

Delegated Report

Planning Reference 25/00344/FUL
Applicant(s) Mrs Carlota Larrosa
Ward Earl Shilton



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Application Site 38 Almey's Lane, Earl Shilton,
Leicester

Proposal Change of use from dwellinghouse to Sui Generis (use as large HMO) and addition of a side extension

Case Officer Sullivan Archer (Senior Planning Officer)

1. Recommendations

1.1. Refuse planning permission subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

2.1. This planning application seeks full planning permission for a change of use of an existing three-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) to a seven-person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Sui Generis) at 38 Almey's Lane, Earl Shilton.

2.2. To facilitate this development, a single storey extension to the western side elevation of the property is proposed, which creates two further bedrooms, and enlarges the kitchen and dining area. The side extension externally measures 6.5m in width by 7.4m in depth, which creates a total footprint of 47.6sqm. The extension features a hipped roof that has a ridge height of 3.8m, and an eaves height of 2.6m.

2.3. It is noted that the Application Form refers to the change of use from a dwellinghouse but suggests that the property is currently utilised as a three-bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy. The Case Officer contacted the Applicant to revise the wording of the application description, but a response was never received.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

3.1. The 280sqm application site is within the identified settlement boundary of Earl Shilton to the south of Almey's Lane. Almey's Lane is an adopted but unclassified road that is subject to a 30mph speed limit. Almey's Lane is wholly residential in character in the vicinity of the site and is predominantly characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings that are constructed with a red brick finish and concrete tiled hipped roofs. Public Footpath U86 runs north-to-south adjacent to the western boundary of the site.

- 3.2. The site consists of a two-storey, semi-detached residential property. The property is constructed with a concrete tiled hipped roof and a grey rendered finish and features a side garden to the southwest of the site.

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 18/00041/PP

- Erection of one detached bungalow (resubmission of 17/00363/FUL)
- Appeal Dismissed
- 30.10.2018

4.2 17/01292/FUL

- Erection of one detached bungalow (resubmission of 17/00363/FUL)
- Refused
- 07.03.2018

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. By virtue of the plot size, layout, scale and design, the scheme would result in an uncharacteristic, incongruous and cramped form of development that would not be well integrated within the existing street scene, would neither complement nor enhance the character of the surrounding area and would result in a loss of openness to the immediate setting and wider street scene of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document.
2. By virtue of the plot size, the scheme would result in the subdivision of the plot that would result in inadequate private amenity space to serve the occupiers of no. 38 Almey's Lane and the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling which would be detrimental to their residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document.

4.3 17/00636/FUL

- Two residential apartments
- Withdrawn
- 13.12.2017

4.4 13/00389/OUT

- Erection of two apartments (Outline – access only)
- Permitted
- 11.09.2013

5. Publicity

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. An objection has been received by one member of the public who raised concerns in relation to insufficient off-street parking provision and highway safety concerns. No further responses have been received.

6. Consultation

- 6.1 There have been no objections from the Council's Drainage, Environmental Health or Private Sector Housing Departments, and Leicestershire County Council as the Local Highway Authority had no objections to the development, subject to three planning conditions.
- 6.2 Leicestershire County Council's Ecology Department had a holding objection to the development proposal as insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate that the development did not adversely affect protected species and their habitats, nor that mandatory biodiversity net gain did not apply in these site-specific circumstances. To date, no further information has been submitted by the Applicant.
- 6.3 Therefore, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that protected species and their habitats are not adversely affected by this proposal, nor that the scheme can provide sufficient biodiversity net gains to meet the 10% mandatory requirement. Given the above, the application is contrary to, and in conflict with, the statutory requirements of Paragraphs 98 and 99 of the ODMP Circular 06/2006 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation), Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Net Gain in England) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as well as Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024), and Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
- 6.4 No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

- 7.1 Core Strategy (2009):
- Policy 2: Development in Earl Shilton
- 7.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016):
- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy DM10: Development and Design
 - Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
 - Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3 Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (ESBAAP) (2014):

- Policy 22: Development and Design

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)
- Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

8. Appraisal

8.1. The application site features an existing residential property and is within the identified settlement boundary of Earl Shilton. Therefore, whilst the proposed scheme is for a sui generis use, the principle of additional accommodation connected to an existing residential property in this location is acceptable, subject to the assessment of all other material considerations. Other material considerations are set out within the next sections of the report.

8.2. The key issues in respect of this application are therefore:

- Design and impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Planning balance

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.3. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design (as contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code), taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

8.4. Chapter 12 of the NPPF confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality, beautiful, and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places.

- 8.5. 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.
- 8.6 Policy 22 of the ESBAAP requires development to ensure that it does not result in detriment to the character of appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Furthermore, Policy 22 of the ESBAAP requires development to respect the local distinctiveness of existing buildings and landscape settings, and its design should respect the scale, proportions, and heights of existing buildings, neighbouring structures, and the overall street scene.
- 8.7 Guidance Point C1 of the National Design Guide (NDG) confirms that well-designed new development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond including the existing built development and landscape character, amongst others.
- 8.8 The Good Design Guide states that two-storey side extensions should appear smaller in scale and massing in order to be subordinate to the main dwelling. Any proposal for a two-storey side extension should be set down from the ridge of the existing house and set back from the front elevation (the minimum distance for this should be 0.5 metres in both directions) unless in design terms this in itself would create an imbalance in the overall design of the property.
- 8.9 There are several inconsistencies with the submitted plans over the existing use of 38 Almey's Lane. Nevertheless, the scheme proposes the creation of a side extension to facilitate the provision of two additional bedrooms within an existing House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). This creates seven bedrooms, which exceeds limitations of Use Class C4 of The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), and is therefore considered to represent a Sui Generis Use.
- 8.10 Whilst the scheme represents a Sui Generis use, this change of use in principle is not considered to result in significant harm to the character of the site and the surrounding area.
- 8.11 However, Paragraph 4 of the appeal decision for the previously dismissed scheme for a new bungalow within the site stated:
- “Due to the absence of any significant space to the sides of the building and the two-storey nature of the adjacent houses, the proposal would have a cramped appearance, incongruous in its context. New planting would do little to reduce its contrast with its immediate surroundings.”*
- 8.12 As a result, Paragraph 5 of this appeal decision confirmed that:
- “The bungalow would appear as a substantial built development on the site.”*
- 8.13 As confirmed later in this Report, the development fails to provide an appropriate or sufficient level of private outdoor amenity space to ensure a high level of residential

amenity for the future occupiers of the scheme and represents the overdevelopment of the site. This is considered to result in significant harm to the character of the area.

- 8.14 Furthermore, in comparison to the previously refused scheme with 17/01292/FUL, the development is still single storey in massing, but the extension is 1.6m deeper and 6.5sqm larger in footprint than the previously proposed bungalow and located 2m further away from the western side elevation.
- 8.15 Therefore, whilst the distance from the western elevation has increased, the structure is now attached to the host dwelling, and the development is larger than the previously dismissed scheme. Therefore, the scheme is still considered to appear as substantial built development within the site. This can be seen by the fact that the proposed extension almost doubles the width of the host property.
- 8.16 Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension is subordinate to the host dwelling, the proposal is not set back from the principal elevation of the property by 0.5m, which is contrary to the design guidance within the Good Design Guide. The proposal also does not utilise the same roof pitch of the existing building, which heightens the incongruous nature of the scheme.
- 8.17 Ultimately, there are no other examples of single storey side extensions within the vicinity of the site and by virtue of its design, size, scale, massing, and layout, the proposed extension is considered to result in an uncharacteristic, incongruous and cramped form of development that is not well integrated within the existing street scene, and does not complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area. This harm is exacerbated by the visual prominence of the development from the public highway and Public Footpath U86.
- 8.18 In light of the above, the development is not considered to be well designed and fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design. Therefore, the proposal is considered to result in significant harm to the character of the site and the surrounding area, which is contrary to, and in conflict with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy 22 of the ESBAAP, Chapter 12 of the NPPF, the National Design Guide, and the Council's Good Design Guide. In accordance with Paragraph 139 of the NPPF, it is recommended that the planning application is refused.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.19 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible, which promote health and well-being, and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 8.20 Paragraph 198 of the NPPF confirms that planning decisions should ensure that new developments are appropriate for their locations, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions, and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.

- 8.21 In doing so, Paragraph 198(a) of the NPPF highlights that planning decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impact resulting from noise from new developments and avoiding noise that gives rise to significant impacts on health and quality of life.
- 8.22 Footnote 72 of the NPPF refers to the Noise Policy Statement for England (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2010), which recognises at Paragraph 2.14 that noise exposure can cause annoyance and sleep disturbance, which both impact on quality of life and give rise to adverse health effects.
- 8.23 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.
- 8.24 Policy 22 of the ESBAAP requires development to not adversely affect the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings, including matters of lighting, air quality (including odour), noise, vibration and visual intrusion. Policy 22 of the ESBAAP also states that the amenity of occupiers of the proposed development should not be adversely affected by activities in the vicinity of the site.
- 8.25 The Good Design Guide requires the way buildings to relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity. Every application will be assessed on its own merits depending on the individual characteristics of the site such as orientation, ground levels, window positions, garden size, and shape.
- 8.26 The side extension is single storey in massing and does not protrude any further to the rear than the host dwelling. Therefore, the extension is not considered to result any significant adverse overbearing or loss of light impacts to neighbouring residential amenity.
- 8.27 No windows are proposed to habitable rooms on the east or west of the site, and it is noted that the windows on the side elevation of 36 Almey's Lane are partially obscure glazed. In light of this and the single storey massing of the development, the scheme is not considered to result in any loss of privacy or overlooking impacts to 40 Almey's Lane to the east, 36 Almey's Lane to the west, or 2 Avenue South to the south of the site.
- 8.28 The neighbouring properties to the north of the site are separated from the development by Almey's Lane and are not considered to be affected by significant adverse loss of privacy or overlooking impacts.
- 8.29 However, the proposal increases the capacity of the property beyond the limitations of Use Class C3 dwellinghouses and Use Class C4 HMOs and is therefore considered to be a Sui Generis Use.

- 8.30 The intensification of the use of the property is considered to increase the number of comings and goings, including visitors and deliveries, as well as increased activity within the building and people using the outdoor spaces around the property. In addition, the noise and use of a property by a single household is significantly and materially different to that compared to the use of a property for seven individual occupiers. No information has been submitted to demonstrate that the impact of a HMO beyond the limitations of Use Class C4 does not generate more noise and disturbance in comparison to the fallback position of a six-bedroom HMO in these site-specific circumstances.
- 8.31 Therefore, in light of the proposed intensification of the site and the increased number of intermittent and arbitrary activities associated with such an intensification, and given the close spatial relationship of the site to neighbouring dwellings, the development is considered to result in unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants as a result of noise and disturbance, which is considered to cause significant harm to their residential amenity.
- 8.32 Whilst noise concerns may be slightly mitigated via planning condition internally for neighbouring properties, the effectiveness of such conditions is limited within the private outdoor amenity spaces of the property and for the future occupants of the scheme. Moreover, such a condition is not considered to mitigate the significant increase in noise and disturbance as result of the activity of seven independent individuals.
- 8.33 To support the residential amenity of future occupiers of the scheme, Regulation 2 of The Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Mandatory Conditions of Licenses) (England) Regulations 2018 within the amended Schedule 4 of the Housing Act 2004 to require the floor area of any room in a HMO used as sleeping accommodation by one person aged over 10 years to be a minimum of 6.51sqm and 10.22sqm when any room in a HMO is used as sleeping accommodation by two persons aged over 10 years.
- 8.34 All bedrooms within the proposed development comply with minimum floor space requirements for one person as detailed within Regulation 2 of The Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Mandatory Conditions of Licenses) (England) Regulations 2018 within the amended Schedule 4 of the Housing Act 2004. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council also required HMOs occupied by six to ten people within Borough to be provided with a kitchen with a minimum size of 10sqm and an additional living room or dining room with a minimum size of 16.5sqm. Alternatively, there must be a kitchen dining area with a minimum size of 19.5sqm.
- 8.35 Whilst the proposed kitchen dining room in an unusual shape, the footprint of this area is 30.2sqm and exceeds the Council's requirements.
- 8.36 Regulation 2 of The Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Mandatory Conditions of Licenses) (England) Regulations 2018 within the amended Schedule 4 of the Housing Act 2004 also requires the provision of a storage and waste disposal scheme. This can be secured via planning condition.

- 8.37 To comply with the Good Design Guide, properties with three or more bedrooms should provide a minimum of 60sqm of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m.
- 8.38 Although this guidance applies to Use Class C3 dwellinghouses, the principle of the necessity for a high standard of residential amenity is required by Paragraph 135 of the NPPF and Policy DM10 of the SADMP. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority are of the view that the requirements of the Good Design Guide can be considered within the determination of this application.
- 8.39 Importantly, it is noted that Paragraph 11 of the appeal decision for the previously dismissed scheme within the site confirmed that the previous proposal failed to provide sufficient garden space for the occupiers of 38 Almey's Lane as a three-bedroom dwellinghouse, which was considered to result in harm to the living conditions of the residents of the property.
- 8.40 Based on the Proposed Block Plan, the private amenity space for the proposed seven-person property has an area of 48sqm, with a depth that ranges between 6.4m and 0.8m. Whilst there appears to be additional 41.2sqm of potential outdoor amenity area to the west of the proposed extension, this area also has a depth that only ranges between 6.6m and 3.9m, and is within 3m of the two-storey side elevation of 36 Almey's Lane, which does not comply with the minimum depth and separation distance requirements of the Good Design Guide.
- 8.41 Ultimately, every application will be assessed on its own merits, and the site's private outdoor amenity area is severely reduced in size and by virtue of its size, and high means of enclosure, the proposed amenity area is constrained and inadequately small to facilitate its everyday and functional use as an outdoor amenity area. Whilst it is acknowledged that Queen Elizabeth II Hall Field is located a short distance away to the north of the site, this is not considered to overcome the harm to the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the scheme.
- 8.42 As a result, the scheme represents the overdevelopment of the site and fails to provide a sufficient level of private outdoor amenity space to ensure a high level of residential amenity for the future occupiers of the scheme.
- 8.43 By virtue of these factors, the proposal significantly intensifies the use of the site beyond the limitations of Use Class C3 and Use Class C4 uses, which results in significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity as a result of noise and disturbance. In addition, the scheme results in the overdevelopment of the site, which fails to provide a high level of residential amenity to the future occupiers of the scheme, as a result of insufficient and appropriate private outdoor amenity space, which is considered to result in significant harm to their residential amenity.
- 8.44 Therefore, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy 22 of the ESBAAP, Paragraphs 135 and 198 of the NPPF, and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.45 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. All proposals for new development and changes of use should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highway authority (currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG)) (2024).
- 8.46 Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision. Any reduction below minimum standards will require robust justification.
- 8.47 Table 28 (Residential Parking Standards) of the LHDG requires Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) with up to six residents to provide a minimum of three off-street vehicular parking spaces per dwelling where planning permission is required, with a preference for up to six. For Sui Generis residential uses, including HMOs with more than six residents, one off-street vehicular parking space is required per resident (e.g., 12 residents would require 12 parking spaces) (excluding visitor parking).
- 8.48 Figure 44 (Dimensions) of the LHDG requires minimum parking sizes to be 2.4m in width by 5.5m in depth, and an additional 0.5m in width is required the parking space is bounded by a wall, fence, hedge, line of trees or other similar obstructions on one side. This width increases to 1m if the parking space is bounded on both sides.
- 8.49 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has reviewed its Personal Injury Collision (PIC) database and are of the opinion that there are no existing highway safety issues that would likely be exacerbated by the development proposal.
- 8.50 The Proposed Site Plan suggests that seven off-street vehicle parking spaces are accommodated on the front of the existing property. However, it is noted that these off-street vehicle parking spaces do not meet the minimum dimension requirements detailed at Figure 44 of the LHDG.
- 8.51 The LHA have considered the nature of the development, the location of the development from amenities and services within Earl Shilton, the location of bus stops 220m west of the site at High Street, and the lack of parking restrictions in the surrounding area. It is noted that cycle parking can be secured via planning condition. In light of this, the LHA considered that it would be difficult to demonstrate that a shortfall of two off-street parking spaces would lead to a severe impact on the public highway to the extent that is contrary to Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.
- 8.52 By virtue of these factors, whilst the scheme does not provide off-street vehicle parking spaces in accordance with the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide's minimum dimensions, in light of the site-specific circumstances of the surrounding area and without any objections from the Local Highway Authority, it is considered that the proposal does not create an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the road network in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP.

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 Taking national and local planning policies into account, and regarding all relevant material considerations, it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

11.2 **Reasons**

1. By virtue of its size, scale, massing, layout, and design, the proposal results in an uncharacteristic, incongruous, and cramped form of development that is not well integrated within the existing street scene and does not complement or enhance the character of the area. The development is therefore not

considered to be well designed and fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, which results in significant harm to the character of the site and the surrounding area. Given the above, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (2014), Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), the National Design Guide (2019), and the Council's Good Design Guide (2020). In accordance with Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the application is refused.

2. The proposal significantly intensifies the use of the site beyond the limitations of Use Class C3 and Use Class C4 uses, which would be significantly detrimental to, and result in significant harm to, the residential amenity of neighbouring residents as a result of noise and disturbance. The development is therefore contrary to, and in conflict with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (2014), and Paragraphs 135 and 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
3. The scheme represents the overdevelopment of the site, which results in an insufficient and constrained area of proposed private outdoor amenity space that is inadequately small to facilitate its everyday and functional use as an outdoor amenity area. The proposal therefore fails to provide a high level of residential amenity to the future occupiers of the scheme, which causes significant harm to their residential amenity. As a result, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (2014), Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), and the Council's Good Design Guide (2020).
4. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that protected species and their habitats are not adversely affected by this proposal, nor that the scheme can provide sufficient biodiversity net gains to meet the 10% mandatory requirement. The application is therefore contrary to, and in conflict with, the statutory requirements of Paragraphs 98 and 99 of the ODMP Circular 06/2006 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation), Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Net Gain in England) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as well as Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024), and Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

a. **Notes to Applicant**

1. The application has been determined in accordance with the following submitted details:

- Application Form (submitted: 31.03.2025)
- Block Plan (Rev B) (submitted: 30.04.2025)
- BNG Metric (submitted: 30.04.2025)
- Design and Access Statement (submitted: 31.03.2025)
- Existing and Proposed Elevations Rev D (submitted: 19.06.2025)
- Existing and Proposed Floor Plans Rev C (submitted: 19.06.2025)
- Planning Statement (submitted: 31.03.2025)
- Site Location Plan (Rev B) (submitted: 30.04.2025)