

Delegated Report

Planning Reference: 25/01079/HOU
Applicant(s): Mr and Mrs R Surti
Ward: Field Head



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Application Site: 4 Lancaster Court, Groby

Proposal: Proposed first-floor side and single-storey rear extension.

Case Officer: Gwion Russell (Planning Officer)

1. Recommendations

1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This householder planning application seeks planning permission for a first-floor side and single-storey rear extension to 4 Lancaster Court.
- 2.2. The first-floor element of the extension is proposed to measure a depth of approximately 10.6m, spanning a width of 2.8m from the first-floor side elevation of the dwelling, with a footprint of 32.2m², base to hipped roof ridge height of 3.2m and sited broadly atop the existing attached garage. The first-floor element also includes a hipped dormer to the front elevation with a footprint of 1.7m² and base to ridge height of 3.2m. Consequently, some internal re-configurations are proposed, with the expansion of the existing rear bedroom and addition of a front bedroom and main bathroom.
- 2.3. The ground floor extension element broadly introduces a footprint of 26.3m² to the existing dwelling, with a depth of 3.4m and width of 8.2m and is proposed to be covered with a flat roof. This expansion will incorporate an open plan kitchen/dining space.
- 2.4. New fenestration includes a 4.4m wide bi-fold door and 1.2m standard casement window at the rear elevation, serving the open plan kitchen/dining space; two 1.2m wide windows and a 1.8m wide casement window serving the proposed master bedroom and existing rear bedroom respectively; a 0.6m window serving the proposed bathroom at the first-floor side elevation and the aforementioned 1.8m wide window that would sit centrally to the front dormer serving a front bedroom. One 2.4m by 1.2m rooflight is proposed atop the flat-roof rear element.

- 2.5. The front extension element would be finished in facing brick, whilst the rear single-storey element would be finished in light-coloured render. All fenestration and roof materials will be designed to match with the host dwelling.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is located at 4 Lancaster Court, which is currently a three-bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling constructed using buff brick. It features white uPVC windows and a single-bay integrated garage. 4 Lancaster Court is the only dwelling within the cul-de-sac with a hipped roof configuration as part of the original design.
- 3.2. The dwelling sits at the end of a cul-de-sac which is in the midst of a number of dwellings which are similar in design, massing and scale and uniformly feature facing brick. The dwelling is part of a larger residential estate which sits at the southwest corner of the settlement boundary of Groby. The site is not within a conservation area and has no further constraints for planning consideration.
- 3.3. In terms of position, the host dwelling sits perpendicular to No. 5 Lancaster Court and adjacent to No. 3 Lancaster Court. Both the application dwelling and No. 3 Lancaster Court are sited on the perimeter of the cul-de-sac and prominently opposite its entry road.

4. Relevant Planning History

- 4.1. There is no planning history associated with this property.

5. Publicity

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. The following concerns were raised:
- 5.2. One objector commented on the lack of separation distances between the dwellings and the oppressive nature of the side extension element.
- 5.3. The applicants have considered the comments made and provided an amended scheme to address these. The amended scheme sees the reduction of the overall bulk and massing of the first-floor extensions. The rear of the first-floor projection has been reduced by approximately 2.25m, thereby lessening any potential overbearing impact while creating a more consistent design with the existing dwelling. In addition, the side element has been reduced by approximately 25cm, which, although modest, slightly increases boundary spacing and overall separation distances.

6. Consultation

- 6.1. There have been no objections received from Groby Parish Council, however they noted the lack of off-street car parking available to meet potential demand.

6.2. No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

7.1. Core Strategy (2009):

- No relevant policies

7.2. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016):

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3. National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

7.4. Other Relevant Guidance:

- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council – The Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)

8. Appraisal

8.1. Extensions to existing domestic properties are generally considered to be sustainable development in principle. The key issues in respect of this application are therefore:

- Design and impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.2. Chapter 12 of the NPPF confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality, beautiful, and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places.

8.3. Guidance Point C1 of the NDG confirms that well-designed new development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond including the existing built development and landscape character, amongst others.

Guidance Point I1 of the NGD highlights that new developments should consider the composition of street scenes and individual buildings and their elements including the height, scale, massing and relationship between buildings, as well as views, vistas, landmarks, and landscaping, amongst others.

- 8.4. Ultimately, Guidance Point I2 of the NDG advised that well-designed places should contribute to local distinctiveness and Guidance Point I3 of the NDG highlights that design decisions at all levels and scape should help to create a memorable sense of place.
- 8.5. Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states that applicants, where applicable, should provide sufficient information to demonstrate how their proposals will meet the design expectations set out in local and national policy.
- 8.6. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design (as contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code), taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
- 8.7. Policy DM4(i) of the SADMP states that development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where it does not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside.
- 8.8. Policy DM10(c) of the SADMP states that developments will be permitted where they complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.
- 8.9. The Good Design Guide (2021) explains that household extensions, whether to the side, front or rear of an existing property or to the roof, both individually and collectively, can result in changes to the built environment that, if designed insensitively, can have a significant negative impact.
- 8.10. According to the Good Design Guide, rear extensions should be designed to be clearly subordinate to the main dwelling. They should be an appropriate height, width, depth and reflect or complement the detailing and materials of the original building. The rear extension remains subordinate in massing, and this is strengthened by its flat-roof form however it does span the rear elevation of the dwelling.
- 8.11. In addition, two-storey side extensions should appear smaller in scale and massing in order to be subordinate to the main building. Any proposal for a two-storey side extension should be set down from the ridge of the existing house and set back from the front elevation (the minimum distance for this should be 0.5 metres in both directions). It also states the importance of roofscapes forming a key character forming feature of detail in residential design. This includes the shape and pitch of roofs, as well as the materiality. The host dwelling benefits from a hipped roof structure which differs to the residential dwellings along the street. Any compliance of this guidance may exacerbate the already different roof form of the host dwelling

and appear incongruous to the established roofscape of the street. By providing a consistent hipped roof structure, this significantly mitigates any further roof variation.

- 8.12. The proposed first-floor element would project forward of the existing main first-floor elevation and include a dormer window. Dormer windows are traditionally subordinate by virtue of their design within existing roof structures. In this case, the dormer proposed would project forward of the existing first floor elevation, resulting in an imbalanced design relationship. While this would not usually be supported, it is considered acceptable on balance in this case given that the addition would still retain a setback from the ground floor elevation. In addition to this, No. 8 Lancaster Court has a similar side extension arrangement, with the entire side extension projecting forward of the principal elevation. As a result, this already disrupts the established rhythm of the street scene. On balance, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis.
- 8.13. In terms of elements of detailing, it is generally appropriate to ensure that the new development integrates coherently with the existing, whether this is an extension to an existing building or a new home in a conservation area. Given that all properties in the area are finished in matching facing brick, finishing the extension in light render would result in an incongruous dwelling to the established street, with the hipped roof exacerbating this. Therefore, it would be a strong design recommendation to finish the side extension in a facing matching brick, and this is secured by condition.
- 8.14. Dormer windows, which allow for additional headroom within roofspaces, can be appropriate in certain situations. However, these will be considered in the context of impact upon the character of the building and on neighbours' amenity and should reflect the window pattern of the dwelling. Material selection, and scale of window opening and position within the roofscape, is critical in the success of dormers. Dormers to fronts of properties will only be acceptable where this is a prevailing feature of the surrounding context. There are some dormers in the area which are part of the first floor, for example, No. 5 Lancaster Court, perpendicular, has two gabled dormers to the front of the dwelling in keeping with its original design. This proposal introduces a hipped dormer to the front elevation, consistent with the original roof design of the main dwelling and this provision, is no different from No. 5 Lancaster Court.
- 8.15. Fenestration, including the scale, rhythm, proportions and elements of detail used for window and door openings plays a critical role in the success of housing design. In the case of residential extensions, care should be taken to ensure that the existing horizontal and vertical rhythm together with the proportion of openings is either reflected or complemented. With regard to the front of the property, a 1.8m wide casement window is proposed centrally to the hipped dormer, this dormer is sat centrally to the garage below and creates a balanced, symmetrical overall appearance. The fenestration at the rear introduces a considerable opening with the bi-fold door, at 4.4m wide - this is not uncommon for a householder extension and does not disrupt the established fenestration pattern. Therefore, it is considered the fenestration proposed at the front and rear elevations of the extension respects the established fenestration pattern and materiality.

- 8.16. The proposed development respects the established separation distances along Lancaster Court, maintaining a consistent frontage that aligns with the prevailing character of the area. Although the introduction of a first-floor extension results in the closure of the separation distance between No. 3 Lancaster Court, adjacent and No. 4, the host dwelling, this is mitigated by the generous separation distance between No. 5 Lancaster Court, perpendicular. Regardless, a separation distance of 2.7m is maintained between the application dwelling and the neighbouring No. 3 Lancaster Court, which is not disruptive to the street and complies with the Good Design Guidance.
- 8.17. In terms of design and visual impact, the proposal has been assessed from both public and private viewpoints. Public views from the cul-de-sac are strong given the dwelling is sat centrally and prominently on Lancaster Court. Private viewpoints are minimal, with the properties to the rear having some visibility of the side extension element. However, this is mitigated by its use of facing brick and the maintenance of separation distances.
- 8.18. By virtue of the above the proposal respects the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area and is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.19. Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible, which promote health and well-being, and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 8.20. Policy DM10(a) and (b) of the SADMP states development will be permitted provided that it would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings, including matters of lighting and noise and that the amenity of occupiers would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.21. The Good Design Guide requires the way buildings to relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity.
- 8.22. The host dwelling sits adjacent to No. 3 Lancaster court and perpendicular to No. 5 Lancaster Court. At the rear of the application dwelling sits No. 8 Garnedon Way. The side extension sits directly adjacent to No. 3 Lancaster Court. No. 5 Lancaster Court sits perpendicular to the application dwelling and given the large bulk of the extensions are at the opposite elevation, this results in no amenity impact for these occupiers.
- 8.23. The 45-degree guidance, as set out in the Good Design Guide, is applied for planning applications for extensions to existing properties which might affect the outlook from

or daylight to a neighbouring property. No element of the proposals breach 45-degree from the central point of the nearest neighbouring window.

- 8.24. The Good Design Guide recommends that a principal window to a habitable room should ideally be no less than 8m from the blank side of a single storey neighbouring property, rising to 14m for a two-storey property. There are no principal habitable windows at the side elevation of No. 3 Lancaster Court and therefore the proposals remain considerate to this guidance.
- 8.25. In addition, the separation distance between two principal windows to habitable windows should be a minimum of 21m. However, the Good Design Guide also states that, *“An exception to this rule is in an urban location where it may be acceptable to have a reduced distance where issues of amenity and overlooking are dealt with by good design.”* The side elevation of No. 8 Garendon Way, to the rear, sits perpendicular to the property and has no principal habitable windows at its side.
- 8.26. Notwithstanding this, these separation distances are the minimum standards that are required, and every application will be assessed on its own merits depending on the individual characteristics of the site such as orientation, ground levels, window positions, garden size, and shape.
- 8.27. The first-floor side window proposed would serve the proposed main bathroom. This will be obscure-glazed and secured by condition. This window, therefore, does not result in loss of privacy or poor outlook for any neighbouring property. The bi-fold doors at the rear are softened by a high degree of vegetation at the shared boundaries and high timber fencing which significantly mitigates the loss of privacy cause, if any. Regardless, a separation distance of 21m is maintained between the rear of the application dwelling any neighbouring side window to the south.
- 8.28. Although the proposal introduces massing to the property, the first-floor extension sits atop the ground floor garage that exists. This maintains a 1.2m separation distance from the shared boundary and 3.3m from the adjacent property's side elevation at its closest point. This is compliant with the Good Design Guide.
- 8.29. To comply with the Good Design Guide, dwellings with three or more bedrooms should also provide a minimum of 80m² of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m. The proposals are all provided with private outdoor amenity space that exceeds 9m in length and 95m² in total area, which is compliant with the Good Design Guide.
- 8.30. By virtue of the above the proposal does not result in any adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts or any overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties and therefore is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.31. Paragraph 115(b) of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users. In accordance with Paragraph 115(d) of the NPPF, any proposal should ensure that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.
- 8.32. Ultimately, development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios in accordance with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.
- 8.33. Table 28 (Residential Parking Standards) of the LHDG requires dwellings with up to three bedrooms should provide a minimum of two off-street parking spaces. This increases to a minimum of three off-street parking spaces for properties with four or more bedrooms. Any reduction below minimum standards will require robust justification.
- 8.34. Although adding an extra bedroom may result in additional parking demand, it is acknowledged that the property benefits from two off-street parking spaces as well as an integrated garage, all of which are to be retained. Considering the low traffic levels on Lancaster Court and its access road, along with the availability of on-street parking, the development would not result in an inability to meet parking needs. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP as well as the LHDG.

9. Equality Implications

- 9.1. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states: -
- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 9.2. Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.

9.3. There are no known equality implications arising directly from this development.

10. Conclusion

10.1. Taking national and local planning policies into account, and regarding all relevant material considerations, it is recommended, on balance, that planning permission should be granted, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Grant planning permission** subject to:

- Planning conditions detailed at the end of this report.

11.2 Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details received by the Local Planning Authority as follows:

- Application Form – received by the Local Planning Authority on 07/11/25
- Site Location Plan, Block Plan, Drg No. 3349/3 - received by the Local Planning Authority on 10/11/25
- Proposed Elevations and Floor plans - Drg No. 3394/02 Rev A - received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/01/26

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

3. The external materials used in the construction of the first-floor extension shall match in colour, texture and finish those of the existing brickwork of the host dwelling. The materials shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP).

4. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the side southeast-facing window serving the proposed bathroom shall be fitted with obscure glazing to a minimum of

Pilkington Level 3 (or equivalent) prior to the first use of the extension. The window shall be permanently retained in this form thereafter. No part of the window shall be capable of being opened below 1.7 metres above internal floor level.

Reason: To protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP).

a. **Notes to Applicant:**

1. The approved development may require Building Regulations Approval, for further information please contact the Building Control team via e-mail at building.control@blaby.gov.uk or call 0116 272 7533.