

Delegated Report

Planning Reference: 26/00354/HOU
Applicant(s): Mr M Jelley
Ward: Newbold Verdon with
Desford & Peckleton



Application Site: 15 Oxford Road, Desford

Proposal: Single storey front extension, porch and two storey side extension

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 application seeks permission for a two-storey side extension and single-storey front extension, including a new entrance porch, at 15 Oxford Road, Desford.
- 2.2. The two-storey side extension would project 2.4m from the original southwest elevation and extend approximately 8.7m in depth, providing a snug at ground floor and two en-suite bathrooms at first floor. The maximum ridge height would be approximately 5.4m.
- 2.3. The single-storey front extension would project 4m from the principal elevation and measure 5.4m in width, creating additional open-plan kitchen/dining space and entrance porch.
- 2.4. New window openings are proposed to the front and rear elevations, including a small first-floor side window serving bedroom 1's en-suite.
- 2.5. The first-floor extension would feature a hipped roof set below the main ridge, with a proposed maximum ridge height of approximately 5.4m. The front extension and existing garage would feature a dual-pitched roof; its maximum ridge height would be approximately 3.7m.

- 2.6. Proposed materials comprise white render and grey cladding to the front and side elevations, with red facing brick retained on the rear elevation.
- 2.7. The scheme has been amended since submission, including reductions to the original ground-floor extension footprint.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling at 15 Oxford Road, located within the settlement boundary of Desford.
- 3.2. The dwelling is constructed of red brick with white cladding, uPVC windows and a dual-pitched concrete tiled roof. An integral single-bay garage projects from the front elevation, reflecting a common design feature within the street.
- 3.3. The property benefits from a hardstanding driveway and front gravelled area providing off-street parking. A single-storey side projection already exists, above which the proposed first-floor extension would be located.
- 3.4. Surrounding properties are of a similar scale and form, creating a generally consistent residential character despite some variation in design.

4. Relevant Planning History

04/00993/FUL

- Extension and alteration to dwelling
- Permitted
- 28.09.2004

89/01428/4

- Extension to dwelling
- Permitted
- 29.01.1990

5. Publicity

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.
- 5.2. No responses have been received.

6. Consultation

- 6.1. There have been no objections from the following consultees:
-

- Desford Parish Council

6.2. 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. Desford Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2036 (DNP) (2021):

- Policy H7: Housing Design

7.4. National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)
- 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)

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
-

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

- 8.2. Policy DM10(c) of the SADMP states that development will be permitted where they complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.
 - 8.3. The Good Design Guide (2021) explains that household extensions, whether to the side, front or rear of an existing property or to the roof, both individually and collectively, can result in changes to the built environment that, if designed insensitively, can have a significant negative impact. It also states that front extensions should not normally extend beyond the front elevation by more than 2 metres and not cover more than 50% of the front elevation.
 - 8.4. With regard to the roofscape, The Good Design Guide states that extensions to the front 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.
 - 8.5. Policy H7 of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan states 'new development should enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness and character of the area in which it is situated'.
 - 8.6. The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey detached dwellings of similar scale and form, typically featuring pitched roofs, brick elevations and projecting front garages, although properties are not identical in design. Whilst some nearby properties have been extended, these generally remain subordinate and do not materially alter the established character of the street scene.
 - 8.7. The proposed first-floor side extension is considered acceptable in terms of scale, height and massing and would not appear disproportionate to the host dwelling or out of keeping with neighbouring properties. The hipped roof form contrasts with the main gable roof form, however this is not considered to result in wider visual harm.
 - 8.8. However, the proposed front extension, by reason of its significant projection, width, height, and asymmetrical gable roof form, would be contrary to the guidance within HBBC's Good Design Guide and result in a dominant and overly prominent frontage. The prevailing character of the street scene is characterised by flat roof front extensions that are broadly uniform in height and design.
-

- 8.9. Additionally, the proposed roof form and pitch of the front extension would not mirror the design and pitch of the main roof. Combined with its increased height, the introduction of a differing roof pitch would result in a prominent addition that would appear incongruous to the main dwelling and surrounding area.
- 8.10. Therefore, the proposed design would fail to complement or enhance the character of the existing dwelling and the wider street scene and would create an incongruous appearance within the street scene. The proposal is contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2016), Policy H7 of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan and the Council's Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.11. The proposed first-floor windows would introduce some additional overlooking; however, given all three serve bathroom spaces, they would all be obscure-glazed and would not result in loss of privacy. Windows at the front and rear elevations of the ground floor would not result in loss of privacy for nearby properties.
- 8.12. Whilst the development would result in a modest increase in shadowing due to the increased roof height and building width, this would not be significant enough to adversely impact neighbouring properties. Adequate separation distances would be maintained between all surrounding properties and there would no significant loss of natural light to nearby habitable rooms.
- 8.13. Furthermore, the proposal would not appear overbearing or oppressive, as it would not introduce a blank elevation facing neighbouring properties.
- 8.14. Overall, whilst the proposal would result in some increase in overlooking and shadowing, it would not be unacceptable in this case. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in amenity terms and complies with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.15. The scheme retains its provision of three bedrooms. Whilst the proposed front extension would result in some loss of garden space, the LHDG states the properties with three bedrooms should provide two off-street car parking spaces; it is 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.
-

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 be refused for the reasons outlined at the end of this report.

11. Recommendation

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

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

11.2. **Reason**

1. The proposed single-storey front extension, by virtue of its depth, width, height and overall design, would fail to complement or enhance the character of the dwelling and street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and Policy H7 of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan.

Notes to applicant

1. This application has been assessed and determined with reference to the submitted documentation below:

- Application Form – received by the Local Planning Authority on 15/04/26
 - Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plan - PL-P-003 Rev D – received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/06/26
 - Proposed Elevations - PL-E-002 Rev B – received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/06/26
 - Proposed Site Plan - PL-SP-002 Rev B – received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/06/26
 - Proposed Roof Plan - PL-P-004 Rev C – received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/06/26
-