The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 1 November 2016

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP DMS MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/W/16/3152485
Land to the south-east of Warwick Road, Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire LE8 0JP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Manor Oak Homes against the decision of Harborough District Council.
- The application Ref 15/01153/OUT, dated 29 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2015.
- The development proposed is described as outline planning permission for up to 110 dwellings (including affordable housing) with associated landscaping, open space, car parking and vehicular and pedestrian access from Warwick Road and a footpath link to Melbourne Close. All matters other than means of access are reserved for consideration at a later date.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for up to 110 dwellings (including affordable housing) with associated landscaping, open space, car parking and vehicular and pedestrian access from Warwick Road and a footpath link to Melbourne Close at land to the south-east of Warwick Road, Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire LE8 0JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/01153/OUT, dated 29 July 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application to which the appeal relates was submitted in outline form with all matters reserved except for access. An indicative layout was submitted with the planning application, but I note that this is for illustrative purposes only.

3. The last sentence within the description of development is superfluous and I have left it out of my formal decision as set out above.

4. A dated and signed planning obligation in the form of an agreement was submitted during the Inquiry pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106). This has been agreed between the Appellant, District Council and Leicestershire County Council. I deal with its contents below.

5. The Inquiry sat for 1 day. I held an accompanied site visit on 1 November 2016 and I conducted an unaccompanied visit on 2 November 2016.

6. An agreed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) was submitted which sets out the policy context along with the matters of agreement.

7. The Council state in the SoCG that they no longer seek to defend their reasons for refusal for this appeal. This was confirmed at the Inquiry in the Council's opening statement. This decision had been agreed at the Planning Committee of 6 September 2016 and was in light of new evidence and information provided by the Appellant.

8. Nonetheless, whilst it has been confirmed that there is no longer any material difference in position between the main parties, it is necessary for me to consider the issues involved, not least as a number of concerns have been raised by interested parties.

Main Issue

9. I consider the main issue is whether the proposal would be in a location where services would be readily accessible by sustainable modes of travel.

Reasons

10. The appeal site, which comprises an agricultural field around 5.2 ha in size, is located on the western edge of the existing built up area of Kibworth Beauchamp, adjoining but outside the defined settlement boundary. The Midland main railway line lies immediately adjacent to the north of the site, with a new housing estate (Kibworth Meadows and also referred to as KB1) beyond. This development is nearing completion. To the south east lies further existing residential development and to the south and west are agricultural fields. The development would be accessed off Warwick Road which runs along the western boundary of the site.

11. The 'Kibworths' (also referred to as Kibworth) consist of two separate parishes and villages that adjoin each other, Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt. For planning purposes the Council treats the Kibworths as a single settlement. For the purposes of my decision I will refer to the two settlements as Kibworth.

Policy Context

12. Policy CS17 of the Harborough District Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2028 (2011) (CS), seeks to direct new development, of an appropriate scale to the rural centres and rural villages. Kibworth is identified as a rural centre, though for the purposes of this policy is excluded from further housing development (by section b). The policy also seeks to strictly control new development in the countryside to protect the integrity of the landscape character and settlement pattern.

13. In addition Policy HS/8 of the Harborough District Local Plan 2001 (LP) sets out the defined Limits to Development for settlements and supports development within these limits subject to certain criteria being met. As the appeal site lies outside the Limits to Development and Kibworth is excluded from the list of settlements where additional housing is planned in accordance with CS Policy CS17, the proposal would be contrary to the above policies.

14. However I note that the Council acknowledges that the Limits of Development for the villages are based on now out-of-date housing need evidence. A more

recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in 2014 identifies a significantly higher objectively assessed housing need (OAN) (475 dpa) when compared to that set out within the CS (350 dpa). As agreed between the main parties within the SoCG, LP Policy HS/8 and the supporting text for CS Policy CS17 are considered not to be consistent with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and therefore carry significantly reduced weight. I have no reason to disagree with this view.

15. Furthermore, the Council acknowledges that in the absence of a five year housing land supply (5YHLS) [1], adopted development plan policies relevant to the supply of housing are considered to be out of date and planning decisions on housing development must therefore be made in the context of paragraph 14 of the Framework. This states that where policies are considered to be out-of-date there is a presumption in favour of granting planning permission for sustainable development, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

16. I note that the Council's stance on its 5YHLS has been disputed by an interested party and reference made to the findings of an Inspector for an appeal decision in Broughton[2]. Whilst I note this decision, it relates to a different local planning authority where there was a clear dispute between the main parties over the full objectively assessed housing need, the buffer to be applied and whether there was a 5YHLS. Furthermore the Inspector found that irrespective of whether a 5% or 20% buffer was applied, the Council could demonstrate a 5YHLS.

17. In comparison, for the appeal that is before me, there is no dispute between the main parties on these matters. The Council's own assessment has taken account of the 2014 SHMA housing need requirement, has included the shortfall within the 5 year housing requirement (the Sedgefield method) which is in accordance with the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)[3] and has provided evidence supporting the application of a 20% buffer[4]. Whilst I do not have full details relating to the Broughton appeal I nevertheless consider that the circumstances between it and the case that is before me are significantly different. Based on the substantive evidence provided I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment that it does not currently have a 5YHLS.

Accessibility

18. Kibworth, as a rural centre is served by an extensive range of services and facilities, including two schools (one primary and one secondary), newsagents, supermarket, doctors surgery, health centre, pharmacy, community library, post office, two churches, restaurants, pubs, a range of other shops and a number of halls and other accommodation for use by community groups. As set out in the SoCG, following the submission of further evidence by the appellant as part of the appeal, the Highway Authority considers that route 3

[1] Document 3
[2] Appeal Ref: APP/L2620/A/13/2204628
[3] Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 035 Reference ID: 3-035-20140306
[4] Document 3

would provide an acceptable and deliverable walking route between the site and these local facilities.

19. In addition I note that Kibworth is served by several bus services providing connections to Leicester, Market Harborough and other settlements. Furthermore whilst there would be access to an existing bus service from a bus stop within the Kibworth Meadows development, a short walk from the appeal site, new bus stops are proposed on Warwick Road to directly serve the proposal. These would provide direct access to local facilities by public transport. I also note that planning permission[5] for new retail and employment facilities on a site at the junction of Warwick Road and Wistow Road, has recently been granted by the Council. This is within a short walking distance to the north of the appeal site.

20. Therefore based on the evidence that is before me and observations gleaned from my site visits, it is clear that future occupiers of the proposed development would have access to everyday local facilities and services using means other than the private car.

21. Concerns have been raised that as the local primary school is at capacity, the children from the appeal site would attend other primary schools further away in adjacent settlements, which would be most likely accessed by private car, resulting in unsustainable transport movements. It has also been suggested that this would not assist social cohesion with village life. However the appellant's evidence, which is accepted by the Council, indicates that primary aged children generated by the development would have priority for admission over others who may reside further away from the school. I note from the agreed evidence that a number of children admitted to the school in September 2016 were from outside the school catchment area. Some existing pupils are therefore travelling into the village to attend the school. The admission of pupils within walking distance of the school would encourage more sustainable travel movements.

22. Furthermore I note that if primary aged pupils arising from this development could not be accommodated within the local school, a financial contribution towards the cost of transporting these pupils to alternative education facilities would be provided to the County Council to cover a period of up to 7 school years[6].

23. Taking all the above into account I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would be in a location where services and facilities would be readily accessible by sustainable modes of travel.

Other Matters

Emerging Plans

24. Both Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt Parish Councils confirm that a Kibworths' Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is in progress. The pre-submission version of the NP[7] has been provided to me. In relation to housing provision the NP states under emerging Policy H1 that '*Having regard to the high number of dwellings already constructed and existing sites with planning*

[5] Council ref: 16/00286/OUT
[6] Document 17 – S106 Planning Agreement
[7] Document 7

permission between 2011 and 2016, the Kibworths has exceeded its housing requirement over the Plan period.' Consequently the policy proposes to restrict further housing to windfall development only on small infill and redevelopment sites within the defined Limits of Development. I note that since the Inquiry closed consultation on the NP in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, has commenced.

25. Whilst the PPG states that an emerging neighbourhood plan may be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, the weight to be attached to relevant policies within it are dependent upon the stage of preparation of the NP and the extent to which there are unresolved objections[8]. Therefore whilst I acknowledge local residents interest in the local planning process and applaud the commitment to producing a NP, I am mindful that the PPG[9] indicates that refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified in the case of a NP, before the end of the local planning authority publicity period (Regulation 16). The emerging NP has not reached this more advanced stage. Furthermore the NP is only now at pre-submission consultation and therefore I have no knowledge of the extent of any objections that may be made. As such I bear in mind that the contents of the emerging NP could change quite considerably before reaching the more advanced submission stage.

26. I also note that the Council did not refuse the proposal on the grounds of prematurity and has indicated[10] that due to the early stage of plan preparation only minimal weight should be given to the NP. Therefore taking all the above factors in to account and in accordance with paragraph 216 of the Framework and the advice set out in the PPG, I can afford the NP limited weight in my decision.

27. Reference has also been made to the emerging Harborough Local Plan but this is at an even earlier stage of production, having not reached pre-submission stage yet. Evidence submitted at the Inquiry indicates that this new Plan is not proposed to be submitted for examination until November 2017 and adopted in September 2018[11]. Whilst I heard at the Inquiry that recommendations regarding the preferred strategic option for housing and employment development for this new Plan have been put forward by the Council's Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel[12], due to the stage of preparation and taking account of paragraph 216 of the Framework, I can give the Plan no weight.

Planning Obligations

28. The S106 includes a range of contributions that would be provided were the appeal to be allowed. This includes the provision of 40% affordable housing, on-site open space and monetary contributions towards education, sustainable transport, community and health facilities and the police. In relation to these contributions, the S106 sets out details of what the different contributions would provide.

[8] Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework
[9] Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 21b-014-20140306
[10] Document 8
[11] Document 13
[12] Documents 15 and 16

29. The education contributions would go towards projects at specific primary, secondary and post 16 schools to accommodate the additional pupils generated by the appeal proposal and as stated earlier would also, where necessary, contribute towards transportation costs for primary school pupils. The sustainable transport contributions would fund bus passes, travel packs, new bus stops and the provision of real time information, which would encourage and support the use of public bus transport.

30. None of these contributions are in dispute between the main parties and the District Council, County Council, NHS and Leicestershire Police have provided evidence within their submissions that justifies the requirements and amounts sought. It is clear from the information provided that these contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed, which satisfies the tests in the Framework and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010. I therefore take these planning obligations in to consideration within my decision.

31. The S106 also includes contributions towards monitoring costs for both the District and County Councils. The District Council monitoring fee of £1,894 would be used to monitor the open space and affordable housing provision and contributions relating to health, police, community facilities and the open space commuted maintenance sum. I note that whilst some of the contributions would be one off payments others would be delivered in instalments and would necessitate monitoring on behalf of the health and police bodies.

32. As regards the County Council the education contribution would also be provided in instalments. In addition some of the sustainable transport contributions, namely the bus passes, travel packs and travel plan, would necessitate extended monitoring periods whilst the development was first being occupied.

33. Taking these factors into account I consider that as aspects of the contributions would be monitored over an extended period rather than just through one off payments, overall this would go beyond what would be considered to be everyday monitoring activities for the District and County Councils. Consequently I am satisfied in this instance that the monitoring costs are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind. I therefore take the S106 into consideration in reaching my decision.

Other Issues

34. In addition to concerns raised about the location of the appeal site in relation to services, local residents have also made representations on other sustainability matters. I acknowledge that the development would increase traffic within the locality, but the agreed evidence indicates that the level of increase proposed would be small and would not result in additional highway safety issues. I note in this regard that the Highway Authority does not object to the proposal and I have no reason to disagree.

35. Whilst I have considered concerns about the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties these are matters to be considered at the reserved matters stage. Furthermore matters such as

drainage could be adequately provided through the imposition of a suitable condition.

36. Some detailed matters relating to appearance can also be dealt with at the reserved matters stage, but I acknowledge that due to the loss of open land and encroachment of development into the countryside, the development would result in some limited harm to the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area.

37. As regards air quality, the Appellant's assessment concludes that there would be a negligible negative impact at all modelled receptors and an increase in nitrogen dioxide at relevant receptors along the A6. The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) indicates that these increases are small and the negligible negative increases would be within the natural variation of background concentrations. As such I concur with the Council's EHO conclusions (doc 7) that the likely impact of this would be imperceptible.

38. Local residents have also suggested that local services and facilities would not cope with this level of development particularly when the cumulative impacts from other recent developments and planning permissions are taken into account. Whilst I recognise the continued concern that local residents have about the number of residential developments that have been permitted within Kibworth in recent years, I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that local services and facilities are at breaking point.

39. Indeed the Appellant proposes to provide a level of planning contributions towards necessary facilities and local infrastructure as part of a legal agreement, such that the concerns on this matter could be overcome. I also note that the Council and statutory agencies responsible for such facilities as health and education have not objected to the proposal and I have no reason to disagree. In any case, irrespective of other developments I must consider this appeal on its own planning merits.

40. In relation to concerns raised about the level of consultation about the proposal with local residents, I note that pre-application discussions and exhibitions were carried out and consultation was conducted in accordance with legislative requirements.

41. In addition to the social and economic benefits that the proposal would provide in relation to the provision of housing, I recognise that it would also be likely to boost the local economy by providing construction jobs and supporting local building trades, albeit that this would be for a temporary period. I also acknowledge that the future occupants of the development would be likely to support businesses and facilities within the village and local area. Environmentally the site could be designed to retain the existing boundary trees and hedgerows and provide further native tree and shrub planting within the site, which could enhance biodiversity. Such matters would be considered at the reserved matters stage. I consider overall that such benefits would weigh in support of the appeal.

The Planning Balance

42. I have found that the development would be accessible to services and facilities. The Framework aims to boost significantly the supply of housing and the proposal would make a significant contribution to both the market and

affordable housing supply for the district. This weighs substantially in support of this appeal, particularly in the absence of a 5YHLS. Other benefits outlined in paragraph 41 also weigh in the appeal's favour.

43. I recognise that there would be conflict with Policies CS17 and HS/8. There would also be some limited harm to the character and appearance of the area. I have given careful consideration to the local representations including the petition against the development. However I have concluded on the evidence before me that there would be no material harm arising from the proposal in relation to these other matters.

44. As the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5YHLS, relevant policies for the supply of housing are out of date (CS17 and HS/8). The limited adverse impacts that would arise would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is a case where material considerations indicate that determination should be other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently I consider that subject to the S106 planning obligations and the conditions set out in the attached schedule, the appeal proposal would be sustainable development and would accord with the provisions of the Framework when read as a whole.

Conditions

45. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in light of the advice given in the PPG. As such I impose most of them, combine two and amend some wording where necessary in the interests of precision and enforceability. I have included pre-commencement conditions on matters including levels and the construction method statement as these are fundamental to ensuring that the development is satisfactory. I am satisfied that the conditions set out in my decision meet the tests within the PPG.

46. Conditions on setting reasonable time limits and the provision of details on reserved matters are necessary as the application made is for outline permission. I also impose a condition specifying the approved plans for reasons of certainty.

47. Whilst landscaping and layout are reserved matters, conditions requiring specific details be included within these matters are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. For landscaping this is also necessary to protect arboricultural and ecological interests. In addition I impose a floor levels condition to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the surrounding area. In order to prevent flooding a drainage condition is necessary.

48. To ensure a satisfactory form of development and in the interest of highway safety, and notwithstanding that layout and design are reserved matters, I attach a condition requiring compliance with the design standards of the Leicestershire County Council Highway Authority on highway matters.

49. I attach a condition requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the ecological report and updated surveys to ensure that biodiversity is protected. I also impose conditions requiring a 5m buffer between the development and existing hedgerows on site and native planting, to protect the existing hedgerows and green corridor on the site boundary and to provide biodiversity enhancement.

50. A condition requiring the submission and implementation of a construction method statement is necessary to minimise detrimental effects to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, to protect the natural environment from pollution and ensure highway safety during the construction phase.

51. I impose archaeological conditions to ensure satisfactory archaeological investigation and recording of the site.

52. As was discussed and agreed by the Council at the Inquiry I do not impose conditions relating to bin and recycling storage or external materials as these can be dealt with under reserved matters.

Conclusion

53. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Y Wright

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1) No development shall commence on site until details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved and are hereinafter called "the reserved matters") have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
   (a) The scale of the development;
   (b) The layout of the development;
   (c) The external appearance of the development; and
   (d) The landscaping of the site.

   The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

3) The development hereby approved shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

4) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   Location Plan – 40405 003

   Proposed Access Drawing – T7628pm-10A

5) The landscape details to be submitted in accordance with Condition 1 shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the site, and shall confirm which are to be retained and which are to be removed. No hedgerows or trees shown to be retained shall be felled, pollarded or otherwise removed during or after the construction period.

6) The landscape details to be submitted in accordance with Condition 1 shall include details of the position and design (dimensions and materials) of all boundary and surface treatments (including details of paths, driveways and all public areas). The boundary and surface treatments shall be provided to each dwelling before that dwelling is first occupied, or in accordance with an approved phasing plan.

7) The layout details to be submitted in accordance with Condition 1 shall include open space, amenity areas and play areas, the defined boundaries for these areas, their proposed uses, the age groups for which they are intended and the items of equipment, means of enclosure and all other structures to be installed, together with a programme for their provision and a phasing plan for the development as a whole. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved programme and phasing.

8) No development shall commence on site (including any site clearance/preparation works), until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

   a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;

b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;

c) storage of oils, fuels, chemicals, plant and materials used in constructing the development;

d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding, including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;

e) wheel washing facilities;

f) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;

g) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from site preparation and construction works;

h) measures for the protection of the natural environment;

i) hours of work on site, including deliveries and removal of materials; and

j) full details of any piling technique to be employed, if relevant.

9) No development shall commence on site until plans of the existing and proposed ground levels of the site and the finished ground floor levels of dwellings, garages and other structures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

10) All the details of the proposed development shall comply with the design standards of the Leicestershire County Council Highway Authority (as contained in its current design standards document; The 6Cs Design Guide). Such details must include parking and turning facilities, access widths, gradients, surfacing, signing and lining (including that for cycleways and shared use footway/cycleways) and visibility splays. No development shall commence on site until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

11) No development shall commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions and:

- The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
- The programme for post investigation assessment
- Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
- Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation.

12) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 10 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

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. The scheme shall include the utilisation of holding sustainable drainage techniques with the incorporation of two treatment trains to help improve water quality; the limitation of surface water run-off to equivalent greenfield rates; the ability to accommodate surface water run-off on-site up to the critical 1 in 100 year event plus an appropriate allowance for climate change, based upon the submission of drainage calculations; and the responsibility for the future maintenance of drainage features. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing and phasing arrangements as approved within the scheme.

14) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the ecological report (First Environment Limited, March 2015).

15) An updated protected species survey shall be submitted in support of the reserved matters application, or prior to the commencement of the development, whichever is soonest after March 2017. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the survey.

16) A 5m buffer should be in place between the development and existing hedgerows on site

17) Planting in the area of the detention basin should include locally native species.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Howard Leithead Counsel of No 5 Chambers

Instructed by Verina Wennham, Head of Legal services and Monitoring Officer, Harborough District Council

No witnesses were called. The following persons appeared at the Inquiry for the Council but did not give formal evidence:

Mrs Nicola Parry BA, MA, MRTPI	Planning Applications and Connections Team Leader, Harborough District Council
Mr Nigel Harris MRTPI	Planning Consultant
Ms Sarah Farrow	Community Partnerships Officer, Harborough District Council
Mr Matthew Bills	Neighbourhood and Green Spaces Officer, Harborough District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Mark Lowe QC of Cornerstone Chambers

Instructed by Armstrong Rigg

No witnesses were called. The following persons appeared at the Inquiry for the Appellant but did not give formal evidence:

Mr Geoff Armstrong BA (Hons) MRTPI	Director of Armstrong Rigg Planning
Mr Jan Kinsman	Educational Facilities Management Partnership Ltd

FOR THE RULE 6 PARTY:

Mr Andrew Tyrer BA (Hons), MRTPI	Developer Contributions Officer, Leicestershire County Council

INTERESTED PERSONS/PARTIES:

Dr Kevin Feltham	Local resident
Mr Stefan Richter	Local resident
Mr Christopher Wood	Chairman of Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council

Cllr Christopher Holyoak	Local resident and ward member
Cllr Phil King	Local resident and ward member

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY:

1 Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council's Assessment of Pedestrian Routes to local facilities

2 Appellant's planning note in response to Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council's Assessment of Pedestrian Routes

3 Council's 5 year housing land supply dated 22 June 2016

4 Decision letter dated 25 October 2005 for appeals APP/F2415/A/04/1152503, APP/F2415/A/05/1176004 and APP/F2415/A/05/1174805

5 Council's opening statement

6 Appellant's opening statement

7 Kibworths' Neighbourhood Plan – submitted by Dr Feltham

8 Email correspondence dated 31 October 2016 from the Council in response to the Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan

9 JACOBS fee proposal for Leicestershire County Council's Fleckney, Great Glen and the Kibworths Cumulative Development Traffic Impact Study September 2016 – submitted by Dr Feltham

10 Email correspondence dated 27 October 2016 from the Council in response to the Appellant's Air Quality Assessment

11 Dr Feltham's statement

12 Mr Richter's statement including an appendix of photographs showing local traffic conditions

13 Agenda and report to the Extraordinary meeting of the Executive 31 October 2016 - Harborough Local Plan Local Development Scheme Review

14 List of appearances on behalf of the Council

15 Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel Meeting of 19 September 2016 – Assessment of Selected Spatial Options and Meeting Notes

16 Report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel Meeting of 17 October 2016 – Assessment of Selected Spatial Options: Update and Meeting Notes

17 Signed Section 106 Planning Agreement dated 1 November 2016