



Planning Ref: 25/01159/HOU

Applicant: Mr Mandeep Daphu

Ward: Hinckley DeMontfort

Site: 66 Leicester Road Hinckley Leicestershire

Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

**Proposal:** Two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gates, erection of an outbuilding and internal alterations (revised scheme of 25/00510/HOU).



© copyright. All rights reserved Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council LA00018489 Published 2006

## 1. Recommendations

- 1.1. **Refuse planning permission** for the reasons outlined in the report below.

## 2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This householder application is a revised scheme of approved planning permission (25/00510/HOU) for a two-storey rear extension above an existing single storey

extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gate, erection of an outbuilding and internal alterations.

- 2.2. The proposals seek to re-orientate the frontage of the dwelling which currently faces south. The existing south/front elevation would become a side elevation with a new frontage created on the east elevation facing Leicester Road. Therefore, whilst the extension is described as a rear extension as this accurately reflects the current layout of the dwelling once completed it would appear as a side extension to the new front elevation.
- 2.3. The proposal includes a two storey rear extension on top of an existing single storey rear extension creating a three storey extension in total. This part of the extension is proposed to have a width of 8.6m and depth of 8.7m. The roof would be an asymmetric design with a ridge height of 9.86m and the eaves height would be 6.2m to the new front elevation and 8.2m to the new rear elevation. Part of the extension is two storey only (with accommodation in the roof), this element would have a ridge and eaves height matching the original dwelling of 10.4m and 5.9m respectively. A single storey mono-pitch extension is proposed to protrude to the rear. These latter elements would protrude no further than the existing side elevations.
- 2.4. A two-storey gable is proposed to the new front elevation to match the existing gable on the same elevation, with a single storey extension and porch creating an entrance way.
- 2.5. The existing dwelling has four bedrooms; the extensions and alterations would increase the number of bedrooms to seven.
- 2.6. The proposed materials would match the existing render with feature brickwork.
- 2.7. One outbuilding (to be used for storage) is also included as part of the application. This would be located on the western edge of the property, with dimensions of 7m x 3.60m, an eaves height of 2.25 metres and a ridge height of 3.59 metres.
- 2.8. Two new sections of 1.8m high wall and gates are proposed to each of the existing vehicular entrances to Leicester Road. The gate will be finished in black, while the wall will be constructed in facing brickwork and decorated with reconstituted stone coping.
- 2.9. It should be noted that these plans were submitted as part of discussions during application 25/00510/HOU but were considered unacceptable by the LPA. The applicant subsequently amended the former application to an acceptable degree. The applicant then submitted a revised application (25/00986/HOU) with identical plans to those proposed here despite officer advice, this previous revised scheme was refused on the grounds of design and its impact on the character of the area. This current application is identical to the previously refused application.

### 3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. 66 Leicester Road is a detached, two-storey, four-bedroom property constructed of red brick with white rendering. The house features an L-shaped layout, with a single storey protrusion to the north. The roof is fully hipped with the exception of two feature gables on the existing side elevation. The property features window and door openings on all elevations, all constructed in white uPVC.

- 3.2. The house occupies a large plot. As discussed above, the front elevation currently faces south as opposed to east onto Leicester Road from which there are two vehicular access points. There is a detached garage to the north of the dwelling with a parking area to the front. The properties gardens wrap around the entire dwelling.
- 3.3. The property is enclosed by wooden fencing, which serves as a boundary treatment separating it from the neighbouring properties. In addition there is substantial planting and mature trees on the site boundaries.
- 3.4. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of two-storey and single-storey properties in varying design and forms. Overall, the street scene lacks any distinctive or unique architectural character but the prevailing scale is two storey dwellings.

#### 4. Relevant Planning History

##### 25/00986/HOU

- Two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gates, outbuilding erection and internal alterations.
- Refused
- 18.11.2025

##### 25/00510/HOU

- Two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gates, outbuilding erection and internal alterations.
- Permitted
- 18.09.2025

##### 05/01326/FUL

- Conversion of garage to granny annexe and erection of detached garage
- Permitted
- 07.02.2006

##### 74/00859/4

- Erection of chalet bungalow
- Refused
- 26.11.1974

##### 74/01291/4

- Erection of a two storey house
- Outline Approved

- 28.01.1975

## 5. **Publicity**

5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents.

5.2 One objection has been received, raising concerns about the height of the proposed side extension and its resulting impacts on privacy and loss of light.

## 6. **Consultation**

- N/A

## 7. **Policy**

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 1: Development in Hinckley

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 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

7.4 Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- National Design Guide (2024)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)

## 8. **Appraisal**

8.1. Extensions to existing domestic properties are generally considered to be sustainable development in principle. 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

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.2 Policy DM10 requires new development to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regards to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials, and architectural features.

8.3 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).

8.4 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, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes.

8.5 According to the HBBC Good Design Guide, extensions should be subordinate to the main dwelling. For two-storey side extensions, this typically requires a reduction in ridge height and a setback from the front elevation. In this case, the proposed extension is set down by 1.11 metres from the highest ridge line of the property but it is not set back from the new front elevation. Despite this, the extensions when viewed from the front would appear sensitive to the character of the existing dwelling.

8.6 However, despite the subordinate ridge height, the overall roof form, eaves height and width of the new rear elevation of the extensions do not achieve subordination. The eaves height is higher than any currently present on the dwelling and the extension would be three storeys in comparison to the existing two storey dwelling with dominant hipped roof design. The extension appears visually dominant and its design disrupts the original layout and architectural rhythm of the main dwelling, creating an unacceptable and over dominant appearance to the rear. As a result, the proposal would not respect the character and appearance of the main dwelling and is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

8.7 Given the three-storey nature of the extension and the plot's prominent location, the unbalanced and discordant design would be highly visible from multiple spots along 'The Rills' to the rear despite the presence of hedges to the rear. Its design and incongruous form would significantly harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Furthermore, the presence of vegetation which screens part of the extension cannot be relied upon in perpetuity.

8.8 As a result, the proposed extensions would not respect the character of the existing dwelling with regards to scale and design, as a result the proposal would neither complement nor enhance the character of the site and surrounding area, therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

8.9 The proposed porch on the front elevation, relocated from the side, enhances the façade and contributes to a more symmetrical street appearance. Featuring a pitched

roof, two pillars, and a wooden door, the element of the design complements and elevates the overall design of the main dwelling in this elevation.

- 8.10 The proposals for the walls, gate and outbuilding have already been granted consent under application 25/00510/HOU. Walls and gates to the height proposed are not common features within the streetscene; however, due to the presence of planting, the use of matching materials, and the setback from the highway, they are not considered to have a significant impact on the design of the main dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 8.11 The proposed outbuilding, located in the southwest corner of the garden space, does not affect existing trees or planting. It features a pitched roof and white render to match the main dwelling, along with two windows and a door in a consistent style. Though not readily visible from public view, its design ensures no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the property or surrounding area.
- 8.12 In summary, the proposed extension fails to complement the design, form, rhythm, and scale of the existing dwelling, and its prominence within the streetscene is not considered to be in keeping with the design and character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the development is not in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) and the aims of the Good Design Guide.

#### Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.13 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.
- 8.14 The most affected neighbouring property is No. 11 The Rills, located to the northwest of the application site. In line with the HBBC Good Design Guide and in the principle of good neighbourliness, a minimum separation of 1 metre from the boundary—resulting in a total distance of at least 2 metres between properties—is encouraged. The proposed development maintains this separation.
- 8.15 The proposed extension would include habitable rooms windows at ground, first and second floor approximately 2m from the shared boundary with No.11 The Rills. This is not considered to present a neighbourly form of development as it will appear somewhat overdominant, would cause some loss of light and as the windows would overlook No.11 would cause some loss of privacy. Therefore, the revised development is considered to have an additional adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenities compared to the previously approved plan. However, the front outdoor space at No.11 does not appear to be utilised for primary/private amenity space and there are no habitable room windows on the closest south facing elevation of No.11 and therefore this harm is not considered to be unacceptable.
- 8.16 The neighbouring property at No. 68a Leicester Road is located to the north of the application site. Due to the separation distance of approximately 16 metres between

the proposed development and this property and its orientation, the development would not have any impact on the residential amenity of this neighbour.

- 8.17 The proposed outbuilding will be positioned in the southwest corner of the garden, maintaining a 1-metre distance from the timber boundary fence. As there are no neighbouring residential properties directly adjacent to this location (there is only a footpath which remains unaffected) the proposed outbuilding is not considered to have any adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity to the dwelling to the south.
- 8.18 The proposed new window and door openings on the front elevation are not expected to have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties, due to a generous setback of approximately 12 metres from the Leicester Road boundary and adjacent dwellings.
- 8.19 By virtue of the factors outlined above, the development is judged to be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP and the principles set out in the Good Design Guide in terms of its impact on residential amenity.

#### Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.20 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.
- 8.21 Policy DM18 of the SADMP also requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.22 According to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG), table (28) states that a minimum of three off street parking spaces are required for a seven-bedroom dwelling. The existing property includes a single garage, which will be retained, and parking spaces which can comfortably accommodate more than three parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to result in any harm or adverse impact on parking provision or highway safety.
- 8.23 To conclude, the proposal does not create any adverse impact on highway safety or the road network. Therefore, the scheme is 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 The proposal relates the householder application which is a revised scheme of approved planning permission (25/00510/HOU) for a two storey rear extension above existing single storey extension, loft conversion, new front wall with electric gate, erection of an outbuilding and internal alterations.

10.2 Whilst the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity and the surrounding highway network, by virtue of its scale and design, the proposed extension would have an appearance that is incongruous with the architectural rhythm of the existing dwelling and would create an extension which is over dominant and inconsistent with the character and appearance of the main dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, it is considered to be contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Hinckley and Bosworth Good Design Guide (2020) and National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

## 11. Recommendation

### 11.1 **Refuse planning permission** for the following reason

1. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed extension would have an appearance that is incongruous with the architectural rhythm of the existing dwelling and would also appear over dominant in scale. The proposed design would also fail to complement or enhance the surrounding area with regard to its scale, mass and

design. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), the Hinckley and Bosworth Good Design Guide (2020) and National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

## 12. Notes to applicant

This application has been determined with assessment of the submitted Application Form, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations Dwg No.167-02 E, Location & Block Plan Dwg No.167-03 B, and Gate & Wall Design Plan Dwg No.167-04 as received by the Local Planning Authority on the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2025.