

Delegated Report

Planning Reference: 25/00524/HOU
Applicant(s): Mr Michael O'Rourke
Ward: Newbold Verdon with Desford and Peckleton



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Application Site: 57 Preston Drive, Newbold Verdon

Proposal: Two storey side extension and addition of porch to existing dwelling.

Case Officer: Gwion Russell (Planning Officer)

1. Recommendations

- 1.1. **Refuse planning permission** for the reasons detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This householder planning application seeks full planning permission for a two-storey side extension and the addition of a front porch to 57 Preston Drive, Newbold Verdon.
- 2.2. The two-storey side extension externally measures 3.35m in width and 5.33m in depth and will provide a sitting room on the ground floor and a bedroom and en-suite on the first floor. A porch is proposed at the property frontage which replaces an existing canopy that covers the existing front door and includes a w.c. The proposed porch measures 1.35m by 3.85m externally. The side extension proposes a subordinate hipped roof while the smaller front porch extension has a gabled roof.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached house located on Preston Drive, in the north-eastern part of Newbold Verdon, within the defined settlement boundary. The dwelling is set back approximately 4m from the road and features a hipped roof and a brick exterior. The design of properties along Preston Drive and adjacent streets is notably uniform, with all dwellings being semi-detached. However, there is some variation in external finishes, with brick and render being the most common and brick being the predominant material. The properties along Preston Drive and neighbouring streets are entirely residential.

4. Relevant Planning History

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

5. Publicity

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. No formal objections have been received.

6. Consultation

- 6.1 There have been no objections from the following consultees:

- Newbold Verdon Parish Council

- 6.2 There have been no comments received from the following consultees:

- Newbold Verdon Parish Council

- 6.3 No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

- 7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 12: Rural Villages
- 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 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

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

- 7.4 Other Relevant Guidance:

- HBBC 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 advises 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 In accordance with the Good Design Guide, two-storey side extensions should appear smaller in scale and massing in order to be subordinate to the main dwelling. Any proposal should be set down from the ridge of the existing house and set back from the front elevation by a minimum of 0.5m. Extensions to the front of properties should not normally extend beyond the front elevation by more than 2m

and not cover more than 50% of the front elevation. The proposed side extension maintains a 0.5m set down distance from the main dwelling roofline, the proposed porch projects 1.35m from the principal frontage and does not cover more than 50% of the proposed principal frontage. The two storey side extension is not set back from the front elevation. As a result, this aspect of the proposals fails to comply with the guidance set out in the Good Design Guide.

- 8.9 The majority of properties along Preston Drive, Statham Street and the wider estate are uniform in massing, size and scale but differ slightly in choice of external materials. In the immediate street-scene only five dwellings have a render finish but all properties along the Northeastern side of Statham Street are finished in their original brown brick. Upon initial assessment, it seems the estate is typical of 1930 - 1950s dwelling design where uniformity was commonplace.
- 8.10 Due to the flat topography of the site, the proposal is visible from the principal elevations of Nos. 88, 86, 84, 82, 80, 78 Preston Drive and properties on the northeastern side of perpendicular Statham Street. Due to the distinct layout and corner plot of the application site, the proposal will be seen by properties to the rear, also. As the proposed extensions, along with the existing dwelling, are to be finished in an off-white render, this would have a detrimental impact on the design of the estate but not significant enough to warrant refusal, due to the nearby properties which also have render finishes.
- 8.11 The scale of the side extension is contrary to the massing and scale of nearby properties and disrupts the design of the street which may result in an incongruous street-scene. This is exacerbated by the fact that the application site sits on a corner plot, which, according to the Good Design Guide, play an important role in setting the local design scene. Given that the side extension is sensitively designed to complement and be subservient to the main dwelling, through its choice of matching hipped roof and consistent finishing render, this is seen to mitigate any design drawbacks.
- 8.12 There are few frontage porches or front extensions within the immediate vicinity, so while the porch may look incongruous to the design of the street it would not warrant a refusal on this basis.
- 8.13 By virtue of its sensitive visual design, setback distance and matching materials the proposal is seen to be in partial accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.14 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.

- 8.15 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.
- 8.16 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.
- 8.17 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. Although the proposed extension sits perpendicular to No. 2 Statham Street there is a distance of just 4m from the application side elevation to the nearest habitable window of No. 2 Statham Street. Given the unusual relationship between the two dwellings it is considered that this minimal distance is likely to have a significantly detrimental impact on the amenity of occupiers of No. 2 Statham Street.
- 8.18 The massing and scale of the proposed two-storey side extension would result in an overdeveloped and overbearing appearance and would significantly harm the amenity of occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at 2 Statham Street when seeking to enjoy their small existing rear garden.
- 8.19 The proposal would result in a rear elevation length of 10.7m. Along with the fact that the dwelling is semi-detached, this will create a building that is approximately 19.5m in width, which will create a building with an elongated width, which not only will be incongruous to the street-scene but will also create an overbuilt and dominating building line which will contribute to the sense of overdevelopment.
- 8.20 Due to the direction of sun travel, the side extension will cause some loss of light to the rear garden of No. 2 Statham Street and may impact the ecological value and growth potential of the rear garden.
- 8.21 Due to the corner plot and its perpendicular positioning to nearby No. 2 Statham Street and the fact that the neighbouring dwelling also has a single-storey garage and extension on the side of the property (which is sensitive to the amenity of neighbouring properties), the 2-storey side extension will create almost a corner, terraced effect which will result in a separation of very little space.
- 8.22 The originally submitted plans have been amended and the width of the extension has been reduced by 39cm. While it is acknowledged that the applicant and agent have been pro-active in amending the plans and that the resulting proposals align slightly better with DM10 and the Good Design Guide, this reduction is still considered insufficient and the proposed two storey side extension still causes a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby dwellings.

- 8.23 Due to the general design and layout of the street, the rear garden of No. 2 Statham Street is relatively small by modern standards, with only 40m² of private enclosed rear space. Given the relationship between the two respective rear gardens the proposed extension would minimally impact the Applicant's rear garden space but would have a far greater and significantly detrimental effect on the rear garden of No. 2 Statham Street, making it feel even smaller and more enclosed by virtue of the two storey scale and massing of the proposal.
- 8.24 To comply with the Good Design Guide, three-bedroom houses should also provide a minimum of 80m² of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m. The proposal will retain 110m² of private garden space and a length of 19m, which is compliant with the Good Design Guide.
- 8.25 The proposals are unlikely to impact the amenity of the properties on the opposite side of Preston Road and Statham Street, due to the width of the road and adequate separation distance. The proposals are only minimally seen from the rear garden of No. 59 Preston Drive and so are unlikely to cause a detrimental impact on the amenity of this property.
- 8.26 Notwithstanding this, any separation distances or guidance set out in the Good Design Guide 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.
- 8.27 By virtue of these factors, it is considered that the mass, siting and scale of the proposal will significantly detrimentally impact the amenity of nearby residents, particularly of 2 Statham Street, as a result of the significant overbearing impact on the existing small rear garden and the significant loss of privacy and is therefore contrary to paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF, 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 The scheme retains its provision of three bedrooms by converting one existing bedroom to a study/office and constructing a new bedroom on the first floor of the extension. The existing principal frontage benefits from a wide, paved driveway approximately 6m in width, which appears to accommodate two vehicles side-by-side. In addition, the surrounding area offers ample on-street parking, supported by the site's flat topography and its location on a quiet residential road. Given these factors, it is considered that the dwelling has sufficient off-street parking provision. Consequently, the proposal is not expected to result in any unacceptable impact on highway safety or place undue pressure on the local road network. Additionally, during the site visit, no parking issues were observed. This suggests that if parking is not a concern at present, it is unlikely to become one in the future. 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 be refused.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Reasons detailed at the end of this report.

12. Reasons

1. By virtue of its siting, scale and massing, the proposal would have a significantly detrimental effect on the amenity of occupiers of 2 Statham Street as a result of the overbearing effect of the proposed two storey side extension, which is exacerbated by the small existing size of the rear garden of 2 Statham Street. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), contrary to the requirements of the adopted Good Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and contrary to paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Notes to applicant

1. This application has been assessed and determined with reference to the submitted Householder Planning Application Form (received by the local planning authority on 15/05/25) and Plans and Elevations Existing and Proposed Drg. no 2025/9563/01D 9563AS_57 AJS/AJA (received by the local planning authority on 24/06/25).