

Delegated Report

Planning Reference 25/00894/HOU
Applicant(s) Mr and Mrs Goodwin



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Ward
Application Site Nursery Barn Farm, Priory Lane, Far Coton, Market Bosworth

Proposal Single Storey Extension

Case Officer Rudi Simpson (Technical Planning Assistant)

1. Recommendations

- 1.1. **Refuse planning permission** subject to reasons 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 extension to the southern rear elevation of Nursery Barn Farm, Tinsel Lane, Far Coton, Market Bosworth. The single storey extension will measure 14m in length and 4.5m in width, which results in the formation of a 'U' shaped courtyard development within the wider site. The scheme will incorporate three different dual pitched roofs that have varying ridge heights between 3.3m and 3.6m. The proposed extension will be constructed with red brick and clay roof tiles to match the brick and roof materials of the existing dwelling. Several new openings are proposed to all four elevations, comprising of six new windows and four new doors.
- 2.2. During the Case Officer's site visit, the Agent advised that the proposed extension is required to provide level access living accommodation for the Applicants who are no longer able to access the first-floor areas of the existing dwelling.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site (Nursesey Barn) is situated to the south of Market Bosworth on Tinsel Lane, just west of the junction at Shenton Lane, within the designated open countryside. The property is set back from the public highway, and benefits from a large driveway that is capable of providing off road parking for multiple vehicles and is fronted by a mature hedgerow.
- 3.2. Nursery Barn consists of three individual agricultural units, which are joined in an 'L' shape formation, which have been converted into one residential dwelling via permission 15/00562/FUL. The original conversion was sympathetic to the original structures within the site and retained their original agricultural character and historic 'L' shaped form.

- 3.3. Nursery Barn is not listed, nor situated within a conservation area however, it is identified as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset of important historical significance within the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan (2025) and it is also recorded on the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) (reference: MLE25042).
- 3.4. Three further agricultural barns lie to the southwest of the application dwelling, outside of the red line boundary of the site, which were granted planning permission via applications 15/01337/GDO and 16/00490/FUL. Beyond this, the site is bounded by agricultural land, which is currently used by the Applicants to graze cattle.
- 3.5. The application site is within a Gas Transmission Buffer Zone and National Gas Transmission were therefore consulted on the development proposal. The site is also located within the Risk Impact Zones of the Ashby Canal and Kendall's Meadow, which are both Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Due to the nature of the proposal, no formal consultation is required for the SSSI's Risk Impact Zones or the Mineral Safeguarding Area.

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 15/00562/FUL

- Change of use from barn to dwelling along with extensions, associated access works, parking areas and residential curtilage
- PER
- 11.09.2015

4.2 15/01337/GDO

- Erection of steel framed agricultural building
- GDO
- 22.01.2016

4.3 16/00490/FUL

- Erection of 2x agricultural buildings
- PER
- 08.08.2016

5. Publicity

- 5.1 Due to the remote nature of the site no letters were sent to local residents, however a site notice was posted within the vicinity.
- 5.2 No responses have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1 There have been no objections from the Health and Safety Executive, Market Bosworth Parish Council, Market Bosworth Society, nor National Gas Transmission.

6.2 The Council's Conservation Officer raised the following concerns:

- The proposed U-shaped conversion deviates from the original form
- The extension is proposed to extend further to the South and West than the original conversion
- The proposed fenestration gives an overly domestic appearance
- Overall uncharacteristic layout, scale and appearance

6.3 No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- No relevant policies.

7.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016):

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Policy DM12: Heritage Assets
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3 Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan 2020 – 2039 (MBNP) (2025):

- Policy CE1: All New Development within Market Bosworth
- Policy CE5: Landscape of the Wider Parish
- Policy BD4: Heritage Asset Protection
- Policy DC1: Design Codes

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. Notwithstanding the countryside location of the development, extensions to existing domestic properties are generally considered to be sustainable development in principle. The key issues in respect of this application are therefore:

- Impact upon the significance of the historic environment
- 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 and the Historic Environment

8.2 Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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.

8.3 Chapter 16 of the NPPF provides the national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF addresses non-designated heritage assets stating that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

8.4 Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP seek to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets. Policy DM12 of the SADMP confirms that all developments affecting heritage assets and their setting will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the proposals are compatible with their significance and their setting. Assets identified on the Locally Important Heritage Asset List should be retained and enhanced wherever possible.

8.5 Policy BD4 of the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan (MBNP) states that proposals that will result in harm to, or unnecessary loss of, an asset of local heritage value listed in Appendix 1 Heritage Assets and referenced within the Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value (2023), will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that, on balance, the overall benefit outweighs any harm or loss.

- 8.6 Policy DM4(i) of the SADMP states that development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where it does not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside.
- 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 CE1(a) of the MBNP seeks to ensure that all new development is in keeping with the character area with regards to scale, layout and material.
- 8.9 The Good Design guide recognises that agricultural buildings were designed for a specific purpose, illustrating the historic agricultural processes which usually result in a specific appearance and layout. The basis for any conversion should therefore be an understanding of its original use and the evolution of the building or group.
- 8.10 When converting an agricultural building, the Good Design Guide places emphasis on the retention of the buildings agricultural character regardless of its new use to ensure that the building does not become overly domestic in appearance. Essentially, it should not look like a house. This includes avoiding domestic add-ons such as chimneys, dormer windows, conservatories, porches, visual clutter, domestic external lighting, domestic window or door styles and retaining features characteristic of the historic working buildings such as their apertures (openings). New openings should generally be avoided and kept to an absolute minimum when necessary. When justified, they should replicate existing proportions, construction, and should be placed into an appropriate reveal, and uPVC should always be avoided.
- 8.11 The Good Design Guide also states that it is not usually appropriate to extend an agricultural building or to add new buildings within its curtilage. Extensions risk losing the simple historic form of the building, and its own status as an ancillary outbuilding. The Good Design Guide does however note that in certain circumstances, a very high-quality addition or extension might be appropriate. Any extensions or additions should generally be simple, unobtrusive, and respect the plan form of the building and group layout. They should be also subordinate and should in no way impact the spatial and historic relationship of the farmstead.
- 8.12 The proposed site has been identified as a non-designated asset of heritage value due to its historic character as a historic barn, which is located within a prominent position in the landscape and its partial construction of Carlton Stone.
- 8.13 When the existing structures were converted into a dwelling via 15/00562/FUL, the Delegated Officer Report confirmed that the development was acceptable because:
- “This scheme has been sympathetically designed and dictated by the existing external appearance, internal configuration and the need to retain as much of the existing external façade and character as possible”*

- 8.14 This statement is supported by the Design and Access Statement that was submitted as part of this previous application, which confirms that the design ambitions of the development were to maintain:

“Maintain the overall character and appearance of the barns... respecting the individual character of each element and sensitively converting them into a new family home which will safeguard the barns for another Century for everyone driving along Coton Lane to appreciate.”

- 8.15 These comments demonstrate the importance of preserving the historic agricultural character and appearance of the site and this non-designated heritage asset.
- 8.16 The extension is considered to result in a convoluted ‘U’ shaped plan form for the building, which would considerably, and uncharacteristically, deviate from the original and simple plan form of the historic agricultural character of the existing property. This is considered to result in significant harm to the historic agricultural character and appearance of the host dwelling, and thus its significance as a non-designated heritage asset, and the rural character of the surrounding area and the designated open countryside
- 8.17 This significant adverse impact is considered to be exacerbated by the extensive footprint of the proposed extension, which would project further south and west than the original building. Ultimately, the proposed size and scale of the scheme are not considered to be subordinate to the host dwelling in these site-specific circumstances, nor respect or conserve the character of the non-designated heritage asset.
- 8.18 The development also proposes multiple additional openings, comprising of four natural timber double doors and six painted timber windows. Whilst it is accepted that timber is an historically appropriate material, the sheer volume of the proposed openings is considered to result in an overly domestic design which would be out of keeping with the original historic agricultural character of the property, and the rural character of the surrounding area.
- 8.19 Although the proposed siting of the development and the location of the existing buildings are considered to provide some degree of screening, the proposed extension would still be a prominent form of development that detracted from the character of the existing property from public views, such as along the public highway. This is considered to heighten the detrimental impact of the proposed development.
- 8.20 By virtue of these factors, the proposed extension is considered have an uncharacteristic layout, scale and appearance, which would result in significant harm to the historic agricultural character and appearance of the host dwelling, and its significance as a non-designated heritage asset, and the rural character of the surrounding area and the designated open countryside with minimal public benefit. Given the above, the proposal is considered to be contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4, DM10, DM11, and DM12 of the SADMP, Policies BD4 and CE1 of the MBNP, Paragraph 216 of the NPPF, and the Good Design Guide.

- 8.21 As such, the scheme is not well designed and fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, and therefore it is considered that the development should be refused in accordance with Paragraph 139 of the NPPF.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.22 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.
- 8.23 The Good Design Guide requires the way buildings relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity.
- 8.24 Due to its isolated rural location, there are no comparable properties nearby. The proposal is therefore not considered to raise any concerns in regard to its orientation or separation distances. Consequently, it is not considered that the proposal results in any significant harmful effects on neighbouring residential privacy or amenity.
- 8.25 To comply with the Good Design Guide, two-bedroom houses should provide a minimum of 60sqm of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m.
- 8.26 The property occupies a large plot with views to the open countryside beyond. Whilst the proposed extension would reduce the amenity space provided, ample private garden space is retained, thus satisfying the requirements of the Good Design Guide.
- 8.27 By virtue of the above the proposal is considered to be in accordance with DM10 of the SADMP and the Council's Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.28 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.
- 8.29 Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision. The Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) requires dwellings with up to three bedrooms to provide a minimum of two off-street parking spaces.
- 8.30 Access to the site is gained via an existing and unamended access from Tinsel Lane. Whilst the scheme provides an additional bedroom to the property, the existing site is considered to be able to accommodate at least three off-street vehicle parking spaces in accordance with the LHDG. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to result in any unacceptable impact upon highway safety or the road network 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.

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 Whilst the proposal is not considered to result in any significant adverse impacts to neighbouring residential amenity or highway safety, the proposal would result in significant harm to the historic agricultural character and appearance of the host dwelling, and its significance as a non-designated heritage asset, and the character of the surrounding area. Taking national and local planning policies into account, and regarding all relevant material considerations, it is recommended that planning permission to be refused.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to the reasons detailed at the end of this Report.

12. Reasons

1. The uncharacteristic layout, scale and design of the proposed extension result in significant harm to the historic agricultural character and appearance of the host dwelling, and thus its significance as a non-designated heritage asset, and the rural character of the surrounding area and designated open countryside. Given the above, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4, DM10, DM11, and DM12 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policies BD4 and CE1 of the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan (2025), Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), and the Council's Good Design Guide (2020). As such, the scheme is not well designed and fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, and in accordance with Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the development is refused.

a. Notes to Applicant(s)

1. The application has been determined in accordance with the following details, submitted to the Local Planning Authority:
 - Application Form (submitted: 19.09.2025)
 - Existing Floor Plans and Elevations (submitted: 02.10.2025)
 - Proposed Plans (0899 01) (submitted: 19.09.2025)
 - Site Location Plan (submitted: 19.09.2025)