

Delegated Report

Planning Reference: 25/00865/HOU
Applicant(s): Mr Matthew Hinchliffe
Ward: Newbold Verdon with Desford and Peckleton



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Application Site: 51 Main Street, Newbold Verdon

Proposal: Single storey wrap-around extension to one side and on the back of the house, with a new porch to be built on the front. Render the front of the house with the addition of stone cills and an oak porch with reclaimed features, keeping in with similar property styles in the area.

Case Officer: Gwion Russell (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. This householder planning application seeks planning permission for a single-storey side and rear extension to 51 Main Street, Newbold Verdon.
- 2.2. The proposed extension comprises a wrap-around addition located primarily to the rear (north) and side (east) of the dwelling. The rear element externally measures approximately 12.04m in width and 3.5m in depth, creating an additional footprint of 54.3m². This extension incorporates an enlarged kitchen, a family/dining area, a W.C. and an integrated garage.
- 2.3. The extension adjoins the existing structure at the rear and side elevations and includes the removal of a conservatory, but the retention of a double-bay detached garage within the rear of the property curtilage (which is now used as a store). No first-floor extensions are proposed as part of this development.
- 2.4. With regard to fenestration, the proposed development includes the addition of a 2m wide garage door at the right-hand side of the principal frontage and forming the frontage of the proposed side extension element. In addition, a 4.15m wide bi-fold door, along with a windowed gable, and two 1.7m wide patio-style doors are also proposed at the rear elevation of the extension. No windows are proposed at either side elevation of the extension. Four 78cm x 1.18m rooflights are proposed at the hipped roof of the extension, two at the side roof element and two at the rear roof element.

- 2.5. Proposed materials include cream uPVC for the fenestration, the replacement of plastic window cills with stone cills. The hipped roof is proposed to be finished in concrete interlocking tiles to match existing. The existing walls are finished with brick, and the proposed finish is a cream render. The dual-pitched frontage porchway is proposed to be finished in a timber frame, with concrete interlocking roof tiles to match existing and reclaimed bricks.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is located at 51 Main Street, within the settlement boundary of Newbold Verdon. The property comprises a two-storey, detached dwelling situated on a plot measuring approximately 400m².
- 3.2. The dwelling is constructed using a 'buff' brick and features a central front doorway, currently flush with the main dwelling, with beige uPVC fenestration either side, one being a shallow bow-bay window at its ground-floor left side elevation. The property is set back 6m from the highway (at its nearest) by a verged turfed front garden and driveway (which extends down the right-side of the dwelling) and is bounded by a hard boundary treatment in the form of a dwarf brick wall to the frontage and wooden fences at either side. The overall rectangular shaped dwelling has a dual-pitched (gabled) roof and the plot benefits from a large, paved garden to the rear along with an existing detached garage building sited at the rear boundary and within the property curtilage, which is to be retained as part of the proposals.
- 3.3. Although the nearby properties are residential in use, there is a church and war memorial within close proximity to the application site, along with a small cluster of local retail units and a village hall opposite. Properties in the vicinity vary greatly in design, heritage value and massing. However, the application dwelling is one of three nearly identically sized and designed dwellings, which are all built using buff brick and feature identical dual-pitched roofs, sitting neatly at the left-most site, each positioned further stepped-back from the highway.
- 3.4. Although the application site is mostly bordered by residential dwellings, to the rear of the site lies a small parcel of publicly accessible green space, which is likely used by residents of Rectory Gardens. In addition, there are various mature trees along the rear (north) boundary of the site, some of which tower over the dwelling and largely screens the plot from nearby properties.
- 3.5. The site is located within the designated Newbold Verdon conservation area, however, the property itself is not listed or recognised locally as holding significant heritage value. There are three Grade II listed buildings nearby: a K6 telephone Kiosk (List ref: 1115715), the gates and side screens to the old rectory (List ref: 1074088) and Cobb Cottage (List ref: 1115714), the latter having direct invisibility to the application dwelling and sited approximately 40m away. In addition, the site is located within a Swift Nesting site and lies within a coal mining area.

4. Relevant Planning History

23/00488/HOU

- Proposed solar panels and satellite dish
- PER
- 07.08.2023

81/00654/4

- CONVERSION OF SINGLE GARAGE TO DOUBLE GARAGE
- WDN
- 23.07.1981

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 and a notice was displayed in the local press.
- 5.2. No responses have been received.

6. Consultation

- 6.1. There have been no objections received from the following consultees:
- Newbold Verdon Parish Council
 - LCC's Ecology Unit
 - HBBC's Conservation Officer
- 6.2. No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

- 7.1. Core Strategy (2009):
- No relevant policies
- 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 DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
 - Policy DM12: Heritage Assets
 - 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:

- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council – The Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)
- Newbold Verdon Conservation Area Appraisal

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. 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. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places.

8.3. 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. Guidance Point I1 of the NDG 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, landmarks, and landscaping, amongst others.

8.4. Ultimately, Guidance Point I2 of the NDG advised that well-designed places should contribute to local distinctiveness and Guidance Point I3 of the NDG highlights that design decisions at all levels and scape should help to create a memorable sense of place.

8.5. 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.

- 8.6. 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.
- 8.7. 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.
- 8.8. Policy DM11 of the SADMP states that all development proposals which have the potential to affect a heritage assets or its setting will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset and its setting, including measures to minimise or avoid these impacts. In this case, the Grade II listed Cobb Cottage is the nearest site, at only 40m from the application site. A heritage statement has also been provided which outlines the cultural significance of the nearby listed buildings and the following key points:
- *Retaining or reinstating traditional materials and details (e.g., sash windows, traditional doors, brick features, render & stone cills).*
 - *Avoiding modern, alien features at the frontage (e.g., extensive driveway paving with non-traditional materials) that disrupt the established street character.*
 - *Respecting the prevailing building lines and scales, and ensuring any alterations are sympathetic in design and material.*
 - *Changing the look of the boundary wall by adding traditional stone copings mentioned in the area management plan.*
 - *Changing the overall look of the property so that it better sits within the conservation area and hopefully removing it from being a weak point in the appraisal map.*
- 8.9. Policy DM12 of the SADMP states that all development proposals affecting heritage assets and their setting will be expected to secure their continued protection or enhancement, contribute to the distinctiveness of the areas in which they are located and contribute to the wider vibrancy of the borough. To support the proposals a Conservation Management Plan has been submitted which details the varied property designs in the area.
- 8.10. All development proposals affecting the significance of heritage assets and their setting will be assessed in accordance with Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment and will require justification. Newbold Verdon is identified as a designated Conservation Area.
- 8.11. The Newbold Verdon Conservation Area Appraisal states, with specific regard to Main Street:

'The west end of Main Street is the heart of the conservation area. This wide street is characterised by the rows of small, two storey flat fronted terraced cottages which form its edges. Its surface is a random mix of cobbles, tarmac, and granite setts broken only by a series of small trees on its eastern edge. Whilst the wide street channels views along Main Street towards the Hall and the church, it also provides opportunity for on-street parking which detracts from the traditional street scene. Other buildings of interest in this area include a group of Victorian terraced houses and the late 18th century Church Farm which is grade II listed.'

- 8.12. The Appraisal also provides guidance on what is acceptable, in design terms and suggests the following criteria should be met:

'Ensure new development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area: siting, scale, design and materials used.'

Ensure house extensions satisfy the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance or subsequent Supplementary Planning Documents.

'Seek to resist unsympathetic development proposals that would have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the conservation area.'

- 8.13. The Good Design Guide (2021) explains that household extensions, whether to the side, front or rear of an existing property or to the roof, both individually and collectively, can result in changes to the built environment that, if designed insensitively, can have a significant negative impact. According to the Good Design Guide, 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. The rear extension is not subordinate in its proposed width but is in its proposed massing (being single-storey). However, given the proposals do not introduce significant depth to the original rear dwelling façade, the dominant width of the rear extension balances the overall depth of the proposal.
- 8.14. Proposals for front extensions should not normally extend beyond the front elevation by more than 2 metres and not cover more than 50% of the front elevation. The front extension is minor in scale and depth from the principal frontage of the dwelling and does not cover more than 50% of the front elevation. It is therefore considered to comply with this guidance.
- 8.15. In terms of elements of detailing, it is generally appropriate to ensure that the new development integrates coherently with the existing, whether this is an extension to an existing building or a new home in a conservation area. The use of render provides a design inconsistency with its two neighbouring properties to the east, however given there is a number of rendered properties nearby, including No. 49 adjacent, the introduction of further variation is mitigated somewhat. In addition, it is considered that the use of render complies with the guidance as set out in the Newbold Verdon Conservation Area Appraisal, by remaining consistent with nearby dwellings and not proposing a harmful design. To bolster this, the proposed use of stone cills is

consistent with the area generally and provides a design betterment without resulting in a further design inconsistency.

- 8.16. Roofscape is a key character forming feature of detail in residential design. This includes the shape and pitch of roofs, as well as the materiality. The wraparound extension is proposed to be topped with a hipped roof, which differs from the existing main dual-pitched (gabled) roof. However, given this, the use of a gable roof form on the surrounding wraparound extension may not be entirely possible to coherently implement and it is regarded the hipped roof would be the better option.
- 8.17. Fenestration, including the scale, rhythm, proportions and elements of detail used for window and door openings plays a critical role in the success of housing design. In the case of residential extensions, care should be taken to ensure that the existing horizontal and vertical rhythm together with the proportion of openings is either reflected or complemented. The only proposed opening along the principal frontage is the garage door, positioned to the right. Its positioning and siting appears constrained within the corner and but does align well with the existing fenestration pattern. This introduces an additional design consideration, especially as it is so exposed on the street scene and on a road bend. However, given the removal of the detached garage at the rear and the justification provided it would be inappropriate to refuse on this basis. The rooflights which are proposed atop the hipped roof structure are largely designed to be flush with the roof and provide little consideration in design terms. Windows at the rear elevation are almost invisible to neighbouring properties, given the hard boundary treatment and established vegetation/trees at the rear boundary.
- 8.18. The application site sits on an internal angle of a bend in the road and is naturally exposed, to the east, given it is sited forward of its neighbouring dwellings. Therefore public views of the proposals would be of the side extension element, the timber porchway and the use of render, as seen from the roadside. However, given the side extension element is single-storey in massing, there is minimal impact on the established building lines. Private views are limited, with the neighbouring property No. 53 Main Street, having indirect views of the side and rear extension element. The dwellings sited opposite will also be able to see the proposals.
- 8.19. By virtue of its sensitive design and minimal views from the highway the proposal respects the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area and is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, the Newbold Verdon Conservation Area and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.20. 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.
- 8.21. 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, including matters of lighting and noise and that the amenity of occupiers would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.

- 8.22. The Good Design Guide requires the way buildings to relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity.
- 8.23. Notwithstanding this, these separation distances are the minimum standards that are required, and every application will be assessed on its own merits depending on the individual characteristics of the site such as orientation, ground levels, window positions, garden size and shape.
- 8.24. The host dwelling sits adjacent to No. 53 Main Street and set forward by approximately 3.4m. It sits adjacent and set back 5.4m from 49 Main Street. No. 55, the second subsequent neighbouring dwelling, its separation distance is insufficient to assess any amenity impact.
- 8.25. Fenestration proposed on the ground floor includes a 4-panel bi-fold door (along with a windowed gable) and two openable patio doors to the rear elevation, which directly face the hard boundary treatment and will not result in loss of privacy for any neighbouring properties. The garage door on the front elevation does not create any amenity concerns, and the rooflights do not result in a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- 8.26. The 45-degree guidance, as set out in the Good Design Guide, is applied for planning applications for extensions to existing properties which might affect the outlook from or daylight to a neighbouring property. Given the shallow depth of the rear extension element from the original rear façade of the dwelling, there is no breach of this guidance at the rear or side elements. The addition of a front garage so close to the shared neighbouring boundary provides some amenity concerns, but it does not impinge directly upon this guidance. It is noted the application site sits higher topographically than its neighbouring property, No. 53 Main Street, however, the proposals will not result in loss of light given the natural direction of the sun's path. Thinking specifically about the single-storey massing and shallow depth of the rear extension, this element is not likely to provide any detrimental impact to neighbouring No. 49 Main Street, by way of loss of light or overdominance.
- 8.27. The Good Design Guide recommends that a principal window to a habitable room should ideally be no less than 8m from the blank side of a single storey neighbouring property, rising to 14m for a two-storey property. No aspect of the proposals introduce an oppressive blank wall that directly faces a habitable space, and with specific regard to the side elevation of No. 53, adjacent, there are no principal habitable windows facing this side extension element. As a result, the proposals do not result in oppressive or overbearing development. Given the single-storey massing of the proposals and that the side extension does not introduce a dominant eaves height, it is regarded that the proposals will not result in overdominance.

- 8.28. In addition, the separation distance between two principal windows to habitable windows should be a minimum of 21m. The proposed rear extension maintains a 55m separation distance from its nearest property, at the rear, along Rectory Fields. There is a sufficient separation distance of 28m maintained between the dwellings opposite, Nos. 26, 28 and 30 Main Street, and the introduction of a garage door does not pose any amenity concerns.
- 8.29. The side extension, which is proposed to extend to the eastern property boundary, which is shared with No. 53, adjacent, may result in visual overdevelopment on the plot. However, given the retention of side access at the eastern and the space retained at the rear of the property, this is largely seen to be mitigated.
- 8.30. The proposals introduce an additional roof form to the separation distance between Nos. 51 and 53, and therefore will disrupt the established building line. Given it has been sensitively designed with the main dwelling in mind, and its single-storey massing, this is largely seen to mitigate any impact upon the established building lines.
- 8.31. It is noted that given the presence of established mature trees at the rear boundary of the property, the rear garden is shaded. During a Autumnal site visit, it was noted that many of these trees were evergreen and provided ample shade. By severing the side access it may result in a shaded garden, however the single-storey massing of the extensions proposed result in minimal further loss of light and therefore further harm.
- 8.32. To comply with the Good Design Guide, dwellings with three or more bedroom should also provide a minimum of 80m² of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m. The proposals are all provided with private outdoor amenity space that exceeds 10m in length and 126m² in total area, which is compliant with the Good Design Guide. Side pedestrian access is to be retained at the west boundary.
- 8.33. By virtue of the mitigated amenity impacts mentioned above, 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

- 8.34. 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.
- 8.35. 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.

- 8.36. 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.
- 8.37. 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).
- 8.38. Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.39. Table 28 (Residential Parking Standards) of the LHDG requires dwellings with up to three bedrooms should provide a minimum of two off-street parking spaces. This increases to a minimum of three off-street parking spaces for properties with four or more bedrooms. Any reduction below minimum standards will require robust justification.
- 8.40. The LHDG recommends that tandem parking layouts be avoided where possible. If more than two parking spaces are proposed in a tandem arrangement, only the first two will be counted towards the required minimum parking standards.
- 8.41. Figure 44 (Dimensions) of the LHDG requires minimum parking sizes to be 2.4m in width by 5.5m in depth, and an additional 0.5m in width is required the parking space is bounded by a wall, fence, hedge, line of trees or other similar obstructions on one side. This width increases to 1m if the parking space is bounded on both sides. Tandem parking spaces should be provided with a depth of 6m per space (i.e., a depth of 12m is required for two tandem parking spaces.).
- 8.42. The LHDG states that garages will not normally be counted as a parking space for the purpose of calculating parking provision for:
- The garage meets the minimum dimensions
 - Planning conditions are imposed to control the use of the garage; or
 - Restrictions are placed on converting the garage to a room that can be lived in.
- 8.43. In accordance with the LHDG single bay garages should have a minimum internal dimension of 3m in width by 6m in depth, with a minimum door width for 2.3m. This increases to 6m in width with a minimum door width of 4.2m for double garages.
- 8.44. The proposal sees the removal of the side driveway, severing vehicular access to its rear detached garage. This regrettably, results in the loss of at least two off-street car parking spaces at the side of the property (and replacement with an integrated garage that does not meet the requirements of the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide).

- 8.45. The scheme, however, does not create an additional bedroom and retains its current provision of four bedrooms. The loss of approximately two off-street car parking spaces results in insufficient off-street parking to meet the demand of the property.
- 8.46. As it is considered there is off-street parking for two vehicles for the dwelling, either to park in tandem or side by side (which would not meet the dimensions outlined in the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide) and given there is sufficient on-street parking in the immediate area, it is considered the proposal does not create an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the road network. Therefore, the scheme is regarded as 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.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1. 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**

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:

- Application Form
- Proposed Block Plan, Floor, Roof Plans, Elevations - Drg No. P01 51 LE99NN 02
- Design and Access Statement
- Heritage Statement
- Conservation Management Plan
- Biodiversity Report
- Appraisal Plan
- All received by the Local Planning Authority on 12/09/25

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 proposed extension, porch and alterations shall accord with the approved plan as follows:

- Proposed Block Plan, Floor, Roof Plans, Elevations - Drg No. P01 51 LE99NN 02 – received 12/09/25.

Reason: To ensure that the development has a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with Policies DM1, DM10 and DM11 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

a. **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.
2. Development Low Risk Area - Standing Advice

The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is

encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242.

Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

Standing Advice valid from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 2026.