

**DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT  
(incl. PLANNING STATEMENT)**

## **1      Introduction**

- 1.1 This document forms both Design & Access Statement and Planning Statement to support a retrospective planning application for the demolition of the existing semi-detached property and replacement with a new-build dwelling at 2 The Green.
- 1.2 The property is sited off a private access driveway (owned by the applicant), which links into Mill Lane – a publicly maintained highways.
- 1.3 This document has been prepared in accordance with the principles of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England Order 2015). It summarises the process undertaken by the design team to form the proposed development and addresses the use/amount, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the proposal.
- 1.4 This document was prepared by Atelier 81 on behalf of the owner Mr Florczak.
- 1.5 The application site totals approximately 799sq.m as indicated by the red boundary on the location plan. The site used to be occupied by a two-storey semi-detached property, which included a garage.

## **2 Site Context**

- 2.1 2 The Green is located within the hamlet of Sheepy Parva in Leicestershire. Existing property is accessed off a private driveway, which serves four houses. The houses comprise of two pairs of semi-detached, Victorian, red brick houses which have been substantially altered over time. The land was originally in the ownership of The Mill, No's 3 and 4 were built in 1895, while No's 1 and 2 in 1901.
- 2.2 The site is bound to the west by open landscape and a well-used Public Right of Way accessed from Mill Lane. To the north, 1 The Green has been extended to include a two-storey extension to the front and side, a single-storey rear extension and a new garage to the main frontage. To the south, 3-4 The Green have been altered to include front and side extensions and garages.
- 2.3 The site itself comprised a two-bedroom Victorian house attached in a semi-detached configuration to 1 The Green. The original dwelling has been altered over time to include a single storey glazed lean-to to the front elevation, a single storey brick extension to the side elevation and a garage to the main frontage. There are no other buildings or gardens immediately to the rear elevation of the property with fields extending to the west and south.
- 2.4 Access to the site is from The Green, which is a private access serving all four properties. The access is bound at its juncture with Mill Lane by the side elevation of properties fronting the main highways. The access is within the site boundary and applicant's ownership.

### **3 Planning Policy Context**

- 3.1 Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009)
  - Spatial Objective 11: Built Environment & Townscape Character
- 3.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)
  - Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
  - Policy DM10: Development & Design
- 3.3 Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan (2019)
  - Policy S8: Design
- 3.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
- 3.5 Other relevant guidance
  - Good Design Guide (2020)

## **4 Planning History**

4.1 The site has been subject to a number of planning applications – the most recent and relevant one comprised the approval to alter and extend the existing dwelling (ref 21/01342/HOU).

4.2 Relevant planning history is outlined below:

- Alterations to existing dwelling, two storey front / side extension and single storey side / rear extension - resubmission of 21/00222/HOU (21/01342/HOU) – Approved 21/02/22
- Appeal decision (Ref: APP/K2420/D/21/3274457) relating to planning refusal 21/00222/HOU – Dismissed 22/10/21
- Alterations to the existing dwelling incorporating a two storey front/side extension and single storey side/rear extension (21/00222/HOU) – Refused 15/04/21
- Two storey side and front extension, single storey rear extension and external alterations - resubmission of 20/00499/HOU (20/01017/HOU) – Refused 23/11/20

## 5 Design Proposals

5.1 The proposal replicates all the design principles (use, layout, scale, appearance, landscaping) of the previously approved scheme (ref 21/01342/HOU).

5.2 The application seeks to retrospectively formalise the principle of a new-build dwelling, which is based on demolition of the existing semi-detached house and like for like replacement of its original form along with previously approved extensions (front, side and rear).

5.3 *Use, amount and layout*  
As per the original approval, the extensions would incorporate M4(3) principles to provide level-access threshold to the main entrance, accessible bedroom and shower room at ground floor. The additional footprint would also comprise large open living/kitchen/dining spaces, utility room and home office (all at ground floor) and two additional bedrooms at first floor.  
  
Refer to floor plans for further details.

5.4 *Scale*  
Scale and massing of the new dwelling will reflect those of previously approved scheme.  
  
Refer to elevations for further details.

5.5 *Appearance*  
There will be no change to the elevational treatment and materials approved as part of the original application.  
  
Refer to elevations for further details.

5.6 *Landscaping*  
In line with the previously approved scheme, boundary treatment will comprise 1.8m 'Cequence' venetian-style timber fence (both sides), naturally pre-weathered corten steel panels (rear) and feature hit-and-miss brick walls (selected locations).  
  
Refer to site plan for further details.

## **6      Contextual Justification**

6.1      During the construction works of the previously approved proposals, the contractor and the design team encountered structural and functional constraints, which subsequently resulted in an alternative method of implementing the original approval – demolition of the existing property and replacement with a new-build dwelling.

6.2      Existing roof structure had to be completely removed and replaced with a new build-up. Similarly, external brick walls previously outlined to be retained were demolished and rebuild in the same position and to the same height. Former garage was also taken down and replaced with a new structure.

6.3      Original slate roof tiles (existing roof) and imperial bricks (existing side and rear gables) have been carefully stripped down, cleaned and reclaimed, so that they could be utilised in its original locations (albeit forming part of a new build-up).

6.4      When compared with the original planning approval, current proposals offer no changes to the building footprint, scale/massing or appearance other than the following minor tweaks:

- introduction of 3no rooflights (above ground floor annex and first floor bath and bedroom 2); see ‘ground/first floor plans’
- change of door type to living/dining/kitchen along the rear elevation (sliding instead of bifold); see ‘rear elevation’
- change of boundary treatment material along the rear northern boundary with no 1 The Green (hit-and-miss brickwork instead of rainscreen cladding); see ‘side elevation’

## **7 Conclusion**

- 7.1 This document forms both Design & Access Statement and Planning Statement to support a retrospective planning application for the demolition of the existing semi-detached property and replacement with a new-build dwelling at 2 The Green.
- 7.2 Taking into account new proposals replicate all the design principles established as part of the original approval (other than a couple of minor tweaks listed under section 6) and simply differ in terms of the construction methodology, we feel the application warrants the approval.

# Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council

## Town and Country Planning Act 1990

### Planning Permission

#### Name and Address of Applicant

Florczak  
C/o Agent  
2 The Green  
Mill Lane  
Sheepy Parva  
Atherstone  
Leicestershire  
CV9 3RL

#### Name and Address of Agent (if any)

Filip Florczak  
IDP  
27 Spon Street  
Coventry  
CV1 3BA  
United Kingdom

### Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application	Application No.
4 November 2021	21/01342/HOU

#### Particulars and location of development :

Alterations to the existing dwelling incorporating a two storey front/side extension and single storey side/rear extension (resubmission of 21/00222/HOU)

#### 2 The Green Mill Lane Sheepy Parva Atherstone Leicestershire

### Part II - Particulars of decision

In dealing with the application, through ongoing negotiation the local planning authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service and by seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application and this has resulted in the approval of the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

**In pursuance of its powers under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council grants permission for the carrying out of the development referred to in Part I hereof in accordance with the application form and plans submitted, subject to the following conditions :-**

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:

- Front & Rear elevations Drg No C2224 062 – received 04/11/2021
- Side Elevations Drg No C2224 063 – received 04/11/2021

**IMPORTANT - PLEASE READ THE NOTES AT THE END OF THIS DOCUMENT**

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM10 and DM11 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

3. The materials to be used on the external elevations of the proposed extension and alteration shall accord with the approved plans.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development has a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

#### **Notes to applicant**

The approved development may require Building Regulations Approval, for further information please contact the Building Control team via e-mail at [buildingcontrol@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk](mailto:buildingcontrol@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk) or call 01455 238141.



**Matt Bowers MRTPI**  
Director Environment and Planning

Date : 21 February 2022

## NOTES

1. It will be most helpful if the application number shown overleaf is quoted in all correspondence.
2. If you consider that this decision has been made invalidly through the Council failing to follow a procedure correctly, not having the legal power to make the decision in the way it did or through its decision being so unreasonable as no reasonable local authority would make the same decision based on the same facts, then you may enter a claim for judicial review to quash the decision. In order to proceed with a claim for judicial review an initial application for permission will need to be made to the Administrative Court, this application is required to be made "promptly and in any event within three months of the decision". The initial permission application will decide if you have an arguable case, whether you are sufficiently materially affected by the decision to bring the claim. If you are granted permission to bring the claim it will proceed to a full hearing at the Administrative Court. Although there is no requirement for you to do so it is highly recommended that you seek independent legal advice before bringing forward a claim for Judicial Review.
3. As this is a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions for a householder application, if you want to appeal against your Local Planning Authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice. (Appeals must be made on a form which is obtainable from the Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN, tel. 0303 444 5000 or online at <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>). You must use a Householder Appeal Form when making your appeal. If requesting forms from the Planning Inspectorate, please state the appeal form you require. The Secretary of State has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a notice of appeal but he will not normally be prepared to exercise this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal. The Secretary of State is not required to entertain an appeal if it appears to him that the permission for the proposed development could not have been granted by the Local Planning Authority, or could not have been so granted otherwise than subject to the conditions imposed by them, having regard to the statutory requirements as set out in Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to the provisions of the development order, and to the directions given under the order. He does not in practice refuse to entertain appeals solely because the decision by the Local Planning Authority was based on a direction given by him.
4. If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application then, you must do so in accordance with the guidance found using the following link <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-enforcement-notice>.
5. If permission to develop land is granted subject to conditions, whether by the Local Planning Authority or by the Secretary of State for the Environment, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, he may serve on the Council a purchase notice requiring that Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
6. In certain circumstances, a claim may be made against the Local Planning Authority for compensation, where permission is refused or granted subject to conditions by the Secretary of State on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in Section 114 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
7. This permission covers only consent under the Town and Country Planning Acts and does not give permission to demolish a Listed Building, for which separate consent is required. Amongst other things the consent of the Council of the district in which the land is situated may be required under the Building Regulations and if the proposals affect land within the limits of the highway (that is between the highway fences or hedges) the separate consent of the Highway Authority may also be required. Steps to obtain the necessary further consents should be taken before proceeding with the development.

## SHOPS, OFFICES, FACTORIES, EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS & BUILDINGS TO WHICH THE PUBLIC ARE TO BE ADMITTED : ACCESS AND PROVISION FOR THE DISABLED PERSONS

- 1 The Local Planning Authority is required to bring to your attention the requirements of the Disabled Persons 1981, Building Regulations 1991 "Access and facilities for Disabled People" document M and the Chronically Sick & Disabled Act 1970 (as amended 1976) (Sections 4.7.8 and 8A) requiring the provision of access facilities, car parking and toilets for the disabled and the provision of signing indicating what provision has been made for disabled persons within the building. Your attention is also drawn to the Code of Practice B.S 5619 "Design of Housing for the convenience of Disabled People", 1978 and Code of Practice, B.S. 5810 : 1979, "Access for the Disabled to buildings" available from the British Standards Institution, 2 Park Street, London W1A 2BS. (Tel 071-629-9000) and (in so far as educational buildings are concerned), to Design Note 18 "Access for the Physically Disabled to Educational Buildings."
- 2 The buildings to which these requirements apply are :-
  - a) Buildings to which the public are to be admitted to which Section 4 of the Chronically Sick & Disabled Act 1970 (as amended 1976) applies.
  - b) Offices, Shops & Railway Premises as defined in the Offices, Shops & Railway Premises Act 1963 or premises deemed to fall within the Act.
  - c) Factories as defined by Section 175 of the Factories Act 1961.  
Educational Buildings as defined by Section 29B of the Disabled Persons Act 1981.



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

## Start Notice

### **Important Information – Please keep this with your decision notice**

Please read the above decision notice carefully and ensure that you understand and comply with the requirements of any planning conditions imposed.

If you require any further information about why a particular planning condition has been imposed or in respect of what information is needed to discharge your condition please contact the case officer who will be happy to advise of the requirements and information required.

We carry out a programme of site monitoring to check compliance with conditions in order to proactively manage the development and to ensure development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission granted.

Please ensure that any application for the discharge of pre-commencement conditions are carried out in a timely manner as this may take up to 8 weeks depending on the requirements of the condition. Please also be aware there is a charge to discharge conditions per request which means you can discharge conditions individually or group details together as a single request to discharge multiple planning conditions. The fee for discharging these pre-commence conditions, can be found on the [planning portal](#).

We would be grateful if you could email the development address and application reference number with your contact details and the intended start date by email to [planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk](mailto:planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk) or complete the form on the reverse.

**Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council**  
**Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 0FR**  
**TEL: 01455 238141 EMAIL: [planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk](mailto:planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk)**



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

### Development Details

<b>Planning application ref:</b>	21/01342/HOU
<b>Proposal:</b>	Alterations to the existing dwelling incorporating a two storey front/side extension and single storey side/rear extension (resubmission of 21/00222/HOU)
<b>Site Location:</b>	2 The Green Mill Lane Sheepy Parva Atherstone Leicestershire

<b>Date when work is intended to start:</b>	
<b>Have all pre-commencement conditions been discharged?</b>	
<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Print Name:</b>

### Your contact details (or attach letterhead/business card):

<b>Name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>	
<b>Mobile:</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	

**Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council**  
**Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 0FR**  
**TEL: 01455 238141 EMAIL: [planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk](mailto:planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk)**



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 July 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

### Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2021

### Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/21/3274457

#### 2 The Green, Mill Lane, Sheepy Parva CV9 3RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Filip Florczak against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 21/00222/HOU, dated 29 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2021.
- The development proposed is re-modelling of the existing semi-detached property incorporating a double-storey extension at the front, single extension to the rear and associated landscaping.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Preliminary Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. Any comments received have been addressed in this decision.

### Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Along The Green are two sets of two-storey semi-detached Victorian dwellings that vary in appearance, albeit red brick is the predominantly used facing material. There are differences in brick bond and detailing across the properties, which have been altered and extended in various ways. Nonetheless, the red brick elevations are a key feature of this small group which creates a visual link between them and contributes positively to their character and appearance and that of the immediate area.
6. The evidence before me is that historically these properties faced west, however the elevations were reversed many years ago such that the original rear facades are today's main elevations facing The Green. Therefore, the

western elevations have characteristics of rear facades, and the outbuildings and parking areas for the properties generally front The Green.

7. While in many street scenes two storey front extensions may be visually prominent the properties in this group are set back behind properties along Mill Lane. Most also have significant extensions and outbuildings facing The Green. The main elevation of the appeal site is therefore seen in a somewhat different context to a typical frontage residential development.
8. The proposed two-storey extension would add significant bulk to the main elevation of the host dwelling; however, the articulation of the front elevation and the dual gables would break up its massing. It would be similar in height and form to an existing extension on the attached dwelling, albeit wider. However, the section projecting past the side of the original dwelling would be set back from both the front and rear elevations and highly glazed. As such, this additional width would not be a prominent feature in views from the public right of way behind the appeal site or from The Green. In terms of proportions and scale it would also give the semi-detached pair a more balanced appearance than at present and would help reinforce the reorientation of the dwelling towards The Green.
9. The large vertical openings of the proposed two-storey extension would contrast with the very different form of windows on the adjoining property, a distinction which would be evident from The Green. However, the design and appearance of windows varies considerably across the area, with several other contemporary examples nearby, and there is little consistency of window form even among the dwellings along The Green. As a result, the use of larger areas of modern glazing would not appear out of character within the wider area.
10. The contemporary glazing design would also relate well to the shape of the gables, and as such would sit comfortably with this relatively traditional form. While there would be large blank areas at first floor on the elevation facing The Green, this is not unusual for this row of properties given their historic orientation. The proposal would also result in a noticeable increase in glazing compared to the existing situation. Therefore, I consider that the window form would complement the traditional appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.
11. There is render on the existing properties and historically on the host dwelling, but this appears to be only at ground floor level as a minor element of the relevant elevations, and on outbuildings. Red brick remains the dominant material and gives the street scene of The Green a consistent appearance and character clearly different to the modern properties around it, despite the differences in the design of the individual dwellings. In this context, the proposed use of off-white architectural cast concrete would introduce a very different and alien material into this row of properties. In particular, the proposed two-storey extension would cover the whole of the existing elevation fronting The Green. It would almost entirely obscure views of the red brick in views from that road, as only small glimpses of the existing wall could be achieved through some of the proposed windows.
12. The proposed concrete would have a somewhat harsh and urban appearance and would contrast sharply with the brick in colour and texture, creating a plain surface with little detailing, contrasting harmfully with the various brick bonds and colour variation which lend visual interest and a degree of softness to the

existing dwellings. Therefore, the use of this material to the extent proposed would relate poorly to the traditional red brick Victorian development which the dwelling is viewed as part of and would fail to anchor the extension to the host dwelling or its surroundings.

13. While I appreciate the desire to reinterpret the architecture of the host property, the use of this harsh, utilitarian and unsympathetic material to the extent proposed would substantially and harmfully alter the appearance of the host dwelling and would not achieve the subtle reinterpretation of context to which the appellant's Design and Access Statement refers. It would make the extension a dominant and prominent feature when seen from The Green and fundamentally alter its relationship with the neighbouring properties, to the detriment of the appearance of the host dwelling, the group and street scene.

14. Existing outbuildings would screen much of the proposed two-storey extension from view from Mill Lane. While small parts of the concrete would be glimpsed from that road, they would be seen in conjunction with areas of similarly coloured render on other nearby buildings. Consequently, the proposed material would have a limited visual impact from Mill Lane and the wider area. Nevertheless, this element of the proposal would be highly visible from The Green, and although it is a private road it would be seen by residents and visitors. Therefore, due to its use of materials this proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area and would not respond to or work with the character of the location.

15. Render and reconstituted stone are found elsewhere locally, however those properties are considerably more recent and of different form to those on The Green and are therefore of significantly different appearance. Furthermore, those materials are used in combination with others and broken up by windows, porches and other architectural features, and as such do not dominate the host properties to the same extent as would occur with the appeal proposal. As such, the presence of other similar materials nearby does not justify the harm identified above from the use of architectural concrete for the two-storey element of the proposal.

16. The proposed single storey extension would also use architectural concrete, but would only cover part of the rear elevation, with the brick remaining visible at first-floor level. Given its relatively small scale it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling and would be largely screened from view from the public right of way by existing boundary treatments. Consequently, it would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.

17. The garage would be extended and altered using red brick and would remain subordinate in both scale and appearance to the host dwelling. The use of facade perforation would add detail and visual interest to the elevation and overall would improve the appearance of this outbuilding. Due to its small scale however, this enhancement would not reduce the harm from the proposed two-storey extension.

18. I recognise that the appellant has sought advice in developing the proposal, as encouraged by the Framework. However, the appellant's evidence shows that the design options submitted to the Council in previous schemes and for pre-application advice were different to the design before me. The Design Midland Design Panel comments pre-date the submitted plans, so I cannot be certain that they assessed the appeal scheme. In any event, the use of

architectural concrete would be at odds with the Design Panel's advice to explore a restraint material palette which references the existing unassuming and humble materials, and which reflects the colour and considers the texture of the brickwork. As such, this aspect of the proposal does not accord with the Design Panel's comments.

19. Both the development plan and the Framework support outstanding or innovative design, but within the context that such development should be sympathetic to local character and fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings. Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) (DPD) allows for some limited conflict with its design criteria in exceptional circumstances where outstanding, innovative design is demonstrated, and Policy S8 of the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2036 (made 2019) (NP) does not exclude innovative design where appropriate. However, whilst the proposal would be an unusually contemporary approach for this area and a bespoke design, there is no compelling evidence before me that it would be an innovative or outstanding example of contemporary design or construction. I therefore find that, for the reasons above, it would not achieve the high-quality design required by local and national policies.
20. Accordingly, the proposed two-storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Consequently, it would conflict with DPD Policy DM10 and NP Policy S8 which permit development where it complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area, including with regard to materials, and where it makes a positive contribution to the street scene. The Framework directs that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

### **Other Matters**

21. The proposal would be an opportunity to repair and improve the dwelling and would 'future proof' the accommodation for the appellant's family and future residents. It would improve natural surveillance of The Green and remove existing unsympathetic additions. The redesign of the front garden and driveway would complement the reorientation of the dwelling and would follow the pattern of development along The Green, and these works and the alterations to the garage would improve the appearance of the site. However, given my findings above regarding the scale and siting of the proposed extension, there is no compelling evidence before me that this would be the only scheme where these benefits could be achieved. Consequently, they carry limited weight, and do not outweigh the harm identified.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

22. There are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Sibley*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

**Inspector's Decision**

23. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

*L McKay*

INSPECTOR

Design Midlands | Pera Business Park | Melton Mowbray | Leicestershire | LE13 0PB  
Email: [dharmista@designmidlands.org](mailto:dharmista@designmidlands.org) | [www.designmidlands.org.uk](http://www.designmidlands.org.uk)

23.11.2020

Filip Florczak  
2 The Green  
Sheepy Parva  
CV9 3RL

Dear Filip,

**Design Midlands Design Panel – Thursday 19th November 2020  
Walk and Talk of 2 The Green in Sheepy Parva (Our Ref: DMDR2035)**

We write following the Walk and Talk of 2 The Green in Sheepy Parva and would like to take this opportunity to thank you for utilising the Design Midlands Design Review Service. The Walk and Talk was carried out remotely using Zoom which included a virtual site visit undertaken by Filip (architect and client).

The Design Midlands Panel members reviewing the scheme were Nils Feldmann (Chair) and Andy Thomas and followed the ten principles of Design Review.

Site Context

No 2 The Green is located within the hamlet of Sheepy Parva in Leicestershire. The Green is a private access road which serves 4 houses. The houses comprise of two pairs of semi-detached, Victorian, red brick houses which have been altered over time. The land was originally in the ownership of The Mill, Nos 3 and 4 were built in 1895 and Nos 1 and 2 in 1901.

The site is bound to the west by open landscape and a well-used Public Right of Way accessed from Mill Lane; to the north by 1 The Green which has been extended to include a two storey extension to the front, a single storey rear and side extension and a garage to the frontage, and the backs of properties fronting Mill Lane. To the east by the side elevation and boundary treatment for The Parva which fronts and is accessed from Mill Lane. To the south by 3 and 4 The Green which have been altered including front and side extensions and garages to the frontage / The Green. The houses are set back from No 2.

The site itself comprises a two bedroom semi-detached Victorian house which has been altered including a single storey glazed lean-to to the front elevation, a single storey brick extension to the side elevation and a garage to the frontage onto The Green.

Access to the site is from The Green which is a private access which serves the four properties only. The access is bound at its juncture with Mill Lane by the side elevation of properties fronting Mill Lane. The access is within the site boundary / clients ownership.

#### Planning Policy Context

An application was submitted to Hinckley and Bosworth in May 2020 for a two storey side and front extension, single storey rear extension and external alterations. The application was refused for the following reason:

*By virtue of its design and siting the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development that would detract from the character of the application site, the area and streetscene, contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Policy S8 of Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan (2019).*

Discussions and dialogue have taken place with the client and the local planning authority on the scheme proposals with a revised application submitted in September.

#### The Proposed Scheme

The scheme proposes the removal of the existing extensions and the provision of a two storey extension to the front elevation, the incorporation of the stand-alone garage into the house, and a single storey extension to the rear and side elevation. The design of the front extension takes reference from and mirrors the front extension to No 1 The Green.

The extensions will provide two bedrooms to the first floor, a third bedroom for the clients mother in law, additional living space and a utility room to the ground floor. The garage will be converted to a games room.

Six design options have been explored for the front extension which include alterations to the treatment / materiality of the extension, fenestration and roof form. The design review focussed on the front extension, as requested by you and agreed with all parties attending the meeting.

#### **The Panel's Comments**

The Panel has the following comments and recommendations for your consideration:

##### Design Concept

The Panel understood the design approach to the extensions in meeting the need of your family and lifestyle. Encouragement was given to strengthen the design approach / concept and suggested an exercise to explore how the proposal could not just alter, but improve the street scene while meeting the needs of the client. This should include an idea on how you want to live on the site, what could /should be taken away from the existing building and why, what could / should be added. Other questions include how the proposals meet the design concept and importantly how the proposals improve / contribute to the street scene.

The above design process should be recorded which will assist in demonstrating a robust rationale and understanding of the design decisions.

#### Streetscene and Frontage

The Panel observed the existing houses on The Green have been subject to significant change, including front, side and rear extensions which have left the original houses considerably obscured, with little or no symmetry to the semi-detached houses. There is no longer a prevailing character to the properties, with further impact by the addition of garages to the building frontages. The changes were considered to have altered the street scene of The Green substantially.

The Panel highlighted the opportunity the scheme presents to repair and improve the street scene. The provision of the main entrance to the building frontage (rather than the side elevation as the existing houses) and thereby reinstating the original approach with the house directly accessed from The Green is positive.

Encouragement was given to seek opportunities to enliven the proposed elevation further, reinforcing its role as the main / front elevation of the house, including options to increase the level of fenestration, in particular to the ground floor to enable passive surveillance. Attention was drawn to the fact that there is no reoccurring fenestration pattern of the adjacent houses on The Green, enabling a more playful approach to be pursued.

The integrated garage acts as a welcoming gesture ("extending an arm to visitors") for the house along the street edge, creating an opportunity for the garage elevations to strengthen the access and provide a sense of animation, for example the use of a perforated material hinting of the activity taking place within the house / games room. However, the Panel also agreed that consideration should be given on whether the removal of the garage would help to create a strong entrance and to test this in principle.

#### Massing

Attention was drawn to the alterations to the existing houses on street with the proposed front extension which is similar in scale and massing to its neighbour (No 1 The Green). It was understood concerns have been expressed on the impact of the larger gable in preventing the existing / original building to be appreciated.

The existing buildings are not subject to protection i.e. within a conservation area, locally listed and have all been altered with extensions to 1, 3 and 4 The Green obscuring the original buildings. The alterations to the houses were considered to form part of the character of the street. The massing of the front extension was therefore considered to be suitable within this setting and not incongruous to the street scene.

With regard to the design of the front extension, the Panel did not consider it necessary for the design to match that of the neighbouring property literally, as any historic symmetry of the existing houses is no longer evident on the street scene. Encouragement was given to explore options which result more vertical and slender gables.

The Panel also considered the proposals provide an opportunity to create good architecture / design and future proof the house i.e. provision of a downstairs bedroom.

#### Material Palette

The Panel encouraged the architect to explore a material palette which helps to anchor the extension in the original house. Suggestions include to explore a restraint material palette which references the existing unassuming and humble materials, including research on the existing brick, its quality and origin.

The Panel suggest to explore the use of brick further with a carefully considered brick as a modern interpretation and pattern, referencing the original house whilst being of its time. An alternative approach could explore the use of through colour render, which could reflect the colour of the brickwork, and consideration of its texture. In each case a different / contrasting material for the garage is encouraged, which reflects the subservient function of the former garage to the house.

#### Summary

We would like to thank you for the excellent virtual site visit, site and character analysis, scheme information and the opportunity to comment on the proposals for the front extension.

The Panel recognised The Green to be private drive (not in the public realm) and Sheepy Parva / The Green not subject to special protection. The works undertaken in extending and altering the existing four houses have changed the character of The Green significantly, which is an eclectic mix of houses with individual characters, but with little of the consistency, symmetry or uniformity of the original semi-detached pairings remaining. The proposed massing of the front extension and integrating the existing garage was considered to be successful, appropriate and would not cause harm to the street scene.

The scheme presents an opportunity to repair the street frontage i.e. reinstate a front door that is visible from the street, create good architecture and future proof the house. The Panel encouraged further consideration be given to the following:

- To revisit the design brief and record the design process to provide a robust rationale for the proposed scheme, including the test of whether to retain or remove the existing garage;
- To explore a narrow, elegant form / massing for the gables with positive contributions to the street scene rather than a literal reinterpretation of the neighbouring gabled extension;
- To explore opportunities to enliven the façade to reference / reflect the extension function as the front of the house i.e. strengthen the approach and design of the front access, additional fenestration to enable passive surveillance;
- To simplifying the material palette by using one material for the frontage, further exploring the use of brick in a modern interpretation, or a material that references the existing brick, for example coloured render.

We trust that the feedback provided within this letter will prove to be of benefit to you in seeking a successful resolution and outcome for this scheme and provide an opportunity for further discussions with the determining authorities. We would be happy to provide further design advice on the project and



we will seek to ensure that the composition of the Panel remains the same throughout any ongoing review process.

Yours sincerely,

Dharmista Patel  
Design:Midlands Design Review Panel Manager

**Design Midlands Design Review adheres to the ten principles for design review as follows:**

1. Independent: It is conducted by people who are separate from the scheme promoter and decision-maker, and it protects against conflicts of interest.
2. Accountable: It records and explains its advice and is transparent about potential conflicts of interest.
3. Expert: It is conducted by suitably trained people who are experienced in design and know how to criticise constructively. Review is usually most respected where it is carried out by professional peers of the project designers, as their standing and expertise will be acknowledged.
4. Advisory: It does not make decisions. It acts as a source of impartial advice for decision-makers.
5. Accessible: Its findings are clearly expressed in terms that decision-makers can understand and use.
6. Proportionate: It is used on projects whose significance warrants the public investment of providing design review at national, regional and local level, as appropriate. Other methods of appraising design quality should be used for less significant projects.
7. Timely: It takes place as early as possible in the life of a design because this saves the most time and costs less to make changes. If a planning application has already been made, it happens within the timeframe for considering it. And it is repeated when a further opinion is required.
8. Objective: It appraises schemes in the round according to reasoned, objective criteria rather than the stylistic tastes of individual panel members.
9. Focused on outcomes for people: It asks how this building or place can better meet the needs of the people using it, and of the public at large who are affected by it.
10. Focused on improving quality: It constructively seeks to improve the quality of architecture, urban design, landscape, highway design and town planning.