

# Public Document Pack



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

**Bill Cullen** MBA (ISM), BA(Hons) MRTPI  
*Chief Executive*

**Date: 07 February 2022**

**To: Members of the Planning Committee**

Cllr MJ Crooks (Chairman)	Cllr A Furlong
Cllr DJ Findlay (Vice-Chairman)	Cllr SM Gibbens
Cllr CM Allen	Cllr L Hodgkins
Cllr RG Allen	Cllr KWP Lynch
Cllr CW Boothby	Cllr LJ Mullaney
Cllr SL Bray	Cllr RB Roberts
Cllr DS Cope	Cllr H Smith
Cllr WJ Crooks	Cllr BR Walker
Cllr REH Flemming	

Copy to all other Members of the Council

(other recipients for information)

Dear member,

There will be a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** in the De Montfort Suite, Hinckley Hub on **TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2022** at **6.30 pm** and your attendance is required.

The agenda for the meeting is set out overleaf.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Owen'.

Rebecca Owen  
Democratic Services Manager

## Fire Evacuation Procedures

- On hearing the fire alarm, leave the building **at once** quickly and calmly by the nearest escape route (indicated by green signs).
- *There are two escape routes from the Council Chamber – at the side and rear. Leave via the door closest to you.*
- Proceed to **Willowbank Road car park**, accessed from Rugby Road then Willowbank Road.
- **Do not** use the lifts.
- **Do not** stop to collect belongings.

## Recording of meetings

At HBBC we are open and transparent about how we make decisions. We allow recording, filming and photography at all public meetings including Council, the Executive and Planning Committee as long as doing so does not disturb or disrupt the proceedings. There may occasionally be some reports that are discussed in private session where legislation requires this to happen, but this is infrequent.

We also allow the use of social media during meetings, which helps to bring the issues discussed to a wider audience.

Members of the public, members of the press and councillors are hereby informed that, in attending the meeting, you may be captured on film. If you have a particular problem with this, please contact us so we can discuss how we may accommodate you at the meeting.

## Use of mobile phones

To minimise disturbance to others attending the meeting, please switch off your phone or other mobile device or turn it onto silent or vibrate mode.

Thank you

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 FEBRUARY 2022

### A G E N D A

1. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

2. **MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2022.

3. **ADDITIONAL URGENT BUSINESS BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES**

To be advised of any additional items of business which the Chairman decides by reason of special circumstances shall be taken as matters of urgency at this meeting. Items to be taken at the end of the agenda.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To receive verbally from Members any disclosures which they are required to make in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct or in pursuance of Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. **This is in addition to the need for such disclosure to be also given when the relevant matter is reached on the agenda.**

5. **QUESTIONS**

To hear any questions in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12.

6. **DECISIONS DELEGATED AT PREVIOUS MEETING**

To report progress on any decisions delegated at the previous meeting.

7. **21/00787/OUT - LAND NORTH EAST OF ASHBY ROAD, MARKFIELD (Pages 5 - 32)**

Application for residential development of up to 93 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and SuDS (Outline – access only) (cross boundary application with Charnwood BC)

8. **APPEALS PROGRESS (Pages 33 - 44)**

To report on progress relating to various appeals.

This page is intentionally left blank

## HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 JANUARY 2022 AT 6.30 PM

PRESENT: Cllr MJ Crooks - Chairman  
Cllr DJ Findlay – Vice-Chairman  
Cllr RG Allen, Cllr CW Boothby, Cllr MB Cartwright (for Cllr SL Bray),  
Cllr MA Cook (for Cllr CM Allen), Cllr DS Cope, Cllr WJ Crooks,  
Cllr REH Flemming, Cllr A Furlong, Cllr SM Gibbens, Cllr DT Glenville (for Cllr L  
Hodgkins), Cllr KWP Lynch and Cllr LJ Mullaney

Also in attendance: Councillor DC Bill MBE and Councillor JMT Collett

Officers in attendance: Matthew Bowers, Louise Jelley, Rebecca Owen and  
Michael Rice

#### 279. **Apologies and substitutions**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors C Allen, Bray, Hodgkins, Roberts, Smith and Walker with the following substitutions authorised in accordance with council procedure rule 10:

Councillor Cartwright for Councillor Bray  
Councillor Cook for Councillor Allen  
Councillor Glenville for Councillor Hodgkins.

#### 280. **Minutes**

It was moved by Councillor Findlay, seconded by Councillor Cope and

RESOLVED – the minutes of the meeting held on 14 December be approved as a correct record and signed by the chairman.

#### 281. **Declarations of interest**

No interests were declared.

#### 282. **Decisions delegated at previous meeting**

It was noted that the section 106 agreements were being finalised in relation to the decisions delegated at the previous meeting. It was reported that the target to finalise the section 106 agreement for application 21/00656/OUT which had been reported to the October meeting was approaching and a short extension had been agreed with the chairman.

#### 283. **21/01147/OUT - Land off Wood Lane, Higham on the Hill**

Application for residential development for up to 61 dwellings, including a shop, open space, new access and associated works.

Notwithstanding the officer's recommendation that permission be granted, it was moved by Councillor Allen and seconded by Councillor Boothby that permission be refused due to the proposal being outside of the settlement boundary and therefore contrary to policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies development plan document (2016). Upon being put to the vote, the motion was LOST.

Councillor Cartwright requested that, if members were minded to grant permission, the S106 agreement should include a requirement to market the shop for a period of 24 months. It was subsequently moved by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Cartwright and

RESOLVED –

(i) Permission be granted subject to:

(a) The completion within 6 months of this resolution a S106 agreement to secure the following obligations:

- Affordable housing at 40% with a split of 75% as social/affordable rented and 25% as intermediate tenure (shared ownership)
- Location connection requirement for the affordable housing for rent and cascade mechanism
- Maximum of 100 square metres of shop floorspace (Use Class Ea)
- Marketing Strategy for the shop (Use Class Ea)
- On-site open space requirement of 1,330sqm informal/casual play space and a 20 year maintenance cost (minimum of £14,364.00)
- Off-site equipped open space contribution of £39,951.83 towards HIG04 and a 10 year maintenance cost (minimum of £19,280.88)
- Off-site outdoor sports provision contribution of £21,198.72 towards site HIG04 and 10 year maintenance of £10,072.32
- On-site accessibility natural green space requirement of 2,440sqm along with a 20 year maintenance cost (minimum of £34,648.00)
- Civic Amenity contribution of £3,021 towards Barwell Household Waste Recycling Centre
- Library services contribution of £1,850.00 towards provision of additional resources at Hinckley Library, Lancaster Road, Hinckley
- Education contribution of £556,918.51 to be used to accommodate the capacity issues created by the proposed development by improving, remodelling or enhancing existing facilities at Higham-on-the-Hill Church of England Primary School (£335,914.80), Redmoor Academy (£182,156.44) and Hinckley Academy and John Cleveland Sixth Form Centre (£38,847.27)

- NHS Health care contribution (£30,885.06)
- Travel Packs (1 per dwelling)
- 6 month travel passes (2 per dwelling)
- Raised kerb provision at the nearest two bus stops (ID's 2032 & 2035) at a cost of £3,500.00 per stop (total of £7,000.00).

(b) Planning conditions outlined in the officer's report

- (ii) The Planning Manager be granted powers to determine the final detail of planning conditions;
- (iii) The Planning Manager be granted delegated powers to determine the terms of the S106 agreement including trigger points and claw back periods based on the terms agreed by the planning committee.

**284. 21/00699/FUL - Congregational Church, 114 Main Street, Markfield**

Application for change of use of church to one dwelling with two bedrooms and elevational changes to the building.

Whilst generally in support of the proposal, Cllr Furlong proposed that condition 8 be amended to require the screening along the rear boundary yard wall to be appropriate in order to maintain the privacy of the neighbouring property rather than simply requiring the erection of a trellis and a minimum of 50cm above the wall. The motion was seconded by Councillor Cartwright and it was subsequently

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) Permission be granted subject to the conditions contained in the officer's report with condition 8 amended as outlined above;
- (ii) The Director (Environment & Planning) be granted delegated powers to determine the final detail of the conditions.

**285. 21/01189/FUL - Land at rear of 8 Wykin Road, Hinckley**

Application for two dwellings.

Notwithstanding the officer's recommendation that permission be granted, it was moved by Councillor Lynch and seconded by Councillor Cartwright that the application be deferred to enable discussion with the applicant to explore the possibility of reducing the application to one dwelling which would preferably be a bungalow, and reducing its scale and mass. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED and it was

**RESOLVED** – the application be deferred for discussion with the applicant.

286. **21/00787/OUT - Land north east of Ashby Road, Markfield**

It was reported that this application had been deferred.

(The Meeting closed at 8.00 pm)

---

CHAIRMAN



Planning Committee - 15 February 2022  
Report of the Director Environment and Planning

Planning Ref: 21/00787/OUT


Applicant: Penland Estates Limited, RV Millington Limited,  
Ward: Markfield Stanton & Fieldhead



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

Site: Land North East Of Ashby Road Markfield

Proposal: Residential development of up to 93 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and SuDS (Outline- access only) (cross boundary application with Charnwood BC)



1. This application was taken to the previous Planning Committee (14.12.2021) and was set to be heard at January Committee (18.01.2022). The December committee report and accompanying late items are attached to this report as Appendix A and B. The January committee report can be found at Appendix C. The application was not heard in January but deferred again until this committee.
2. At the December committee, the item was deferred to consult with LCC Highways and Environmental Health on the impact upon neighbouring residential amenity from car headlights leaving the proposed access.
3. LCC highways have no further comments to add and state their comments are as per provided within Appendix A. The HBBC Environmental Health officer was also consulted. The details have been assessed and the late item will report in full the

conclusion in relation this aspect of the application which will then also be considered within the revised planning balance.

4. At December committee it was also requested that legal advice was sought on the application and this is still currently taking place.
5. The late item will therefore confirm if the item on the agenda has altered from that already presented to Planning Committee in December and if the recommendation remains the same.

## APPENDIX A

Planning Committee 14 December 2021  
Report of the Director Environment and Planning

Planning Ref: 21/00787/OUT


Applicant: Penland Estates Limited, RV Millington Limited,  
Ward: Markfield Stanton & Fieldhead



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

Site: Land North East Of Ashby Road Markfield

Proposal: Residential development of up to 93 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and SuDS (Outline- access only) (cross boundary application with Charnwood BC)



### 1. Recommendations

#### 1.1. Grant planning permission subject to:

- Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report

#### 1.2. That the Planning Director be given powers to determine the final detail of planning conditions.

## **2. Planning application description**

- 2.1. This application seeks outline planning permission for a residential development of up to 93 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and SuDS north-east of Ashby Road, Markfield.
- 2.2. This application is a cross-boundary application with Charnwood Borough Council for which the only land which lies within the administrative boundary of Hinckley and Bosworth BC is the front of the site where the access is proposed and the protected trees lie. The majority of the built development lies within Charnwood Borough Council. It will fall to the respective Local Planning Authorities to determine the part of the development that falls within their area. The application has all matters reserved except for access.
- 2.3. The proposed access would be off Ashby Road. The indicative layout shows the removal of two trees where the access is proposed and replacement tree planting along the tree line adjacent to Ashby Road.
- 2.4. The following documents were submitted in support of the application;
  - Application Form
  - Site Location Plan
  - Illustrative Layout
  - Design and Access Statement
  - Landscape and Visual Appraisal
  - Tree Survey
  - Phase 1 Desk Study Assessment
  - Transport Assessment
  - Travel Plan
  - Ecological Appraisal
  - Consultation Statement
  - Flood Risk Assessment
  - Noise Assessment
  - Heritage Assessment

## **3. Description of the site and surrounding area**

- 3.1. The application site is situated to the North of Ashby Road, Markfield, outside of the defined settlement boundary. The application site is approximately 3.66 hectares with approximately 0.25 hectares of the site lying within Hinckley and Bosworth. The land within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough comprises an existing gate to the field and trees. The trees are protected under a County Council Tree Preservation Order (49/00001/TPORD).
- 3.2. The application site is situated within the National and Charnwood Forest, and is bound by Ashby Road to the south, the motorway to the north. The site comprises of three separate paddocks divided by a combination of post and rail fencing and hedgerow with mature trees.

## **4. Relevant planning history**

None Relevant.

## **5. Publicity**

- 5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents. A site notice was also posted within the vicinity of the site and a notice was displayed in the local press.

5.2. 13 letters of objection from 10 addresses have been received from third parties raising the following concerns:

- 1) Single access dangerous
- 2) Impact upon infrastructure
- 3) Loss of countryside
- 4) Contrary to Markfield NDP
- 5) Important wildlife site
- 6) Create a permanent noise disruption
- 7) Light pollution
- 8) Issue with pedestrian safety
- 9) Overdevelopment of the site
- 10) Loss of amenity

## **6. Consultation**

6.1. No objection, some subject to conditions and/or obligations have been received from:

- LCC Ecology
- HBBC Affordable Housing
- LCC Tree Officer
- HBBC Drainage
- HBBC Environmental Health
- LCC Drainage
- HBBC Pollution
- LCC Highways
- LCC Developer Contributions
- Leicestershire Police
- Leicestershire CCG

6.2. Markfield Parish Council comments that the development is contrary to the made Neighbourhood Development Plan. In addition, the development will also place an unbearable pressure on key infrastructure i.e. GP services. The site lies outside of the settlement boundary and in a highly sensitive area which will encroach onto Charnwood Forest. The access from Ashby Road is of concern as it would be dangerous and create an additional burden on the highway network.

## **7. Policy**

7.1. Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (2020)

- Policy M1: Countryside
- Policy M3: Green Infrastructure
- Policy M5: Trees
- Policy M9: Locally Valued Heritage
- Policy M15: Housing Provision
- Policy M16: Housing Allocation – Land south of London Road

7.2. Core Strategy (2009)

- Policy 7: Key Rural Centres
- Policy 8: Key Rural Centres Relating to Leicester

7.3. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM7: Preventing Pollution and Flooding

- Policy DM10: Development and Design
  - Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
  - Policy DM12: Heritage Assets
  - Policy DM13: Preserving the Borough's Archaeology
  - Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- 7.4. National Planning Policies and Guidance
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
  - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- 7.5. Other relevant guidance
- Good Design Guide (2020)
  - National Design Guide (2019)
  - Leicestershire Highways Design Guide
  - Landscape Character Assessment (2017)
  - Leicestershire Highways Design Guide
- 8. Appraisal**
- 8.1. Key Issues
- Assessment against strategic planning policies
  - Design and impact upon the character of the area
  - Heritage
  - Impact upon trees
  - Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
  - Impact upon highway safety
  - Drainage
  - Impact upon Public Rights of Way
  - Ecology
  - Other matters
- Assessment against strategic planning policies
- 8.2 Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) states that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and that the NPPF is a material consideration in determining applications. Paragraph 12 of the NPPF confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.
- 8.3 Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM1 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) set out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and state that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this instance consists of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (2020-2039).
- 8.4 The spatial distribution of growth across the Borough during the plan period 2006-2026 is set out in the adopted Core Strategy. This identifies and provides allocations for housing and other development in a hierarchy of settlements within the Borough. Markfield is identified as a Key Rural Centre within Policy 7 and 8 of the Core Strategy. Markfield has several key services, including a Library, Primary School and Medical Centre. This shows that the village has accessible community facilities serving the existing community, and any new residents of the future. In

addition to this, within Markfield centre the following economic activity: beauty salon, hot food takeaways, hairdressers, financial advisor, hardware store, convenience stores and supermarket (co-op) (This is supported in the District, Local and Neighbourhood Centre Review (2015) and the Community Facilities Review (2013)). In this sense Markfield is an economically and socially sustainable settlement.

- 8.5 To support its role as a Key Rural Centre, Policy 8 allocated a minimum of 80 new homes in Markfield. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) allocated sites for housing in Markfield in three locations all of which had planning permission at the time of allocation equating to more than 80 dwellings.
- 8.6 Notwithstanding this, the housing policies in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD are considered to be out-of-date as they focus on delivery of a lower housing requirement than required by the up-to-date figure when using the standard method set out by MHCLG. In addition, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Therefore, any formal application should be determined against Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework whereby permission should be granted unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, supported by Policy DM1 of the SADMP.
- 8.7 This is weighed in the balance of the merits of any application and considered with the policies in the Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD and the Core Strategy which are attributed significant weight as they are consistent with the Framework.
- 8.8 In relation to paragraph 11(d), paragraph 14 of the framework states that where an application applies for housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (subject to criteria. Markfield Neighbourhood Plan was made in September 2021 and is less than 2 years old and therefore supersedes the housing requirement within the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD.
- 8.9 Policy M15 of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan identifies a housing requirement of 334 dwellings up to 2036. Taking into account completions and commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 280 dwellings to be provided within the neighbourhood plan area. Policy M16 of MNP allocates the land south of London Road for 280 dwellings to meet the residual requirement. This site now has planning permission for 282 dwellings and is classed within the Residential Land Availability Statement (2020-21) as deliverable. It should be noted that the majority of this site is not within the administrative boundary of HBBC and therefore this site could not be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
- 8.10 The site is located outside of the settlement boundary of Markfield, within the countryside and therefore any application should be assessed against Policy DM4 of the SADMP and Policy M1 of the MNP.
- 8.11 Policy DM4 of the adopted SADMP seeks to protect the intrinsic value, beauty and open character and landscape character through safeguarding the countryside from unsustainable development.
- 8.12 DM4 states Development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where:
  - a) It is for outdoor sport or recreation purposes (including ancillary buildings) and it can be demonstrated that the proposed scheme cannot be provided within or adjacent to settlement boundaries; or

- b) The proposal involves the change of use, re-use or extension of existing buildings which lead to the enhancement of the immediate setting; or
  - c) It significantly contributes to economic growth, job creation and/or diversification of rural businesses; or
  - d) It relates to the provision of stand-alone renewable energy developments in line with policy DM2: Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development; or
  - e) It relates to the provision of accommodation for a rural worker in line with Policy DM5: Enabling Rural Worker Accommodation.
- and:
- i) It does not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside; and
  - ii) It does not undermine the physical and perceived separation and open character between settlements; and
  - iii) It does not create or exacerbate ribbon development;
  - iv) If within a Green Wedge, it protects its role and function in line with Core Strategy Policies 6 and 9; and
  - v) If within the National Forest, it contributes to the delivery of the National Forest Strategy in line with Core Strategy Policy 21

8.13 Policy M1 of the MNP states that the following types of development will be supported in countryside locations:

- 1) Recreation and tourism that cannot be provided within the Settlement Boundary;
- 2) Development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers;
- 3) The subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; and
- 4) Development that is otherwise in accordance with: national policies, or strategic planning policies or allocations; or with the other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

8.14 The illustrative masterplan shows only the access, part of the road, the tree line and a minor part of the unadopted 'Lane 2' within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's boundary. These parts of the proposal do not come under any of the categories identified in DM4 as sustainable development and so there is a conflict between the proposed development and the policy. The proposals within HBBC would not undermine the physical separation between settlements or exacerbate ribbon development. Its impact upon the countryside will be assessed within the character section below.

8.15 Policy M1 of the MNP is complied with subject to the development being in accordance with national and local policies.

8.16 As the area within HBBC contains no housing development paragraph 14 of the NPPF does not apply to Hinckley and Bosworth's part of the site and therefore the conflict with Policy DM4 of the SADMP and Policy M1 of the MNP will be weighed within the tilted balance.

Design and impact upon the character of the area

8.17 Policy DM4 of the SADMP requires that development in the countryside does not have an adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside, does not undermine the physical and perceived



separation and open character between settlements and does not create or exacerbate ribbon development.

- 8.18 Policy DM10 of the SADMP seeks to ensure that new development should complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.
- 8.19 The site falls adjacent to HBBC Landscape Character Area (LCA) A: Charnwood Forest Settled Forest Hills, where the majority of the Borough's woodland is found. Rectilinear agricultural fields make up much of the land cover in the area and these are arranged in an irregular pattern, well-defined by hedgerows and hedgerow trees, which add to the perception of a well-wooded context. Smaller blocks of deciduous woodland plantations also break up the expanse of agricultural fields, as well as frequent historic quarries which are scattered throughout the landscape within this character area. Markfield is well integrated in the landscape because of the rolling topography and wooded character and is well connected by a good road network with links to Leicester via the M1, A46 and A50.
- 8.20 The Landscape Character Assessment (2017) sets out key sensitivities of this LCA which include;
- Late to post medieval enclosure, ridge and furrow as well as some assarts in and around Ancient Woodland contributes to the sense of place and provides continuity to the agricultural past.
  - Large mature woodlands and newer woodland plantations interspersed throughout the landscape create a well-wooded context and create relatively tranquil subareas away from the busy roads.
  - The distinct historic cores of the villages with an abundance of local building stone provide a strong sense of place and a sense of time depth.
- 8.21 In accordance with this strategy the proposal should seek to conserve and enhance the historic core of the village, promote characteristic building forms and integrate within this wooded landscape. It should also support the vision of the National Forest Strategy by planting native and mixed species woodland. Conserve and enhance the well wooded character of the landscape. Promote woodland management such as coppicing and ground flora diversification, as well as hedgerow tree planting.
- 8.22 The illustrative masterplan shows the retention of the existing boundary tree and hedgerow planting aligning with the landscape strategies for this LCA, and would help integrate development in to the landscape.
- 8.23 The proposed access would be approximately 5.5 metres in width and would extend into the site. Two trees within the Tree Preservation Order group would need to be removed in order to provide this access however it is not considered that the removal of these trees would have a significant detrimental impact upon the character of the area – this is assessed further within the impact upon trees section.
- 8.24 The level of development proposed within the HBBC administrative boundary is considered to be minor. The proposed access would introduce hardstanding into a rural location however it would not be out of character within Ashby Road. It is not considered that the additional tarmac surface required for this development would have a detrimental impact on the open character of the countryside in this location. Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policies DM4 and DM10 of the SADMP.

## Heritage

- 8.25 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
- 8.26 Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraphs 199-202 of the NPPF require great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets when considering the impact of a proposed development on its significance, for any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset to have clear and convincing justification, and for that harm to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal.
- 8.27 Paragraph 203 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 8.28 Paragraph 206 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.
- 8.29 Policies DM11 and DM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP) Development Plan Document seek to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets. Policy DM11 states that the Borough Council will protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment throughout the borough. This will be done through the careful management of development that might adversely impact both designated and non-designated heritage assets. All development proposals which have the potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting will be required to demonstrate:
- a) An understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, and
  - b) The impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset and its setting, including measures to minimise or avoid these impacts; and
  - c) How the benefits of the proposal will outweigh any harm caused
  - d) Any impact on archaeology in line with Policy DM13
- 8.30 All development proposals affecting the significance of heritage assets and their setting will be assessed in accordance with Policy DM11 and will require justification as set out in this policy. Policy DM12 states that development proposals should ensure the significance of a conservation area is preserved and enhanced, and that development proposals should make every effort to retain the significance of locally listed heritage assets.
- 8.31 Policy M9: Locally Valued Heritage Assets of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan states that development proposals that will affect the following local valued heritage assets (which includes the Queens Head and Council Houses on Ashby Road) or their setting will be assessed having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 8.32 In determining applications, paragraph 194 of the NPPF and Policy DM11 of the SADMP requires an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF also requires local planning authorities to identify and assess the particular

significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal, including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset. That required assessment has been undertaken in the body of these comments. The Heritage Assessment that has been prepared to accompany the application identifies the significance of affected heritage assets; this document is considered to be proportionate and meets the requirements of paragraph 194 of the NPPF and Policy DM11 of the SADMP.

#### Affected heritage assets

- 8.33 There are designated heritage assets located within the vicinity of this application site (particularly to the south) which includes the Markfield Conservation Area, the Church of St. Michael, this being a grade II\* listed building that is a prominent feature within the landscape, and the grade II listed Old Rectory which is located within the settlement's historic core. The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan also identifies twenty-four non-designated heritage assets within the Parish and these closely align to significant local buildings identified within the Markfield Conservation Area Appraisal (MCAA) (2010).
- 8.34 As there are heritage assets located within a proportionate search area around the application site, it must be assessed if the site falls within the setting of these assets. The NPPF (Annex 2) defines the setting of a heritage asset as "the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral." Historic England provide advice on the setting of heritage assets in their Good Practice in Planning Note 3 (2015), this identifies that the surroundings in which an asset is experienced may be more extensive than its curtilage. The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations.
- 8.35 Historic England recommends undertaking a five step approach to assessing change in the setting of heritage assets. The first step is to identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected by the proposal.
- 8.36 Due to either the topography and presence of intervening built form and vegetation there is no clear or particular inter-visibility between the application site and any listed buildings and the majority of the non-designated heritage assets identified within the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan and MCAA, nor is there any known key historic, functional or other relevant relationships between the application site and these heritage assets. The application site is therefore not considered to fall within their setting and none of these heritage assets would be sensitive to or affected by an appropriate form of development within the application site.
- 8.37 The built development to the western side of Main Street and to the north of Forest Road, in addition to its varied topography, means there is no inter-visibility between the application site and these areas of the Markfield Conservation Area. There is however some inter-visibility between the site and the closest section of the conservation area, marked by the junction of Main Street and Ashby Road. There is a small cluster of significant local buildings (and locally valued heritage assets / non-designated heritage assets) located within this section of the conservation area. Intervening built form and vegetation prevents or greatly limits inter-visibility between the application site and Town Head Farm and the Old Police House nor is there any known key historic, functional or other relevant relationships between the application site and these heritage assets. Of those local heritage assets located within the conservation area the only asset where there is a visual relationship to the application site is The Queens Head public house.

- 8.38 The Council Houses on Ashby Road are features of local heritage interest identified within the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. They are located opposite the south-western corner of the application site and there is some inter-visibility between the application site and the front elevations and gardens of the Council Houses between the intervening vegetation.
- 8.39 The application site is therefore considered to fall within the setting of the Markfield Conservation Area and the local heritage assets The Queens Head and the Council Houses on Ashby Road.
- 8.40 No assessment has been made of the impact of the proposal upon Home Farm, Priory Lane, Ulverscroft, which is a locally listed building identified by Charnwood Borough Council and is located within that local authority boundary.

#### Significance of affected heritage assets

- 8.41 Step 2 is to assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset or allow significance to be appreciated.
- 8.42 The Markfield Conservation Area comprises the historic core of the village and has an organic street pattern, building style and use of materials, including the prevalent use of local stone. Buildings within the conservation area variously relate to the agricultural and industrial heritage of the village which remains discernible within the built form. The significance of the conservation area is vested within its historic and evidential value as a rural agricultural community which also developed into a centre for framework knitting. This heritage is reflected in traditional cottages, farmsteads and local vernacular buildings of architectural interest which are interspersed within the streetscene.
- 8.43 The conservation area is largely surrounded by modern housing development which reflects the expansion of the village during the 20<sup>th</sup> century and in many instances prohibits expansive views outwards within its boundaries. Some sections of the conservation area do remain close to adjacent to surrounding fields however and this includes the area near the application site, described as the norther gateway to the conservation area within the MCAA: *At the northern edge of the designated area the approach from both the east along Leicester Road and the west along Ashby Road follows the line of the former turnpike road which is arrow straight. At its junction with Main Street, the strategically sited former Police House and Town Head Farm, are a rather formal entrance. This formality is emphasised by the avenue of trees along the northern side of Ashby Road, which together with the grass verges and dry stone walls provides a natural link with the countryside beyond the limits of the village and the densely built up historic core of the village.* As such the conservation area is primarily experienced within a developed setting but where views of surrounding fields are possible they can be expansive and do contribute to the understanding of the agricultural history and rural setting of the village.
- 8.44 The site is currently largely undeveloped and has been used for agricultural purposes during its history. Currently from within the conservation area the site is only barely visible from the vicinity of the Queens Head in the position of an important view along Ashby Road as identified in the MCAA. Visibility of the site does increase considerably when leaving the conservation area along Ashby Road. Given the distance between the conservation area and the site, the topographical changes, some built form already experienced in the views, and the presence of some partially screening features including the band of trees and dry stone walls, it is considered that the site makes a minor contribution only to the significance of the conservation area by allowing for an appreciation of its rural setting. It therefore currently comprises a minor positive element of its wider setting.

8.45 The Queens Head is a three bay two storey slate roofed building that likely dates from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Its heritage significance is primarily vested within its age and illustrative historical interest as part of the social development of the village although it does retain some limited architectural interest derived from its vernacular form with tall chimney stacks. Its open car park to the west and roadside gateway position ensure it is a local landmark along Ashby Road meaning it has a relatively wide setting which allows for its significance to be appreciated. Whilst there is some inter-visibility between the between the Queens Head and the application site the public house itself derives no particular significance from the application site as a series of paddocks so the site is considered to form a neutral element of its setting.

8.46 The heritage significance of the Council Houses on Ashby Road is primarily vested in the architectural value of their built form which allows for an appreciation of their role in the social history of the village. Whilst there is some inter-visibility between them and the application site, they derive no particular significance from their wider setting to the north and the site is considered to form a neutral element of their setting.

The proposal

8.47 A site layout plan has been submitted which indicates details of the proposal. A new vehicular access is proposed off Ashby Road to the south-eastern corner boundary of the site. Dwellings would be sited within the central core of the site. Surface water attenuation ponds and areas of landscaping would be sited around the edge of the site. Boundary vegetation including mature trees is indicated to remain on the site plan as are some existing field boundary hedgerows within the interior of the site.

Impact of the proposal upon the significance of affected heritage assets

8.48 Step 3 of the Historic England Good Practice in Planning Note 3 is to assess the effects of the proposal, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance of affected heritage assets or on the ability to appreciate that significance.

8.49 The site has been assessed as a minor positive element of the wider setting of the Markfield Conservation Area. The proposed development will be set back with the application site from Ashby Road on a north facing slope. There is separation from the conservation area due to the intervening distance and the visual representation of modern housing to the west of Town Head Farm and the rising ground between the site and the Queens Head. This effectively obscures views to and from the development site and limits any experience of the conservation area to roof lines and distance street frontage. The effect of the walling and tree line along Ashby Road, the position of the dwellings set slightly back into the site and the sloping topography will greatly limit views from within the conservation area, which would be from around the position of the Queens Head. It is therefore considered that whilst the proposed development of the application site may result in a negligible visual change in some distant and limited views from the conservation area, the development would not appear as particularly incongruous or a harmful addition given the presence of some surrounding built form and the overall impact upon the conservation area from the introduction of the proposed development within its wider setting would be negligible.

8.50 The proposal has no physical impact upon the Queens Head and Council Houses on Ashby Road as non-designated heritage assets but it does result in a minor change to their setting. Given that this setting makes no particular contribution to their significance and the development would be experienced alongside the partially established developed character of the area to the west, south and east the proposed development of the site will maintain its present neutral role within the

setting of these non-designated heritage assets. An appreciation of the significance of these heritage assets would also be maintained via views towards them from within the undeveloped and landscaped development site frontage along the higher ground of Ashby Road.

#### Heritage Summary

- 8.51 This proposal affects the significance of the Markfield Conservation Area and the non-designated heritage assets the Queens Head and the Council Houses on Ashby Road by virtue of its location within the wider setting of these heritage assets. Overall the proposal is considered to have a neutral impact causing no harm to their significance. The proposal therefore preserves the significance of the Markfield Conservation Area, the Queens Head and the Council Houses on Ashby Road and consequently it accords with Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP, section 16 of the NPPF and Policy M9 of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.
- 8.52 Step 4 in the Historic England assessment approach is to explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm. It is considered that there is no particular means to achieve an enhancement to the setting of affected heritage assets via this proposal.
- 8.53 Step 5 relates to making and documenting the decision and monitoring outcomes. Such recommended good practice has been achieved by setting out the assessment stage of the decision-making process in an accessible way in the body of this report.

#### Impact upon trees

- 8.54 Policy DM10 of the SADMP seeks to ensure that new development should complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area.
- 8.55 The application proposes to remove two trees which are protected by a County Tree Preservation Order in order to provide the access. A further 9 trees will also be removed which are protected. LCC Tree Officer has no objections to the application. A tree survey has been submitted as part of the application as well as an arboricultural method statement.
- 8.56 Tree coverage and boundary trees and hedgerows are important to the landscape character of the area. Policy M5 of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan also sets out that trees help define the character of the area. The neighbourhood plan also states that “where trees or hedgerows of lower arboricultural and amenity value are to be lost, then native species replacements should be planted in locations where they would have the opportunity to grow to maturity, increase canopy cover and contribute to the local ecosystem and the appearance of the area”. All of the trees proposed to be removed as unclassified trees and their removal will help promote the vitality of the tree group. The proposed access is located away from the root protection of Category A and B trees although there will still be conflict with the root protection area of some category B trees. Due to this an arboricultural method statement was asked for and received. This statement will be conditioned in order to protect the nearest Category B trees.
- 8.57 In regards to the Category U trees lost, replacement trees will be conditioned to be replaced by similar species and within the administration boundary of Hinckley and Bosworth so that the character of the site and area can be retained. .
- 8.58 Subject to conditions the proposed loss and replacement of trees on the site therefore complies with Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

#### Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.59 Policy DM10 of the adopted SADMP seeks to ensure that development would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy or amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings and the amenity of the occupiers of the proposed development would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.60 The development in the Hinckley and Bosworth boundary is considered to be minor. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon the nearest residential dwellings.
- 8.61 If the overall scheme is considered the indicative plan shows the site could incorporate the majority of Charnwood's Open Space requirements and that the other requirements will be deferred to contributions within the Section 106 agreement.
- 8.62 The indicative layout shows the dwellings towards the front of the site being set back considerably from Ashby Road. With the mature tree line to the front of the site there will be considerable screening and therefore there would be no adverse impact upon the properties on Ashby Road.
- 8.63 No. 50 Ashby road is the closest residential dwelling to the site and is set approximately 15 metres from the boundary of the site. It is considered that the reserved matters submission will be able to design the layout of the site so that there is no conflict with this dwelling.
- 8.64 The residential amenity of future occupiers is to be determined at reserved matters stage and considered by Charnwood Borough Council.
- 8.65 Overall, it is considered that there would be no adverse impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring or future dwellings at this stage and therefore the proposal development within HBBC complies with DM10 of the SADMP.

#### Impact upon highway safety

- 8.66 Policy DM17 of the SADMP states that all new development should be in accordance with the highway design standards.
- 8.67 The application is not assessed against DM18 of the SADMP as the parking for the proposed dwellings is not within HBBC's administrative boundary. Although it is only the access within HBBC to consider whether it is acceptable the use of the site has to be taken into account and therefore this section will be assessed with that in mind.
- 8.68 A Transport Assessment and addendum and a Travel Plan has been submitted as part of the application.
- 8.69 The site access and connectivity only is for formal consideration by HBBC. The junction capacity assessments and transport sustainability has been assessed by the Local Highway Authority for Charnwood Borough Council and is considered acceptable (subject to section 106 contributions).

#### Site Access

- 8.70 Access to the site is proposed off Ashby Road, a C classified road subject to a 40mph speed limit. For clarity, no form of access is being proposed off the A50 to the north of the site.
- 8.71 Details of the site access arrangements are provided on MAC drawing number 454-TA10. The Applicant has proposed an access width of 5.5 metres, junction radii of 6.0 metres and 2.0 metre wide footways on either side. This is considered in

accordance with the guidance set out within Part 3 of the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide.

- 8.72 In order to ascertain the speed of traffic passing the site, the Applicant has obtained speed survey data from Leicestershire County Council, which was undertaken between 21 - 29 August 2017 in the vicinity of the site access. The speed survey indicated average 24 hour 85%ile speeds of 40.8mph south eastbound and 39.6mph north westbound. On this basis, the Applicant has detailed vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 x 120 metres in each direction on the site access drawing. These splays are accepted by the LHA as they either meet or exceed the visibility requirements set out within Part 3, Table DG4 of the LHDG. The visibility splays could be fully achieved within the existing extents of the public highway.
- 8.73 The Applicant has also submitted drawing number MAC drawing 454-TA12, which details tracking of a refuse collection vehicle entering and exiting the site in all directions. This is accepted by the LHA.
- 8.74 An independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) of the site access proposals has been submitted by the Applicant. This raised two problems, one being existing vegetation restricting visibility and the other being a direct footway from the site access to the existing bus stops on Ashby Road has not been provided. The Applicant has confirmed within the TA that the existing vegetation would be removed in order to provide the visibility splays.
- 8.75 Overall, the LHA considers the site access arrangements to be acceptable.

#### Pedestrian/ Bus Stop Connectivity

- 8.76 It was considered that the bus stops would need a footway link to be provided to connect to the site. The Applicant has advised they intend to maintain the character of the route in to Markfield as much as possible and retain the existing dry stone wall and tree line, some of which are partly protected by a Tree Preservation Order. A footway running alongside Ashby Road is therefore not proposed. The Applicant has however confirmed in Part 6 of the TA Addendum that the proposed pedestrian connection towards the west of the site would connect to the existing northern bus stop on Ashby Road using an existing gap in the wall at an existing gated access to the site. The Applicant has also confirmed that uncontrolled dropped crossing points to the existing bus stop to the south of Ashby Road would be considered at detailed design along with at the footways at the site access. Overall, this is accepted by the LHA.

#### Highway Safety

- 8.77 The Applicant has obtained Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data from Leicestershire County Council for the five years between 1 January 2015 - 28 November 2020. The Applicant obtained PIC data for the whole Markfield area as detailed within Appendix E of the TA.
- 8.78 The Applicant has identified two PICs which have occurred on Ashby Road, both of which were recorded as slight. The first occurred in 2015 to the south of the proposed access and involved a vehicle colliding with a parked vehicle. The second occurred at the junction of Ashby Road/ Altar Stones Lane and also involved a vehicle colliding with a parked vehicle.
- 8.79 The Applicant has advised that after studying the junctions and links within Markfield, there are also no specific patterns or trends of PICs. The LHA would highlight that there have been a number of PIC's occur at the A50 Field Head roundabout, all of which were recorded as slight, however otherwise the LHA accepts the Applicant's conclusion that there are no specific highway safety concerns within the study area. The A50 Field Head roundabout is discussed



further later in this report. Based on current records, the LHA is not aware of any additional PIC's occurring on Ashby Road between November 2020 and April 2021.

- 8.80 Overall it is considered the site access and its connectivity is acceptable and that there would be no severe highway safety impact from the proposed development. Therefore, the scheme complies with Policy DM7 of the SADMP.

#### Drainage

- 8.81 Policy DM7 of the SADMP seeks to ensure that development does not create or exacerbate flooding. The Environment Agency (EA) Flood Maps confirm that the site is located within Flood Zone 1, having low probability of flooding from rivers and sea and low risk from surface water flooding. The scale of proposal does not require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted. Nevertheless a flood risk assessment, which also includes a drainage strategy. The strategy suggests that surface water would be collected within a detention basin and SuDs features within the site and discharged at a green field run off rate.
- 8.82 The majority of the site drainage will not be within HBBC's boundary however as this is an outline application with all matters accept access reserved the conditions requested by the LLFA will also be imposed upon this application as the drainage the site should be considered as a whole.

- 8.83 Therefore the application complies with Policy DM7 of the SADMP.

#### Ecology

- 8.84 Policy DM6 of the SADMP requires development proposals to demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation. If the harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against or appropriate compensation measures provided, planning permission will be refused.
- 8.85 Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that development should result in a net gain for biodiversity by including ecological enhancement measures within the proposal.
- 8.86 LCC Ecology deferred the assessment of the application to Charnwood's Ecologist as the majority of the site is within their administrative boundary. The application is supported by an Ecological Appraisal.
- 8.87 The site has been assessed by both Charnwood's Senior Ecologist and the applicant's ecologists and it is recognised by both parties that an amount of the grassland within the site meets the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) criteria and constitutes an important ecological feature. The Council and the applicant have considered the indicative layout as a potential direction of travel for the development of the site and have both concluded that the level of biodiversity loss resulting for the indicative development needs to be addressed.
- 8.88 It is considered that in this instance potential loss could be addressed by detailed measures secured by approval of planning conditions and approved as part of the detailed reserved matters application. It is also recommended that a mechanism be included within the Section 106 agreement that requires the reserved matters scheme to be subject to a biodiversity impact assessment (BIA) using an appropriate metric which can secure an off-site mitigation contribution in the unlikely event that the scheme does not protect against a net loss of biodiversity.
- 8.89 Overall, it is considered that a carefully considered reserved matters application could result in a development which can ensure that there is no biodiversity loss on site or that if there is unavoidable loss it is otherwise compensated for offsite. The NPPF.

Other matters

8.90 Charnwood Borough Council have considered the following aspects as part of their application and have found no conflict with policies:

- 1) Noise
- 2) Land contamination
- 3) Light Pollution
- 4) Housing Mix
- 5) Open Space
- 6) Amenity
- 7) Infrastructure

8.91 The following Section 106 contributions will be secured by Charnwood Borough Council as the development within HBBC's boundary does not trigger any contributions (HBBC will be party and signatories to the S106):

Education	A contribution of £512,132.40 towards Newtown Linford Primary School and £277,632.16 Brookvale Groby Learning Campus Secondary School.
Affordable Housing	40% of units to be affordable comprising a mix of 77% social and affordable rent and 23% shared ownership.
Open Space	The provision of off-site contributions for outdoor sports facilities £32,839.00 and allotments equating to £10,501.00 (directed towards Open Spaces in Markfield).
NHS – CCG	A contribution of £51,367.69 towards improving the capacity of Markfield Medical Centre to allow for the accommodation of 225 additional patients generated by the scheme.
Libraries	£2,810.00 towards library facilities.
Highways	<p>A contribution of £454,212 (£4,884 per dwelling) towards the extended Coalville Transport Strategy to facilitate improvements to the A511/ A50 corridor in mitigating off-site impacts from developments in the area</p> <p>The provision of raised kerbs at the nearest two bus stops.</p> <p>The provision of travel packs for each dwelling, which will include two six-month bus passes, two per dwelling.</p> <p>Sustainable Travel Accreditation and Recognition Scheme monitoring fee of £6,000.</p>
Civic Amenity	£6,080.00 towards improving waste capacity within the area.
Biodiversity Mitigation	<p>The submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy which includes a new BIA assessment (using the Warwickshire County Council calculator) with an agreed baseline for the site, at reserved matters stage. Mitigation will be provided in order of the following preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To achieve no net biodiversity loss.</li> <li>2. Mitigation on site.</li> <li>3. Offsite contribution to commentary payment for a project within the vicinity of the development (to be agreed by all parties).</li> </ol>

8.92 As shown above the contributions will be directed to services and infrastructure within HBBC, where the impact of the development will be felt. This includes the provision of Play and Open Space that accords with the HBBC Open Space and Recreation Study (2016) requirements. In addition to the above contributions the following open space will be required on site and has been conditioned to be submitted as part of the reserved matters by Charnwood Borough Council:

- 0.07ha multi-functional green open space
- 0.45ha natural and semi-natural open space
- 1 equipped LEAP
- 0.10ha multi-functional green space area
- A young people's equipment/facilities

#### Planning Balance

8.93 Policy DM4 sets out what type of development within the countryside is acceptable however as this is based on out-of-date settlement boundaries this policy is also classed as out-of-date but afforded significant weight. As there are out-of-date policies within the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD this application should be assessed within the 'tilted balance' in accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. Therefore a presumption of sustainable development applies.

8.94 In terms of the development within Hinckley and Bosworth's administrative boundary the development conflicts with Policy DM4 of the SADMP in terms of part a-e however it does not conflict with part i-v. As there would not be any adverse impact on the character of the area which is partly countryside in line with Policy DM4 and DM10 it is considered that the conflict with Policy DM4 is moderate. Due to the proposals being in conflict with Policy DM4 the proposals are therefore also in conflict with Policy M1 of the MNP. This policy is afforded full weight.

8.95 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that any harm identified should be significant and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. It is therefore important to identify any further benefits. Following the three strands of sustainability the benefits are broken down into economic, social and environmental.

8.96 The wider proposal would result in economic benefits through the construction of the scheme albeit for a temporary period (applicable to the HBBC administrative area). Additionally the residents of the proposed development would provide ongoing support to local services.

8.97 The social benefit to the area and also to the borough would be from the wider scheme by the provision of dwellings but there is not any identified social benefit from the development within HBBC.

8.98 Some environmental benefits would be provided such as the pruning of trees within the protected tree line and the removal and replacement of unclassified trees to promote the vitality of the tree line and biodiversity of the site.

8.99 The only harm identified is the conflict with Policy DM4 as the proposed works within HBBC does not fall within the a-e criteria. This harm has been classified as moderate. It is considered on balance that this level of harm does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the identified benefits of the scheme when assessed against the Framework as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does apply in this case and material considerations outweigh the conflict with some elements of the development plan.

## 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 in the consideration of this application. The Committee must also ensure the same when determining this planning 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. There would be no conflict with policies M3, M5, M9, M15 and M16 of the MNP, policies 7 and 8 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM6, DM7, DM10, DM11, DM12, DM13 and DM17 of the SADMP.
- 10.2. Conflict has been identified with Policy DM4 of the SADMP and M1 of the MNP. Economic and Environmental benefits have been identified. As the application should be determined within the 'tilted balance' in line with paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF it is considered that the harm would not outweigh the benefits and therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to the below conditions.
- 11. Recommendation**
- 11.1 **Grant planning permission** subject to:
  - Planning conditions outlined at the end of this report
- 11.2 That the Planning Director be given powers to determine the final detail of planning conditions.
- 11.3 **Conditions and Reasons**
  1. Application for the approval of reserved matters shall be made within three years from the date of this permission and the development shall be begun not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

**Reason:** To comply with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
  2. No development shall be commenced until plans and particulars of "the reserved matters" referred to in the above conditions relating to the:-
    - a) Appearance of the development including the aspects of a building or place that determine the visual impression it makes, including proposed materials and finishes

- b) Landscaping of the site including treatment of private and public space to enhance or protect the site's amenity through hard (boundary treatments) and soft measures and details of boundary planting to reinforce the existing landscaping at the site edges
- c) Layout of the site including the location of electric vehicle charging points, the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces are provided and the relationship of these buildings and spaces outside the development. This should include a design statement that sets out how consideration has been given to lower density to edges of site and higher density along main routes.
- d) Scale of each building proposed in relation to its surroundings have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

Site Location Plan Drg No: 001 Revision C received by the Local Planning Authority on 15 July 2021.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

4. Before any development commences on the site, including site works of any description, a Tree Protection Plan prepared by a suitably qualified arboriculturist shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include protective barriers to form a secure construction exclusion zone and root protection area in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, any trenches for services are required within the fenced-off areas, they shall be excavated and back-filled by hand and any tree roots or clumps of roots encountered with a diameter of 25cm or more shall be left un-severed. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Tree Protection Plan.

**Reason:** To ensure that the trees on site are to be retained and adequately protected during and after construction in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and biodiversity in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5. During the construction period, none of the trees or hedges indicated to be retained shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. If any of the trees or hedges to be retained are removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, a replacement shall be planted at the same place and that tree or hedge shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as maybe specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that the existing trees on the site are retained and protected in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

6. Within one month of the removal of the trees; details of trees, including their location within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Administrative Boundary, to replace the removed trees; shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The replacement trees shall be planted in accordance with the approved details in the next available planting season (October to March).

**Reason:** To ensure that replacement trees are planted on site in the interests of protecting the amenity of the conservation area in accordance with Policy DM11 and 12 of the adopted Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

7. No development shall commence on site until such time as the existing and proposed ground levels of the site, and proposed finished floor levels have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

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

8. No development shall commence on the site until such time as a construction traffic management plan, including as a minimum details of the routing of construction traffic, wheel cleansing facilities, vehicle parking facilities, and a timetable for their provision, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

**Reason:** To reduce the possibility of deleterious material (mud, stones etc.) being deposited in the highway and becoming a hazard for road users, to ensure that construction traffic does not use unsatisfactory roads and lead to on-street parking problems in the area in accordance with Policy DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

9. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as the access arrangements shown on MAC drawing number 454-TA10 have been implemented in full.

**Reason:** To ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site may pass each other clear of the highway, in a slow and controlled manner, in the interests of general highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

10. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 120 metres have been provided at the site access. These shall thereafter be permanently maintained with nothing within those splays higher than 0.6 metres above the level of the adjacent footway/verge/highway.

**Reason::** To afford adequate visibility at the access to cater for the expected volume of traffic joining the existing highway network, in the interests of general highway safety, and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

11. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as site drainage details have been provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter surface water shall not drain into the Public Highway and thereafter shall be so maintained.

**Reason:** To reduce the possibility of surface water from the site being deposited in the highway causing dangers to road users in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

12. The new vehicular access hereby permitted shall not be used for a period of more than one month from being first brought into use unless the existing vehicular access on Ashby Road that becomes redundant as a result of this proposal has been closed permanently and reinstated in accordance with details first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

13. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy DM7 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

14. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as details in relation to the management of surface water on site during construction of the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To prevent an increase in flood risk, maintain the existing surface water runoff quality, and to prevent damage to the final surface water management systems through the entire development construction phase in accordance with Policy DM7 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

15. No occupation of the development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as details in relation to the long-term maintenance of the surface water drainage system within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To establish a suitable maintenance regime that may be monitored over time; that will ensure the long-term performance, both in terms of flood risk and water quality, of the surface water drainage system (including sustainable drainage systems) within the proposed Development in accordance with Policy DM7 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

16. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as infiltration testing has been carried out (or suitable evidence to preclude testing) to confirm or otherwise, the suitability of the site for the use of infiltration as a drainage element, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To demonstrate that the site is suitable (or otherwise) for the use of infiltration techniques as part of the drainage strategy in accordance with Policy DM7 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

#### 11.4 Notes to applicant

1. 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.
2. Planning Permission does not give you approval to work on the public highway. To carry out off-site works associated with this planning permission, separate approval must first be obtained from Leicestershire County Council as Local Highway Authority. This will take the form of a major section 184 permit/section 278 agreement. It is strongly recommended that you make contact with Leicestershire County Council at the earliest opportunity to allow time for the process to be completed. The Local Highway Authority reserve the right to charge commuted sums in respect of ongoing maintenance where the item in question is above and beyond what is required for the safe and satisfactory functioning of the highway. For further information please refer to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide which is available at <https://resources.leicestershire.gov.uk/lhdg>
3. To erect temporary directional signage you must seek prior approval from the Local Highway Authority in the first instance (telephone 0116 305 0001).
4. All proposed off site highway works, and internal road layouts shall be designed in accordance with Leicestershire County Council's latest design guidance, as Local Highway Authority. For further information please refer to the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide which is available at <https://resources.leicestershire.gov.uk/lhdg>.



## APPENDIX B

ITEM 08

21/00787/OUT

Penland Estates Limited, RV  
Millington Limited,

**Site:-** Land North East Of, Ashby Road, Markfield, Leicestershire

**Proposal:-** Residential development of up to 93 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and SuDS (Outline- access only) (cross boundary application with Charnwood BC)

### Introduction:-

This application was heard at Charnwood Borough Council's Planning Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2021 and the development within Charnwood is now approval subject to a section 106 agreement. Following the committee the following is reported for clarification:

1. Section 106 contribution update:

Education	A contribution of £512,132.40 towards Mercenfield Primary School (not Newtown Linford Primary School as previously reported) and £277,632.16 Brookvale Groby Learning Campus Secondary School. In addition £98,422.35 is requested for early year's education by the County Council.
-----------	--

All other contributions specified within the report remain unchanged.

### Recommendation:-

As previously outlined within the committee report.

---

## APPENDIX C

Planning Committee - 18 January 2022  
Report of the Director Environment and Planning

Planning Ref: 21/00787/OUT

Applicant: Penland Estates Limited, RV Millington Limited,


Ward: Markfield Stanton & Fieldhead



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

Site: Land North East Of Ashby Road Markfield

Proposal: Residential development of up to 93 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and SuDS (Outline- access only) (cross boundary application with Charnwood BC)



1. This application was taken to the previous Planning Committee (14.12.2021). The previous report and accompanying late items are attached to this report as Appendix A and B.
2. At the committee, the item was deferred to consult with LCC Highways and Environmental Health on the impact upon neighbouring residential amenity from car headlights leaving the proposed access.
3. LCC highways have no further comments to add and state their comments are as per provided within Appendix A. Discussions with the Environmental Health officer

as still ongoing and will be reported through the late items. It was also requested that legal advice was sought on the application and this is currently taking place.

4. The late item will therefore confirm if the item on the agenda has altered from that already presented to Planning Committee and if the recommendation remains the same.

This page is intentionally left blank

# PLANNING APPEAL PROGRESS REPORT

Week ending: 04.02.22

## WR – WRITTEN PRESENTATIONS

## IN – INFORMAL HEARING

## PI – PUBLIC INQUIRY

File Ref	Case Officer	Application No	Type	Appellant	Development	Appeal Status	Process Dates
21/00038/PP	EC	21/00070/FUL (PINS ref 3282352)	WR	Everards Brewery Limited	The White Swan 47 High Street Stoke Golding (Proposed development of 6 detached dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping (resubmission of 19/01244/FUL))	Appeal Valid	11.10.21
21/00036/PP	EC	21/00237/OUT (PINS Ref 3281772)	WR	Mr T Barton Northwood Farm Wood Lane Higham on the Hill Nuneaton	Northwood Farm Stud Wood Lane Higham On The Hill Nuneaton (Erection of a bungalow (Outline - access only))	Appeal Valid Awaiting Start Date	01.10.21
	CAP	21/00692/OUT (PINS Ref 3281844)	WR	Onyxrose Ltd 19 Station Road Hinckley LE10 1AW	Factory Units 23 Wood Street Hinckley Leicestershire LE10 1JQ (Redevelopment of existing site to residential)	Appeal Valid Awaiting Start Date	01.10.21
		21/00196/FUL		Mr Rakesh Mistry 24 Main Street Ratby LE6 0JG	24 Main Street Ratby LE6 0JG	Awaiting Start Date	25.01.22
22/00001/ENF	CZ	EN20/00278/UNBLDS (PINS:3289687)	IH	Mr William Willett	Bungalow Farm The Paddocks Earl Shilton LE9 7TJ	Start Date Statement of Case Final Comments	04.04.22 15.02.22 08.03.22

	GS	20/00862/HOU (PINS Ref 3273173)	WR	Mr Micky Ahluwalia 10 Rosemary Way Hinckley	10 Rosemary Way Hinckley (Two storey side and rear extension)	Awaiting Start Date	
22/00004/PP	OP	21/00307/OUT (PINS Ref 3283898)	WR	Mr & Mrs Brooks 7 Assheton Lane Twycross	7 Assheton Lane Twycross (Erection of one dwelling (outline - access only))	Start Date Questionnaire Statement of Case Final Comments	03.02.22 10.02.22 10.02.22 24.03.22
	HW	20/01003/FUL (PINS 3286965)	WR	Mr Farhad Tailor	Oldlands Fenn Lanes Dadlington CV13 6DS	Awaiting Start Date	
	OP	21/00775/FUL (PINS: 3287157)		Mr Konrad Gajda	102 Druid Street Hinckley Change of use from 6 person House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4) to 8 person House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis), roof light	Awaiting Start Date	14.12.21
	SW	19/00464/OUT (PINS:3281840)		Onyxrose Ltd	Factory Units 23 Wood Street Hinckley Residential development of existing industrial site (Outline - access, layout and scale only)	Awaiting Start Date	15.12.21
	JPS	21/01149/OUT (PINS:3290898)		Mr Roger Edwards 2 De Montfort Road Hinckley LE10 1LQ	Land North 258 Ashby Road Hinckley LE10 1SW	Awaiting Start Date	14.01.22
	AH	21/00130/FUL (PINS: 3288892)		Mr and Mrs Chris and Mandy Wright	236 Ashby Road HINCKLEY LE10 1SW (Erection of two dwellings)	Awaiting Start Date	13.12.21
	OP	21/00687/OUT (PINS: 3283890)		Hallmark properties (Leic) Ltd	Land at Higham Lane Stoke Golding	Start Date Questionnaire Finial Comments	02.02.22 09.03.22 23.02.22
	OP	21/01011/FUL		Mr K Fisher Lindley Hall Farms Wide View Fenn Lane CV13 6BJ	Lindley Hall Farms Wide View Fenn Lane Fenny Drayton CV13 6BJ	Awaiting Start Date	13.01.22

21/00027/NONDET	GP	21/00813/CLP (PINS Ref 3281105)	WR	Ms Joanne Haddon	Fairways Cottage Leicester Road Hinckley (Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development for detached outbuilding)	Start Date <b>Awaiting Decision</b>	22.09.21
21/00029/PP	GP	21/00257/HOU (PINS Ref 3277395)	WR	Ms Joanne Haddon	Fairways Cottage Leicester Road Hinckley (Two storey rear extension)	Start Date <b>Awaiting Decision</b>	22.09.21
21/00025/PP	OP	20/00919/OUT (PINS Ref: 3272986)	WR	DHASC Limited	14 Chesterfield Way Barwell (Residential development for five dwellings (Outline- access and scale))	Start Date <b>Awaiting Decision</b>	16.09.21
21/00025/PP	OP	21/00290/OUT (PINS Ref 3281222)	WR	Mrs Hannah Ladkin- Berry	14 Chesterfield Way Barwell (Residential development for four dwellings (Outline- access and scale))	Start Date <b>Awaiting Decision</b>	16.09.21
21/00033/CLD	EC	21/00889/CLE (PINS Ref 3283791)	WR	Mr & Mrs Alec Moore 78 Main Street Bagworth	78 Main Street Bagworth (Certificate of Lawful Existing Use for the use of the outbuilding (only) to the rear of 78 Main Street, Bagworth as a maintenance, service and repair workshop (resubmission of 20/01141/CLE))	Start Date <b>Awaiting Decision</b>	09.11.21
21/00035/PP	OP	21/00022/FUL (PINS Ref 3282342)	WR	Mr & Mrs E Orme 6 Highfields Thornton	Land Rear Of 70 To 74 Main Street Thornton (Construction of one dwelling)	Start Date <b>Awaiting Decision</b>	10.11.21

21/00031/NONDET	SL	21/00581/OUT (PINS ref 3284379)	PI	Mr David Thornton-Baker Barwell Capitol Ltd Harris Lamb Ltd 75-76 Francis Road Birmingham	Land At Crabtree Farm Hinckley Road Barwell (Residential development of up to 25 dwellings with associated public open space and infrastructure (outline - access to be considered))	<b>Awaiting Decision</b>	
21/00032/PP	LJ	20/00511/FUL (PINS Ref 3285060)	PI	Mr Jamie Gibbins Barwood Homes and JH Hallam & Son Ltd	Land off Beech Drive Thornton ( Residential development of 49 dwellings with associated infrastructure, access and areas of open space )	<b>Awaiting Decision</b>	



## Decisions Received

21/00016/PP	SW	20/00249/OUT (PINS Ref 3272931)	WR	Mrs Louise Ward Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Davidson House Leicester	Land At Sketchley Farm Sketchley Old Village Burbage (Residential Development for up to 80 dwellings and associated works (Outline- access only))	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>10.12.21</b>
20/00025/CLD	HK	18/01255/CLUE (PINS Ref 3238520)	WR	George Denny Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby	The Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby (Certificate of lawful use for the change of use from agricultural land to residential curtilage)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>02.12.21</b>
20/00027/CLD	HK	19/01164/CLUE (PINS Ref 3246256)	WR	George Denny Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby	The Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby (Certificate of lawful use for the change of use from agricultural land to residential curtilage)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>02.12.21</b>
20/00026/CLD	HK	19/00391/CLUE (PINS Ref 3238743)	WR	George Denny Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby	The Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby (Certificate of lawful use for the change of use from agricultural land to residential curtilage)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>02.12.21</b>

21/00016/PP	SW	20/00249/OUT (PINS Ref 3272931)	WR	Mrs Louise Ward Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Davidson House Leicester	Land At Sketchley Farm Sketchley Old Village Burbage (Residential Development for up to 80 dwellings and associated works (Outline- access only))	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>10.12.21</b>
20/00025/CLD	HK	18/01255/CLUE (PINS Ref 3238520)	WR	George Denny Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby	The Old House Farm Sutton Lane Cadeby (Certificate of lawful use for the change of use from agricultural land to residential curtilage)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>02.12.21</b>
	OP	21/00159/OUT (PINS:3286259)	WR	Mr & Mrs K Kooner Four Acres Leicester Lane Desford LE9 9JJ	Four Acres Leicester Lane Desford LE9 9JJ (Erection of a dwelling, outline- access only)	Awaiting Start Date Turn away out of time	02.12.21

21/00030/PP	AH	21/00688/HOU (PINS Ref 3279925)	WR	Mr Jason Stray	98 Hollycroft Hinckley (Proposed extension to existing garage, and replacing existing flat roof with a tiled pitched roof to improve the aesthetics. Existing gates to drive to be removed)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>25.11.21</b>
21/00021/RPAGDO	GS	21/00394/HAAGD O (PINS Ref 3274537)	WR	Mr & Mrs Ryan Jones	3 Grey Close Groby (Prior notification for construction of additional storey upon existing single storey dwelling)	<b>DISMISSED</b>	<b>17.09.21</b>
21/00018/PP	SW	19/01405/OUT (PINS Ref 3265143)	IH	Davidsons Developments Ltd Wilson House 207 Leicester Rd Ibstock	Land North Of Deepdale Farm Lutterworth Road Burbage (Residential development of up to 135 dwellings (Outline- access only))	<b>ALLOWED</b>	<b>06.10.21</b>
	SW	19/00464/OUT (PINS Ref 3281840)	WR	Onyxrose Ltd 19 Station Road Hinckley LE10 1AW	Factory Units 23 Wood Street Hinckley Leicestershire LE10 1JQ	<b>Deadline Expired</b>	<b>11.10.21</b>
21/00028/PP	SG	20/00400/FUL (PINS Ref 3278670)	WR	Mr James Startin	2 Ashby Road Twycross Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3PW (Erection of a new workshop and ancillary services building, new wash bay building and change of use of land to create an agricultural machinery display area)	<b>Withdrawn</b>	<b>21.10.21</b>
21/00020/FTPP	EC	21/00222/HOU (PINS Ref: 3274457)	WR	Mr Filip Florczak	2 The Green Mill Lane Sheepy Parva (Alterations to the existing dwelling incorporating a two storey front/side extension and single storey side/rear extension)	<b>DISMISSED</b>	<b>22.10.21</b>

21/00030/PP	AH	21/00688/HOU (PINS Ref 3279925)	WR	Mr Jason Stray	98 Hollycroft Hinckley (Proposed extension to existing garage, and replacing existing flat roof with a tiled pitched roof to improve the aesthetics. Existing gates to drive to be removed)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>25.11.21</b>
21/00021/RPAGDO	GS	21/00394/HAAGD O (PINS Ref 3274537)	WR	Mr & Mrs Ryan Jones	3 Grey Close Groby (Prior notification for construction of additional storey upon existing single storey dwelling)	<b>DISMISSED</b>	<b>17.09.21</b>
21/00023/NONDET	AH	21/00590/FUL (PINS ref 3278545)	WR	Mrs Rita Morley	5 White House Close Groby (Erection of detached dwelling in side garden)	<b>DISMISSED</b>	<b>26.10.21</b>
21/00034/VCON	CAP	21/00655/CONDIT (PINS Ref 3281831)	WR	Mr & Mrs Jackson Sutton Ridge Barn Sutton Lane Cadeby Nuneaton Leicestershire CV13 0AR	Sutton Ridge Barn Sutton Lane Cadeby Nuneaton Leicestershire CV13 0AR (Removal of condition 4 of of planning permission 14/00400/FUL (permitted development rights))	<b>Allowed</b>	<b>26.01.22</b>

21/00022/PP	JB	21/00531/HYB (PINS Ref 3279939)	PI	Ms Harriet Moloney	Wood Farm Stanton Lane Ellistown (Hybrid application comprising of Outline permission for the erection buildings for storage and distribution uses (Class B8), general industry (Class B2) and associated infrastructure including the formation of a new access (All matters reserved expect for access) and Full planning permission for the demolition of existing farmstead and relocation, including the erection of 2 replacement farm managers dwellings and associated agriculture buildings and structures (Revised Scheme))	<b>Allowed</b>	<b>22.11.21</b>
21/00019/PP	JB	20/00407/HYB (PINS Ref 3274706)	PI	Wood Farm Holdings	Wood Farm Stanton Lane Ellistown Coalville (Hybrid application comprising of Outline permission for the erection buildings for storage and distribution uses (Class B8), general industry (Class B2) and associated infrastructure including the formation of a new access (All matters reserved expect for access) and Full planning permission for the demolition of existing farmstead and relocation, including the erection of 2 replacement farm managers dwellings and associated agriculture buildings and structures)	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>22.11.21</b>
21/00024/PP	SW	20/01021/OUT (PINS Ref 3279808)	PI	Richborough Estates & Messrs Vero	Land At Station Road Market Bosworth (Residential development up to 63 dwellings with associated access, landscaping, open space and drainage infrastructure (Outline - access to be considered))	<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>02.02.22</b>

Designation Period 1 April 2020 - 31 March 2022

Appeal Decisions - 1 April 2020 – 30 September 2021 (Rolling)

Major Applications

No of Appeals Decisions	Allowed	Dismissed	Split	Withdrawn	Officer Decision			Councillor Decision			Non Determination		
					Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis
7	2	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0

August – Total No of Major decisions made 65/Total No of appeals allowed 1 = 1.53%

September – Total No of Major decisions made 67/Total No of appeals allowed 1 = 1.49%

Minor/Other Applications

No of Appeals Decisions	Allowed	Dismissed	Split	Withdrawn	Officer Decision			Councillor Decision			Non Determination		
					Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis
32	9	23	0	0	6	0	23	2	0	0	1	0	0

August – Total No of all Minor/Other decisions made 1141/Total No of appeals allowed 9 = 0.78%

September – Total No of all Minor/Other decisions made 1229/Total No of appeals allowed 9 = 0.73%

Designation Period 1 April 2019 - 31 March 2021

Appeal Decisions - 1 April 2019 – 31 March 2021 (Rolling)

Major Applications

No of Appeals Decisions	Allowed	Dismissed	Split	Withdrawn	Officer Decision			Councillor Decision			Non Determination		
					Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis
13	4	8	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	2	1	0	2

August – Total No of Major decisions made 90/Total No of appeals allowed 4 = 4.44%

September – Total No of Major decisions made 90/Total No of appeals allowed 4 = 4.44%

#### Minor/Other Applications

No of Appeals Decisions	Allowed	Dismissed	Split	Withdrawn	Officer Decision			Councillor Decision			Non Determination		
					Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis	Allow	Spt	Dis
62	21	41	0	0	15	0	40	5	0	0	1	0	1

August – Total No of all Minor/Other decisions made 1706/Total No of appeals allowed 21 = 1.23%

September – Total No of all Minor/Other decisions made 1706/Total No of appeals allowed 21 = 1.23%

#### Enforcement Appeal Decisions

No of Appeal Decisions	Allowed	Dismissed	Split	Withdrawn
0	0	0	0	0

This page is intentionally left blank