

Officer Report

Planning Ref: 25/00941/HOU

Applicant: Mr Kevin Daly

Ward: Hinckley Castle



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 28 Springfield Road Hinckley Leicestershire

Proposal: First floor extension over existing garage, single storey rear extension, replacement roof, windows and doors and external facade re-dressed.

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 full planning permission for a first-floor extension over the existing garage, single storey rear extension, replacement roof, windows and doors and external facade being re-dressed at 28 Springfield Road Hinckley.
- 2.2. The proposed first floor side extension would have a width of 4.28 metres and a ground-floor depth of 11.72 metres, with a first-floor depth of 8.16 metres. It would feature a gabled roof with an eave's height of 5.43 metres and a ridge height of 7.53 metres. In addition, the proposal includes a mono-pitched roof to the first-floor front elevation, with an eave's height of 2.08 metres and a ridge height of 3.44 metres.
- 2.3. The proposed rear extension would measure 4 metres in depth and 14.8 metres in width. It would feature a flat roof with a height of 2.87 metres and would also include a lantern roof on top.
- 2.4. The proposal would also include an increase to the existing roof line to create a straight profile that would create a cross-gabled roof form.
- 2.5. A contemporary glazed treatment is proposed to the front elevation, incorporating the main entrance and the associated double-height void, thereby introducing a modern architectural feature to the principal façade.
- 2.6. It also proposes re-dressing all the windows and doors openings from white uPVC to black PPC aluminium casement units.
- 2.7. The external walls will be finished in render and brickwork to match the existing property.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Hinckley. The street scene is a mix of detached and semi-detached properties of different size, design and finishes. A number of the properties within the street have been extended to the side.
- 3.2. 28 Springfield Road is a detached two-storey dwelling. The property features a modern architectural façade to the principal elevation, incorporating black and red brickwork alongside areas of white render. The plot is comparatively large, and the dwelling is positioned on land that slopes downwards from the street level and relative to the adjoining neighbouring property.
- 3.3. The adjacent neighbouring properties occupy large plots with substantial built forms, some of which are partly stepped. In contrast, the remaining dwellings within the wider area are generally set within smaller plots.
- 3.4. The dwelling is set back from the highway with a small front garden and a driveway.

4. Relevant planning history

13/01072/HOU

- Extensions and alterations to dwelling
- PER
- 03.03.2014

5. Publicity

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.
- 5.2 Three objections were received in relation to the initial design. Following amendments to the proposal and a subsequent public re-consultation, a further objection was received.
- 5.3 Issues raised relate to boundary ownership, mutual boundary trees, and the impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. Concerns are raised with the legality of removing trees on a shared boundary, the impact their removal would have on residential amenity and biodiversity concerns. Concerns have been raised regarding views of the extension, a sense of overdominance and overshadowing. In addition concerns have been raised regarding impacts on Severn Trent infrastructure, right of access during construction and noise and disturbance during construction.
- 5.4 One support comment was received stating that the resident was satisfied that the plans had been drawn up with proper consideration for the surrounding properties.

6. Consultation

- 6.1 An objection was received from LCC Ecology on 17 November 2025, requesting a bat survey. The applicant subsequently provided the bat survey on 30 January 2026,

after which the ecology officer advised that no further bat surveys are required and that they have no objection. The officer advised that a condition relating to swift nest protection is required.

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 DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- 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
- Ecology Matters
- Other matters

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), two storey side extensions should appear smaller in scale and massing in order to be subordinate to the main dwelling. Any proposal for a two-storey side extension should be set down from the ridge of the existing house and set back from the front elevation (the minimum distance for this should be 0.5 metres in both directions) unless in design terms this in itself would create an imbalance in the overall design of the property.
- 8.5 Although the side extension would not be set back at ground-floor level, consistent with the line of the existing garage, the proposed first-floor element would be set back by 2 metres and set down by 1 metre from the existing main ridge height. Given the overall dimensions, modest scale, and the established character of the area, the extension is considered to be subordinate to the host dwelling. As such, it is not considered to have any adverse impact on the design quality or character of the surrounding area.
- 8.6 According to the HBBC Good Design Guide (2020), rear extensions should be designed to be clearly subordinate to the main dwelling. They should have an appropriate height, width and depth, and should reflect or complement the detailing and materials of the original building. Although a flat roof is not normally encouraged under the Good Design Guide, the extension is single-storey and would not be visible from public viewpoints. Whilst a large extension, by virtue of its scale in comparison to the existing two storey dwelling, the rear extension is considered to be subordinate to the main dwelling.
- 8.7 The proposal also includes raising the existing roof line to create a straight profile, resulting in a cross-gabled roof form. This increase would not exceed the maximum height of the existing building, nor would it be higher than the adjacent neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposed increase in roof height is not considered to have any adverse impact on the design, streetscene, or the character of the surrounding area considering the mixed characteristics of the area.
- 2.8. A contemporary glazed treatment is proposed to the front elevation, incorporating the main entrance and the associated double-height void, thereby introducing a modern architectural feature to the principal façade. The proposal also includes re-dressing all the windows and doors openings from white uPVC to PPC aluminium casement units in black. Given the variety of designs in the area, the alternations are not considered to cause any harm to the design and character of the area.
- 8.8 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

- 8.9 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.
- 8.10 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.
- 8.11 The HBBC Good Design Guide (2020) (GDG) 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.
- 8.12 The properties most directly affected by the proposed development are No. 26 Springfield Road to the west, No. 30 Springfield Road to the east, and No. 34 Hurst Road to the south-east of the host dwelling.
- 8.13 One ensuite window and a side door are proposed in the side elevation facing No. 26 Springfield Road, considering the presence of existing windows in this elevation and the nature of the rooms they serve, the windows will not cause additional overlooking. The separation distance between the properties would remain unchanged, and no other significant alterations are proposed on this side. Therefore, the extension is not considered to have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of residents at No. 26.
- 8.14 No. 30 Springfield Road, as mentioned above, is located to the east of the host dwelling and would retain a separation distance of 1 metre. Although a 2-metre distance is recommended in the Good Design Guide, given this is an existing situation, the topographical setting of the host dwelling—being at a lower level than the adjacent property—and the absence of any proposed windows on this side of the main dwelling and no.30, the side extension is not considered to cause any overbearing, overdominant, loss of privacy, or loss of light impacts on this neighbouring property or its amenities. The rear windows at No.30 are set away from the shared boundary ensuring that despite the depth of the extension, it does not breach the 45⁰ guidance. It is likely there will be some additional enclosure to the rear of this property but in light of the above, this would not be to a harmful degree.
- 8.15 No.34 Hurst Road, is located to the south-east of the main dwelling. The rear garden boundary of No.34 and part of the side boundary of the application dwelling are shared. A line of mature conifer trees are present on the boundary, there is dispute between the parties as to who owns the trees. Concerns have been raised regarding a sense of overdominance, loss of light and the visual impact of the extension upon No.34 should it be approved. In its amended form the proposed extension extends only marginally along the rear boundary of No.34. Therefore, whilst it may be visible (were the boundary trees to be removed) it would not extend significantly along the rear boundary of the dwelling. The separation distance between the dwelling and

proposed extension is approximately 28m which significantly exceeds the separation distance guidance within the HBBC GDG. Ground floor windows would be screened by the existing boundary treatment or replacement conventional boundary treatment. The proposal includes a first-floor window closer to the shared boundary with No.34, however, this would not cause significantly adverse overlooking beyond the existing situation and in the context of surrounding two storey dwellings with windows facing no.34.

- 8.16 Given the presence of the flat roof to the single-storey rear extension below the new first floor windows, a condition is required to prevent any potential use of this flat roof as a balcony.
- 8.17 It is likely that nearby residents will experience noise and disturbance during construction of the extensions, however, this will be temporary. Some extensions and alterations can occur to residential properties without planning permission and for this reason, alongside the scale of development, a condition limiting construction activities is not judged to be reasonable or necessary in this case.
- 8.18 By virtue of 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

- 8.19 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.
- 8.20 Policy DM18 of the SADMP also requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.21 Table 28 (Residential Parking Standards) of the LHDG requires dwellings with four or more bedrooms to provide a minimum of three off-street parking spaces. The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to five. As the development would not result in the loss of the existing garage and the front driveway can accommodate two parking spaces, the proposal is not considered to have any adverse impact on parking provision, highway safety, or pedestrian safety.
- 8.22 Therefore, the scheme is regarded as being in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, and the LHDG.

Ecology matters

- 8.23 Policy DM6 of SADMP states that development proposals must demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation and geological value including proposals for their long-term future management.

- 8.24 The proposed extension involves significant alterations to the existing catslide roof and roof structure. Including the roofline, loft space, soffits and tiles which provide potential access and suitability for roosting bats. Bats are particularly associated with the roof structure of buildings, including lofts, rafters, beams, gables, eaves, soffits, flashing, ridge-tile, chimneys, the under-tile area, etc. but may also be present in crevices in stone or brickwork and in cavity walls. It is also proposed that the conifer trees onsite could be removed. In their initial consultation response on 17 November 2025, LCC stated that the submission of a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was required on the existing dwelling and conifers, prior to determination of the application.
- 8.25 The applicant submitted an ecological survey on 30 January 2026. The survey was reconsulted upon, and following this process, the Ecology team got back to LPA on 13 February 2026 stating *'The Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) carried out by Stefan Bodnar (January 2026) shows the dwelling is in good condition, and any missing hanging tiles have been investigated with an endoscope. The PRA has assessed the dwelling as having negligible bat roost potential and no evidence was found to indicate the presence of bats. Therefore, no further bat surveys are required, and we have no objection.'*
- 8.26 The ecology team also stated in their final letter that *"The site is located within a 'Swift Alert' zone as it is within 250m of recorded nest sites. Swifts are a declining species, and a priority species in our Local Biodiversity Action Plan, therefore ecological enhancements in the form of at least two swift boxes should be installed on the proposed building. It is preferable that the boxes/bricks are grouped together to increase the likelihood of uptake, given their natural social nesting behaviour. The boxes/bricks should be located at least 5m above ground level with a clear approach, close to the eaves and grouped together on the same elevation. Any enhancement measures need to be shown on all relevant submitted plans, including details of the make/model, installation height and location."* Details of the swift boxes have been submitted and are acceptable.

Other matters

- 8.27 Objections have been received regarding ownership of the shared boundary treatment. The neighbouring resident has expressed concerns about the development due to its impact on the existing mature trees located along the shared boundary. As outlined above, the trees are not considered to have high ecological value and the trees are limitedly visible from public viewpoints, their removal would not be resisted on visual amenity grounds. In assessing the application officers have considered the impact of the development on neighbouring properties should the boundary treatment be removed. The acceptability of the scheme is not reliant on the retention of the boundary trees.
- 8.28 Boundary ownership disputes are not material planning considerations. An informative note will be placed on the permission reminding the applicant that planning permission does not give permission to carry out works on land or to trees which are outside of their ownership. The case officer has advised the applicant to

resolve this matter directly with the concerned neighbour as it constitutes a civil issue rather than a planning consideration.

- 8.29 Separately concerns have been raised regarding Severn Trent infrastructure. Such issues fall outside of the planning application process and will be dealt with at Building Regulations stage or via separate consent regime with Severn Trent.

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 Elevations & 3D Floor Plans 2025-08111 Rev F
as received by the local planning authority on 16 February 2026 and

- Amended Proposed floor plan 2025-08 110E
as received by the local planning authority on 05 February 2026 and

- Proposed Block & Location Plans 120 Rev B

as received by the local planning authority on 04 December 2025.

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 flat roofed area of the rear extension hereby approved shall not at any time be used as a balcony or sitting out area neither shall any balustrade, railings, wall or other means of enclosure be erected on any part of the flat roof.

Reason: In the interest of the residential amenity and privacy in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

4. Prior to first occupation of the extensions hereby approved 2 swift boxes/bricks shall be installed in accordance with the approved plan Proposed Elevations & 3D Floor Plans 2025-08111 Rev F and submitted Internal/External Bat Survey by Stefan Bodnar. Once installed the swift boxes/bricks shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to provide measurable net gains for biodiversity and to accord with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

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. Nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); therefore, building demolition and significant alteration should take place outside the breeding season (March to August inclusive) unless carefully checked beforehand by a suitably qualified person.