Delegated Report

Planning Reference: **25/00870/HOU**
Applicant(s): **Mr Adrian Young**
Ward: **Fenny Drayton**

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council

Application Site: **3 Quaker Close, Fenny Drayton**

Proposal: **Two-storey side extension, single-storey front extension, single-storey rear extension and internal alterations.**

Case Officer: **Gwion Russell (Planning Officer)**

---

1. Recommendations

1.1. **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

2.1. This householder planning application seeks planning permission for two separate ground-floor single-storey extensions and an associated first-floor extension to 3 Quaker Close, Fenny Drayton.

2.2. The single-storey front extension would form a new projected entrance to the dwelling, and would feature a prominent windowed gable, providing an expanded entrance hallway.

2.3. The property would also be expanded to both its east and west elevations, providing a further 40m² of gross footprint at ground floor level, wrapping around the southern section of the property.

2.4. The proposed first-floor extension would be positioned above the existing and proposed ground floor configurations, set back approximately 2.4m back from the ground-floor principal elevation, adding 77m² to the first-floor footprint and approximately 7.5m in width to the original first-floor principal frontage.

2.5. A uniform dual-pitched roof would span the entire building with no habitable space proposed at second floor (loft) level. The attached garage at the north side elevation would be retained.

2.6. The original cloisters would be removed at the principal frontage of the dwelling resulting in a level principal façade at ground-floor level, notwithstanding the projecting dual-pitched entrance. This would serve the existing ground-floor living room and entry hallway space.

2.7. There are no further internal external configurations at ground floor level. At first floor level the proposals would reconfigure the existing three bedrooms and would propose four bedrooms with associated en-suite bathrooms and the removal of the main family bathroom.

2.8. Windows proposed are identical in siting, location and dimensions of the windows at ground floor level, with only the introduction of a 1.3m wide side elevation window at first-floor level serving the landing area.

2.9. Accompanying the proposals, the entire elevations of the property would be finished in a light-coloured render with brick-cill detailing along the principal elevation.

2.10. The application was originally submitted in September 2025 and proposed the conversion of a habitable loft space, providing a property with approximately 9 bedrooms in total. However, amended plans and elevations have since been submitted detailing a reduction to 4 bedrooms.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

3.1. The application site is located at 3 Quaker Close, to the east and within the settlement boundary of Fenny Drayton. The street is a residential cul-de-sac with dwellings situated along the west side, established vegetation at the eastern side and the A444, sited parallel, to the east.

3.2. Properties along Quaker Close vary in design and scale. Despite variation in design, most dwellings are dual-pitched (gabled) and finished in facing brick.

3.3. The application property is currently a 3-bedroomed, detached dwelling with a dual-pitched roof; it is constructed primarily of red brick with a tiled, pitched roof and features distinct cloisters at the south of the principal elevation which serves an open patio space. This frontage also incorporates a stone-faced chimney breast extending above the eaves and separating it from the first-floor footprint. The principal elevation features a prominent front-facing gable above the central section of the building. The upper-floor windows are fitted with decorative, white shutters. To the north of the dwelling is an integrated single garage with a white ‘up-and-over’ door.

3.4. The front garden is landscaped with a lawn and paved driveway providing off-street parking. There is no distinct boundary treatment, but a timber fence encompassing the rear of the property.

4. Relevant Planning History

06/00455/FUL

- Extensions and alterations to dwelling
- Permitted
- 13.06.2006

92/00415/4

- Erection of detached garage
- Permitted
- 21.07.1992

82/00611/4

- Extension forming granny accommodation
- Permitted
- 29.07.1982

80/00664/4M

- Extensions to dwelling house
- Permitted
- 08.05.1980

74/00562/4M

- One dwelling
- Permitted
- 28.08.1974

5. Publicity

5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. A site notice was also posted within the vicinity of the site. In total, 7 neighbour objections were received. The following concerns were raised to the original plans and elevations:

- Concerns over the conversion of a single family to a house of multiple occupancy/B&B. The absence of a main family bathroom would suggest this.
- The raising of the roof ridge height would be out of character with the surrounding area.
- Lack of parking for the development, if it were to be operated as a house of multiple occupancy.
- The increase in massing would result in some overlooking concerns
- Some drainage concerns resultant from an increase in bedroom provision.
- Concerns over construction vehicles.

5.2. The LPA concludes that amended plans and elevations which have been provided have sufficiently addressed these concerns.

5.3. The Leicestershire Highway Design Guide suggest that bedrooms with four or more bedrooms should provide three off-street parking spaces, the property already benefits from a driveway sufficient to park three vehicles off-street.

5.4. Since the amended plans and elevations have been received, no further responses have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1. Witherley Parish Council objected to the original scheme; however, have not provided comment to the subsequent scheme:

'Witherley Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons:

- *Overdevelopment of site, scale of development is not in keeping with other properties.*
- *Out of keeping with street scene.*
- *Development constraints.*
- *Issues with vehicle parking - only space for two spaces, turning property into additional bedrooms will lead to parking issues.*
- *Possible future use as HMO/B&B.*
- *Increase in ridge height not to keeping with other properties.*
- *Privacy issues with neighbours.*
- *No plan online for the top floor.*
- *If the application goes ahead, constraints on vehicular access for construction vehicles due to road being a dead end with a 90-degree bend, with no turning circle.'*

6.2. The County Council's Ecology Department were consulted on the proposals. As the works include significant alterations to the roof structure, roof void, eaves, soffits and roof coverings, a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was requested in November 2025 for the proposed alterations to the property. A suitably licensed ecologist must undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment, including internal and external building inspections, identification of potential bat roost features, assessment of roosting potential and other protected species, and recommendations for any necessary mitigation or biodiversity enhancements.

6.3. No further responses have been received.

6.4. The responses can be read in full on the Council's website.

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. Witherley Neighbourhood Plan (2023):

- Policy H3: Design

7.4. National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

7.5. Other Relevant Guidance:

- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council – The Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)
- Open Space and Recreation Study (2016)
- Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

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
- Impact upon ecology

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.2. The proposals would result in a significant increase in the overall cubic massing of the dwelling, particularly at first floor level, where the first-floor massing would more than double, and the ridge height would increase from 6.9m to 7.8m.

8.3. Due to the siting of the dwelling, when considering the spatial relationship with neighbouring dwellings and how it is experienced from the public realm, Officers consider that the dwelling is viewed in the context of the neighbouring dwellings to the north rather than neighbouring White Wings to the south. This is an important distinction given the scale of White Wings and the scale of the proposed extensions.

8.4. The amended proposals include a dual-pitched roof and large first-floor extension which approximately doubles the cubic massing of the dwelling at

the first-floor level. This would result in a building which is significantly larger than neighbouring dwellings within the street scene both in height and overall scale. Furthermore, the extensions would result in a comprehensive remodelling of the dwelling, with the original design of the dwelling being completely lost. No element of the proposed extensions is subordinate or in keeping with the existing dwelling. Therefore, the proposed extensions would fail to complement or enhance the existing dwelling or the surrounding area and would conflict with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

8.5. The proposed single-storey central front gable projection, which would project 2m from the property's front elevation, would remain proportionate and subordinate to the expanded property footprint. However, when considered cumulatively with the entire proposal would exacerbate the proposal's general increase in scale. Furthermore, this projection would feature a windowed gable, which is not a typical feature along Quaker Close.

8.6. The rear extension projecting gable, at an approximate proposed width of 8.3m and depth of 2.1m, spans nearly 50% of the expanded rear elevation and presents a large cubic massing of build form to the rear of the property. However, given its siting to the rear, would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area when assessed separately to the wider proposed extensions.

8.7. With respect to the roof form, the existing dwelling currently features a dual-pitched roof with the gable fronting the highway. Within the proposed development, this arrangement would be altered, with the gable instead orientated towards the neighbouring properties, and the ridge height increased by approximately 0.9m. This increase in roof height would contribute to the increase in visual prominence and scale of the dwelling, which, cumulatively with the rest of the extensions, contributes to the excessive bulky and over dominant design which is detrimental to the site and surrounding area.

8.8. Pedestrian views of the proposals are limited to mainly neighbouring residents given that it is located near the end of a cul-de-sac and established vegetation screening the property from the A444. Notwithstanding this, the roofscape is still readily visible from the A444, and the proposed extensions and roof alterations would be experienced by passing vehicles. Furthermore, as part of the proposals the dwelling would be finished in a light-coloured render and feature brick detailing. Whilst this material choice is not unacceptable, it would increase the prominence of the building and exacerbate its incongruous appearance within the street scene.

8.9. By virtue of the above, the cumulative impact of the design of proposed extensions and alterations, the application would fail to complement or enhance the existing dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy H3 of the Witherley Neighbourhood Plan and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

8.10. The increase in massing is predominantly located at the south side of the dwelling which is adjacent to the rear garden of neighbouring White Wings. The dwelling sits parallel with No. 2 Quaker Close to the north, and none of the proposals would have an adverse impact on the amenity of this neighbour.

8.11. The first-floor footprint expansion would breach 45-degrees from two principal habitable windows at neighbouring White Wings, both serving bedrooms, and is therefore contrary to Good Design Guidance. Notwithstanding this, White Wings is partly occupied as a permanent dwelling and partly as a Bed and Breakfast. It is understood that the affected bedroom windows both form part of the B&B and are therefore not permanently inhabited bedrooms. The 45-degree breach is therefore considered acceptable in these site-specific circumstances.

8.12. The increase in massing may further result in a limited loss of light and additional shadowing for the rear garden at White Wings. However, the neighbouring garden would experience sufficient natural light given its size and orientation.

8.13. The proposed first floor north-facing landing window would front the side elevation of neighbouring No. 4 Quaker Close. There are no principal habitable room windows along this neighbouring elevation and would therefore not result in loss of privacy. The introduction of first-floor windows reflects the established fenestration pattern along Quaker Close and, given that these windows only overlook the applicant's own garden, they would not result in any harmful loss of privacy.

8.14. By virtue of the above the proposal results in some degree of harm to neighbouring properties by way of loss of light and oppressive development. However, on balance is considered to be acceptable in these site-specific circumstances, and is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

8.15. The scheme creates one new bedroom and makes the property a four-bedroom dwelling. The associated driveway provides three off-street parking spaces, which is compliant with the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide for four-bedroom properties.

8.16. Furthermore, there is sufficient on-street parking available to meet potential demand, in addition to a turning circle at the end of the cul-de-sac and minimal 'through' traffic. Whilst properties with three off-street parking space would not ordinarily require on-street parking, it would therefore, be unreasonable to resist the application based on its potential future parking demand.

8.17. It is therefore considered that there is already adequate off-street parking for the dwelling and that the proposal does not create an unacceptable impact on

highway safety or the road network. Therefore, the scheme is regarded as in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, and the LHDG.

Impact upon Ecology

8.18. The proposal involves a two-storey extension and an increase in ridge height to create an additional floor. Given the site's location adjacent to suitable bat and bird habitat, concerns were raised regarding the potential impact on protected species.

8.19. The Local Planning Authority requested a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) in November 2025, due to the extent of the proposed roof alterations and the potential for bat roosting features to be present.

8.20. No Preliminary Roost Assessment, biodiversity information, or details of ecological enhancements were submitted in support of the application. In the absence of sufficient ecological information, the Local Planning Authority is unable to properly assess the impact of the proposal on protected species and biodiversity. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

8.21. Therefore, the Applicant has failed to comply with the statutory requirements within Paragraphs 98 and 99 of the ODMP Circular 06/2006 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation), and the proposal is in conflict with Policy N6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026), and Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016)

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 that planning permission to be granted, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

11.2 **Reason/s**

1. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that protected species and their habitats are not adversely affected by this proposal. Therefore, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, the statutory requirements of Paragraphs 98 and 99 of the ODMP Circular 06/2006 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation), as well as Chapter 19 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026), and Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

2. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive first-floor massing, scale and increased ridge height, would result in an overly bulky and visually dominant dwelling that would fail to complement or enhance the street scene, contrary to Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

a. **Notes to Applicant:**

1. The application has been determined in accordance with the following submitted details:
    - Brick cill detailing - Drg No. QC/2025/010B – received by the Local Planning Authority on 14/04/26
    - Proposed First Floor Plans - Drg No. 20260122 - received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/01/26
    - Proposed Side (South) Elevations - Drg No. 20260122 (5) - received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/01/26
    - Proposed Side (North) Elevations - Drg No. 20260122 (4) - received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/01/26
    - Proposed Front Elevations - Drg No. 20260122 (3) - received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/01/26
    - Proposed Rear Elevations - Drg No. 20260122 (2) - received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/01/26

- Proposed Ground Floor, Drg No. QC/2025/007 - received by the Local Planning Authority on 10/09/25/
- Application Form - received by the Local Planning Authority on 10/09/250