

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/00707/HOU
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Morris
Ward: Earl Shilton



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 30 Equity Road East Earl Shilton Leicester

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage, single/two storey side and single storey rear extension, erection of front boundary wall, new porch and driveway

1. Recommendations

1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report

2. Planning application description

- 2.1. The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of an existing garage and erection of a single/two-storey side, single-storey rear extension, porch, front boundary wall and hardstanding at 30 Equity Road East, Earl Shilton.
- 2.2. The proposed porch extension would project outwards from the existing front elevation by 0.92 metres for a width of 3.72 metres. It would have a mono-pitched roof form which would have an eaves height of 2.41 metres and a ridge height of 3.36 metres. It would then project for a further 1.00 metre for a width of 2.05 metres and would have a forward facing gable canopy form with an eaves height of 2.32 metres and a ridge height of 3.47 metres. A door with sidelight and a window would sit to its front elevation.
- 2.3. The proposed two-storey side extension would project outwards from the existing side elevation by 4.04 metres for a width of 6.93 metres. It would have a dual-pitched roof form with a forward fronting gable feature with an eaves height of 4.90 metres and a ridge height of 6.49 metres to the gable and 7.28 metres to the main ridge. A window would sit to the ground and first floor of its front elevation.
- 2.4. The proposed two-storey rear extension would adjoin onto the proposed two-storey side extension and would project outwards by 4.38 metres for a width of 4.51 metres. It would have a rear facing gable form with an eaves height of 4.90 and a ridge height of 7.00 metres. Two windows would sit to the ground floor and one to the first floor of its rear elevation.
- 2.5. The proposed single-storey garage extension would project outwards from the proposed two-storey side extension by 3.21 metres for a width of 6.89 metres. It would have a dual-pitched roof form with an eaves height of 2.42 metres and a ridge height of 4.60 metres. A half glazed personal door would sit to its side elevation, an up and over door to its front elevation and a solid personal door to its rear elevation.
- 2.6. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project outwards from the proposed garage extension by 4.38 metres for a width of 2.08 metres. It would have a mono-pitched roof form which would have an eaves height of 2.29 metres and a ridge height of 3.55 metres.
- 2.7. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project outwards from the existing rear elevation hosting the current living/dining area by 4.38 metres for a width of 7.55 metres. It would have a flat roof form with an overall height of 3.03 metres. A

set of French doors and a set of four bi-fold doors would sit to its rear elevation with a roof lantern to its roof.

- 2.8. The proposed red brick front boundary wall is to measure 7.72 metres for a depth of 0.46 metres. The pillars would measure 1.94 metres in height and the walls 1.51 metres including the black metal pillars atop of. The matching black metal gate would measure 1.70 metres in height for a width of 1.20 metres and would be situated in line with the dwellings porch access.
- 2.9. The proposed hardstanding would be increased by 33.82m².
- 2.10. Additional alterations include amendment in scale and design of the existing fenestration, and the demolition of the existing front boundary wall and garage.
- 2.11. The proposed external materials would match those of the existing dwelling with the exception of off-white render and red multi brick to the walls.
- 2.12. During the application process amendments have been sought to reduce the scale and height of the proposed two-storey side extension.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application site relates to a two-storey detached residential dwelling situated within the settlement boundary of Earl Shilton.
- 3.2. The application dwelling has a predominant dual-pitched design with a flat roof form present to the single-storey side extension and stand-alone single garage. It is finished in red buff brick to the walls, brown interlocking tiles and felt to the roof and white uPVC to the openings. The site benefits from an extensive plot. Concrete hardstanding provides access to the aforementioned garage, the rear of the site and the personal doors with grass in between of. The sites frontage is enclosed by a variety of boundary treatments, comprising a red brick wall with railings atop of, stone with a metal gate to the mid of and a mix of vegetation. The private rear amenity area measures approximately 619 m².
- 3.3. It is surrounded by other residential dwellings to the north, south and west. To the rear of the property is the playing fields of Townlands Church of England Primary School to the rear (east). Many of the surrounding dwellings have been altered and extended with both single and two-storey extensions.

4. Relevant planning history

- 4.1. None.

5. Publicity

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.
- 5.2. Following the publication no comments have been received.

6. Consultation

- 6.1. Earl Shilton Town Council;

- No comments have been received.

- 6.2. LCC Ecology;

'No objection (for recommended conditions or informatives - see below)

- *The submission of supporting photographs supplied are acceptable.*
- *The current dwelling/roof and garage appear to remain in good condition. Therefore, the additional photographs suitability addresses our comments. As such, no further ecological surveys are required.*
- *Please see the below recommended condition.*
- *No development shall take place until a biodiversity enhancement scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Enhancements shall include (but is not limited to) at least one woodcrete/integrated bat box. Any enhancement measures need to be shown on all relevant submitted plans, including the make/model and their locations. All works are to proceed strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.'*

7. Policy

7.1. Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (EABAAP) (2014)

- Policy 22: Development and Design

7.2. Core Strategy (2009)

- Policy 2: Development in Earl Shilton

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

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.4. National Planning Policies and Guidance

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

7.5. 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 domestic properties within urban 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 neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon highway safety and parking provision
- Impact upon ecology

Design and impact upon the character of the area

8.2. Policy DM10 of the SADMP seeks to ensure that new development should complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.

- 8.3 Policy 22 of the EABAAP seeks to ensure that developments do not have a detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the host building or the surrounding area and respect the scale, proportions, height and materials of the existing building, neighbouring structures and overall street scene.
- 8.4 The Councils Good Design Guide states that *'extensions to the front of properties are unlikely to be acceptable as they will be visually prominent within the streetscene. If this type of development is proposed, it should take the form of the existing building, mirroring the roof pitch, replicate or have lower eaves height and the ridge should be below the existing ridge height. In addition, the proposal should not normally extend beyond the front elevation by more than 2 metres and not cover more than 50% of the front elevation.'*
- 8.5 The proposed porch extensions would project outwards from the from the existing porch/hallway by 1.92 metres in total, hosting a modest width of 3.72-2.05 metres, satisfying the requirements set out within the Councils Good Design Guide. It would have a mono-pitched to a forward facing gable form which would have an eaves height of 2.32-2.41 metres and a ridge height of 3.36-3.47 metres appearing subordinate. The proposed addition is therefore considered to be minor not bearing any significant impacts upon the main dwelling or character of the area.
- 8.6 The Councils Good Design Guide seeks to ensure that *'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).'*
- 8.7 The Councils Good Design Guide states 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.'*
- 8.8 The proposed two-storey side extension would extend for an appropriate width of 4.04 metres from the existing side elevation, less than half the width of the existing dwelling. It would have the same dual-pitched gable sided roof form as the main dwelling with a clearly subordinate eaves and ridge height whilst being set back 0.40 metres from the principle elevation and set down 0.30 metres from the main ridge. By virtue of the total setbacks and lower ridge height, the proposal would appear as a clearly subordinate addition to the existing dwelling in accordance with the Councils Good Design Guide in respect of two storey side extensions. Furthermore the need for the full 0.50 metres set back/down distance from the principle elevation and ridge is mitigated by the fact that the adjacent property has a very different profile and roof form such that little perceived terracing effect would occur.
- 8.9 The rear two-storey section would extend beyond the main rear elevation for an appropriate depth of 4.38 metres, less than half the depth of the two-storey section of the existing dwelling and for an appropriate width of only 4.51 metres. It would have acceptable rear facing gable form with a matching eaves height as the main roof and a subordinate ridge height which would be set down from the proposed two-storey side extension. By virtue of its depth, width and height the proposal would appear as a clearly subordinate addition to the existing dwelling. Access to the rear garden would also be maintained.
- 8.10 Single-storey extensions would extend from either side of the rear two-storey aspect. The extensions would mirror its projection whilst sitting within the confinements of the existing building line to the south and behind the proposed garage to the north being screened from the streetscene.

- 8.11 The Council's Good Design Guide seeks to ensure that *"Flat roofs on extensions will not normally be considered appropriate where they do not form part of the original design of the house, however in some circumstances where they are not visible from the public realm and the use of a flat roof may result in a reduced visual impact, they may be considered acceptable, particularly if designed with a contemporary aesthetic style."*
- 8.12 The extension to north would have a mono-hipped form complementing the form of the existing dwelling, but the extension to the south would have a flat roof form. It should be noted that a flat roof is not usually a welcomed addition as they do not represent a traditional roof form prevalent in the Borough, however, as proposal would be single storey, of a subordinate scale and positioned to the rear of the dwelling screened by the existing dwelling and two-storey additions and the garage (as highlighted above), the addition is not considered to bear any additional detrimental impacts upon the character of the area.
- 8.13 The Council's Good Design Guide states that *'Garages attached to the sides of dwellings should follow the same guidelines as extensions.'* Appear *'smaller in scale and massing in order to be subordinate to the main building'* and that *'Garages and car ports should generally be set back from the existing building so as not to dominate the streetscene.'*
- 8.14 The proposed replacement garage would extend would project outwards from the proposed two-storey side extension for an appropriate width of 3.21 metres for a appropriate depth of 6.89 metres to be flush with the existing rear elevation of the dwelling. An internal covered passage would maintain access to the rear garden. The proposed dual-pitched design would be characteristic of the existing dual-pitched dwelling, having a clearly subordinate eaves height of 2.29 metres and a ridge height of 3.55 metres. It would be set back by 0.40 metres from the front elevation and 7.95 metres from the highway boundary where it would not over dominate the street scene.
- 8.15 The Council's Good Design Guide states that *'Boundary treatments are also key generators of character within the public realm that can help to integrate new development into a context or simply define the quality of a new development.'*
- 8.16 The proposed red brick front boundary wall is to mirror the design, scale and finish of the wall present to the front of 26 Equity Road East and similarly to the wall present to the front of 36 Equity Road East. This aspect of the proposal is therefore not considered to bear any significant impacts upon the main dwelling or character of the area.
- 8.17 The Council's Good Design Guide states that *'Where hardstanding is proposed at the front of a property, this should not constitute more than 50% of the total area'* and that *'Permeable paving materials are supported as a means of minimising the cumulative impact on flood risk. It is also recommended to consider incorporation of soft landscape features and boundary treatments to minimise negative impacts upon character and pedestrian specific movement routes to ensure safety.'*
- 8.18 The proposed hardstanding would be increased by 33.82m², not constituting more than half of the total area to the front of the property whilst retaining existing landscape features. This alteration is therefore considered to be minor and acceptable.
- 8.19 Off-white render and red multi brick are to be introduced to the walls of both the main dwelling and extensions/alterations the proposed additions are, however not considered to be detrimental to the character of the area given the wide range of materials present within the streetscene.

- 8.20 By virtue of the above, the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy 22 of the EABAAP and the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.21 Policy DM10 of the SADMP requires that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.22 Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell AAP seeks to ensure that developments do not adversely affect the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.23 To the south of the application dwelling sits, 26 Equity Road East, a residential detached dormer bungalow. The proposed rear extensions would sit behind the rear elevation of no.26, whilst retaining the existing distance to the shared boundary. Openings are present to the immediate side elevation, nevertheless they are already screened by the existing dwelling not resulting in any further loss of light impacts. No windows are proposed to the immediate side elevation retaining no.26's privacy.
- 8.24 To the north of the application dwelling sits, 32 Equity Road East, a residential detached dormer bungalow. The proposed extensions would sit behind the rear/front elevations of no.32, being set in 2.43 metres from the shared boundary. A dormer window faces directly towards the south of the site; this window is nevertheless a non-habitable room (hallway) meaning that the proposal would bear no adverse impacts in terms of loss of light. Only a glazed personal door would sit to the extensions immediate side elevation at ground floor level retaining no.32's privacy.
- 8.25 The proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy 22 of the EABAAP and the general principles of the Council's Good Design Guide.

Impact upon highway safety and parking provision

- 8.26 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.
- 8.27 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.
- 8.28 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).

- 8.29 The Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024) seeks to ensure that a dwelling hosting four bedrooms provides a minimum off-street parking provision for three vehicles.
- 8.30 The LHDG seeks to ensure that single garages have minimum internal dimensions of 3.00 x 6.00 metres with a minimum door width of 2.30 metres and that a four or more bedroom dwelling provides an off-street parking provision for a minimum of three vehicles.
- 8.31 The proposed extensions and alterations would see the addition of two bedrooms increasing the dwelling to host four bedrooms instead of the existing two. Despite the extensions to the front of the dwelling the site would remain to host sufficient hardstanding for three vehicles, with an additional space to the proposed garage as it satisfies the minimum internal dimensions stated within the LHDG.
- 8.32 By virtue of the above, the development would accord with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, the LHDG and the NPPF.

Impact upon ecology

- 8.33 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.

- 8.34 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."*
- 8.35 Within the relevant Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements householder development is exempt. Nevertheless, as the works involve significant alterations to the existing roof, roof line, tiles and soffits of the existing property whilst being situated on adjacent to significant open space and mature trees leading out into the wider agricultural habitat, providing good habitat connectivity and suitable foraging habitat for bats the submission of a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) scoping in bats and birds was requested by LCC Ecology.

- 8.36 Whilst a PRA was not submitted, on the 12th August supporting photographs were supplied by the agent and subsequently forwarded to LCC Ecology for their review. On the 19th August LCC Ecology confirmed that the photographs demonstrated that the current dwelling and garage appear to be in a good condition providing limited suitability for protected species and as a result the original holding objection was removed, subject to a biodiversity enhancement scheme condition being imposed. An informative has also been added regarding Great Crested Newts.
- 8.37 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.

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 proposal is for the demolition of an existing garage and erection of a single/two-storey side, single-storey rear extension, porch, front boundary wall and driveway to an existing dwelling within the settlement boundary of Earl Shilton where there is a general presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in Policy DM1 of the SADMP and the overarching principles of the NPPF.
- 10.2. The proposals are considered acceptable as they would respect and complement the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling, not result in any significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity or privacy of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties, not result in any significant adverse impacts on highway safety, parking provision, or ecology.
- 10.3. On this basis, the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies DM1, DM6, DM10, DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, Policy 22 of the ESABAAP, the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide, the LHDG and the overarching principles of the NPPF. The proposal is, 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, Floor Plan, 3D View, Drg No. 25/53 02d, as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 17th 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), Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (EABAAP) (2014) and the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide and the overarching principles of the NPPF.

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

- Proposed Elevations, Floor Plan, 3D View, Drg No. 25/53 02d as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 17th September 2025.
- Location and Block Plan, Drg No. 25/53 03a as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 23rd September 2025.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policy DM10, DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016, Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (EABAAP) (2014) , the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide, the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024) and the overarching principles of the NPPF.

4. No development above floorplate level shall take place until a biodiversity enhancement scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Enhancements shall include (but is not limited to) at least one woodcrete/integrated bat box. Any enhancement measures need to be shown on all relevant submitted plans, including the make/model and their locations. All works are to proceed strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected wildlife species and their habitats in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and Paragraph 192 of the NPPF (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) Great Crested Newts, a species fully protected by law, are known to breed in a pond within 500m of the proposed development, therefore there is a small possibility that a newt, or small numbers of newts could be present on the site. The applicant should therefore exercise due care during implementation of the proposed development, ensuring that all contractors are aware of the possibility of finding great crested newts, and stored materials are carefully removed by hand. Work should cease if a great crested newt is found, and advice from a licensed ecologist should be sought.