

## Delegated Report

**Planning Reference:** 25/00501/HOU  
**Applicant(s):** Mr and Mrs Chapman  
**Ward:** Newbold Verdon with Desford and Peckleton



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

**Application Site:** 66 Manor Road, Desford L89 9JS

**Proposal:** Single storey side extension

**Case Officer:** Gwion Russell (Planning Officer)

**Date:** 01/07/2025

---

### 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 full planning permission for a single-storey side extension to 66 Manor Road, Desford.

2.2. The extension externally measures 3.15m in width, 10.15m in depth with a setback of 1m from the principal frontage. The side extension element includes the removal of an internal wall to create an open-space kitchen area to the rear and an enclosed Utility room to the front. A non-dominant door is proposed at the front elevation of the proposed extension also, leading into the Utility room. Overall, the proposed scheme has a footprint of 31.25m<sup>2</sup>.

### 3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

3.1. The application dwelling is a two-storey, detached property on Manor Road in Desford. The property is set back 13.7m from the highway and has a notable hipped roof structure which is consistent with nearby properties. It is constructed with a 'red' brick finish and 'Mock Tudor' detailing on its projecting gable covering both the ground and first-floor bay windows. Properties along Manor Road are typically two-storey in massing with similar external finishes, massing and scales. However, further afield there is generally more variety in building styles, massing and design. Manor Road is an arterial road which is predominantly residential and sits within the settlement boundary of Desford.

### 4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 There is no relevant planning history associated with this property.

## **5. Publicity**

5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.

5.2 No responses have been received.

## **6. Consultation**

6.1 There have been no objections from the following consultants:

- LCC's Ecology Unit

6.2 There have been no comments received from the following consultants:

- Desford Parish Council

6.3 No further responses have been received.

## **7. Policy**

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 16: Housing Density, Mix and Design

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 Desford Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2036 (DNP) (2021):

- Policy H7: Housing Design

7.4 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

7.5 Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)

- 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 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 scale 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 H7 (a) of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan states that care should be taken to ensure that the development does not disrupt the visual amenities of the street scene and impact negatively on any significant wider landscape views and Policy H7 (i) states that development should be of a density that respects the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting.
- 8.9 The width of the side extension element is proposed to extend close to the existing property boundary. However, as there is still a separation distance of 3.1m from the neighboring dwelling, No. 64 Manor Road, this will be consistent with usual property separation distances in the area. In addition, the proposed single-storey side extension appears subservient to the main dwelling with a setback distance of 1.74m which as a result mitigates any design impact and respects separation distance.
- 8.10 The proposed external materials are to match the existing, with brickwork to match existing and roof tiles to match those currently in place. The pitch of the rear extension is proposed to align with that of the previous extension constructed under Permitted Development rights. The roofs of the proposed side single-storey extension are designed with three elements. The rear roof is design to match the existing rear extension roof. At the front, the design incorporates a feature that conceals a flatter pitched roof at the centre of the extension, respecting and concealing its design. As a result, it is seen to comply with DM10 of the SADMP.
- 8.11 The proposed roof pitch of the rear extension, as a whole, will be of a different pitch to that of the main dwelling. However, if it were designed to be the same pitch it may create an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties and the design would be inconsistent with the scale and massing of dwellings in the area. As a result, it is seen to comply with Policy H7 (a) and (i) of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan.
- 8.12 The rear single storey element is in close proximity to the garage outbuilding, however as the side extension conceals, and aligns with, the existing outbuilding, this mitigates design impact and is therefore seen to comply with DM10 of the SADMP.
- 8.13 The frontage of the single-storey extension proposes a non-dominant door that serves an internal utility room. There is a risk that this poses a design challenge with two external doors at the frontage of a property. The host dwelling is setback 13.7m from the highway and benefits from an enclosed front garden, and as such bears little design impact on the immediate street-scene.
- 8.14 It is noted that the neighbouring property, No. 68 Manor Road, has a two-storey side extension which appears greater in massing and scale than what is proposed at the host property and, as a result, will not look incongruous and may even enhance the design consistency of the immediate street-scene.
- 8.15 By virtue of the distance from the highway, the design, the proposed use of matching external materials, the scale and the limited prominence of the extension, the proposal respects the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area

and is in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy H7 of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.16 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.
- 8.17 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.
- 8.18 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.
- 8.19 The Good Design Guides states that side-to-side distances should be at least 2m, with a 1m separation distance from the property boundary to aid neighbouring amenity, however, single-storey extensions are acceptable up to the boundary. The proposed extension at No. 66 Manor Road is positioned close to the boundary but maintains a side-to-side separation distance of 3.6m. Due to the massing of the side-storey extension and separation distance it will not cause overlooking or loss of privacy for any nearby neighbours.
- 8.20 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.
- 8.21 The Good Design Guide states extensions should not exceed 45-degrees from the centre of the nearest principal window to a habitable room. The side extension does not breach the 45-degree guidance from the rear habitable windows of No. 64 Manor Road. Additionally, there are no principal habitable windows on the side elevation of No. 64 Manor Road so the proposal does not raise concerns regarding overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 8.22 The proposed side extension is completely concealed from and is not seen by adjacent No. 68 Manor Road and thus will not cause any overbearing, loss of privacy or loss of light for the residents at this property.
- 8.23 The proposed side extension is concealed by an existing garage outbuilding within the curtilage of the host property and therefore there is no residential amenity

impact for the residents in the property to the rear, No. 1 Manor Gardens. In addition, the separation distance between two principal windows to habitable windows should be a minimum of 21m. There is a separation distance of 20m from the existing garage outbuilding to the side elevation of No. 1 Manor Gardens, however the proposed development does not impact this separation distance.

- 8.24 Properties on the opposite side, along Manor Road, are separated by a wide arterial road and therefore it would be reasonable to assume there will be no residential amenity impact for these residents.
- 8.25 3.85m is the highest ridge line of the front elevation roof but as this is adjacent to the driveway of No. 64 Manor Road it will not cause any significant loss of light, overbearing or loss of privacy to this property. The rooflight windows that are proposed on the roof will not have a direct view into the rear garden or driveway of No. 64 Manor Road.
- 8.26 To comply with the Good Design Guide, three-bedroom houses should also provide a minimum of 80m<sup>2</sup> of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m. The proposals retain 250m<sup>2</sup> of total area and a length of 18m, which is compliant with the Good Design Guide. There is also a side access retained at the West boundary of the property.
- 8.27 By virtue of these factors and the fact that there have been no objections to the scheme, 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

- 8.28 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.
- 8.29 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.
- 8.30 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.

- 8.31 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).
- 8.32 Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.33 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.
- 8.34 Any reduction below minimum standards will require robust justification.
- 8.35 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.
- 8.36 Given that the scheme does not create any new bedrooms and provision for four off-street parking spaces has been provided 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, Policy H7 (b) of the Desford Neighbourhood Plan 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 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 received by the Local Planning Authority as follows:

- Block plan & Location map, Drg No. 2025-11-01
- Car Parking Layout, Drg No. 2025-11-04
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Elevations, Drg No. 2023-11-03
- Application Form
- All received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.05.2025

**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).

### 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](mailto:building.control@blaby.gov.uk) or call 0116 272 7533.