

OFFICER REPORT – DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION

REFERENCE

26/00527/HOU

APPLICANT DETAILS

Mr And Mrs Vickers

SITE ADDRESS

25 Roseway, Stoke Golding, Nuneaton

PROPOSAL

Proposed single storey rear extension

SITE DESCRIPTION

This application relates to a two storey, semi-detached dwelling on the northern side of Roseway opposite its junction with Greenhill Road in the settlement boundary of Stoke Golding. The property is constructed with a red brick and partial off-white rendered finish, and the dwelling is set back and slightly set down from the public highway with a hard surfaced driveway in front of the property.

Roseway is wholly residential in character and is host to a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings that are predominantly two storeys in massing, with a small number of single storey bungalows to the west. A new residential development is currently under construction to the east of the site, which was approved under 20/00779/OUT. To the north of the site is open countryside.

AGREED EXTENSION OF TIME TARGET DATE FOR DECISION

7 August 2026

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES / GUIDANCE

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

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

Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan Review 2020 – 2042 (SGNP) (2024):

- Policy SG1: Decision-Taking
- Policy SG15: Design

National Planning Policies and Guidance:

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

Other Relevant Guidance:

- The Council's Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)

In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the "Officer Assessment" section of the report.

SITE CONSTRAINTS

The application site falls within the Risk Impact Zone of Kendall's Meadow, which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest ('SSSI'). However, due to the nature of the proposal, no formal consultation is required.

PUBLICITY RESPONSES

The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents and a site notice was posted within the vicinity of the site. Two letters of objection have been received from one member of the public, expressing the following concerns:

- The extension is larger than that previously approved under 26/00011/HHGDO
- Harm to the character and amenity of the surrounding area
- Harm to neighbouring residential amenity through loss of light and increased sense of enclosure

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

No responses have been received.

OFFICER ASSESSMENT

History

Is there any planning history relevant to the current application?	Yes The Local Planning Authority confirmed that Prior Approval was not required for the development of a single storey rear extension at the property, which externally measured 3.75 metres in depth, 3.5 metres at ridge height and 2.95 metres at eaves height via application 26/00011/HHGDO.
--	--

Design

Is the design and scale in keeping with the dwelling / street / area or otherwise appropriate?	Yes The extension would be positioned to the rear of the application site and therefore the proposal would not be considered to have a material impact upon the principal elevation of the application property or the character of Roseway. By virtue of its size, scale, height, and massing, the extension would be considered to be appropriate to complement the character of, and appear clearly subordinate to, the host dwelling in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and Policy SG15 of the SGNP.
--	--

Would the materials, details and features generally match the existing dwelling and / or be consistent with the general use of materials in the area? Is a condition needed?	Yes The scheme would be constructed with a rendered finish, which is a common material utilised along Roseway, including on the front of the application property. As such, it is considered that this proposed light grey coloured material finish would be acceptable and complement the character of the existing dwelling in these site-specific circumstances. The proposed materials of the extension could be secured via planning condition to ensure that the scheme has a satisfactory external appearance.
Are there any overlooking / privacy / residential or other amenity issues?	The closest neighbouring properties to the proposed rear northern extension would be 23 Roseway to the west and 27 Roseway to the east. No neighbouring dwellings are to the north of the site. No windows are proposed on the side elevations of the extension and therefore the scheme would not be considered to result in any overlooking or loss of privacy to these neighbouring properties. The development would be single storey in massing and extend across the entire width of the host property to a depth of 4.1 metres and would be constructed with a 3.1-metre-high flat roof. The rear extension would replace an existing conservatory and extend beyond this existing structure by 0.5 metres. In comparison to the previously proposed single storey extension scheme via 26/00011/HHDGO, the current proposal would be 0.4 metres deeper and 0.4 metres lower at ridge height. In addition, the proposed development would only exceed the maximum depth and height limitations of a single storey rear extensions that could be achieved via Permitted Development Rights without Prior Approval by 0.1 metres. The extension would be separated from 23 Roseway by a width of 2.6 metres. Although the scheme would go beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property by 4.1 metres, the proposal would not contravene the 45-degree line of this neighbouring property's closest window. In light of these factors, and the size, scale, height, and massing of the proposed extension, and the material considerations of the application site, the proposal would not be considered to result in any significant adverse impacts to the residential amenity of this neighbouring property as a result of any overbearing or loss of light impacts. However, the development would be immediately adjacent to 27 Roseway. Based on the submitted plans, the proposal would not extend as far as this neighbouring property's existing conservatory.

	Although the proposed extension would be considered to result in a degree of loss of light to this neighbouring property in comparison to the existing conservatory within the site, it is noted that the proposal would be lower in height than the previously proposed extension within the site, and the scheme would only extend 0.1 metres in depth and height beyond what is achievable without planning permission under Permitted Development Rights. In light of these factors, the degree of loss of light and overbearing impact of the development would not be considered to be to such an extent that would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of this neighbouring property in these site-specific circumstances. Given the above, the proposal would not be considered to result in any significant adverse impacts to neighbouring residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and Policy SG15 of the SGNP.
Is the proposal sited such as to avoid overdevelopment?	Yes By virtue of its size and scale, and due to the size of the application site, the proposed development would not be considered to represent the overdevelopment of the plot.
Is there sufficient amenity space?	Yes The host property occupies a large plot, and the proposed extension would not involve any changes to existing bedroom numbers and would ensure that the dwelling retains sufficient private outdoor amenity space to comply with the minimum requirements of the Council's Good Design Guide.

Heritage

Does the development affect the setting of a Listed Building, the character and appearance of a Conservation Area or otherwise impact on a heritage asset?	No
Does the development impact on an archaeological site?	No

Flooding / Drainage

Are there any drainage or flooding issues having regard to the Environment Agency's Advice for minor extensions and whether the property is within a Critical Drainage Area?	No
--	----

Contamination

Are there any contaminated land issues?	No
---	----

Transport

Is access, parking and turning provision acceptable having regard to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide?	Yes The scheme would not impact the number bedrooms within the property or the amount off-street parking provision available to the site. The scheme would therefore not be considered to have a material impact on highway safety or the site's off-street parking provision. As such, the proposal would be considered to comply with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, Policy SG15 of the SGNP, and the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide.
---	--

Natural Environment

Are any impacts on protected, or otherwise significant, trees mitigated or acceptable?	N/A
Has an ecological survey / protected species survey been submitted?	N/A
Are any impacts on protected species and other biodiversity properly addressed through design or other mitigation / compensation and are any biodiversity enhancement measures proposed?	N/A

Site Visit

Has there been a site visit?	Yes A site visit was carried out on 07/07/2026.
------------------------------	---

Additional Observations

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.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act, and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. This Act gives further effect to the rights included in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regard has been given to the Applicant's reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interests, as expressed through third party interests / the Development Plan and Central Government Guidance.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITIES

This planning application has had due regard to Section 149 of the Equality Act with regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty and the case officer has concluded that the application does not cause discrimination on the grounds of gender, race and disability.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to planning conditions and reasons at the end of this Report.

CASE OFFICER

Rudi Simpson

Conditions/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 development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details received on 09 June 2026, as follows:
 - Block Plan
 - Proposed Plans & Elevations - 225052-04
 - Site Location Plan

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 materials to be used on the external elevations of the proposed extension shall accord with those detailed on the Proposed Plans & Elevations – 225052-04 plan (submitted: 09.06.2026).

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).

Informatives

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.