



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/25/3372830

163 Coventry Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 0JS

- 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 Reagan Hayes against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00467/HOU.
 - The development proposed is erection of double storey rear, single storey front and loft extensions.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development within the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, it is clear from the evidence before me that the proposed development includes the erection of a wall and gates to the front boundary of the appeal site, as well as balconies to bedrooms 3 and 4 at the first floor. Although these particular elements are not included in the above description, as the Council made its decision on this basis, so shall I.

Main Issues

4. 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 occupiers of the neighbouring properties, in terms of privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. The front boundaries on this part of Coventry Road including the appeal property are predominantly open. Even where front boundary treatments feature walls, these are primarily low and thus have a discreet presence in the street scene. Furthermore, the materials used in such boundaries tends to be stone

or brick which has a conventional appearance. Where there are high hedges and trees to the boundaries of some properties, these provide a soft and natural appearance which also contributes positively to the verdant character and appearance of the area. Overall, the prevalence of either open front boundaries or the generally traditional and modest walls contributes to an open character on this part of Coventry Road and reflects positively on the street scene.

6. However, due to the significant height of the wall and gates together with its extent across the front and side boundaries, it would be a dominant and enclosing feature on this part of Coventry Road. Furthermore, its mostly solid design and its stark materials including grey steel railings, a panelled gate and door, as well as white render would unacceptably contrast with the generally modest and traditional appearance of typical front boundary treatments in the area. Consequently, the proposal would erode the open character of the street scene and as such, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I have been referred to several other developments including boundary walls and gates along Coventry Road. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances in which these were erected and so I cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. Moreover, none of these are in the same immediate street scene as the appeal site. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own individual merits.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) (DPD), which amongst other matters, requires that developments complement and enhance the character of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

9. The balconies to bedrooms 3 and 4 would be sited on top of the single storey rear extension of the host dwelling. Although the property has a spacious rear garden, the side elevations of the single storey rear extension are close to the boundaries to the neighbouring gardens on either side. The top of the extension where the balconies would be located is also significantly higher than the wooden boundary fences to the neighbouring properties on either side.
10. Due to the elevated position of the balconies and their proximity to the side boundaries, users of the space could overlook the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties on both sides. Given that balconies are often used for sitting out, and that they would be a sufficient size for such uses, I find it reasonable to conclude that overlooking of the neighbour's gardens would occur. The overlooking would be worse than the originally approved Juliet balconies, since they would likely be used for sitting out longer periods, and views from Juliet balconies would be comparable with bedroom views. Although the privacy screens would restrict overlooking from the side, the balustrades would not prevent views from the rear of the balconies across the neighbouring gardens. Consequently, the proposal would result in a significant loss of privacy at the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties.
11. For the above reasons, the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, in terms of privacy. It would conflict with Policy DM10 of the DPD, which amongst other matters, requires that

developments do not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.

Other Matters

12. I can understand the appellant's desire to improve security at the site following a recent burglary. However, I do not consider that these factors outweigh the harm of the proposal as a whole and the resulting conflict with the development plan.
13. The appellant has also referred to the lack of communication and discussion with the Council. I acknowledge that such matters may have been a source of frustration to the appellant, however, they would not be reasons to allow the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan and there are no other material considerations which would alter this conclusion. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR