

## Officer Report

**Planning Ref: 26/00175/HOU**  
**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Stewart Kendrick**  
**Ward: Hinckley Castle**



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

**Site: 62 Princess Road Hinckley Leicestershire**

**Proposal: Demolition of the existing detached garage and erection of a two storey side extension.**

**Case Officer: Zahra Jam-Rotbeh (Planning Officer)**

---

### 1. Recommendations

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

- Planning conditions detailed at the end of this report.

### 2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. The applicant seeks a full planning permission for the demolition of the existing detached garage and erection of a two storey side extension at 62 Princess Road. The existing garage is currently detached from the existing property, and this would be removed in the new development. The side extension would protrude 5.07 metres from the side elevation creating an overall width of 11.57 metres.
- 2.2. The proposed extension would also have a depth of approximately 7.02 metres, a ridge height of 7.81 metres and eaves height of 5.07 metres.
- 2.3. The extension would be slightly set back from the original dwelling house and would have a dual pitch roof. The extension would use materials matching the existing property.
- 2.4. Following concerns raised by the case officer regarding the proposed front elevation fenestration, amended plans were submitted. The revised scheme reduced the size and number of windows, resulting in a design that is considered acceptable and more in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling.

### 3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Hinckley. The street scene is a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. A number of the properties within the street have had two storey side extensions. The current property is a semi-detached property.

- 3.2. The dwelling is set back from the road with a small front garden to the front with large parking area to the side of the garden.

#### **4. Relevant Planning History**

##### **07/00186/CTPO**

- WORKS TO ONE BEECH TREE
- CC
- 22.02.2007

##### **14/00650/CTPO**

- To fell a beech tree T1 protected by LCC Hinckley (Thornecroft) TPO 1963
- CC
- 10.07.2014

#### **5. Publicity**

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.
- 5.2 One letter of objection was received, raising concerns that the proposed rear window and Juliet balcony would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.

#### **6. Consultation**

- 6.1 An objection was received from LCC Ecology requesting a Preliminary Roost Appraisal. This was provided by the applicant on 03 September 2026, and following the results of the bat survey, Ecology removed their objection on 18 September 2026, and they have recommended a condition to be applied which is detailed at the end of this report.
- 6.2 Comments were received noting that the submitted plans indicate the presence of several trees within the site protected by the Leicestershire County Council Hinckley, Thornecrofts 1963 Tree Preservation Order (Trees T18-T24). The Tree Officer advised that the application documents do not include sufficient information regarding the condition, retention, or potential impact of the proposed development on these protected trees. It was therefore requested that a BS 5837:2012 tree survey be submitted, together with details of the Root Protection Areas (RPAs), a Tree Protection Plan, and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

#### **7. Policy**

- 7.1 Core Strategy (2009):
- Policy 4: Development in Hinckley

7.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (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

7.3 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

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

7.4 Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- National Design Guide (2024)
- 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
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Trees

### Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.2 Policy DM10 requires new development to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regards to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials, and architectural features.

8.3 According to the HBBC Good Design Guide (2020), two storey side extensions should appear smaller in scale and massing in order to be subordinate to the main building. Furthermore, it states any proposal for a two-storey side extension should also be set down at the minimum distance of 0.5 metres in both directions.

8.4 The proposed extension would incorporate a ridge set-down of 0.16 metres and a front setback of 0.5 metres. Taking into account the similar two-storey side extension at the attached neighbouring property, No. 64 Princess Road, the proposal is considered subordinate to the host dwelling and would not result in harm to the street scene or the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

- 8.5 The proposed fenestration on the front elevation is considered sympathetic to the existing dwelling in terms of its design, proportions, and appearance. As such, it would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 8.6 Therefore, the form and design of the development is considered modest, and the scale of the extension would have a minimal impact upon the character of the area. It is considered that the development is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

#### Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.7 Policy DM10(a) and (b) of the SADMP states development will be permitted provided that it would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.8 The HBBC Good Design Guide (2020) requires the way buildings to relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity. In the spirit of good neighbourliness, an adequate distance of 1m between the property and its boundary (giving a total distance of at least 2m between properties) should be encouraged.
- 8.9 The nearest neighbouring property to the proposed development is No. 60 Princess Road to the south of neighbouring property. Given both property outlooks and a minimum of 2.33 metres separation distance, and the absence of any proposed side facing window to the neighbouring property, the proposed development is not considered to cause any overdominance, overbearing, loss of privacy or any loss of light impact to the neighbouring property and amenities
- 8.10 No. 72 Priesthills Road is located to the rear of the application property. The proposed development would maintain a separation distance of approximately 22 metres to the neighbouring garden and 42.63 metres to the dwelling itself. Although a Juliet balcony window is proposed on the rear elevation, the significant separation distances are considered sufficient to prevent any material overlooking or loss of privacy. Whilst objections have been received on the potential overlooking impacts, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity.
- 8.11 By virtue of these factors, the proposal does not result in any adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts or any overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties and therefore is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

#### Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.12 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.
- 8.13 Policy DM18 of the SADMP also requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.14 According to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) Table 28 (Residential Parking Standards) requires dwellings with four or more bedroom dwellings should provide a minimum of three off-street parking spaces. Moreover, according to the LHDG, the minimum dimensions for a parking space are 2.4 metres by 5.5 metres. An additional 0.5 metres is required if the space is bounded by a wall, fence, hedge, line of trees, or similar obstruction on one side.
- 8.15 The proposed development includes the addition of one bedroom, bringing the total to four and it would result the removal of the garage area. As shown on the submitted Block Plan, the driveway frontage is capable of providing three off-street parking space. And therefore, the proposed parking provision complies with the LHDG standards, DM17 and DM18 and is not considered to have any adverse impact on parking provision, pedestrian safety, or highway safety.

#### Impact upon ecology

- 8.16 According to DM6 of SADMP, on site features should be retained, buffered and managed favourably to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term.
- 8.17 The proposed extension involves significant alterations to the existing roof, roofline, loft space, soffits and tiles which provide potential access and suitability for roosting bats. The LCC Ecology provided its first response on 30 March “*Bats are particularly associated with the roof structure of buildings, including lofts, rafters, beams, gables, eaves, soffits, flashing, ridge-tile, chimneys, the under-tile area, etc. but may also be present in crevices in stone or brickwork and in cavity walls. Therefore, a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) is required to assess the building and garage for potential bat roosting features. This should also scope in any potential disturbance to other protected species.*” Therefore, based on the nature of the works and surrounding habitat, a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was required.
- 8.18 The applicant submitted an ecological survey, provided with the support of a licentiate ecologist, on 28 July 2026. The survey was reconsulted upon, and following this process, the Ecology team retained their objection and confirmed that ‘To assess for presence or absence of bats in line with the Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines 4th edition (Collins, J. 2023), at least two emergence surveys are required to be carried out on the existing building. Such surveys are required be completed during the optimum activity season (01 May – 31 August) and should be spread at least three weeks apart.’ therefore, an emergence bat survey was required.

- 8.19 The applicant submitted the emergence bat survey, provided with the support of a licentiate ecologist, on 03 September 2026. The survey was reconsulted upon, and following this process, the Ecology team withdrew their objection and confirmed that *'The Bat Emergence and Re-entry Survey (Arbtech, Aug 2026) has been reviewed. This identified foraging activity within the garden but no bats emerging. On this basis, no further ecological surveys are required and we have no objection.'*
- 8.20 The ecology team also stated in their final letter that *"Emergence Report are appropriate and are required to be adhered to. • Enhancements: We note swift boxes have been incorporated into the revised plans and altered to include a group of boxes. The revisions encourage uptake of the boxes considering their nesting behaviour and are therefore welcomed."* As such, a condition has been recommended which is detailed at the end of this report.

### Trees

- 8.21 The LCC Tree Officer initially raised concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on trees within the site and requested further information to assess any effects on protected trees. However, following a site visit, the case officer confirmed that the proposed development would not encroach upon or adversely affect any trees on the site. As such, no arboricultural survey or further tree-related information is considered necessary in this instance.

## **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.
- 9.4 The decision has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including General Data

Protection Regulations (2018) and The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

## 10. Conclusion

- 10.1 As outlined in the report the development complies with the relevant policies of the Development Plan therefore, 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 **Grant planning permission** subject to:

- Planning conditions detailed 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 development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

- Block, Site Location Plan, Drg No.2026-01-00 received by the local planning authority on 24 February 2026 and
- Proposed Amended Plans Drg. No. 2026-01-03 received by the local planning authority on 05 May 2026 and
- Proposed Amended Elevations Plans Drg. No. 2026-01-02, received by the local planning authority on 05 June 2026.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1, DM6 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 approved development shall match the corresponding materials of the existing dwelling.

**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).

**Notes to Applicant:**

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](mailto:building.control@blaby.gov.uk) or call 0116 272 7533.