

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/01033/HOU

Applicant: Mr Richard Johnson

Ward: Twycross Sheepy & Witherley



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 2 Old Forge Road Fenny Drayton Nuneaton

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension with the addition of a front porch.

1. Recommendations

1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report.

2. Planning application description

- 2.1. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension and a front porch at 2 Old Forge Road, Fenny Drayton.
- 2.2. The proposed porch would project outwards from the existing front elevation by 1.09 metres for a width of 2.25 metres and would have a forward-facing gable form measuring 2.31 metres to the eaves and 3.07 metres to the ridge. It would be constructed out of red facing brick, oak post and beam supports, and brown interlocking roof tiles.
- 2.3. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project outwards from the existing rear elevation serving 'bed 2' by 6.66 metres for a width of 4.50 metres, then angling 45° back towards the existing rear elevation for 5.96 metres. It would have a flat roof form measuring 3.70 metres in height (including the proposed roof lantern) and would be finished in red facing brick, black painted timber/aluminium openings, and brown interlocking roof tiles.
- 2.4. Associated works include the demolition of the existing conservatory, alterations to the fenestration and the incorporation of render to the existing elevations.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application site relates to a detached residential bungalow situated within the settlement boundary of Fenny Drayton.
- 3.2. The application dwelling is characterised by a predominant dual-pitched roof form with a hipped roof form to the rear conservatory and a flat roof form to the south-western single garage and to the dormer atop of the integral double garage. It is finished in red brick, brown interlocking roof tiles and white timber/uPVC openings. To the sites frontage sits a substantial area of hardstanding and amenity grass/vegetation which is bound by low arched timber fencing. Further private amenity space is present to the rear.
- 3.3. Open fields sit to the north and east of the site with residential development to the south and west.

4. Relevant planning history

74/00055/4

- Extension to existing bungalow to provide bedroom and garage
- Planning Permission
- 23.05.1974

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, no representations have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1. LCC Ecology:

- The comments received from County Ecology have been incorporated into the body of this report.

6.2. Witherley Parish Council:

- No representations have been received.

7. Policy

7.1. Core Strategy (2009)

- Rural Villages

7.2. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM10: Development and Design

7.3. National Planning Policies and Guidance

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

7.4. Other relevant guidance

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

8. Appraisal

- 8.1. The proposed development is for extensions and alterations to existing to a property located within the settlement boundary of Fenny Drayton. As such, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development under Policy DM1 of the adopted SADMP and Policy S4 of the NPPF. 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 ecology

Design and impact upon the character of the area

- 8.2. Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF confirms that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with Policies L2 and L3 of the NPPF.
- 8.3. To create well-designed places, Policy DP3 (2(c)) of the NPPF states that development proposals should also create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place and pride,

including through the use of a coherent palette of materials, design features and planting.

- 8.4 Policy DP3 (3) of the NPPF states that development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with NPPF Policy DP3(1) or relevant aspects of the principles in Policy DP3 (2) of the NPPF, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.
- 8.5 Policy DP3 (4) of the NPPF highlights that the principles set out in the Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance should be used to inform how this policy is applied in the absence of locally produced design policies, guides, codes or masterplans.
- 8.2 Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP seeks to ensure that development complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features and the use and application of building materials respects the materials of existing, adjoining/neighbouring buildings and the area generally.
- 8.3 The applicant proposes to construct a porch above the main entrance into the host dwelling. This aspect of the development is considered to be minor, bearing no significant impact upon the existing character of the dwelling or surrounding area.
- 8.4 The Council's GDG 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.
- 8.5 The Council's GDG states that flat roofs on extensions will not normally be considered appropriate where they do not form part of the original design of the house, however in some circumstances where they are not visible from the public realm and the use of a flat roof may result in a reduced visual impact, they may be considered acceptable, particularly if designed with a contemporary aesthetic style.
- 8.6 The proposed rear extension would be positioned in place of the existing conservatory (to be demolished) and would have a lesser projection, mirroring width and would replicate the eaves of the existing dwelling as to appear subordinate. The extension would have a flat roof form, which is not usually supported as it is not a common design feature within the borough, nonetheless as aforementioned the extension would be sited to the rear of the dwelling and as such would be screened from view. It is also observed that the site is already characterised by a flat roof form to the single garage. As a result, the proposed flat roof addition considered to be acceptable in these site-specific circumstances.
- 8.7 Associated works include minor alterations to the fenestration and the incorporation of render to the existing elevations, both which are considered to be appropriate. The existing street scene is varied in design, scale and finish with render present to numerous dwellings namely nos. 8 and 10 and as a result the addition of this material is not considered to bear any significant impacts upon the character of the area.
- 8.8 The proposal is therefore be considered to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP, the Council's GDG, and Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.6 Policy P3 (1) of the NPPF states that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or

the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people).

- 8.7 In accordance with Policy P3(2)(a) and (b) of the NPPF, development proposals should therefore:
- (a) Provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life. Where necessary suitable mitigation measures should be incorporated to secure acceptable living conditions;
 - (b) Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to reduce pollution affecting the wider area (such as through traffic and travel management or improved external lighting);
- 8.9 Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP requires that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings and the amenity of occupiers of the proposed development would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.10 The proposed extensions would be single-storey and would extend no further than the existing built form. In addition, the fenestration alterations to the immediate side elevation facing no.4 would be limited to the replacement of existing openings. In light of the above, the proposal would not be over dominant or result in the loss of light or privacy.
- 8.11 The Council's GDG states that Habitable rooms within a rear elevation should ideally not be less than 8.00 metres from the blank side of a single storey neighbouring property and that habitable rooms within rear elevations of neighbouring properties should never be less than 21.00 metres apart.
- 8.12 The proposed rear extension would be situated in excess of 21.00 metres away from neighbouring properties, 10 and 11 Rookery Close, as to not appear over dominant or result in the loss of light or privacy.
- 8.13 Overall, the proposal is considered to be in compliance with Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP, the Council's GDG and Policy P3 of the NPPF.

Impact upon ecology

- 8.14 Policy N2(1)(c) of the NPPF states that development proposals should take suitable opportunities to connect to and strengthen ecological networks that extend beyond the site, drawing on the measures proposed by Local Nature Recovery Strategies, National Forest Strategies and Community Forest Plans, where present, and other relevant assessments.
- 8.15 Policy N2(1)(f) of the NPPF requires development to minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs. Development proposals should incorporate integrated nest boxes (commonly known as swift bricks) into their construction unless there are compelling technical reasons which prevent their use, or would make them ineffective,

8.16 Policy N2(2) of the NPPF confirms that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then the development should be refused.

8.17 Policy DM6 of the adopted SADMP 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.

8.18 Due to the proposed impact the roof as well as good connective habitat (hedgerow to the east) a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was requested prior to determination. County Ecology have reviewed the submitted PRA and are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available to support determination of this application subject to a biodiversity enhancement scheme condition being implemented alongside a lighting informative.

8.19 By virtue of the above, subject to conditions, the development would accord with Policy DM6 of the adopted SADMP, and Policy N2 of the NPPF.

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. The Council have assessed the scheme and can conclude that the proposed unit would bear no adverse impacts upon the character of the area, neighbouring

amenity nor ecology as such it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with Policies DM1, DM6 and DM10 of the adopted SADMP, the Council's GDG, and Policies DP3 and P3 of the NPPF. The proposal is therefore recommended approval subject to the below 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 development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

- Location Plan as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24th October 2025.
- Proposed Site Plan, Drg No. 2528-02b;
- Proposed Elevations, Drg No. 2528-06
- Proposed Plans, Drg No. 2528-04 as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th February 2026.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM6 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Councils Good Design Guide (2020), and Policies DP3 and P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

3. No development shall take place until a biodiversity enhancement scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Enhancements shall include (but not limited to) at least one woodcrete/integrated bat box, the make/model and their locations. Any enhancement measures will need to be shown on all relevant submitted plans. All works are to proceed strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to protect the protected wildlife species and their habitats that are known to exist on site to accord with in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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 building.control@blaby.gov.uk or call 0116 272 7533.
- b) Lighting Artificial lighting may lead to an increase in disturbance to bat foraging and commuting routes therefore, it is recommended a low impact

lighting strategy will be adopted for the site. A detailed lighting scheme is recommended to be approved by a licensed bat ecologist following best practice guidelines outlined in Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night (ILP, 2023).