



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/D/25/3370147

13 Hill Way, Oadby, Leicestershire, LE2 5YG

- 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 Victor Kaufman against the decision of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00053/FUL.
 - The development proposed is internal alterations to ground and first floor with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site lies at one end of a residential cul-de-sac where it terminates in a broad circular turning head surrounding a central green. The street predominantly comprises two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. They have mainly brick facades and whilst there is some variation in roof form, including hipped, gabled and catslide examples, they are more often simple in form and tiled. Where front gable projections exist, they are typically set well down from the ridge of the main roof. Although many of the dwellings have been extended, second floor level accommodation is not a common feature of the street scene, and there is a predominance of unaltered roof slopes. Where dormers exist, they are usually set well in from the edges of their host roof. These factors combine to give much order, and consistency in scale, to the built environment on Hill Way.
5. Due to its height with the ridge sitting very close to the ridge of the main roof, together with the provision of an uncharacteristic circular window at roof level, the proposed front gabled projection would be an unduly prominent feature. It would appear incongruous within the street scene amongst the roof forms and prevailing two-storey scale of neighbouring dwellings.

6. I acknowledge that the rear dormers would be set away from the ridge and eaves of the host roof. However, their distribution across the substantial proportion of the rear roof slope, the position of the roofs of the outer dormers aligned with the edge of the host roof, together with the indicated flat roof linking sections would combine to form an over dominant and cramped feature that would detract from the simplicity of the roofscape. This would conflict with the guidance in The Oadby and Wigston Borough Council Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) which states that, in order to reduce their visual impact, dormers should relate in scale and style to the original building, be in keeping with its fenestration, be kept to a minimal size and avoid becoming an over dominant feature within the roof.
7. I accept that the proposed development would not increase the footprint of the building and that matching materials and pitched roofs would be utilised. Even so, this would not be sufficient to assimilate the proposals with their host or immediate surroundings.
8. I note the appellant's reference to alterations and extensions at No 9 and No 12 Hill Way. However, I am not aware of the material planning considerations in those particular cases and, from what I have seen, neither are of the same design as the appeal proposal. Therefore, they do not justify the site-specific harm identified.
9. I conclude, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with Policies 6 and 44 of the Borough of Oadby and Wigston Local Plan (2019), which require the highest standards of design, that development respects local character and is in keeping with the area in which it is situated. For the same reasons, the proposal would also fail to accord with the design guidance in the SPD and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure well-designed places.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR