

Officer Report

Planning Ref: 26/00069/HOU

Applicant: Mr Luke Hancock

Ward: Barwell



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 34 Kingsfield Road Barwell Leicester

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear 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 erection of a single storey rear extension at 34 Kingsfield Road, Barwell.
- 2.2. The proposed rear extension would measure 4 metres in depth and 5.96 metres in width and it would have feature a flat roof with lantern on top with a height of 2.7 metres and 3.60 metres to the top of lantern.
- 2.3. The proposal would also propose an installation a new door to the rear.
- 2.4. The external walls would be finished in brickwork to match the existing property, and white uPVC windows that complement the existing materials and finishes.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is a detached two-story residential property on Kingsfield Road, Barwell. It is finished in brickwork and white render to the front elevation and white uPVC openings.
- 3.2. The property is situated in the middle of Kingsfield Road, within a residential area. It is set back from the main road with a front parking area.
- 3.3. The area consists mostly of detached properties of varying designs and sizes, and there is no distinctive character within the area.

4. Relevant Planning History

14/00836/FUL

- Erection of a bungalow (plot 6) including a revised parking layout to plots 2-5 as approved by 14/00190/FUL and the addition of a garage to plot 1

- PER
- 12.12.2014

15/00567/FUL

- Erection of two bungalows with associated access and garages
- PER
- 14.07.2015

87/00086/4

- PROPOSED GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO SIDE
- REF
- 31.03.1987

93/00442/4

- EXTENSION TO DWELLING
- PER
- 19.07.1993

87/00505/4

- GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION
- PER
- 30.06.1987

5. Publicity

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

6. Consultation

- No objections have been received from Barwell Parish Council.

7. Policy**7.1 Core Strategy (2009):**

- Policy 3: Development in Barwell

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 on the highway and parking provision

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.2 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.

8.3 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.

8.4 According to HBBC Good Design Guide (2020) (GDG), 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.

8.5 The proposed single-storey rear extension would not be visible from any public viewpoint. Although flat roofs are generally discouraged as a design feature and the proposed rear layout is not considered to be fully balanced, the modest scale of the extension, its rear position, and its single-storey nature ensure that it remains clearly subordinate to the main dwelling. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in any adverse impact on the design or character of the area.

8.6 A new door is proposed on the rear elevation that is considered to be in keeping with the existing fenestration to the rear of the property and would not result in any harm to the design or character of the surrounding area.

8.7 Therefore, the form and design of the development is considered modest, subordinate to the main dwelling and the design would not have any adverse impact

upon the character of the area. It is considered that the development is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the NPPF (2024).

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.8 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible, which promote health and well-being, and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 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 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. Furthermore, proposals should comply with the 45⁰ guidance.
- 8.11 The properties most likely to be affected by the proposal are No. 36 Kingsfield Road to the northeast and No. 32 Kingsfield Road to the southwest. The proposed development would not breach the 45-degree rule in relation to no.36. The extension would also maintain a separation distance of approximately 6 metres to No. 36. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to result in any adverse impacts in terms of overbearing effects, overdominance, loss of light, or loss of privacy to no.36 property or its amenities.
- 8.12 As mentioned above, No. 32 is located to the southwest of the main dwelling. The proposal would not breach the 45-degree rule in relation to this neighbouring property, and it would maintain a separation distance of 0.96 metres. However, based on the internal layout of No. 32, the lounge area would be affected by the proposal and potentially would have some reduction in natural light and a degree of overdominance as a result of the proposed development. Nevertheless, as the lounge forms part of an open-plan space with the dining area and benefits from additional sources of light from other elevations the overall impact is not considered to be unacceptable. Therefore, the proposal would have a minor loss of light and overdominance impacts toward no.32.
- 8.13 By virtue of above, whilst the proposal would have a minor overdominance and loss of light impacts this would not be significantly adverse. Furthermore, the proposal does not result in any adverse any overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties and therefore overall is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.14 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.
- 8.15 Policy DM18 of the SADMP also requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.16 Table 28 (Residential Parking Standards) of the LHDG requires that dwellings with four or more bedrooms provide a minimum of three offstreet parking spaces. The proposal does not increase the number of bedrooms, and the parking area to the front would remain in place. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to have any adverse impact on parking provision, highway safety, or pedestrian safety.
- 8.17 Therefore, the scheme is regarded as being 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 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:

- Proposed Floor, Roof Plans, Elevations, Site Plan, Site Location Plan Drg No. BKR(20)001

As received by the local planning authority on 23 January 2026.

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 materials to be used on the external elevations of the extension 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 or call 0116 272 7533.