

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 24/01017/HOU

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Flint

Ward: Newbold Verdon With Desford & Peckleton

Site: Lyndale Lindridge Lane Desford



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Proposal: Two storey and single storey rear extension

1. Recommendations

1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report

2. Planning application description

- 2.1. This application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a single-storey and two-storey extension to the rear elevation of, Lyndale, Lindridge Lane, Desford.
- 2.2. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project outwards from the existing single-storey rear elevation by 1.78 metres for a width of 4.26 metres. It would have a dual-pitched form with an eaves height of 2.77 metres and a ridge height of 5.54 metres.
- 2.3. The proposed two-storey rear extension would project outwards from the existing two-storey rear elevation by 4.94 - 6.75 metres for a width of 8.10 metres. It would have a dual-pitched form with a matching rear eaves and ridge height with two subordinate rear gables to the rear elevation with a ridge height of 7.15 metres. An existing rear conservatory would be demolished to enable the development.
- 2.4. Additional works include works to the fenestration.
- 2.5. The proposed external materials are to match those of the existing dwelling with the exception of zinc cladding and zinc standing seam to the two-storey extension and grey uPVC or aluminium to the fenestration.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application dwelling is located in the countryside to the north of Desford. It is a two storey detached house with dual pitched gable sided main roof form. It has a 1½ storey front extension with twin front gabled roof and a single storey front extension with lean-to roof. There is a single storey extension with dual pitched gable sided roof to the side elevation and a conservatory with multi-faceted pitched glazed roof to the rear elevation. It is constructed with smooth white render and white painted facing bricks, green pantile roof and cream painted timber windows. There is a detached double garage with dual pitched gable fronted roof form and a large loose stone surfaced forecourt, turning space and long driveway providing ample off-street parking space. The extensive plot also provides substantial private amenity space and is screened by mature landscaping.
- 3.2. There are no immediate neighbouring residential properties although the paddock land to the south has an extant planning permission for the erection of 4 two-storey detached dwellings (24/00512/REM). The plots although not completed and occupied are a way into their construction. Opposite the site to the northwest lies a tourist attraction (Tropical Birdland).

4. Relevant planning history

79/02255/4M

- Erection of boarding chalets cat runs and stores
- Planning Permission
- 26.02.1980

85/00137/4

- Extensions to dwelling to from bedrooms and lounge comprising entrance porch
- Planning Permission
- 07.03.1985

92/01127/4

- Kitchen extension
- Planning Permission
- 15.02.1993

00/00685/FUL

- Conservatory extension
- Planning Permission
- 16.08.2000

14/01008/HEDGE

- Removal of hedgerow
- Non Important Hedgerow Removal
- 18.11.2014

24/00334/HOU

- Two storey rear extension
- Planning Permission
- 21.05.2024

5. Publicity

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. A site notice was also posted within the vicinity of the site.
- 5.2. Following the publications one comment has been received, it is however not relevant to this specific application.

6. Consultation

6.1. Desford Parish Council

- No comments have been received.

6.2. LCC Ecology:

'No objection (for recommended conditions or informatives- see below)

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

- *The revised plans have been viewed (Dwg No. 03 – Rev B, Dwg No. 02 – Rev C (Oct 2025)). Subsequent to our previous comments, additional information clarifying the location of the bat roost has been provided by the ecologist, illustrated on plan and therefore, suitably addresses the mitigation required given the level of disturbance to the roost. It is worth noting any destructive works should be undertaken under the Bat Low Impact Class Licence (BLICL).*
- *The location and model details of the permanent bat box and the compensatory bat roost provisions have been illustrated on plan and included on Figure 1 (Sept 2025). • Therefore, this suitably address our comments regarding roost compensation and the requirement for the installation of nesting provisions.*
- *Taking the above into the consideration, the development shall be implemented in strict accordance with the revised plans, the compensation measures detailed within Table 9 of the Preliminary Roost Assessment (July 2025) and supporting documents (Figure 1).*
- *We advise applying the following recommended condition, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.*

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS TO BE APPLIED:

- *The development hereby approved shall be implemented in strict accordance with the revised plans (Dwg No. 03 – Rev B, Dwg No. 02 – Rev C (Oct 2025)), the measures within Table 9 of the Preliminary Roost Assessment (Elton Ecology, July 2025) and supporting documents (Figure 1).'*

7. Policy

7.1. Desford Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) (2018-2036)

- Policy H7: Housing Design
- Policy ENV3: Biodiversity General

7.2. Core Strategy (2009)

- Policy 7: Rural Centres
- Policy 8: Key Rural Centres Relating to Leicester

7.3. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADMP) (2016)

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.4. National Planning Policies and Guidance

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

7.5. Other relevant guidance

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- National Design Guide (2019)

- Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)

8. Appraisal

8.1. Notwithstanding the countryside location outside of any settlement boundary, extensions and alterations 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 neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon highway safety
- Impact upon ecology

Design and impact upon the character of the area

- 8.2 Policy DM10 of the SADMP seeks to ensure that new development should complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.
- 8.3 Policy DM4 of the SADMP states that to protect its intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character, the countryside will first and foremost be safeguarded from unsustainable development. The policy goes on to list a number of categories of development that would be considered sustainable in the countryside. These include proposals for the extension and alteration of existing buildings which lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting and where, amongst other matters, the proposal does not have a significant adverse effect on the appearance and open character of the countryside.
- 8.4 Policy H7 of the DNP seeks to ensure that all new development proposals enhance the local distinctiveness and character of the area in which it is situated.
- 8.5 The Councils Good Design Guide states that *‘Rear extensions should be designed to be clearly subordinate to the main dwelling. They should be an appropriate height, width, depth and reflect or complement the detailing and materials of the original building.’*
- 8.6 The proposed single-storey rear extension would mirror the 4.26 metre width of the existing single-storey rear elevation whilst hosting a modest 1.78 metre projection. It would retain its existing dual-pitched form and eaves but would see an increase to its ridge height. Despite the increase to the projection and ridge the proposal would retain its subordinate appearance bearing no significant impacts upon the character of the area.
- 8.7 The proposed two-storey rear extension would project outwards from the existing two-storey rear elevation by 4.94 - 6.75 metres for a width of 8.10 metres and would replace an existing conservatory. The footprint would be clearly subordinate to that of the existing dwelling and is therefore considered to be appropriate in terms of its depth and width. It would have a dual-pitched form with matching rear eaves and ridge height with two subordinate rear gables to the rear elevation with a clearly subordinate ridge height of 7.15 metres. By virtue of its height, depth and width, the extension would respect the scale of, and appear as a clearly subordinate addition to, the existing dwelling and the twin gable design would reflect that of the existing front elevation. The proposal includes the formation of some larger scale openings and first floor Juliette balconies to the rear elevation to provide additional light to existing and new rooms and views over the surrounding gardens. The replacement of all windows throughout with grey uPVC or aluminium windows and the proposed use of zinc cladding and zinc standing seam to the two-storey extension would result in a more contemporary, but nevertheless acceptable, design and uniform

external appearance particularly given the retainment of the render and green terracotta tiles to the main dwelling and single-storey extension.

- 8.8 The proposals would be set in from all of the well landscaped and screened boundaries of the site by a minimum of 29.80 metres and therefore would have no significant adverse impacts on the rural appearance or open character of the surrounding countryside.
- 8.9 By virtue of their siting, scale, design and the proposed use of sympathetic complementary external materials to ensure a satisfactory and unified appearance, it is considered that the proposals would respect and complement the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would not result in any significant adverse visual impacts on the rural appearance or open character of the surrounding countryside. The proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy H7 of the DNP, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the SADMP and acceptable in terms of the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.10 Policy DM10 of the SADMP requires that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.11 To the south of the site sits a residential development consisting of 4 two-storey detached dwellings approved under extant consent 24/00512/REM. The plots although not completed and occupied are a way into their construction. The plots principle elevations all face to the west towards Lindridge Lane. Plot 1 would be situated the closest to the proposal, however still at a generous separation distance of 28.50 metres. Alongside this the proposed rear extensions would be situated to the north-west of the site being screened by the existing built form. The fenestration proposed to the application dwellings principle elevation which is orientated to the side elevation of plot 1 would remain considerably similar to that of the existing albeit with a change to their design and finish which along with the separation distance would retain the residential amenity of the plot.
- 8.12 There are no further immediate neighbouring residential properties.
- 8.13 By virtue of the above the proposals would have no adverse impacts on any residential amenity or privacy and would be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

Impact upon highway safety

- 8.14 Paragraph 115 (b) of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users. In accordance with Paragraph 115(d) of the NPPF, any proposal should ensure that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.
- 8.15 Ultimately, development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios in accordance with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.
- 8.16 To support this, 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. All proposals for new development and changes of use should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highway authority (currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024).

- 8.17 Policy H7 of the DNP seeks to ensure that all new development proposals provide adequate off-street parking.
- 8.18 The proposal would result in the provision of an additional (fifth) bedroom but would not affect the existing off-street parking and turning provision within the existing double garage and on the large loose stone surfaced forecourt, turning space and long driveway which would remain more than adequate to serve the resulting five bedroomed dwelling. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy H7 of the DNP and Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP and the LHDG.

Impact upon ecology

- 8.19 Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016) states that proposals must demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation and geological value including proposals for their long-term future management.

On site features should be retained, buffered and managed favourably to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. The removal or damage of such features shall only be acceptable where it can be demonstrated the proposal will result in no net loss of biodiversity and where the integrity of local ecological networks can be secured.

Proposals which are likely to result in the loss or deterioration of an irreplaceable habitat would only be acceptable where:

- e) The need and benefits of the development in that location clearly
- f) It has been adequately demonstrated that the irreplaceable habitat
- g) Appropriate compensation measures are provided on site wherever possible and off site where this not is feasible.

If the harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against or appropriate compensation measures provided, planning permission will be refused.

- 8.20 In reference to Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005 *"It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may have not been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances."*
- 8.21 Policy H7 of the DNP seeks to ensure that all new development proposals where appropriate, should have built-in facilities for wildlife, for example, bee bricks and swift boxes.
- 8.22 Policy ENV 3 of the DNP seeks to ensure that all new development proposals that cannot avoid (through, for example, locating to an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigate, or, as a last resort, compensate for, the loss of a locally identified site of biodiversity value will not be supported. Where a development proposal will adversely affect a protected species, an appropriate and

suitable survey will be undertaken prior to development, and mitigation measures will be required as a development condition.

- 8.23 Within the relevant Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements householder development is exempt. Nevertheless, as the works involve significant alterations to the existing roof, roof line, tiles and soffits of the existing property whilst being situated nearby countryside with a good connectivity to nearby ponds the submission of a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was requested by LCC Ecology.
- 8.24 An initial PRA was submitted to the LPA on the 13th February, with three further emergence surveys being submitted on the 23rd July and a Bat Mitigation Plan and revised floor plans, elevations, roof, block and location plan being submitted on the 12th October indicating the make, model and location of the bat boxes.
- 8.25 The initial PRA identified potential bat access points including gaps in the mortar, lifted flashing and tiles. In addition to potential roosting locations between tiles, lining and the loft void. As a result, three emergence surveys were conducted. The emergence surveys identified an occasionally used day roost of a single soprano pipistrelle, which would be lost given the proposed works. Therefore, to undertake any modification of the existing dwelling a Bat Licence from Natural England is required to proceed with the development lawfully, as suggested in the report. (This has been obtained by the applicant)
- 8.26 Mitigation methods stated within Table 9 of the report suggested that compensatory bat roost provisions must be installed at the site, including a compensatory bat box on a nearby tree to translocate any bats found and a permanent fixture to be installed on the proposed building. The above enhancement/mitigation measures have been shown on the revised floor plans, elevations, roof, block and location plan. LCC Ecology are therefore satisfied that the proposed scheme of extensions would ensure the protection of protected wildlife species and their habitats subject to a condition being imposed ensuring that the bat boxes are installed in accordance with the most recent emergence survey and plans.
- 8.27 By virtue of the above, subject to conditions, the development would accord with Policy DM6 of the SADMP and Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005.

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. Notwithstanding its location outside of any settlement boundary and therefore within designated countryside, the proposal is an extension and alteration to an existing dwelling within an established residential curtilage and therefore there is a general presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in Policies DM1 and DM4 of the SADMP and the overarching principles of the NPPF.
- 10.2. By virtue of its siting, scale, design and the proposed use of acceptable complementary external materials to ensure a satisfactory and unified appearance, it is considered that the proposals would respect and complement the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would not result in any significant adverse visual impacts on the rural appearance or open character of the surrounding countryside. The proposals would have no adverse impacts on any residential amenity or privacy, not result in any significant adverse impacts on highway safety, parking provision, or ecology.
- 10.3. The proposals would therefore be in accordance with Policies H7 and ENV 3 of the DNP, Policies DM1, DM4, DM6, DM10, DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, the general principles of the Councils Good Design Guide and the LPA and are therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

11. Recommendation

11.1 Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined 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 materials to be used externally shall accord with the approved application form, as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4th November 2024 and the pigment green zinc sample deposited and received by the Local Planning Authority on the 27th January 2025.

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).

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations, Drg No.24707 02 Rev C
Roof Plans, Block and Location Plans, Drg No. 24707 03 Rev B
as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th October 2025.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

4. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in strict accordance with the measures within Table 9 of the Preliminary Roost Assessment (Elton Ecology, July 2025) as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 23rd July 2025 and supporting documents Bat Mitigation Plan, Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations, Drg No.24707 02 Rev C and Roof Plans, Block and Location Plans, Drg No. 24707 03 Rev B as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th October 2025.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected wildlife species and their habitats in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and Paragraph 192 of the NPPF (2024).

11.3 Notes to applicant

- a) The approved development may require Building Regulations Approval, for further information please contact the Building Control team via e-mail at buildingcontrol@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk or call 01455 238141.