

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/00753/HOU
Applicant: Mr Ryan Morgan
Ward: Ambien



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 14 Shenton Lane Dadlington Nuneaton

Proposal: Two storey rear extension (revised scheme of 24/00162/HOU)

1. Recommendations

1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report

2. Planning application description

- 2.1. This application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a two-storey rear extension, a basement, and a porch canopy to the front elevation and other alterations to the external elevations of 14 Shenton Lane, Dadlington.
- 2.2. The proposed two-storey rear extension would incorporate the existing two-storey rear extension and extend for the full 12.00 metres width of the rear elevation. It would extend 8.00 metres to the rear flush with the north-west side elevation and 2.50 metres to the rear flush with the southeast side elevation. It would have a matching rear eaves height of 4.50 metres and three subordinate rear gables to the rear elevation. The gables would be constructed with Oak framing and full height infill glazing including bi-fold doors, one would include an enclosed/recessed external balcony at first floor with glazed rear balustrade, the other a Juliette balcony with glazed balustrade. The ground floor would have five sets of double glazed doors. Matching corresponding materials are proposed in its construction. The construction of the rear extension will require excavation of the raised rear garden to achieve the same ground floor level as the existing dwelling. The proposed basement would be constructed below the new section of the proposed rear extension. It would extend for 8.00 metres in depth and 7.20 metres in width and would be accessed by both an internal staircase and by new external steps along the north-west side elevation.
- 2.3. Other alterations include the construction of a dual pitched roof porch canopy to the front elevation and alterations to fenestration including the insertion of a new door to the north-west side elevation, relocation of a door and removal of a ground floor window on the south-east side elevation. A number of high-level roof/sky lights are also proposed to the main rear roof elevation and side elevations of the proposed rear extension.
- 2.4. The original proposal included a detached double garage with dual pitched roof within the site frontage. However, amended plans have been submitted to remove this from the proposed scheme following case officer concerns raised.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application dwelling lies within the settlement boundary of Dadlington within a ribbon development of residential properties along the north-east side of Shenton Lane within the designated boundary of the historic landscape of Bosworth Battlefield and with open fields to the rear. From the front, the dwelling appears as a detached dormer bungalow with low eaves, a large central subordinate gable

projection forming a dormer window and with one smaller hipped pitched roof dormer window to either side. The dwelling has an asymmetric gable sided roof form with higher eaves to the rear elevation. There is a two storey rear extension with dual pitched roof forming a rear gable that projects flush with its southeast side elevation and extends across part of its rear elevation. The dwelling has been constructed with red rustic facing bricks, small brown plain clay roof tiles and white uPVC windows. It has two red brick chimney stacks, red rustic brick soldier headers and red tiled cills to windows, the rear extension has brick detailing to the roof verge and eaves. The site provides four off-street parking spaces within the site frontage on concrete block paving and loose stone hard standing. There is a large garden to the rear providing extensive private amenity space.

- 3.2. The neighbouring dwellings either side are a mix of detached dormer bungalows and two storey houses of varying size, design and appearance.

4. Relevant planning history

01/00085/FUL

- Extension to dwelling
- Planning Permission
- 16.05.2001

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.
- 5.2. Following the publications two responses have been received raising the following objections/concerns:
- 1) Applicant should be aware that drains from numbers 16 & 18 Shenton Lane discharge into manhole at rear of number 14 within drawn boundary of building works. This must not negatively be impacted by the works;
 - 2) The proposed garage would be forward of the building line and would dominate the street scene;
 - 3) The buildings at 12 and 14 are currently a 'reflected' pair, the proposed changes to number 14 would lose this attractive aspect of the lane;
 - 4) It appears changes at the front of the property would affect a known bat roost;
 - 5) Potential loss of trees;
 - 6) The extension to the rear would cause a loss of light and would be an overbearing design;
 - 7) Basement construction/steps will require substantial retaining structure and excavation in very close proximity to the boundary.

6. Consultation

6.1. Battlefields Trust;

- No comments have been received.

6.2. HBBC Conservation Officer;

'The battlefield was first registered in 1995, when the mid-20th century ribbon development of dwellings along Shenton Lane, which includes the application site, was already constructed. The registered battlefield entry acknowledges that land uses have changed within the area since the battle took place, and therefore the application site, as a modern dwelling situated within the edge of the designation, makes no contribution to the historical importance or topographic integrity of the battlefield. It is also considered that due to the relatively minor extent and scale of proposed development the historical importance of topographic integrity of the battlefield will not be affected, so the proposal will be in accordance with Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP DPD and Section 16 of the NPPF.'

As the proposed development would involve groundworks, with the potential for these to have an effect upon archaeology related to the battlefield and the historic core of Dadlington, Leicestershire County Council Planning Archaeology should be consulted to determine if a programme of archaeological investigation and recording is required.'

6.3. HBBC Drainage;

'Note to Applicant:

Rainwater from the detached garage roof should be positively drained into a suitable water butt, soakaway or domestic drainage system, and not be permitted to discharge directly onto the surface of the application site and neighbouring properties.'

6.4. Historic England;

'We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/>'

6.5. LCC Archaeology;

'Given the extent of previous ground works to the rear of the building as indicated on the submitted photographs, in addition to the removal of the proposed garage to the front of the house (as illustrated on the revised submitted plans), we would revise our previous comments and recommend that no further archaeological involvement will be required for the application.'

6.6. LCC Ecology;

No objection (subject to recommended conditions or informatives- see below)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

- We have reviewed the above document and found this acceptable with the plans now showing that the front elevation with the window shutter will not be impacted on. • Therefore, we have no objection – see condition below*

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS TO BE APPLIED:

- The development hereby approved shall be implemented in strict accordance with the measures stated in Recommendations section of the Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys (BERS) Survey (Arbtech, Jul 2025).'*

6.7. LCC Highways;

'The Local Highway Authority (LHA) refers the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to current standing advice provided by the LHA dated September 2011.

The LHA advises the LPA to consider the following:

- *Parking provision should be provided as three parking spaces for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms with spaces measuring a minimum of 2.4 x 5.5m with an additional 0.5 metre strip where bound by a wall/hedge/fence or other similar obstruction. Garage dimensions should also be in accordance with Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG). <https://www.leicestershirehighwaydesignguide.uk/highway-layouts-anddesign/parking-and-making-provision-service-vehicles/street-residential-car>*

6.8. Sutton Cheney Parish Council:

- No comments have been received.

7. **Policy**

7.1. Core Strategy (2009)

- No relevant policies

7.2. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Policy DM12: Heritage Assets
- Policy DM13: Preserving the Borough's Archaeology
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3. National Planning Policies and Guidance

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

7.4. Other relevant guidance

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024)

8. **Appraisal**

8.1. Extensions and alterations to existing dwellings within settlement boundaries 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 Bosworth Battlefield and archaeology
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Impact upon ecology

Design and impact upon the character of the area

8.2 Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP requires new development to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, mass, design, materials and architectural features and for building material to respect existing/neighbouring buildings and the local area generally.

- 8.3 One response has been received from a neighbouring property as a result of public consultation raising concerns in respect to the loss of the aspect of the lane, due to the dwellings currently being reflected as a pair.
- 8.4 The Councils Good Design Guide seeks to ensure that *'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.'*
- 8.5 The proposed two storey rear extension would incorporate the existing two-storey rear extension and extend for the full 12.00 metres width of the rear elevation. It would extend 8.00 metres to the rear flush with the north-west side elevation and 2.50 metres to the rear flush with the southeast side elevation. It would have a matching rear eaves height of 4.50 metres and three subordinate rear gables to the rear elevation. By virtue of its depth and width, the proposal would effectively provide double the internal floor space of the dwelling at both ground and first floor level. However, notwithstanding the substantial size, scale and flush design of the proposal, it would still have a clearly subordinate roof height to that of the main roof ridge, which would remain dominant, and the proposal would be set well back from the public highway to the rear of the dwelling where it would be largely screened by the neighbouring dwellings either side and, as such, would not be overly prominent or have any significant adverse visual impacts on the varied wider street scene.
- 8.6 The resulting dwelling would be compatible with the size of the substantial plot in which it is located and not out of scale with neighbouring dwellings and therefore the proposal is not considered to be unacceptable in terms of its height, width, depth or design in this particular case. Whilst the front elevation would remain as a more traditionally styled dormer bungalow in terms of design and appearance, the proposal would result in a more contemporary design and style to the rear elevation. The proposed three gables would be constructed with Oak framing and full height infill glazing including bi-fold doors, one would include an enclosed/recessed external balcony at first floor with glazed rear balustrade, the other a Juliette balcony with glazed balustrade both overlooking the open fields to the rear. The ground floor would have five sets of double glazed doors opening to the extensive rear garden. By virtue of its siting, scale and contemporary design with appropriately proportioned fenestration and subject to the proposed use of complementary and matching corresponding external materials in its construction to ensure a satisfactory and unified appearance, the proposed rear extension is considered to respect and complement the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and to be in general accordance with the principles of the Councils Good Design Guide.
- 8.7 By virtue of its underground nature and the siting of the external access steps to the side and set back from the front elevation, the basement element of the proposed scheme would not result in any significant adverse visual impacts on the character or appearance of the dwelling or surrounding area.
- 8.8 One response has been received from a neighbouring property as a result of public consultation. This raises an objection to the visual prominence of the originally proposed detached double garage within the site frontage but this has subsequently been removed from the proposed scheme. It also raises concerns in respect of the potential loss of trees along the side boundary. However, these are outside the boundary of the site and not in the control of the applicant and are not protected by any Tree Preservation Order or considered to be worthy of such protection given their position and form. The proposed rear extension would be set in from the side boundary by at least 2.00 metres with likely only some branch trimming required which could be undertaken at any time.

- 8.9 The proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP and the Council's Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Bosworth Battlefield and archaeology

- 8.10 Policy DM11 of the adopted SADMP seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets and states that the Borough Council will protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment throughout the borough. This will be done through the careful management of development that might adversely impact both designated and non-designated heritage assets. Of relevance to this proposal is that all development proposals which have the potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting will be required to demonstrate any impact on archaeology in line with Policy DM13 of the adopted SADMP which sets out the Council's approach to preserving the Borough's archaeology.
- 8.11 Policy DM12 of the adopted SADMP requires that all development proposals within or adjacent to the historic landscape of Bosworth Battlefield should seek to better reveal the historic significance of the area. Proposals which adversely affect the Bosworth Battlefield or its setting should be wholly exceptional and accompanied by clear and convincing justification. Such proposals will be assessed against their public benefits. Particular regard will be had to maintaining topographical features, archaeological remains or to the potential expansion of the Battlefield.
- 8.12 Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) provides the national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraphs 205-208 of the NPPF require great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets when considering the impact of a proposed development on its significance, for any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset to have clear and convincing justification, and for that harm to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal.
- 8.13 The application site is located within the registered Battle of Bosworth Field, the designated boundary of which extends to the south and east to the edges of the historic core of Dadlington. The Battle of Bosworth is one of the most important battles and an iconic event in English history and the deciding battle of the Wars of the Roses. The principal reasons for its designation are provided by Historic England in the designation description (National Heritage List for England 1000004), with of particular relevance for this application being its:
- Historical importance: an iconic event in English history, the Battle of Bosworth brought the Tudor dynasty to the throne and saw the last death of an English king in battle
 - Topographic integrity: while agricultural land management has changed since the battle, the battlefield remains largely undeveloped and permits the site of encampments and the course of the battle to be appreciated
 - Archaeological Potential: recent investigation has demonstrated that the area of the battlefield retains material which can greatly add to our understanding of the battle
- 8.14 The battlefield was first registered in 1995, when the mid-20th century ribbon development of dwellings along Shenton Lane, which includes the application site, was already constructed. The registered battlefield entry acknowledges that land uses have changed within the area since the battle took place, and therefore the application site, as a modern dwelling situated within the edge of the designation, makes no contribution to the historical importance or topographic integrity of the battlefield. It is also considered that due to the relatively minor extent and scale of

proposed development the historical importance of topographic integrity of the battlefield will not be affected, so the proposal will be in accordance with Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP and Section 16 of the NPPF.

- 8.15 Even though the proposed development would involve groundworks, within close proximity of the battlefield and the historic core of Dadlington, Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology) have stated that given the extent of previous ground works to the rear of the building in addition to the removal of the proposed garage to the front of the house no further archaeological involvement will be required for the application. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policies DM11, DM12 and DM13 of the SADMP and Section 16 of the NPPF.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.16 Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP and the Councils Good Design Guide require that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and/or amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.17 One response has been received from a neighbouring property as a result of public consultation raising concerns in respect of loss of light, and overbearing impacts.
- 8.18 The Councils Good Design Guide states that *'Where there are no public views into a site, a fully integrated two storey rear extension may be acceptable unless there is a detrimental impact on the adjacent properties as assessed by the 45 degree rule.*
- The 45 degree rule is applied for planning applications for new extensions to existing properties which could result in the outlook from or daylight to a principal window to a habitable room being impacted upon. On a plan of the proposal, a projecting line is to be drawn from the nearest principal window to a habitable room that may be affected by the planning application towards the proposed building at an angle of 45 degrees. Habitable rooms include living rooms, bedrooms and kitchens but do not include rooms such as bathrooms, utility rooms, halls, landings or garages. The extension should not cross the 45 degree line.'*
- 8.19 To the south-east of the proposals sits 12 Shenton Lane. The proposed rear extension would extend approximately 7.50 metres beyond the rear elevation of the nearest part of the neighbouring dwelling no.12 but at a separation distance between the respective side elevations of approximately 8.40 metres, approximately 4.20 metres either side of the boundary. Therefore, the proposal would not extend beyond a 45 degree line drawn from any principle habitable room windows in the rear elevation of no. 12 and it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on a first floor window in the near side elevation of no. 12 as this faces towards the existing side elevation rather than the proposed extension and there is in any case approximately 8.50 metres between. The only openings proposed in the side elevation facing no. 12 are a side door and a high level roof light which would not result in any significant adverse impacts from loss of privacy from direct overlooking to the neighbouring occupiers of no. 12.
- 8.20 To the north-west of the proposals sits 16 Shenton Lane. The proposed rear extension would extend approximately 4.50 metres beyond the rear elevation of the no. 16 but at a separation distance between the respective side elevations of approximately 9.80 metres, and between 4.00 metres and 2.00 metres within the side boundary of the site. Therefore, the proposal would not extend beyond a 45 degree line drawn from any principle habitable room windows in the rear elevation of no. 16 and it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts on the residential amenity of the

neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on a number of small windows in the near side elevation of no. 16 by virtue of their secondary nature and separation distance of 9.80 metres. The only openings proposed in the side elevation facing no. 16 are a relocated side door and two high level roof light which would not result in any significant adverse impacts from loss of privacy from direct overlooking to the neighbouring occupiers of no. 16.

- 8.21 One response has been received from a neighbouring property as a result of public consultation raising concerns in respect of the construction of the proposed basement and its access steps which will require a substantial retaining structure and excavation in very close proximity to the boundary. An informative note to the applicant/developer would highlight the responsibilities and requirements of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 in respect of any excavations in close proximity to neighbouring property.
- 8.22 The proposals would therefore be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Councils Good Design Guide.

Impact upon parking provision and highway safety

- 8.23 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.
- 8.24 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.
- 8.25 To support this, Policy DM17 of the SADMP states that development proposals need to demonstrate that there is not a significant adverse impact upon highway safety, and that the residual cumulative impacts of development on the transport network are not severe. All proposals for new development and changes of use should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highway authority (currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024).
- 8.26 The LHDG seeks to ensure that dwellings hosting four or more bedrooms provide a minimum off-street parking provision for three vehicles.
- 8.27 The site currently provides four off-street parking spaces within the site frontage on concrete block paving and loose stone hard standing to serve the existing four bedroomed dwelling.
- 8.28 Notwithstanding the proposed increase in the footprint of the dwelling, the scheme would result in the addition of only one additional (fifth) bedroom. The existing parking provision within the site frontage would remain unaffected by the proposals. This level of existing/retained provision would remain adequate to serve the resulting five bedroomed dwelling as in accordance with Policy DM18 of the SADMP and the LHDG for a dwelling of this size.

Impact upon ecology

- 8.29 Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016) states that proposals must demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation and geological value including proposals for their long-term future management.

On site features should be retained, buffered and managed favourably to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. The removal or damage of such features shall only be acceptable where it can be demonstrated the proposal will result in no net loss of biodiversity and where the integrity of local ecological networks can be secured.

Proposals which are likely to result in the loss or deterioration of an irreplaceable habitat would only be acceptable where:

- e) The need and benefits of the development in that location clearly
- f) It has been adequately demonstrated that the irreplaceable habitat
- g) Appropriate compensation measures are provided on site wherever possible and off site where this not is feasible.

If the harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against or appropriate compensation measures provided, planning permission will be refused.

- 8.30 In reference to Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005 *"It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may have not been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances."*
- 8.31 Within the relevant Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements householder development is exempt. As the works involve significant alterations to the existing roof, roof line, tiles and soffits of the existing property whilst being situated on the outskirts of an urbanised area with good habitat connectivity to the surrounding arable landscape a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was submitted.
- 8.32 The submitted PRA identified a temporary roost beneath the front elevations window shutter, no evidence of bats inside the loft, and no bats were observed using the roof structure during the three BERS surveys. Despite the presence of the temporary roost to the front elevation the works would be limited to the rear and LCC Ecology therefore have no objections subject to a condition being imposed ensuring that the development is implemented in strict accordance with the submitted PRA for precautionary measures.
- 8.33 By virtue of the above, subject to conditions, the development would accord with Policy DM6 of the SADMP and Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005.

Other matters

- 8.34 One response has been received from a neighbouring property as a result of public consultation raising concerns in regard to drainage. The site lies in flood zone 1 and is not in an area identified as at risk from surface water flooding.
- 8.35 The application is for minor householder development. Considering the scale of the development it is unlikely to give rise to adverse additional flooding/drainage concerns and in any event may be considered through any relevant building regulations process.

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. The proposals relate to extensions and alterations of an existing dwelling located within the settlement boundary of Dadlington where there is a general presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in Policy DM1 of the adopted SADMP and the overarching principles of the NPPF.

10.2. By virtue of their siting, scale, design and subject to the proposed use of complementary and matching corresponding external materials in their construction to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, the proposals are considered to respect and complement the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would not result in any significant adverse visual impacts on the character or appearance of the varied street scene or the surrounding area including the historical importance and topographic integrity of Bosworth Battlefield. By virtue of their siting, scale, design and separation distances, the proposals would have no significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity or privacy of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties. The proposals would retain more than adequate private rear amenity space and adequate off-street parking provision of at least four spaces to serve the resulting five bedroomed dwelling.

10.3. The proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policies DM1, DM6, DM10, DM11, DM12, DM13 and DM18 of the adopted SADMP, Section 16 of the NPPF (2024) and the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide and are therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Grant planning permission** subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report

11.2 Conditions and Reasons

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 materials to be used externally shall accord with the approved Proposed Elevations, Drg No. 003 rev C, as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4th September 2025.

Reason: To ensure that the development has a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:
 - Proposed Floor Plans, Block, Site Location Plan, Drg No. 002 Rev B as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 23rd September 2025.
 - Proposed Elevations, Drg No. 003 Rev C as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4th September 2025.

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

4. The development hereby approved shall be implemented in strict accordance with the measures stated in Recommendations section of the Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys (BERS) Survey (Arbtech, Jul 2025).

Reason: In order to protect wildlife species and their habitat in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

11.3 Notes to applicant

- a) 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.
- b) The applicant/developers attention is drawn to responsibilities under the requirements of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and in particular to the construction of the proposed basement and proximity to the boundary of the site and the neighbouring property.