

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 26/00142/HOU

Applicants: Mr & Mrs Burke

Ward: Stapleton

Site: 12 Manor Crescent, Stapleton, Leicestershire LE9 8JQ

Proposal: Proposed single storey front extension to existing detached dwelling

Case Officer: Lindon Morgan

Date: 16/06/2026



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1. **Refuse planning permission** subject to the reasons at the end of this report.

2. PLANNING APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 2.1. This householder planning application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single-storey front extension to an existing detached dwellinghouse located at 12 Manor Crescent, Stapleton.
- 2.2. The proposed extension would project approximately 3.6 metres beyond the principal front elevation of the dwellinghouse and would occupy slightly in excess of 50% of the width of the original dwellinghouse.
- 2.3. The extension would be constructed using materials intended to match the existing dwelling and would incorporate a pitched roof design.
- 2.4. The proposed roof would be steeper than the principal roof slope of the existing dwellinghouse and would partially obscure an existing first-floor window on the front elevation.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

- 3.1 The application site comprises a detached dwellinghouse situated within the settlement boundary of Stapleton.
- 3.2 Manor Crescent is a well-established residential area characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from the highway behind front gardens. The street scene exhibits a generally consistent building line and spacious suburban character.
- 3.3 The application property is of traditional appearance and occupies a prominent position within the street scene. The dwelling contributes positively to the established character of the area through its scale, proportions and relationship with neighbouring properties.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 No planning history directly relevant to the assessment of the current proposal.

5. PUBLICITY

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by neighbour notification letters in accordance with the Council's adopted procedures.
- 5.2 No representations have been received.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 No statutory consultees were required for this application.
- 6.2 Kirkby Mallory, Peckleton and Stapleton Parish Council have no objections to the application.

7. POLICY

Core Strategy (2009)

- 7.1 No specific Core Strategy policies are considered directly relevant to the determination of this application.

Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

- 7.2 Policy DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.
- 7.3 Policy DM10 – Development and Design.

National Planning Policy and Guidance

- 7.4 National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- 7.5 National Design Guide (2019).
- 7.6 Planning Practice Guidance.

Other Relevant Guidance

- 7.7 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Good Design Guide (2020).

8. APPRAISAL

- 8.1 Extensions to existing domestic properties within settlement boundaries are generally considered acceptable in principle. The key issue in determining this application is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

The principal considerations are:

- Design and impact upon the character of the area.
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

- 8.2 Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development which is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and guidance.
- 8.3 Policy DM10(c) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document requires development proposals to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.
- 8.4 The Council's adopted Good Design Guide provides specific guidance in relation to front extensions and advises that front extensions should generally project no more than 2 metres beyond the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and should not normally exceed 50% of the width of the original front elevation. These principles are intended to ensure that front extensions remain subordinate additions and do not appear unduly prominent within the street scene.
- 8.5 The proposed front extension would project approximately 3.6 metres beyond the principal front elevation of the dwellinghouse. This projection substantially exceeds the guidance contained within the Good Design Guide and represents an increase of approximately 80% above the projection generally considered acceptable by the Council.
- 8.6 By virtue of its excessive projection, the proposed extension would extend significantly beyond the established building line and would appear visually dominant and intrusive within the street scene. The proposal would materially alter the proportions of the host dwelling and would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the prevailing pattern of development within Manor Crescent.
- 8.7 The submitted plans further indicate that the extension would occupy slightly in excess of 50% of the width of the original dwellinghouse. The Good Design Guide advises that front extensions should generally occupy no more than half the width of the host dwelling in order to preserve the visual balance and hierarchy of the original building.
- 8.8 Officers consider that the proposed extension would fail to appear subordinate to the original dwellinghouse and would instead become a dominant feature of the front elevation. The scale and width of the proposal would erode the architectural proportions of the dwelling and would result in an overly prominent form of development.
- 8.9 The proposed roof design further exacerbates these concerns. The submitted plans indicate a roof pitch that is noticeably steeper than the principal roof slope of the dwellinghouse. The proposed roof form would therefore appear incongruous and visually disconnected from the established architectural composition of the property.
- 8.10 Furthermore, the proposed roof profile would partially obscure an existing first-floor window and would create an awkward and unsympathetic relationship with the host dwelling. This would further reinforce the visual prominence of the extension and contribute to an unbalanced appearance.
- 8.11 Whilst officers acknowledge that the proposal seeks to utilise materials intended to match the existing dwelling, matching materials alone are insufficient to overcome the significant concerns arising from the scale, width, projection and roof design of the development.

- 8.12 Taken cumulatively, the excessive projection, excessive width and incongruous roof form would result in a visually dominant, intrusive and unsympathetic form of development that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or the wider street scene.
- 8.13 The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10(c) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Good Design Guide (2020), the National Design Guide (2019) and Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.14 Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework requires development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.
- 8.15 Policy DM10 (a) and (b) of the SADMP requires development proposals to avoid significant adverse impacts upon neighbouring residential amenity.
- 8.16 Having regard to the siting of the extension and separation distances to neighbouring dwellings, officers do not consider that the proposal would result in any significant loss of privacy, overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.
- 8.17 The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

9. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- 9.2 Officers have had due regard to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 in determining this application.
- 9.3 There are no known equality implications arising directly from the proposed development.
- 9.4 The decision has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance and Council policies including the Human Rights Act 1998 and General Data Protection Regulations 2018.

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 The proposed front extension would project substantially beyond the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and would exceed the width parameters set out within the Council's adopted Good Design Guide.
- 10.2 The proposal would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling and would materially disrupt the proportions and architectural composition of the building.
- 10.3 The excessive projection, excessive width and incongruous roof design would result in a visually dominant and unsympathetic form of development which would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
- 10.4 The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10(c) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Good Design Guide (2020), the National Design Guide (2019) and Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

11. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed single-storey front extension, by virtue of its excessive projection, width and overall poor design, would result in a visually dominant and unsympathetic form of development that would not appear subordinate to the main dwelling and would fail to complement the character of the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM10(c) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Good Design Guide (2020), and Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).