



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2026

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007979

9 Green Lane, Stapleton, Leicestershire LE9 8JP

- 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 and Mrs Stringer against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01132/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a new side dormer to an existing room above the garage and alterations to the rear including raising the eaves and building up the existing rear walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I observed on my visit that the alterations to the rear of the property were under construction. The Council does not raise objection to those elements of the scheme, which I understand have planning permission¹. Having regard to the rearward location, the planning history, and to comparable nearby extensions, I agree with that assessment. My decision therefore focuses on the proposed extensions to the front of the host property.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extensions to the front of the property on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the living conditions at 11 Green Lane ('No 11'), with particular regard to overlooking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The Green Lane streetscene comprises a mix of single, one-and-a-half, and two storey properties, which are orientated either with their principal ridgeline perpendicular to the road or, as is the case with the host, parallel to it. Many of the bungalows have a dormer window in their front or side-facing principal roof.

¹ 25/00385/HOU

5. Viewed from Green Lane, the host has a broadly single storey form, with a subservient front projecting extension and a dormer off-set to one side in its principal roof. As a result of this scheme, that dormer would be extended to a point close to the northern edge of the principal roof, where it would turn the corner and attach to a proposed dormer in the front projection's side facing roof.
6. Linking these two elements of the property in this way would give it an awkward and contrived appearance, and a significant roof level bulk and mass. Considered cumulatively with other alterations, the overall result would be to overwhelm the original building such that very little of its original form and appearance would still be legible.
7. Whilst there are similarly positioned side facing dormers at 5 and 7 Green Lane ('Nos 5 and 7'), they are reasonably contained within their respective roofs and do not cover such a large expanse of the roofslopes compared to this scheme. Moreover, neither of those properties have been extended to the same degree, and I did not observe any nearby properties with dormers with similar 'dog-legs' linking principal and subordinate roofslopes. Thus, whilst many nearby properties have a dormer window on their principal roof, the resultant building here would have an incongruous and over-dominant appearance in the streetscene.
8. For these reasons, having regard to cumulative impacts, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thereby conflict with that part of Policy DM10 of the Hinckley and Bosworth Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD ('SADMP') which requires development to complement and enhance the character of its surroundings with regard to matters including scale, mass and design; along with the advice that roof extensions should carefully consider the impact upon the character of the building and streetscene at page 46 of the Hinckley and Bosworth Good Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 ('the SPD').
9. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') requirement for good design, which is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

10. There would be close intervisibility, albeit at a fairly oblique angle, between the bedroom window in the proposed side facing dormer and No 11's front facing dormer windows. Additionally, there would be a view from there over No 11's front extension towards that property's front garden, driveway and access. Given the very close proximity of the bedroom window to the plot boundary, it would cause some overlooking and loss of privacy to the detriment of those occupants' living conditions, and a perception of overlooking even if the window were to be obscurely glazed.
11. Although Nos 5 and 7 also have side-facing dormer windows they are set significantly further from those plots' respective side boundaries compared to this scheme.
12. For this reason, the scheme would have a limited harmful impact on the living conditions at No 11. It would thereby conflict with that part of SADMP Policy DM10 which requires proposals not to have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents, having regard to matters such as visual intrusion, and

with the similar requirement to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users at paragraph 135 of the Framework, and with the advice to consider neighbours' amenities in the SPD.

Conclusions

13. I have found that the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and that it would cause a more limited, but nonetheless still harmful, impact on neighbouring occupiers' living conditions. It would therefore conflict with the development plan. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR