendered, save for the entrance, with hung tile decoration to the bay window, whereas the rear elevations are in brickwork. It is part of a residential estate, which, whilst having a variety of dwelling designs, has a consistent traditional architectural style. The properties surrounding the appeal site are similarly large, detached houses with integrated garages. The dwellings are sited on large plots with generously sized rear gardens, which together with the

architectural cohesion of the dwellings provides a sense of order and spaciousness to the area.

5. Despite its large footprint, the extension would not appear disproportionate in the context of the large, detached host dwelling it would relate to. This is due to the single-storey scale and predominantly flat roofed design which would give it a modest profile and would ensure that the experience of it would be restricted to limited views from the rear of neighbouring properties. Together with the matching facing materials, these aspects of the design would sufficiently assimilate the proposal with the rear elevation of its host and the local vernacular.
6. The Leicester City Council – SPD: Residential Amenity (the SPD) Appendix G indicates that chamfered designs to meet its 45-degree guidelines are unlikely to be acceptable where they result in ‘odd wedge-shaped extensions’. However, in this particular instance, the chamfered elements of the extension would be minimal. Given the symmetrical design and its complementary external finishes, the extension would harmonise with its host and surroundings, it would not have an odd appearance. Consequently, it would generally accord with the design guidance in the SPD.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area and thus would comply with Policy CS03 of the Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2014) which seeks to ensure that new development achieves a high quality of design. For the same reasons it would also comply with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework including that developments should be of good architecture and sympathetic to local character.
8. The Council’s reason for refusal relating to this main issue also refers to saved Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan (2006). However, that particular policy primarily relates to the amenity of existing or proposed residents which is a matter I will come on to under the second main issue. Therefore, it does not alter my conclusion on this main issue.

Living Conditions

9. The rear gardens of the appeal site and the neighbouring properties, at 4 Cloughton Road and 23 Barlow Road, are divided by close boarded timber fencing. The proposed development would only be partially visible where it protrudes above the fence line. From the evidence before me, the extension’s chamfered design and position set in from the respective side boundaries would also maintain a 45-degree line taken from the centre of the nearest ground floor principal room windows serving these neighbouring dwellings and so would comply with the guidance in the SPD.
10. Furthermore, these neighbouring dwellings benefit from a spacious aspect due to the generous size of their large rear gardens. Consequently, the proposal would not have an unacceptable enclosing or overbearing presence when experienced from these neighbouring properties.
11. I conclude the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Cloughton Road and 23 Barlow Road having particular regard to outlook. It therefore complies with saved Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan (2006) the requirements of which seeks to ensure that new

development provides residents with a quality living environment. For the same reasons, it also complies with the aims of the guidance within the SPD Appendix G to preserve a reasonable standard of outlook and the requirements at Paragraph 135 of National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conditions

12. Together with the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. The annotations on the approved drawing confirm the extension will be completed in materials to match the existing dwelling. Therefore, a separate materials condition is not necessary in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR