

HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990



**Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council**

WRITTEN STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

PLANNING APPEAL BY MR ANDREW REID

**AGAINST THE REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE CONVERSION
OF EXISTING GARAGE INTO A SEPARATE DWELLING AND ALTERATIONS
(RESUBMISSION OF 23/00666/FUL)**

AT

**502 COVENTRY ROAD, HINCKLEY, LEICESTERSHIRE
LE10 0NJ**

HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL REFERENCE

24/00654/FUL

THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE

APP/K2420/W/25/3359752

CONTENTS

Section 01: Introduction.....	02
Section 02: Description of the Appeal Site and the Proposal.....	03
Section 03: Site History.....	03
Section 04: National Policies.....	05
Section 05: Local Policies.....	05
Section 06: The Case for the Local Planning Authority.....	06
Preliminary Matters.....	06
Determination of the Appeal Proposal.....	07
Impact upon the Character of the Surrounding Area	08
Summary	12
Section 07: Conclusions.....	12
Section 08: Conditions.....	12

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This statement is to be read in conjunction with the previously submitted Appeal Questionnaire papers, in full support of the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to refuse planning permission for the conversion of an existing garage into a separate dwelling and alterations at 502 Coventry Road, Hinckley.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE APPEAL SITE AND THE PROPOSAL

The Appeal Site

- 2.1. The appeal site is located to the west of, but within the identified settlement boundary of, Hinckley, to the south Coventry Road and east of Paddock Way. The site itself comprises a 5.4m high single storey clipped roofed double garage, which benefits from an additional floor in its roof space that is supported by two roof lights on both of its northern and southern elevations.
- 2.2. The double garage externally measures 6.5m in width by 7.5m in depth, which created a total floor space of 48.8sqm. The structure utilises an off-white monocouche render finish and smooth grey Ashmore interlocking concrete roof tiles to match the host dwelling. The garage is currently associated with, and within the rear garden of, 502 Coventry Road, and was permitted via planning application 20/01203/FUL, which also approved the creation of a new access onto Paddock Way, which is an adopted but unclassified road that is subject to a 30mph speed limit. It is noted that the structure's roof and the proposed site access have not been built in accordance with the approved plans. Contrary to the approved plans, the existing access is gated and does not benefit from a dropped kerb.
- 2.3. The character of the area is largely residential, with properties surrounding the site to the north, east, south, and northwest. There is a variety of styles and designs along Coventry Road, but the properties are typically two-storey and semi-detached properties that feature red brick or render finishes, hipped roofs, and long gardens. To the south of the site is 55 flats within five detached buildings along Danelaw Court, which were approved at appeal against the refused planning application 17/00115/FUL in 2018. To the southwest of the site is a selection of commercial businesses.

The Appeal Proposal

- 2.4. This appeal proposal seeks full planning permission for the conversion of a detached double garage into an independent dwellinghouse at 502 Coventry Road, Hinckley. To facilitate this change of use, the two garage doors are replaced with a window and a front door with two glazed panels on either side. No extensions are proposed to the existing structure.

3. SITE HISTORY

3.1. **23/00666/FUL**

- Conversion of existing garage into a separate dwelling and alterations
- Refused
- 31.08.2023

This planning application for a two-bedroom residential property within the appeal site was refused for the following reasons:

1. The development does not safeguard the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the scheme and causes significant harm to the residents of 502 Coventry Road, and the residents of the flats to south of the site within Danelaw Court. This is contrary to Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Good Design Guide (2020), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that an appropriate and safe vehicular access can be provided for the proposed development, nor that adequate off-street parking can be provided within the site contrary to, and in conflict with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Good Design Guide (2020), and the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (2022).

3.2. **20/01203/FUL**

- Detached garage
- Permitted
- 03.02.2021

3.3. **20/00888/HOU**

- Detached garage and associated access
- Withdrawn
- 15.09.2020

This application was withdrawn due to land ownership issues.

3.4. **19/01116/HOU**

- Two storey front and side extension with single storey rear extension with balcony
- Permitted
- 27.11.2019

3.5. **18/00028/FUL**

- Erection of one new dwelling
- Withdrawn
- 06.03.2018

This application was withdrawn due to the development being out of character with the surrounding area.

4. NATIONAL POLICIES

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024).

It is noted that the NPPF was revised in December 2024 after the determination of planning application 24/00654/FUL.

4.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

4.3 National Design Guide (NDG) (2019).

5. LOCAL POLICIES:

5.1 The Development Plan policies referred to for the purposes of the application were:

5.2 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 1: Development in Hinckley

5.3 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

5.4 Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (GDG) (2020)
- Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)
- Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

It is noted that the LHDG was revised after the determination of the planning application in December 2024.

6. THE CASE FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

6.1 The planning application was refused on 26 November 2024 following Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's Planning Committee's decision to refuse the planning application for the following reason:

1. By virtue of its location and siting, the conversion of the existing garage into a dwelling in this site-specific location is contrary to the wider urban grain and consequently does not preserve or enhance the character of the area. The development does not represent good design that preserves or enhances the character of the area. These adverse impacts are compounded by the removal of the existing gates and hedgerow to facilitate the site access, which increase the visual prominence of the development within the street scene. These factors result in a significant adverse impact on the character of the area that is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) and the Good Design Guide (2020). Ultimately, the adverse impacts of this scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.

6.2 It is considered therefore that the main planning issues in relation to this appeal are the adverse effects of the proposed development on the character of the surrounding area.

Preliminary Matters

6.3 Paragraphs 13 to 18 of the Appellant's Statement of Case focus on criticising the Planning Committee's decision to refuse the appeal proposal. Although the Appellant has referred to the case of *Shadwell Estates v Breckland DC* [2013], the Planning Officers who prepared the Committee Report are not statutory consultees and therefore this reference has no relevance to the appeal proposal or its determination.

6.4 Paragraph 16 of the Appellant's Statement of Case then accuses the Local Planning Authority of predetermining the proposal prior to a formal decision being made at Planning Committee. The Local Planning Authority strongly refutes this accusation.

6.5 Appendix 1 of the Appellant's Statement of Case includes an email exchange between the Case Officer and a Ward Councillor. As detailed within Appendix 1 of the Appellant's Statement of Case, a Ward Councillor contacted the Case Officer in light of an objection to the development from a member of the public. The Ward Councillor sought the informal advice of the Case Officer on the acceptability of the proposal and the Case Officer confirmed that they were seeking to raise their concerns with the scheme with their managers to discuss whether the harm of the appeal proposal to the character of the area substantiated a reason for refusal.

- 6.6 Whilst the Appellant has requested that this email exchange is made publicly available on the Council's website, this email exchange is not a material consideration within the determination of this appeal proposal, nor was it relevant at the time to members of the Planning Committee when they made their decision to refuse the appeal proposal.
- 6.7 Ultimately, the email exchange took place almost four months prior to the determination of the appeal proposal by the Planning Committee, and the final Case Officer recommendation was to approve the appeal proposal. The Ward Councillor is not a member of the Planning Committee and the motion to refuse planning application 24/00654/FUL was carried unanimously by the Planning Committee.
- 6.8 Contrary to the assertions of the Appellant's Statement of Case, the decision to refuse planning application 24/00654/FUL was a matter of judgement, and Council Members, who have a greater understanding of local conditions and circumstances, are entitled not to accept the professional advice of Officers. Therefore, the refusal of planning application 24/00654/FUL at Planning Committee was not unreasonable.
- 6.9 Importantly, despite the Appellant's accusations, it is noted that the Appellant did not consider the Local Planning Authority to have acted so unreasonably that it warranted the submission of an award of costs claim alongside their appeal of the refusal of the planning application 24/00654/FUL.
- 6.10 To summarise, the decision to refuse planning application 24/00654/FUL was a matter of judgement, and Council Members, who have a greater understanding of local conditions and circumstances, are entitled not to accept the professional advice of Officers. Therefore, the refusal of this appeal proposal at Planning Committee was not unreasonable.

Determination of the Appeal Proposal

- 6.11 The Planning Policy team are currently reviewing the latest revisions to the NPPF within the 2024 version of the document and its implications for the Council's Five-Year Housing Land Supply. A revised position will be published by May 2025 once the monitoring for the 2024/25 year has been completed. It is however likely that, with the revised need figure of 682 dwellings (649dpa + 5% buffer as per Paragraphs 62 and 78(a) of the NPPF), that the Council will be unable to demonstrate a Five-Year Housing Land Supply once the revised position is published.
- 6.12 Nevertheless, as confirmed at Paragraph 8.6 of the Delegated Officer Report, the age of the relevant housing policies within the adopted Core Strategy are out of date. Therefore, the 'tilted' balance in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is triggered within the determination of this application.

- 6.13 However, as highlighted by Paragraph 8.3 of the Delegated Report, in accordance with Paragraph 225 (now 232) of the NPPF, existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the NPPF. Due weight should be given to existing policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF
- 6.14 For decision-taking, Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF requires planning permission to be granted unless:
- i. The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
- 6.15 Footnote 9 of the NPPF confirms that these key policies include Paragraphs 66 and 84 of Chapter 5 (Delivering a Sufficiently Supply of Homes), 91 of Chapter 7 (Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres), 110 and 115 of Chapter 9 (Promoting Sustainable Transport), 129 of Chapter 11 (Making Effective Use of Land), and 135, and 139 of Chapter 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places).
- 6.16 It is noted Key Policy Paragraphs 66, 84, 91 and 110 of the NPPF are not applicable in these site-specific circumstances.
- 6.17 Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states that applicants, where applicable, should provide sufficient information to demonstrate how their proposals will meet the design expectations set out in local and national policy.
- 6.18 Key Policy Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design (as contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code), taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Impact upon the Character of the Surrounding Area

- 6.19 Key Policy Paragraph 129(d) of the NPPF states that planning decisions should support development that makes an effective use of land, taking into account the desirability of maintaining and area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change.

- 6.20 Chapter 12 of the NPPF confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality, beautiful, and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
- 6.21 Key Policy Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places. Notably, Key Policy Paragraph 135(a) and (c) of the NPPF require development to:
- “Function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development,”*
- and to be,
- “Sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.”*
- 6.22 Key Policy Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
- 6.23 Policy DM10(c) of the SADMP states that developments 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.
- 6.24 Paragraph 14.3 of the SADMP states that:
- “The Borough Council will ensure that all new development helps to create an attractive and safe environment that is in keeping with the character of the location in which is situated.”*
- 6.25 Guidance Point C1 of the NDG confirms that well-designed new development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond including the existing built development and landscape character, amongst others.
- 6.26 Guidance Point I1 of the NGD highlights that new developments should consider the composition of street scenes and individual buildings and their elements including the height, scale, massing and relationship between buildings, as well as views, vistas and landmarks, and landscaping, amongst others.
- 6.27 Ultimately, Guidance Point I2 of the NDG advised that well-designed places should contribute to local distinctiveness.
- 6.28 Pages 14 and 15 of the Good Design Guide highlights the five key components of design are: access, layout, space, appearance, and landscape.

- 6.29 The Good Design Guide confirms that new development should look to respond appropriately to the existing layout of buildings, streets, and spaces to ensure that adjacent buildings relate to each other, streets are connected, and spaces complement one another. Ultimately, the Good Design Guide states that consideration should be given to the ongoing maintenance of the street scene from the outset.
- 6.30 Paragraph 15 of the Appellant's Statement of Case states that the Planning Committee did not provide, *"Cogent or compelling reasons to substantiate the reason for refusal."*
- 6.31 The Appellant's Statement of Case solely relies on the Officer's recommendation within the Committee Report for planning application 24/00654/FUL and the comments within the Delegated Report for the refused planning application 23/00666/FUL to justify their appeal proposal. Despite appealing the decision of the Local Planning Authority, the Appellant has not engaged with the reason for refusal of planning application 24/00654/FUL within their Statement of Case, nor attempted to demonstrate the acceptability of their proposal beyond reciting comments within the previous reports written by the Local Planning Authority.
- 6.32 Therefore, the Appellant has failed to provide cogent or compelling reasons to substantiate the approval of their appeal proposal in light of the Planning Committee's decision to refuse planning application 24/00654/FUL, and the subsequent reason for refusal detailed within the Decision Notice.
- 6.33 In addition, Paragraph 18 of the Appellant's Statement of Case refers to the Planning Committee's failure to reference the previous planning history of the site.
- 6.34 It is noted that the Appellant has failed to acknowledge that planning application 18/00028/FUL for the provision of a dwelling in this location was withdrawn because the Local Planning Authority considered the development to be out of character with the surrounding area. This planning history was highlighted at Section 4 of the Committee Report for planning application 24/00654/FUL and Paragraph 4.4 of the Delegated Report for the refused planning application 23/00666/FUL. Similarly to this previously withdrawn planning application, the current appeal proposal was refused solely on the significant adverse impact of the development on the character of the area.
- 6.35 Paragraph 8.10 of the Committee Report for the appeal proposal confirmed that:
- "There are no single storey dwellings on the south side of Coventry Road, nor along Paddock Way in the immediate vicinity of the site. There are also no other examples of dwellings that are sited in the rear gardens of properties along Coventry Road near the application site, nor any that have a direct vehicular access onto Paddock Way. Therefore, the provision of a dwelling in this location is unlikely to preserve the character of the urban grain this location."*
- 6.36 Notably, the Appellant has not sought to refute this statement.

- 6.37 Therefore, it is agreed between both parties that the proposal represents incongruous backland development in an area where there are no other examples of such development. As a result, the development does not positively respond to the surrounding context of the area, nor contribute to local distinctiveness.
- 6.38 On the contrary, the proposal does not preserve the character of the urban grain in this location and is considered to result in significant harm to the character of the area. As confirmed within the Decision Notice of the refusal of 24/00654/FUL, this significant adverse impact is heightened by the increased visual prominence of the development from the public highway due to the removal of the existing gates and hedgerow. It is noted that the Appellant has not sought to contest this element of the reason for refusal.
- 6.39 Paragraph 15 of the Appellant's Statement of Case states that the appeal proposal is an acceptable feature within the established street scene because it was previously granted planning permission via 20/01203/FUL.
- 6.40 Whilst the limited alterations to the external appearance of the existing garage reduce the impact of the development on the wider character of the area, the use of the structure as a dwelling has a significantly materially different impact to the character of the area in comparison to an outbuilding associated with an existing residential property. This is evident in the planning history of the appeal site, given that application 18/00028/FUL for a new dwelling within the site was withdrawn due to its harm to the character of the area, whereas the provision of a garage in this location was approved via planning application 20/01203/FUL.
- 6.41 As a result, the change of use of the garage would detrimentally impact on the structure's subservience to its host dwelling, and as an independent new dwelling, the development would have an incongruous character to the surrounding area that results in significant harm to its character and urban grain. Given the above, the Local Planning Authority refutes Paragraph 15 of the Appellant's Statement of Case.
- 6.42 In addition, Paragraph 8.11 of the Committee Report stated that:
- "It is also noted that the scheme utilises a clipped gable roof, which is contrary to the approved plans within 20/01203/FUL and there is no other example of this roof form along Coventry Road or Paddock Way, which is not considered to preserve the character of the area."*
- 6.43 The Appellant has also not sought to refute this statement. Therefore, the appeal proposal does not preserve or enhance the character of the area and does not represent good design. This also results in a significant adverse impact on the character of the area.

Summary

- 6.44 In summary, the Appellant has relied on the Committee Report for planning application 24/00654/FUL to justify their appeal proposal. The Committee Report confirms that the proposal does not preserve the character of the area, and a previous planning application was withdrawn due to the Local Planning Authority's intention to refuse the proposal due to its harm to the character of the area. The Appellant has not sought to disagree with these assertions within their Statement of Case.
- 6.45 By virtue of these factors, the conversion of the existing garage into a dwelling in this site-specific location would materially change the character of the site. The provision of a new independent detached dwelling in this location would represent incongruous backland development in an area where there are no other examples of such development. Therefore, by virtue of its location and siting, the proposal does not positively respond to the surrounding context of the area, nor contribute to local distinctiveness, and results in a significant adverse impact on the character of the area. This significant adverse impact is heightened by the use of an uncharacteristic clipped gable roof design and the increased visual prominence of the development from the public highway due to the removal of the existing gates and hedgerow.
- 6.46 In light of the above, the appeal proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Chapter 12 and Key Policy Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, the National Design Guide, and the Good Design Guide. In accordance with Key Policy Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, the development is not well designed and fails to reflect local design policy or Government guidance on design and should be refused.
- 6.47 The Appellant has not sought to demonstrate any benefits of the scheme. Nevertheless, the benefits associated with the provision of dwelling are modest and attract little weight in the planning balance. Therefore, the adverse impacts of this scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development in these site-specific circumstances.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 To summarise, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 and Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 indicates that planning permission should be granted for development proposals that accord with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.2 It is acknowledged that the Development Plan was adopted prior to the publication of the latest NPPF. However, as a result of the strong consistency with the wording of the NPPF, due weight should be given to the policies within the Development Plan, such as Policy DM10 of the SADMP, in accordance with Paragraph 232 of the NPPF.

- 7.3 In the determination of this appeal, the ‘tilted’ balance in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is triggered whereby planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
- 7.4 The appeal proposal results in a significant adverse impact on the character of the area that is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) and the Good Design Guide (2020). Ultimately, the adverse impacts of this scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.
- 7.5 There are no other material considerations to indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the adopted Development Plan in this case. With regard to the information contained in this statement and that submitted with the Appeal Questionnaire, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council respectfully requests that the appeal be dismissed. However, if the Inspector is minded not to do so, the Local Planning Authority requests the inclusion of the following conditions and reasons suggested below.

8. CONDITIONS

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 by the Local Planning Authority as follows:

- Elevations and Floor Plans 1654 (submitted: 03.07.2024)
- Proposed Block Plan (Rev A) (submitted: 15.08.2024)
- Site Location Plan (Rev A) (submitted: 21.08.2022)

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 development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping works, including boundary treatments, for the site including an implementation scheme, has been submitted in writing to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved landscaping scheme in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the development or the completion of the development, whichever is sooner. The soft landscaping scheme shall be maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting.

During this period, any trees or shrubs which die or are damaged, removed, or seriously diseased shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size and species to those originally planted at which time shall be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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).

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be first used until such time as the scheme makes adequate provision for waste and recycling storage of containers and collection across the site which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The details should address accessibility to storage facilities and confirm adequate space is provided at the adopted highway boundary to store and service wheeled containers. The scheme shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To support the policies within the Wheeled Bin and Container Policy (updated March 2018) and to ensure that there is adequate provision of waste and recycling storage so that the amenity of the occupants of the proposed development are not adversely affected in accordance with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's Wheeled Bin and Contained Policy (updated March 2018), Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as the parking and turning facilities have been implemented in accordance with Proposed Block Plan (Rev A) (submitted: 15.08.2024). Thereafter the onsite parking (and turning) provision shall be kept available for such uses in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking provision is made to reduce the possibility of the proposed development leading to on-street parking problems locally (and to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward direction) in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, AA, B, C, D, and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting

that Order with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the dwelling shall be carried out unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the character of the surrounding area and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings from potential overlooking in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no vehicular access gates, barriers, bollards, chains or other such obstructions shall be erected within a distance of 5 metres of the highway boundary, nor shall any be erected within a distance of 5 metres of the highway boundary unless hung to open away from the highway.

Reason: To enable a vehicle to stand clear of the highway in order to protect the free and safe passage of traffic including pedestrians in the public highway in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

8. The windows for the walk-in wardrobe and the bathroom on the first floor of the development shall be fitted with obscure glazing to a minimum of level 3 of the Pilkington scale and non-openable below 1.7m above the floor of the room. Once so provided the window(s) shall be permanently maintained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings from potential overlooking in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).