

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/00986/HOU
Applicant: Mr Mandeep Daphu
Ward: Hinckley DeMontfort



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 66 Leicester Road Hinckley Leicestershire

Proposal: Two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gates (revised scheme of 25/00510/HOU).

Case Officer: Zahra Jam Rotbeh (Planning Officer)

1. Recommendations

- 1.1. Refuse planning permission** subject to the reasons at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1.** This householder application is a revised scheme of approved planning permission (25/00510/HOU) for a two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gate, erection of an outbuilding and internal alternations.
- 2.2.** The alterations include an increase of footprint to the rear for 20.92 square metres and a minor increase to the side of the new entrance of 4.55 square metres creating a total of 25.47 square metres increase to the existing footprint.
- 2.3.** In the revised scheme, the proposed rear extension on top of single storey extension measures 7.26 metres in width and 7.45 metres in depth, with a total eave height of 8.63 metres and a ridge height of 9.86 metres while the approved plan would propose an eaves height of 6.17 metres and a total ridge height of 8.933 metres and.
- 2.4.** Two bay windows have been proposed on the front of the ground and second-floor elevations, measuring 5.46 metres in width. Furthermore, a new porch door along with canopy pitched roof is proposed on this elevation.
- 2.5.** The front elevation involves the removal of the existing porch and the installation of a new-style door, measuring 2.60 metres in length and 2.30 metres in width.
- 2.6.** One outbuilding is included as part of the application, located on the western edge of the property, with dimensions of 7m x 3.60m and an eaves height of 2.25 metres and a ridge height of 3.59 metres.
- 2.7.** A wall and gate in 1.8 metres at the front of the property form part of this scheme. The gate will be finished in black, while the wall will be constructed in facing brickwork and decorated with reconstituted stone coping.

2.8. In the revised scheme, a new side window is proposed at second-floor on the side elevation.

2.9. It should be noted that these plans were submitted as part of discussions on application 25/00510/HOU but were considered unacceptable by the LPA. The applicant subsequently amended the former application to an acceptable degree, however, has subsequently re-submitted these proposals despite officer advice.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

3.1. 66 Leicester Road is a detached, two-storey, four-bedroom property constructed of red brick and white rendered cladding. The house features an L-shaped layout and a hipped roof.

3.2. The property features window and door openings on all elevations, all constructed in white uPVC.

3.3. The property is enclosed by wooden fencing, which serves as a boundary treatment separating it from the neighbouring properties.

3.4. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of two-storey and single-storey properties in varying design and forms. Overall, the street scene lacks any distinctive or unique architectural character.

3.5. The property includes a detached garage and is bordered by substantial planting and mature trees along the fence line.

4. Relevant Planning History

25/00510/HOU

- Two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gates, outbuilding erection and internal alterations.
- PER
- 18.09.2025

05/01326/FUL

- CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO GRANNY ANNEXE AND ERECTION OF DETACHED GARAGE
- PER
- 07.02.2006

74/00859/4

- ERECTION OF CHALET BUNGALOW
- REF
- 26.11.1974

74/01291/4

- ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY HOUSE
- OUT
- 28.01.1975

5. Publicity

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.
- 5.2 Four comments have been received in support of the planning application, and they all relate to design aspects and the positive contribution the proposal would have to the area.

6. Consultation

- N/A

7. Policy

- 7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 1: 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 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

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, extensions should subordinate to the main dwelling. For two-storey side extensions, this typically requires a reduction in ridge height and a setback from the front elevation. In this case, the proposed extension is set down by 1.11 metres from the highest ridge line of the property. However, despite this reduction, the overall roof form and rear elevation design do not achieve subordination. The extension appears visually dominant and its design disrupts the original layout and architectural rhythm of the main dwelling, creating unacceptable and over dominant appearance to the rear. As a result, the proposal would not respect the character and appearance of the main dwelling and is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

8.4 Furthermore, the revised extension had been proposed once by applicant as one of the amended plans in response to initial proposed flat roof in the main application and concerns were expressed regarding the design, rhythm and form it introduces to the main dwelling. Given the two-storey nature of the extension and the plot's prominent location, the unbalanced and discordant would be highly visible from multiple spots along 'The Rills' to the rear. Its design and incongruous form would significantly harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would neither complement nor enhance the character of the site and surrounding area, therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

8.5 Walls and gates to the height proposed are not common features within the streetscene; however, due to the presence of planting, the use of matching materials, and the setback from the highway, they are not considered to have a significant impact on the design of the main dwelling or the surrounding area.

8.6 The proposed porch on the front elevation, relocated from the side, enhances the façade and contributes to a more symmetrical street appearance. Featuring a pitched roof, two pillars, and a wooden door, the design complements and elevates the overall design of the main dwelling in this elevation.

8.7 The proposed outbuilding, located in the southwest corner of the garden space, will serve as storage and does not affect existing trees or planting. It features a pitched roof and white rendered cladding to match the main dwelling, along with two windows and a door in a consistent style. Though not visible from public view, its design ensures no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the property or surrounding area.

- 8.8 In summary, the proposed extension fails to complement the form, rhythm, and scale of the existing dwelling, and its prominence within the streetscene is not considered to be in keeping with the design and character of the surrounding area. Therefore, it is not in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) and the aims of the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.9 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.
- 8.10 The most affected neighbouring property is No. 11 The Rills, located to the northwest of the application site. In line with the HBBC Good Design Guide and in the principle of good neighbourliness, a minimum separation of 1 metre from the boundary—resulting in a total distance of at least 2 metres between properties—is encouraged. The proposed development maintains this separation in both schemes. In the approved plan, the development would result in a minimal loss of light to No. 11. In the revised plan, this impact remains unchanged; however, an additional concern arises due to the introduction of a new side-facing window on the second floor. This window would overlook the neighbouring property at No.11, causing some loss of privacy. Therefore, the revised development is considered to have an additional adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenities compared to the approved plan. However, the front outdoor space at No.11 does not appear to be utilised for primary amenity space and therefore the loss of privacy is not considered to be unacceptable. Owing to the location of the windows at No. 11 minimal window-window overlooking would occur.
- 8.11 The neighbouring property at No. 68a Leicester Road is located to the north of the application site. Due to the separation distance of approximately 12 metres between the proposed development and this property, it is not considered to have any impact on the residential amenity of this neighbouring property.
- 8.12 The proposed outbuilding will be positioned in the southwest corner of the garden, maintaining a 1-metre distance from the timber boundary fence. As there are no neighbouring residential properties directly adjacent to this location (there is only a footpath which remains unaffected) the proposed outbuilding is not considered to have any adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity.
- 8.13 The proposed new window and door openings on the front elevation are not expected to have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties, due to a generous setback of approximately 12 metres from the boundary and adjacent dwellings.
- 8.14 By virtue of the factors outlined above, is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the principles set out in the Good Design Guide in terms of its impact on residential amenity.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.15 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.
- 8.16 Policy DM18 of the SADMP also requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.17 According to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG), table (28) states that a minimum of three off street parking spaces is required for a seven-bedroom dwelling. The existing property includes a single garage, which will be retained, and four proposed parking space provided in the block plan which can comfortably accommodate more than three parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to result in any harm or adverse impact on parking provision or highway safety.
- 8.18 To conclude, the proposal does not create any adverse impact on highway safety or the road network. Therefore, the scheme is 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.
- 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 The proposal relates the householder application which is a revised scheme of approved planning permission (25/00510/HOU) for a two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gate, erection of an outbuilding and internal alternation and in this scheme, it is seeking a planning permission for the same scheme with a different design.
- 10.2 By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed extension would have an appearance that is incongruous with the architectural rhythm of the existing dwelling and would create an extension which is over dominant and inconsistent with the character and appearance of the main dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, it is considered to be contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Hinckley and Bosworth Good Design Guide (2020) and National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- .

11. Recommendation

- 11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to the reasons at the end of this report.

11.2 Reasons

1. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed extension would have an appearance that is incongruous with the architectural rhythm of the existing dwelling and would also appear over dominant and insubordinate in scale. The proposed design would also fail to complement or enhance the surrounding area in regard to scale, mass and design. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Hinckley and Bosworth Good Design Guide (2020) and National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

11.3 Notes to applicant

This application has been determined with assessment of the submitted Application Form, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations Dwg No.167-02 E, Location & Block Plan Dwg No.167-03 B, and Gate & Wall Design Plan Dwg No.167-04 as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 10th October 2025.