

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/00126/HOU

Applicant: Mr Indi Johal

Ward: Markfield Stanton & Fieldhead



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: Coalbourne Cottage Whitwick Road Copt Oak

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension and outbuilding

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 consent for a single storey side and rear extension and outbuilding at Coalbourne Cottage, Whitwick Road, Copt Oak, Markfield.
- 2.2. The proposed single storey side/rear extension would project outwards from the eastern side elevation by 1.11 - 5.02 metres for a width of 7.87 metres. It would have a flat roof form which would measure 3.63 metres in height (including the proposed roof lantern). Three two pane windows and a set of French doors are proposed to the eastern elevation and three two pane windows are proposed to the southern elevation.
- 2.3. The proposed single storey outbuilding would have a depth of 6.00 metres for a width of 11.90 metres. It would have a hipped form with dual pitched forward fronting twin gables measuring 2.35 metres to the eaves and 4.00 metres to the ridge. Two full length two pane windows would sit within either gable to the front elevation with a set of French doors and sidelights in between. A single pane window is proposed to either side elevation with a further full length two pane window to the rear accompanied by three Velux rooflights.
- 2.4. The proposed materials would match those of the existing dwelling.
- 2.5. The originally proposed two-storey element has since been removed from the description.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application site relates to a two-storey detached residential dwelling, situated outside of the settlement of Markfield, but also located within the boundaries of the Charnwood Forest and the wider National Forest. The pitched roof dwelling hosts various flat roof elements (predominantly to the dormers) and compromises the use of stone and white render to the walls of which also extends to the boundary wall, brown tiles to the roof and brown traditional picture windows. The dwelling occupies an extensive plot which accommodates three detached outbuildings to the south, one proposed to be demolished and rebuilt as part of the scheme.
- 3.2. A substantial row of hedgerows line the entire boundary line of the site, predominantly screening the site from its surroundings, with two openings to the south allowing for pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. The site can be accessed to the east of Whitwick Road via a private access track which also serves Ulverscroft Grange, a site which hosts a tearoom and range of charity shops.

- 3.3. The application dwelling is one of a number of sporadic dwellings constructed along Whitwick Road. Whitwick Road has a strongly rural character being flanked predominantly by agricultural fields and woodland.

4. Relevant planning history

76/01911/4M

- Construction of enclosed swimming pool
- Planning Permission
- 22.02.1977

79/01127/4M

- Extension to dwelling
- Planning Permission
- 02.08.1979

81/00922/4

- Garage and sun lounge extensions
- Planning Permission
- 09.10.1981

07/00414/FUL

- Demolition of existing swimming pool, garage and flat roofed bay and erection of extensions and alterations to dwelling
- Planning Permission
- 12.06.2007

24/10139/PREHMO

- Proposed extensions to dwelling house and proposed outbuilding in lieu of existing outbuilding
- 24.10.2024
- Closed

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 publication, no comments have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1. Markfield Parish Council;

- No comments have been received.

6.2. Natural England;

- No comments have been received.

6.3. LCC Ecology:

'Holding Objection - Further information required

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION PROVIDED:

- *The updated survey carried out by Ridgeway Ecology (March 2025), this appears to be similar to the previous survey with one alteration, the addition of Figure 2: Location of identified bat roosts. This is helpful with highlighting the roosts within the main dwelling and the proximity to the proposed works.*
- *The proposed works have also been revised (Drawing 200 - Revision A, Drawing 201 – Revision A) and appear to show the proposed two storey side extension has been removed. Therefore, the impact on the existing dwelling and potential roost features is reduced given this change.*
- *The only remaining works to the existing dwelling is the attached orangery, this is a single storey extension will no direct impact to the roof or the roof line. Therefore, given the additional image showing the location of the roosts, which is not in close proximity of the build and the nature of the proposed remaining works, no further surveying is required on the main dwelling. However, it is worth noting if any future proposed works were to impact the tiles, roof void or roof line, further surveying would be required.*
- *To ensure that the bats are not affected by the proposed works and during the construction, a CEMP is required. Please see the below condition. This considers the recommendations stated within Section 5 of the report.*
- *Nevertheless, it appears the demolition of the detached outbuilding is to still take place. Therefore, our previous comments regarding the outbuilding remain the same. - The outbuilding was found to be classified as being of moderate roost potential given the presence of potential roost features including openings under the tiles, leading to an inaccessible cavity underneath and potentially the enclosed roof void. Therefore, to determine whether bats are roosting in the inaccessible areas, at least two emergence surveys are required.*
- *The survey should be in line with the Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines 4th edition (Collins, J. 2023), highlighted in Table 7.2 of the Good Practice Guidelines. Please see previous comments in relation to this.*
- *The survey should assess the potential impacts of proposed works to the outbuilding and should also include recommendations to inform any enhancements or mitigation that might be necessary as a result of the survey, designed in line with Natural England's & CIEEMs Bat Mitigation Guidelines. Any recommendations will need to be incorporated into the submitted plans.*
- *This should also advise bat and any bird box enhancements.*
- *I have a holding objection until the above is supplied. The bat emergence survey should be submitted and approved by the LPA prior to determination.*

FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED:

- *At least two bat emergence surveys to be carried out on the outbuilding, in line with the good practice guidelines, and should also include recommendations to inform any enhancements or mitigation that might be necessary.*
- *Construction Environment Management Plan*

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS TO BE APPLIED:

- *No development shall take place until a Construction Environment Management Plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The CEMP shall include the following details:*
 - a. *Identification of potentially damaging construction activities*
 - b. *practical measures and sensitive working practices to avoid or reduce impacts during construction on bats*
 - c. *timing of destructive work to avoid those periods when bats are most vulnerable (e.g. between 15th April and 15th September when maternity colonies may be present and between 1st December and 1st March when bats may be hibernating)*
 - d. *responsible persons for overseeing sensitive works*
 - e. *A lighting scheme across the whole site that takes bats into account. For example, the provision of low-level lights with UV filters and directional shrouding/shields to prevent unnecessary light spill above the top of the ground floor level and the avoidance of floodlighting unless it is on a short timer.*

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.'

7. Policy

7.1. Markfield Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2039

- Policy M1: Countryside
- Policy M2: Landscape Character
- Policy M4: Ecology and Biodiversity
- Policy M10: Design

7.2. Core Strategy (2009)

- Policy 7: Key Rural Centres
- Policy 8: Key Rural Centres relating to Leicester
- Policy 21: National Forest
- Policy 22: Charnwood Forest

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

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.4. National Planning Policies and Guidance

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

7.5. Other relevant guidance

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

- The Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024)

8. Appraisal

8.1. Key Issues

- Assessment against strategic planning policies
- Design and impact upon the character of the area and surrounding countryside, Charnwood Forest and National Forest
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision
- Impact upon ecology

Assessment against strategic planning policies

8.2 Notwithstanding that the application site is located in the countryside; the NPPF and Policy DM1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies provide a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies sets out the circumstances in which development would be considered sustainable within the countryside, such as a householder application which leads to the enhancement of the immediate setting and does not impact upon the intrinsic value of the open character of the countryside. Policy M1 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) also seeks to ensure that land outside the settlement boundary will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all.

8.3 This application proposes a single storey side/rear extension and outbuilding to an existing dwelling and therefore is a sustainable development within the countryside and acceptable in principle. Compliance with the relevant sections of Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies and Policy M1 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) will be assessed further in the following section.

Design and impact upon the character of the area and surrounding countryside, Charnwood Forest and National Forest

8.4 Policy 21 of the adopted Core Strategy supports proposals where the siting and scale of the proposed development is appropriately related to its setting within the National Forest and where it respects the character and appearance of the wider countryside.

8.5 Policy 22 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that proposals within the Charnwood Forest retain local character and complement the local landscape.

8.6 Policy M1 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) states the Countryside will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. The following types of development will be supported in countryside locations: 1. Recreation and tourism that cannot be provided within the Settlement Boundary; 2. Development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers; 3. The subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; and 4. Development that is otherwise in accordance with: national policies; or strategic planning policies or allocations; or with the other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

8.7 Policy M2 of the 'made' MNP requires that development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting.

8.8 Policy M10 of the 'made' MNP states that development must be sympathetic to local character and history, be in keeping with the scale, form and character of its

surroundings, protect important features such as hedgerows and trees and meet the general design principles of the National Forest.

- 8.9 Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies allows for sustainable development in the countryside where it meets specific criteria. Criterion b) allows for development where it is for the extension of the existing buildings which lead to the enhancement of the immediate setting and therefore the proposal is acceptable subject to 5 sub-criteria that must be also met. Criterion i) is most relevant and requires that the development represents no significant adverse effects to the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside location.
- 8.10 Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies requires new development to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, mass, design, materials and architectural features and for building material to respect existing/neighbouring buildings and the local area generally. The Council's adopted Good Design Guide provides further advice in respect of the siting and design of house extensions.
- 8.11 The application seeks full planning consent for a single storey side and rear extension and outbuilding at Coalbourne Cottage, Whitwick Road, Copt Oak, Markfield.
- 8.12 The Council's Good Design Guide states, *'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.'* and,
"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.'
- 8.13 The proposed single storey extension hosting an orangery/spice room would be situated to the eastern side elevation of the dwelling. The extension would protrude past the existing building line, nevertheless as the extension would be generously set behind the principle elevation and would be of a single storey nature the impacts would be minimal. It would host a flat roof, with a recessed roof lantern to the midpoint, along with six windows and a set of French doors. As per the above, generally flat roofs should be avoided as they do not represent a traditional roof form prevalent in the Borough, especially when they do not form part of the existing dwellings design. However, due to the proposals set-back distance from the highway the proposal would not being prominent within the street scene, the addition of a flat roof is not considered to bear any additional detrimental impacts upon the character of the area.
- 8.14 This is a householder application which cannot seek planning permission for a new dwelling or the sub-division of the existing planning unit. Instead, the application seeks approval for the construction of a detached single storey outbuilding to be used as a self-contained ancillary residential annexe to the main dwelling. In any case, should the application be otherwise considered to be acceptable, a standard condition restricting the use of the annexe as only for ancillary accommodation to the residential occupation of the host dwelling could be included to ensure its use would remain compatible with the site.
- 8.15 The proposed detached single storey 'C' shaped outbuilding would replace the existing 'L' shaped outbuilding. It would be situated to the far southern boundary of the site and would host a dual pitched roof design, similar to the design of the host

dwelling's rear elevation, albeit on a significantly smaller scale. Whilst the footprint of the replacement outbuilding would be substantially larger than the existing, in relation to the much greater scale of the existing dwelling it would not appear excessive within the extensive plot. The accommodation is indicated to host four rooms, two bedrooms, a kitchenette, and a bathroom, it is not, however indicated to have its own enclosed garden area or vehicular access. The outbuilding technically amounts to having all the facilities needed for independent living nevertheless given that a structure of this scale it could be constructed under Schedule 1, Class E of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), the outbuildings proximity from the main access, and the extensive plot where it is sited it is judged to be acceptable, subject to a standard condition restricting the use of the annexe as only for ancillary accommodation to the residential occupation of the host dwelling being included to ensure its use would remain compatible with the site.

- 8.16 The proposed materials are to match those of the existing dwelling.
- 8.17 A substantial row of hedgerows lines the entire boundary line of the site, predominantly screening the site from its surroundings, resulting in the site being significantly limited from a public vantage point. The impact upon the surrounding area is therefore considered to be considerably limited.
- 8.18 The proposals would therefore have no adverse impacts on the character of the area and surrounding countryside, Charnwood Forest and National Forest in accordance with Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, Policies 21 and 22 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies M1, M2 and M10 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) and the general principles of the Council's Good Design Guide in that respect.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.19 Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies and the Council's Good Design Guide require that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and/or amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings.
- 8.20 In this case the application relates to an extensive plot within the countryside with no nearby neighbouring dwellings in close proximity. The proposals would therefore have no adverse impacts on the residential amenity or privacy of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties and be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies in that respect.

Impact upon parking provision

- 8.21 Policy DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies supports development where there would be no significant impact upon highway safety. Policy DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies seeks to ensure an appropriate level of parking provision of appropriate design.
- 8.22 The Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024) seeks to ensure that a dwelling hosting four or more bedrooms provides an off-street parking provision for a minimum of three vehicles.
- 8.23 The proposed outbuilding would result in the dwelling serving seven bedrooms instead of the existing five. The extensive application site has an abundance of hard surfaced off-street parking space to serve the resulting dwelling and would not

involve the creation of an additional access. By virtue of the above, the proposals would retain more than adequate parking provision to serve the site and would not impact highway safety in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies and the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2024).

Impact upon ecology

- 8.24 Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016) 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.

- 8.25 Policy M4 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) states that proposals that cannot avoid harm to the biodiversity, or the geological significance of a site will not be supported.
- 8.26 In reference to Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005 "*It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may have not been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances.*"
- 8.27 The proposed development consists of the demolition of an existing outbuilding surrounded by good habitat connectivity. As such, this habitat could provide suitable foraging and good connectivity routes for bats, and the submission of a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was requested by LCC Ecology.
- 8.28 A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was submitted to the Local Planning Authority on the 20th May 2025, concluding that the main dwelling has a high bat roosting potential and the outbuilding has a moderate bat roosting potential. Following the above findings at least two emergence surveys in line with the Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines 4th edition (Collins, J. 2023) were requested by LCC Ecology to characterise the roosts and to determine whether bats are roosting in those parts of the house and outbuilding that could not be visually inspected, particularly in those areas where the proposed extensions/demolition will occur. Due to the additional cost implications, the applicant does not wish to instruct an ecologist to carry out the further recommended surveys. LCC Ecology's holding objection therefore remains in place.

- 8.29 Whilst the submission of the surveys would be the strongly preferred way forward, as the survey is limited to the proposed outbuilding which as rightly suggested by the agent is of a scale that could be constructed under Schedule 1, Class E of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) in this case the Local Planning Authority do not feel that the scheme merits refusal on ecology grounds alone. Furthermore, under a full planning application the Local Planning Authority hold power to impose the relevant conditions and informatives to ensure the protection of roosting bats which would be restricted if this element of the proposal was constructed under permitted development rights.
- 8.30 Notwithstanding, LCC Ecology's holding objection and the non-compliance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016), Policy M4 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) and Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005 on balance the proposed scheme of extensions and alterations is considered to be acceptable given the circumstances.

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 proposed development is for a property located within the countryside. As such, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development under Policy DM1 of the SADMP, as long as the proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies of the SADMP.
- 10.1 Whilst the proposed development would not accord with Policy DM6 of the SADMP and Paragraph 99 of Part IV of the ODPM Circular 06/2005 on balance as the proposal could be constructed under permitted development rights, whilst having no impacts upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area, neighbouring amenity of occupants surrounding the application site or off-street parking provision or highway safety, the proposal is therefore considered to acceptable in accordance with Policies DM1, DM4, DM10, DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, Policies 21 and 22 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies M1, M2, M4 and M10 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP), the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide

and the general principles of the Council's Good Design Guide. The proposal is, therefore, recommended for approval subject to 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 materials to be used externally shall accord with the approved application form, as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th February 2025.

Reason: To ensure that the development has a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with Policies DM1, DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, Policies 21 and 22 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies M1, M2 and M10 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) and the general principles of the Council's Good Design Guide.

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

- Proposed Side and Rear Extension - Floor Plans, Elevations, Drg No. 201 Rev A as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 23rd May 2025.
- Proposed Outbuilding - Floor Plan, Elevations, Site Location Plan, Block Plan, Drg No. 200 Rev B as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st July 2025.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1, DM4, DM6, DM10, DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, Policies 21 and 22 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies M1, M2, M4 and M10 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP), the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide and the general principles of the Council's Good Design Guide.

4. The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential occupation of Coalbourne Cottage and shall not be occupied, sold or separately leased or let as an independent unit of residential accommodation.

Reason: To ensure compatible use and that the detached building hereby permitted is not occupied as an independent unit of accommodation which may have additional impacts in accordance with Policies DM1, DM4, DM10, DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development

Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide.

5. No development shall take place until a Construction Environment Management Plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The CEMP shall include the following details:
 - f. Identification of potentially damaging construction activities
 - g. practical measures and sensitive working practices to avoid or reduce impacts during construction on bats
 - h. timing of destructive work to avoid those periods when bats are most vulnerable (e.g. between 15th April and 15th September when maternity colonies may be present and between 1st December and 1st March when bats may be hibernating)
 - i. responsible persons for overseeing sensitive works
 - j. A lighting scheme across the whole site that takes bats into account. For example, the provision of low-level lights with UV filters and directional shrouding/shields to prevent unnecessary light spill above the top of the ground floor level and the avoidance of floodlighting unless it is on a short timer.

Reason: In order to protect the protected wildlife species and their habitats that are known to exist on site in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Policy M4 of the 'made' Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (MNP).

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) The property is highly suitable for roosting bats, which are protected by law from harm. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that bat legislation is not breached and therefore may need to consult with a licenced bat ecologist prior to commencement to ensure that bats will not be impacted by the works. The applicant should ensure that all contractors and individuals working on the property are aware of this possibility, as works must cease if bats are found during the course of the works whilst advice from a bat ecologist is obtained. 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.