



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026

**by Andrew Fulford BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 06 March 2026**

---

### **Appeal Ref: 6001128**

### **2 Caldon Close, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 0PQ**

- 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 Samantha Francis against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00275/HOU.
  - The development proposed is a loft extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the Decision Notice of the Council as it describes the development in a more concise manner than that on the Application Form. Whilst there is no record of a formal agreement to the change in front of me, given that the words 'loft extension' were included in the applicant's original description I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this course of action.

### **Main Issues**

3. The main issues are:
  - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
  - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of 16 Brookdale with regards to privacy

### **Reasons**

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. There are a mix of single and two storey detached properties within Caldon Close which are on reasonably sized plots. Many of the two storey dwellings are quite uniform in appearance. They are constructed of brick with a large projecting gable feature to the front which is rendered. The two storey properties also include a rear projecting gable feature which is 2 storeys in height but appears subservient to the main dwelling. The appeal property is reflective of the surrounding two storey properties and is positioned next to 1 Caldon Close which is a bungalow sited on a corner plot within the cul-de-sac.

5. The building works proposed are quite extensive and involve the creation of additional first floor accommodation and the raising of the roof to incorporate accommodation within the loft space. Whilst the increase in height does not exceed the highest part of the existing roof the additions would create a top-heavy appearance with a much more dominant roofscape unlike surrounding properties. The changes are most apparent on the rear elevation with the addition of a hipped roof projecting gable feature which incorporates a flat roof which would be positioned next to new 2 dormer windows. Combined, these additions would add substantial bulk to the roof and create an unusual mix of hipped and gable end roof designs on the property. This would result in an awkward and unbalanced elevation that detracts from the original appearance of the dwelling.
6. The rear elevation would appear completely incoherent when viewed within the context of surrounding properties. It is important to note that the alterations would appear prominent when viewed along the length of the access drive into Caldon Close as both 14 Brookdale and 1 Caldon Close are modest bungalows. The Good Design Guide SPD highlights that roof extensions can be prominent over a wider area due to their higher scale compared with their neighbours and dormer windows should be considered in the context of their impact upon the character of the building. The guidance contained within the SPD is highly relevant to the appeal scheme, which I have found to be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling and character of the wider area.
7. The appellant has highlighted that they have a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for flat roof dormer windows that increase the volume of the roof by 50m<sup>3</sup>. The appellant suggests this is a realistic fallback position that is more harmful than what is proposed through the appeal scheme. However, the plans associated with the LDC have not been provided. It is therefore impossible to determine how comparable and relevant the LDC is to the appeal scheme. I am therefore unable to attach any meaningful weight to this argument.
8. It has been suggested that the appeal scheme would appear similar to 9 and 12 Caldon Close. I disagree with this view as No 9 is a balanced 2 storey dwelling with a modest dormer window on the front elevation which is in stark contrast to the extensive roof additions proposed on the appeal scheme. No. 12 is also not comparable as this is a bungalow that has a simple, conventional roof design.
9. I conclude that the proposal by virtue of its scale, massing and detailed design would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP) DPD. Amongst other matters, this policy seeks to secure development that complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area with regards to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.

### *Living Conditions*

10. The appeal scheme proposes accommodation at second floor level which would result in the introduction of 2 dormer windows on the rear elevation. The rear elevation of the appeal property faces the rear of 16 Brookdale and there is agreement between the main parties that a distance of at least 30m is retained between these properties.

11. The Good Design Guide SPD sets out guidance on the separation distances recommended in relation to house extensions. Most pertinently it states that habitable rooms within rear elevations of neighbouring properties should not be less than 21m apart. However, the guidance does not clarify how many storeys of development this figure should be applied to.
12. In this case the separation distance comfortably exceeds the minimum guidance and there is no notable level change between the appeal site and No 16. There are already habitable windows at first floor level in the appeal property and the 2 additional windows proposed would be no closer to No. 16. I am therefore satisfied that the roof extension would have no discernible additional impact on the level of privacy experienced by the occupiers of No. 16.
13. I conclude that the proposals would have no adverse impact on the living conditions of No 16. This accords with point (a) of policy DM10 of the SADMP DPD of which seeks to protect the privacy of occupiers of nearby properties. However, my findings on this issue do not overcome the harms that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

14. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*Andrew Fulford*

INSPECTOR