



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 9-12 and 15-19 March 2021

Site visit made on 23 March 2021

by John Woolcock BNatRes(Hons) MURP DipLaw MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/20/3260227

Land off Sketchley Lane, Burbage, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 3HU

- 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 Barwood Development Securities Ltd against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC).
 - The application No.19/00947/OUT, dated 19 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is "Demolition of existing poultry and cattle buildings and mixed use development comprising: extension of Sketchley Meadows Business Park for up to 30,000 sq m (322,920 sq ft) gross external floor space for Class B2 General Industrial / Class B8 Warehousing and Distribution use, with vehicular access from Watling Drive; up to 140 dwellings with vehicular access from Sketchley Lane; and associated internal estate roads, parking, landscaping, open space and sustainable drainage."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application dated 19 August 2019 was made using the proforma for outline planning permission with all matters reserved. This was the proposal cited in HBBC's consultation letters about the application. The applicant subsequently advised HBBC by email dated 4 September 2019 that the form was in error and should have specified that the application was for outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access, as was indicated in the supporting correspondence.¹ HBBC subsequently advised consultees that access was to be determined. HBBC's Refusal of Planning Permission gives the particulars of the development as; "Development comprising of up to 140 dwellings and extension of Sketchley Meadows Business Park for up to 30,000 sq m (322,920 sq ft) gross external floor space for Class B2 General Industrial/Class B8 Warehousing and Distribution use with associated means of access from Watling Drive and Sketchley Lane, associated internal estate roads, parking, landscaping, open space and sustainable drainage (Outline - including access)."
3. The appellant proposes an amendment to the description of the development at the appeal stage. This would reduce the floorspace of the proposed extension of Sketchley Meadows Business Park from up to 30,000 sq m (322,920 sq ft) to

¹ PreID16.

up to 22,637 sq m (243,663 sq ft) gross external floor space for Class B2 General Industrial/Class B8 Warehousing and Distribution use. Other proposed alterations include minor variations to access details, a redistribution of built form within the site, further restrictions on building heights and increasing the proportion of affordable housing from 20% to 40%.² The proposed amendments were the subject of consultation, with a three-week period for representations ending on 3 March 2021.³

4. The Inquiry provided an opportunity for anyone wishing to do so to comment on the proposed alterations and on the adequacy of the consultation exercise. No objections to dealing with the amended scheme at the appeal stage were raised by any interested persons. The proposed alterations to the description of the development and the proposed revisions to the Watling Drive and Sketchley Lane accesses would not result in a significantly different scheme to that considered by HBBC when it determined the application. Nor would the changes be likely to be prejudicial to the interests of any parties or persons.
5. My ruling at the Inquiry was that the appeal proceed on the basis of the amended scheme for outline planning permission with all matters except access reserved for: Development comprising up to 140 dwellings and extension of Sketchley Meadows Business Park for up to 22,637 sq m gross external floor space for Class B2 General Industrial/Class B8 Warehousing and Distribution use with associated means of access from Watling Drive and Sketchley Lane, associated internal estate roads, parking, landscaping, open space and sustainable drainage, and subject to the following amended drawings: Watling Drive access 006A, Sketchley Lane access 004C, Land Budget plan 037m and Building Heights plan 015i.⁴
6. With the exception of the Site boundary plan and Demolition plan, the details shown on other submitted drawings and plans are illustrative material not forming part of the application. The parameter plans would be the subject of planning conditions so that a grant of outline planning permission would also determine the areas within the appeal site for residential use, green infrastructure and the hardstanding within which commercial buildings would be contained. The maximum height of commercial and residential buildings would also be set by these conditions.
7. A unilateral undertaking, dated 30 March 2021, provides for 40% of the dwellings to be affordable dwellings and for 10% to be self-build housing.⁵ Other obligations include a biodiversity and landscape management plan with provision for an ecological clerk of works and maintenance of amenity and strategic green infrastructure on the site. The undertaking provides for on-site open space with a maintenance contribution, as well as a financial contribution towards off-site open space. It includes a local employment and training strategy and a contribution towards health care facilities. The obligations to Leicestershire County Council (LCC) include contributions to bus stops and bus passes, civic amenity, highway improvements, libraries, primary school sector, and a travel plan/travel pack. It also provides for a traffic regulation order for part of Watling Drive. The Inquiry was closed in writing on 6 April 2021.

² CD2.1 and CD2.30.

³ CD2.30-CD2.51 and PreID14.

⁴ ID4.2.

⁵ ID26.2.

Planning policy

8. The development plan for the area includes the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy adopted in 2009 (CS), and the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADMDPD), which was adopted in 2016. The appeal site lies outside the settlement boundary, and in the countryside, as defined in the development plan. The appellant and HBBC are agreed that the CS and SADMDPD rely on an out-of-date evidence base, and so the most important policies for determining this appeal, which are CS Policy 4 and SADMDPD Policy DM4, are out-of-date and the 'tilted balance' applies.⁶ This means that I should be disposed to grant planning permission unless the presumption in favour of sustainable development can be displaced.⁷
9. The referendum for the emerging Burbage Neighbourhood Plan (eBNP) has been delayed because of Covid-19 restrictions, but is planned to take place on 6 May 2021. I have also had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
10. Reference was made at the Inquiry to the emerging Local Plan. However, this is at such an early stage that speculation about likely housing requirements are of little or no assistance in determining this appeal.

Main issues

11. I consider that the main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:

The character and appearance of the area.

Biodiversity.

Highway safety.

I have considered whether and to what extent the following weigh in the planning balance; the effect on heritage assets, agricultural land, the living conditions of neighbouring residents, and on local services and infrastructure. There is also a dispute about whether HBBC can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. I have taken into account the benefits of the appeal scheme in determining whether any adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Reasons

Character and appearance

12. The appeal site, which comprises seven grassland fields used for grazing cattle and horses, forms part of LCA F: Burbage Common Rolling Farmland in LUC's Hinckley & Bosworth Landscape Character Assessment.⁸ The majority of this LCA lies to the east of Hinckley and to the south-east of Burbage. The appeal site lies within a pocket of LCA F to the south of Burbage and to the north of the A5 trunk road. A key characteristic of the adjoining UCA1: Burbage is a ridgetop settlement. The open farmland beyond the A5 lies within the Borough of Rugby. The most relevant key characteristics of LCA F to the appeal site

⁶ PreID13.

⁷ CD7.4 paragraph 28.

⁸ CD15.1.

- include medium to large scale field pattern with smaller scale pasture fields around the settlement, urban fringe influences, along with major transport corridors.
13. The appeal site has some of the attributes of a semi-rural area on the edge of Burbage, which in landscape terms is enhanced by the presence of pockets of ridge and furrow earthworks.⁹ However, parts of it are subject to urban influences given the proximity of residential and hotel development on the higher ground to the east and north, and the industrial estate on the lower ground to the west. Nevertheless, its openness and size provide a significant visual and perceptual break from built development in this part of Burbage, which is an important feature of the local landscape.
14. The appellant acknowledges that the appeal site is a transitional zone between existing industrial premises and residential uses.¹⁰ But it seems to me that the importance of this function is not properly taken into account in the appellant's assessment of the likely effects of the scheme on the local landscape character. The proposed development, given the width and configuration of the strip of land shown on the Land Budget plan as amenity/strategic green infrastructure between the proposed commercial and residential areas, would result in a significant adverse change to this transitional zone. The sense of separation between industrial and residential uses, and of openness, within this part of the landscape, would be largely lost. This would be a fundamental alteration to the landscape resource.
15. The appeal site forms part of Sensitivity Area 07: Sketchley in LUC's 2017 Landscape Sensitivity Assessment.¹¹ Sensitivity Area 07 is considered to have an overall low sensitivity to residential development, but medium sensitivity to further commercial development, where new development to the east would be likely to be more exposed on sloping land. In terms of perceptual qualities, the assessment states that the fields in the east retain some rurality, particularly around Sketchley Grange Hotel, where well-treed field boundaries combine with mature specimens within the field to create a distinctive local landscape from the rest of the area. Building(s) up to 12 m to ridge height and activities on associated hardstanding located within the proposed commercial area to the south of the hotel would be particularly exposed on this higher part of the appeal site. Siting commercial development on this higher part of the appeal site would significantly harm the appearance of the area, particularly given the proposed width of the green infrastructure that would separate the commercial area from the hotel/proposed residential development.
16. The bridleway along the eastern boundary of the appeal site currently provides users with intermittent views over the open appeal site, which contains some visually interesting ridge and furrow earthworks, and in places views towards the wider countryside beyond. This is particularly so from the part of the bridleway that is contiguous with the Policy 9 Green Corridor in the eBNP. This bridleway is a well-used and valued recreational route. The proposed residential development (up to two-storey) to the north of The Spinney development would break the existing visual link between the bridleway and the wider and more distant countryside. The loss of these views would significantly detract from the visual amenity of the area.

⁹ The Inspector in The Spinney appeal considered that the settlement had a semi-rural edge (CD6.8).

¹⁰ Mr Greep's Proof of Evidence paragraph 2.1.4.

¹¹ CD15.2.

17. Sketchley Lane currently has the feel of a semi-rural lane. It is used by pedestrian and cyclists for both commuting and for recreation. The proposed access to the residential area, which would include visibility splays, would open up a gap along the lane providing views of houses. This would have an urbanising influence on the lane. So too, potentially, would a traffic calming scheme for the lane. The need for such a scheme is considered later in this decision. In the absence of a proposed traffic calming scheme it is not possible to assess the likely implications for the character of the lane. However, it was evident from my site visits that measures such as road widening, additional or wider footways, speed cushions, signage, along with any cutting back of roadside verges or vegetation, could give the lane a much more urban look and feel. This would harm the character and appearance of the area and diminish the enjoyment users derived from travelling along the lane. Without a detailed traffic mitigation scheme to enable assessment of the quantum of any such harm, this is not a consideration that can properly be taken into account in the planning balance, other than to find that it adds to my concerns about the likely impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
18. The intrinsic value of this part of the countryside outside the settlement boundary of Burbage largely derives from the contribution its open character makes to the separation of industrial/commercial and residential/hotel development. The appellant's assessment understates the likely impact of the appeal scheme on the local landscape. The scheme would be poorly configured with commercial development extending up from the lower parts of the appeal site to the higher ground in the vicinity of the hotel. This would create an intrusive form of development in a prominent location, and result in an inadequate transition zone between hotel/residential and industrial development in this part of Burbage.
19. From the evidence adduced at the Inquiry and from my site visits, I consider that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area of major significance. This is a consideration that should be given substantial weight in the planning balance.

Biodiversity

20. The evidence indicates that it would be possible, with appropriate future management, for the appeal scheme to result in a net biodiversity gain over the existing situation.¹² Furthermore, in terms of area, the proposed green infrastructure would be comparable to the area identified on Figure 25 of the eBNP for a green corridor on the appeal site. However, the configuration of the proposed green infrastructure would be very different from that sought by the eBNP.¹³ The proximity of urban activity close to the strips of green infrastructure proposed in and around the commercial buildings and residential development would detract from the value of these areas as useful wildlife habitat and corridors. The proposed green infrastructure would fall far short of the wide east/west green corridor across the appeal site envisaged in Policy 9 of the eBNP to protect and enhance the network of green spaces, stepping stones and wildlife corridors shown on Figure 25 of the eBNP.

¹² ID27. The scheme proposes delivery of the green infrastructure through a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan secured by the unilateral undertaking.

¹³ ID14 and ID17.

21. In addition, the illustrative layout indicates that the proposed strategic/amenity green infrastructure would need to be crossed by a road/footway to access the proposed residential area to the north of The Spinney, and would also be crossed by a service road to the proposed commercial development to the south of the hotel. The surfacing of these roads, along with the movement of vehicles and people along these routes, would impair the effectiveness of the proposed green infrastructure as a wildlife corridor. This would be likely even with the measures proposed to maintain permeability, such as tree and shrub planting and a lighting strategy. I am not convinced that the benefits of the scheme to biodiversity should attract the 'moderate' weight attributed by HBBC.
22. Taking into account the above considerations, I find that the proposal would have a biodiversity benefit of minor significance that should be given slight weight in the planning balance. I also consider, notwithstanding the likelihood of a net biodiversity gain, that the appeal scheme would conflict with Policy 9 of the eBNP.

Highway safety

23. HBBC refused the application on the grounds that the development would create an increase in vehicular movements along Sketchley Lane, an access road that has restricted width, which would result in the development having a severe impact on highway safety. HBBC's decision was not supported by the advice of LCC as the Local Highway Authority. Nevertheless, the appellant agreed that the width of the lane, presence of pedestrians, vehicles and cyclists along the route could pose a safety hazard, and so an indicative scheme of mitigation was prepared. But that scheme was not acceptable to LCC, the authority responsible for the implementation of traffic calming.¹⁴
24. The appellant and HBBC therefore proposed at the Inquiry that this matter could be dealt with by the imposition of planning conditions. The suggested conditions provide that prior to the commencement of residential development a detailed design scheme of highway improvements for Sketchley Lane be approved in consultation with LCC and implemented prior to the occupation of the first dwelling. The condition specifies that the scheme includes works to provide a maximum of 1.8 m footway to the east of Sketchley Manor Lane, traffic calming measures to restrain vehicle speeds, a new 2.0 m wide footway between the residential site access and Sketchley Manor Lane, and carriageway widening within highway land on the south side of Sketchley Lane between the residential site access and Sketchley Manor Lane.¹⁵ This approach was acceptable to the main parties to the appeal, but did not allay the concerns of local objectors to the proposed development.
25. Notwithstanding that there have been no injury accidents reported in Sketchley Lane, from the evidence adduced at the Inquiry and from what I saw at my site visits, I consider that a scheme of mitigation would be necessary for the residential element of the appeal scheme to proceed. Vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians associated with the proposed 140 dwellings off Sketchley Lane would significantly add to the acknowledged safety hazard. I have no doubt that the highways experts could devise a scheme of mitigation for the lane that would overcome highway safety objections to the proposed development and

¹⁴ PreID18 Section 4.

¹⁵ ID6.6 Conditions 24 and 25.

achieve compliance with SADMDPD Policy DM17 concerning highway safety. However, there is nothing before me to indicate what impact such a scheme might have on the character and appearance of the lane in its local context. This is a consideration that indicates to me that it would not be reasonable to impose the suggested conditions in the circumstances that apply to this appeal.

26. There is local concern about the appeal scheme adding to existing congestion on the A5. I saw at my site visits how busy this route can be at times. However, there is no technical evidence to support a finding that the appeal scheme would result in severe residual cumulative impacts on the A5 or the wider road network. The impact on highway safety along the A5 would not warrant refusal of the scheme on highway grounds in accordance with NPPF paragraph 109.
27. In the absence of a scheme of mitigation for Sketchley Lane that would be acceptable in both highway and amenity terms, I find that legitimate local concerns about highway safety remain unresolved. Furthermore, if the highway objection could be overcome, it is not clear whether and to what extent such a scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area.

Housing land supply

28. HBBC initially conceded that it did not have a five-year housing land supply, but with the publication of the Government's new affordability ratio, HBBC revised its position from a housing land supply of 4.98 years to 5.01 years. The appellant considers that the housing land supply is 3.86 years with a shortfall of 541 dwellings.¹⁶ The difference concerns the extent of the supply regarding build rates on two sites, the inclusion of four other sites, along with the application of a windfall allowance.
29. HBBC's build rate for the land north of Triumph Motorcycles would exceed the average of 40 dwellings per annum (dpa), but there is evidence that the developer has achieved comparable build rates in similar market areas. I find no clear evidence to displace the presumption of deliverability that applies here. This would reduce the shortfall identified by the appellant by 80 dwellings.
30. The developer of the Springfield Riding School site has confirmed that the site is being built out for a Registered Provider and is contracted to build 50 dpa. The evidence indicates that there is a realistic prospect that the delivery of 168 dwellings on the site within the five year period is achievable. This would reduce the shortfall identified by the appellant by 27 dwellings.
31. Although the owner/developer of the former King William public house is currently converting the building, there is no clear evidence about progress towards completion of the contested 17 dwellings within the five-year period. Despite the owner's plans for the Trinity Marina site there is limited evidence that the housing completions would contribute to the five-year housing supply. For the land south of Station Road and Heath Road long-standing interest in development of this site, part of which HBBC own, is not sufficient evidence to include the site for 100 dwellings within the five-year housing land supply. The Garden Farm site at Bagworth Road is the subject of an application for 99 dwellings on this allocated site. However, this is subject to objections and

¹⁶ ID33.1 and ID33.2.

the information before me falls short of the clear evidence necessary to include 99 dwellings in the supply.

32. HBBC applied the average small site windfall completions of 73 dpa for the past 10 years in arriving at its windfall figure for years 4 and 5. I am satisfied that this is realistic having regard to historic windfall rates and expected future trends. This would reduce the shortfall identified by the appellant by 146 dwellings.
33. Taking all the above into account, I find that HBBC cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The shortfall of 288 dwellings is a significant factor in favour of granting planning permission for the appeal scheme.¹⁷

Heritage assets

34. The ridge and furrow earthworks on parts of the site is an undesignated heritage asset that would be lost if the appeal scheme was implemented. However, the remnant ridge and furrow has lost much of its original context and is appreciated now more as an interesting landscape feature than for its heritage significance. I am satisfied that local heritage considerations in this case could be addressed by the imposition of a recording condition.

Agricultural land

35. The proposal would result in the loss of 5.9 ha of grade 2, and 8 ha of grade 3a/3b, agricultural land. Grade 2 and 3a/3b land is classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land. However, the existing use is as a long-term grassland farm, that is isolated from other agricultural land in the area by urban development and the A5. The economic benefits of this best and most versatile agricultural land are also constrained by the way the better-quality land is mixed with lower-quality land within the site. Nevertheless, the loss of 13.9 ha of best and most versatile agricultural land would be significant and would represent an adverse effect of minor significance.

Living conditions of neighbouring residents

36. There is local concern that the proposed commercial development towards the east of the appeal site would harm the living conditions of existing residents of The Spinney, and also future occupiers of the proposed housing, because of the height and proximity of the buildings. These buildings would be limited to a maximum of 12 m to ridge height. Nevertheless, they would appear as large structures that would alter the view from existing dwellings. This impact on outlook could be softened in time as landscaping matured. Given the local topography here, along with the potential for effective landscape screening, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have an overbearing or dominating effect on the outlook from nearby residential dwellings. Subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions, the appeal scheme would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Local services and infrastructure

37. HBBC is satisfied that all potential impacts on local services and infrastructure would be mitigated or compensated by the provisions in the unilateral

¹⁷ 541-80-27-146=288 dwellings.

undertaking. However, many residents raised concerns about additional pressure on already stretched local services. The scheme would deliver public open space in excess of policy requirements, which would benefit existing and future residents and employees. This would, to some extent, counter harm if the scheme did add to demands on local resources, not all of which were adequately addressed by the provisions of the unilateral undertaking. There is no convincing evidence that an unacceptable impact on local services and infrastructure would justify dismissing the appeal. I find on this issue, that the appeal scheme would result in some beneficial aspects, and others which would add to demands on local services and infrastructure, not all of which might be adequately addressed by the unilateral undertaking. Overall, I consider that the appeal scheme would have a neutral effect on local services and infrastructure.

Planning balance

38. The loss of 13.9 ha of best and most versatile agricultural land would be an adverse effect of minor significance that should be given slight weight in the planning balance. The loss of a non-designated heritage asset requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of loss and the significance of the asset. The remnant ridge and furrow that would be lost has limited heritage significance and is of modest scale having regard to other examples of ridge and furrow in the wider locality. The removal of this heritage asset attracts negligible/slight weight. The most significant adverse effect weighing against the proposal is the effect on the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons set out above this attracts substantial weight in determining the planning balance in this case. Against these adverse impacts must be weighed the benefits of the proposed development.
39. The scheme would make a significant contribution to the supply of housing in the locality, with up to 70 market homes and 56 affordable homes. The latter is double the development plan requirement and would include up to 32 units of affordable rented accommodation. The proposed provision would make a particularly important contribution to meeting the acute need for affordable housing in Burbage. In addition, provision for up to 14 self-build/custom-built plots would make a significant contribution towards meeting HBBC's statutory requirement, especially where there is evidence of demand that is not yet reflected in HBBC's self-build register. Given the shortfall in HBBC's housing land supply, the provision of the proposed market, affordable and self-build/custom-built dwellings, is a benefit of substantial significance in determining this appeal that attracts substantial weight in the planning balance.
40. The construction and use of up to 22,637 m² of general industrial development or warehousing and distribution would provide employment and a useful addition to the local economy. The appellant considers that the scheme would provide for 241 gross per year equivalent temporary construction jobs, 385 gross full time equivalent jobs, and a total of £9.2 million net additional GVA impact over the construction period, together with £10.2 million net additional GVA per annum to the local economy and £5.5 million to the national economy once operational. It is estimated that economically active households would generate expenditure of £4 million per annum. These would be significant economic benefits.

41. However, HBBC's 2020 Employment Land and Premises Study identified that there is an existing supply of land to address the requirement for local needs employment. Nevertheless, it reported an over emphasis in the supply for strategic areas and a lack of local options. Furthermore, HBBC acknowledges the need for additional employment allocations to meet local needs in the Borough up to 2036. In that context the appeal scheme would make an important contribution, but I consider that the appellant overstates the current need for employment land. In my judgement, the economic benefits of the proposed development should attract moderate weight in the planning balance. Given the likely timescales for when these benefits would arise, I find no convincing evidence for giving additional weight to the economic benefits of the appeal scheme because of current Covid-19 considerations.
42. The appellant considers that the site's location, adjacent to the main town in the Borough, and the proposed co-location of employment and residential development, are benefits of the proposal. These are considerations that I have taken into account in arriving at my assessment of the significance of the housing and economic benefits of the proposal.¹⁸
43. The appeal scheme would result in some biodiversity gains, which for the reasons given above should be given slight weight in the planning balance. The proposed development would improve public access to the appeal site with links to existing public rights of way. This should be given some slight weight in the planning balance because, with the exception of access within the appeal site itself, the proposal would not provide footpath connections that do not already exist. The appellant's submission that the enhanced public rights of way network should be accorded 'very substantial weight' exaggerates the benefit.¹⁹
44. Taking all the above into account, I find that the adverse impacts of the appeal scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits. If I am wrong about the housing shortfall and it is 541 dwellings, as argued by the appellant, rather than 288, this would enhance the urgency of adding to supply and would increase the weight given to the benefits of the proposed housing. But not enough in my judgement to alter the overall balance I have found against the proposal.

Planning policy

45. The starting point for the determination of this appeal is the development plan. I am required to make my determination in accordance with it, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development would assist in providing new residential dwellings, and in ensuring a range of employment opportunities, within Burbage, and so would comply with CS Policy 4. It would not conflict with other CS policies.
46. SADMDPD Policy DM4 provides that to protect its intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character, the countryside will first and foremost be safeguarded from unsustainable development. It adds that development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where, amongst other things, it would significantly contribute to economic growth, and would not have a

¹⁸ The appellant lists 31 benefits. Many of these are separate elements of the housing, economic and environmental benefits that I have assessed. The others do not attract significant weight.

¹⁹ Paragraph 8.4 SoCG in respect of planning balance dated 15 February 2021.

significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside. The appeal site lies within the countryside and I have found that the proposed development would result in substantial harm to its intrinsic value and open character. Notwithstanding its contribution to economic growth, I find that the proposal would conflict with SADMDPD Policy DM4.

47. HBBC applies Policy DM4 with some flexibility, but that is a different consideration to assessing compliance. The intention of Policy DM4 is to 'protect' certain attributes of the countryside by safeguarding it from unsustainable development. Within this overall ambition the policy bites where, amongst other things, development in the countryside would have a significant adverse effect on those attributes. This is not inconsistent with paragraph 170 b) of the NPPF, which provides that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 213, the reference to 'protect' in Policy DM4 does not materially diminish the due weight the policy attracts.
48. The commercial element of the appeal scheme potentially derives some support from SADMDPD Policy DM20, which makes provision in some circumstances for employment sites adjacent to existing employment areas. However, the supporting text to this policy notes that this favourable consideration would apply where the proposal conformed to other SADMDPD policies.
49. Taking all the above into account, I find that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. This policy conflict can be attributed little weight given that the most important policies concerning the settlement boundary here are out-of-date.
50. The eBNP also attracts significant weight. The proposal would conflict with Policy 9 of the eBNP, and so notwithstanding that the residential element of the scheme would be sited adjacent to the settlement boundary, it would also be contrary to eBNP Policy 1. However, the weight attributed to conflict with the eBNP is affected by the CS and SADMDPD relying on an out-of-date evidence base.
51. I have found that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan and would be at odds with the eBNP. However, for the reasons given above the weight that can be attributed to this policy conflict is limited. Chief amongst the other material considerations that are important in determining this appeal is the NPPF.
52. For the reasons set out above concerning the effects on the character and appearance of the area, the proposed development would not result in the creation of a high quality place. I find that the appeal scheme would be contrary to NPPF paragraph 124, which states that the creation of high quality places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. In addition, it would conflict with NPPF paragraph 127 a), which provides that planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area. The scheme would gain support from the Government's objectives of significantly boosting the supply of homes and supporting economic growth and productivity. Nevertheless, I consider that the planning balance falls against the proposal because the adverse

impacts of the appeal scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Other matters

53. I have taken into account all other matters raised in evidence but have found nothing to outweigh the main considerations that lead to my conclusions.

Conditions and unilateral undertaking

54. I have had regard to the suggested planning conditions and the obligations in the unilateral undertaking, but do not consider that these would overcome the objections to granting outline planning permission for the appeal scheme.²⁰

Conclusions

55. The appeal scheme would not retain an appropriate transition zone in this part of Burbage between the existing hotel/proposed dwellings on the higher part of the site and the proposed commercial development. The scheme would be poorly configured and would harm the character and appearance of the area. A traffic calming scheme would be necessary for Sketchley Lane, but in the absence of a detailed proposal it is not possible to assess whether and to what extent such a scheme would add to this harm. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and is at odds with the eBNP. But more significantly in this case, it would be contrary to the NPPF. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

56. This decision is issued before the outcome of the eBNP referendum is known.²¹ It has, therefore, been determined on the evidence adduced at the Inquiry and on the basis that the eBNP attracts significant weight. If the referendum endorses the eBNP that would enhance the weight given to the conflict with Policies 9 and 1 in determining this appeal, although the weight attributed to this policy conflict would be affected by the CS and SADMDPD relying on an out-of-date evidence base. If the eBNP is not approved at the referendum little weight could be given to Policy 9. But in my judgement that would not tip the planning balance in favour of the appeal scheme. In that scenario the harm I have identified and conflict with the NPPF would still justify dismissing the appeal because the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

John Woolcock
Inspector

²⁰ ID6.6 and ID26.2. The appellant also indicated at the Inquiry that a condition to reduce the ridge height of the building in the north-western part of the site from 15 m to 12 m would be accepted if this would enable the scheme to be permitted.

²¹ The appellant's closing submissions are made on the basis that the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan is likely to be in force when this decision is issued (ID32 paragraph 2.23).

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Hugh Richards
of Counsel

Instructed by the head of legal services HBBC

He called

David Roberts IEng FIHE FCIHT
Adam Collinge BSc(Hons)
PGDipLA MA AMIEnvSci CMLI
Rob Foers BA MA
Helen Knott BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

Director SCP
Crestwood Environmental Ltd
Principal Planning Officer HBBC
Team Leader (Development Management)
HBBC

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Young QC
James Corbet Burcher
Junior Counsel

Instructed by Elizabeth Marjoram LLB
Consultant Solicitor Bird Wilford & Sale

They called

Ben Pycroft BA(Hons) DipTP
MRTPI
James Stacey BA(Hons) DipTP
MRTPI
Andrew Moger BA(Hons) MA
MRTPI
Tony Kernon BSc(Hons) MRICS
FBIAC
Andrew Crutchley BA(Hons)
PGDip(Oxon) MCIfA
Charles A Spicer BSc(Hons)
MRICS
Tom Wigglesworth BSc(Hons) MSc
MCIEEM
Benjamin Rosedale BSc(Hons)
MSc CMLI PIEMA
Michael Parkinson BSc(Hons)
CEng MICE MIHT MIRSO
Bernard Greep BA(Hons) BTP
MRTPI

Director Emery Planning
Tetlow King Planning
Tetlow King Planning
Principal Kernon Countryside Consultants
Director The Environmental Dimension
Partnership Ltd
Director Savills (UK) Ltd
Director The Environmental Dimension
Partnership Ltd
Director The Environmental Dimension
Partnership Ltd
Regional Planning Director Stantec UK Ltd
Planning Director Stantec UK Ltd

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Richard Flemming MA BA

HBBC Member for Burbage St Catherines & Lash
Hill and Chairman Burbage Parish Council

Cllr Barry Walker

HBBC Member for Burbage Sketchley and
Stretton Ward and Member of Burbage Parish
Council

Cllr Mike Hall

Member of Burbage Parish Council

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED PRIOR TO (PreID) AND AT THE INQUIRY (ID)

PreID	1	Burbage Parish Council's letter dated 2 March 2021
PreID	2	Suggested route for pre-inquiry visit by Inspector
PreID	3	CIL Compliance Statement
PreID	4	Suggested conditions and reasons
PreID	5	Draft programme/timetable for Inquiry
PreID	6	Connection Test Notes dated 2 March 2021
PreID	7	Opening statement by appellant
PreID	8	Opening statement by HBBC
PreID	9	Draft unilateral undertaking
PreID	10	Statement by Cllr Mike Hall
PreID	11	Statement by Cllr Richard Flemming
PreID	12	Statement by Cllr Barry Walker
PreID	13	Statement of Common Ground in respect of most important development plan policies
PreID	14	Note by appellant Appeal Scheme Changes Consultation
PreID	15	Email from HBBC dated 19 February 2021 re Springfield Riding School
PreID	16	Email exchange concerning error on application form
PreID	17	Plan showing publicly accessible routes south of the A5
PreID	18	Updated highways SoCG dated 8 March 2021
ID	1	Extract from Inspector's opening announcements re main issues
ID	2	Written statement by Mr and Mrs Nicol
ID	3	Extract from Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire 2017
ID	4.1	Inspector's ruling about amended description of proposal
	4.2	Corrected ruling
ID	5.1	Email from appellant dated 9 March 2021 re amended plans
	5.2	Land Budget Plan 037m
	5.3	Building Heights Plan 015h
ID	6.1	Revised suggested conditions
	6.2	Inspector's queries about suggested conditions
	6.3	Appellant's revised conditions for scheme
	6.4	Appellant's revised conditions for residential development
	6.5	Appellant's revised conditions for commercial development
	6.6	Agreed conditions applicable to the whole development
ID	7.1	Written statement by Cristian Ettridge
	7.2	Extract from proposal plan showing boundary with The Spinney
ID	8	Green Infrastructure Corridors – Dimensions sk013 11 March 2021
ID	9	Building Separation – Dimensions sk014a 11 March 2021
ID	10	Mr Stacey's list of appeals re affordable housing
ID	11	Extract from Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan 2001
ID	12	HBBC report 17/01043/HYB dated 6 March 2018
ID	13	Hinckley Park – Illustrative Photomontage
ID	14	Hardstanding Separation – Dimensions sk016a 12 March 2021
ID	15	Existing Contours edp4824 d097
ID	16	Existing Contours - Local Area edp4824 d100a
ID	17	Policy 9 Extent and Proposed Green Infrastructure edp4824 d099a
ID	18	Comparison of Policy 9 and Proposed Green Infrastructure Quantum edp4824 d101a
ID	19	Comparison of tree impacts
ID	20.1	Fixing our broken housing market DCLG February 2017

ID	20.2	White Paper: Planning for the Future August 2020
ID	21.1	Statement of Common Ground (Housing Supply) 18 March 2021
ID	21.2	Scott Schedule regarding housing land supply 17 March 2021
ID	22	Leicestershire County Council correspondence
ID	23	Note by Mr Greep re potential to achieve access from The Spinney
ID	24	Ledbury appeal decision APP/W1850/W/20/3244410
ID	25	Bradford appeal decision APP/W4705/V/18/3208020
ID	26.1	Proposed changes to the s106 obligation
ID	26.2	Deed of unilateral undertaking dated 30 March 2021
ID	27	Note on Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan
ID	28.1	Suggested itinerary for accompanied site visit – appeal site
ID	28.2	Suggested itinerary for accompanied site visit – locality
ID	28.3	Email dated 19 March 2021 from Cllr Findlay re suggestions for site visit itinerary
ID	29.1	Photomontage year 0 – view from Sketchley Grange car park
	29.2	Photomontage year 0 – central section with Building 8 at 15 m
	29.3	Photomontage year 0 – central section with Building 8 at 12 m
ID	30	Joint closing submissions from local Councillors
ID	31	Closing submissions on behalf of the local planning authority
ID	32	Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant
ID	33.1	Joint statement re: Local Housing Need following the publication of the latest affordability ratio – 29/03/21
	33.2	Addendum to closing submissions on behalf of the local planning authority

APPEAL PLANS

Site boundary plan edp4824_d002f [CD1.6]
 Demolition plan edp4824_d043b [CD1.11]
 Watling Drive access 43859-5501-006A [CD2.12]
 Sketchley Lane access 43859-5501-004C [CD2.23]
 Land budget edp4842_d037m [ID5.2]
 Building heights edp4824_d015i [ID5.3a]

Illustrative masterplan edp4842_d041i [CD2.31]
 Illustrative layout edp4842_d019f [CD2.32]
 Movement strategy edp4842_d040e [CD2.38]
 Landscape strategy edp4842_d045k [CD2.37]
 Illustrative site sections edp4842_sk004c [CD2.33]

Sketchley Lane – Footway and road narrowing improvements
 50711/5501/0001P02 [Appendix A PreID18]

JUDGMENTS

Bassetlaw DC v Secretary of State for Housing [2019] EWHC 556 (Admin)
 R. (on the application of Cherkley Campaign Ltd) v Mole Valley DC
 [2013] EWHC 2582 (Admin)
 R. (on the application of Hayes) v York City Council [2017] EWHC 1374 (admin)
 R. (on the application of TW Logistics Ltd) v Tendring DC [2013] EWCA Civ 9

CORE DOCUMENTS (CD)

CD1 Application Documents and Plans

- CD1.1 Application Forms and Certificates
- CD1.2 Application Form Supplementary Information
- CD1.3 Cover Letter August 2019
- CD1.4 Planning Statement
- CD1.5 Design and Access Statement
- CD1.6 Site Boundary Plan
- CD1.7 Illustrative Masterplan
- CD1.8 Illustrative Layout
- CD1.9 Land Budget Plan
- CD1.10 Building Heights Plan
- CD1.11 Demolition Plan
- CD1.12 Sketchley Lane Site Access
- CD1.13 Watling Drive Site Access
- CD1.14 Assessment of HBBC's Housing Need and Housing Land Supply Position Statement
- CD1.15 Heads of Terms for S106 Agreement
- CD1.16 Sketchley Economics Benefits Statement
- CD1.17 Employment Land Sequential Assessment
- CD1.18 Sketchley Lane Employment Market Report
- CD1.19 Ecological Appraisal
- CD1.20 Landscape and Visual Appraisal
- CD1.21 Archaeological and Heritage Assessment
- CD1.22 Transport Assessment
- CD1.23 Framework Travel Plan (revision A)
- CD1.24 Sketchley Flood Risk Assessment
- CD1.25 Surface Water Drainage Design Technical Note
- CD1.26 Foul Water Drainage Design Technical Note
- CD1.27 Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment
- CD1.28 Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- CD1.29 Arboricultural Technical Note
- CD1.30 Noise Impact Assessment
- CD1.31 Sketchley Utilities Appraisal
- CD1.32 Soils and Agricultural Quality

CD2 Additional/Amended Reports and/or Plans submitted after validation

Appeal Submission Documents

- CD2.1 Appeal Scheme Changes for Consultation (revision B)
- CD2.2 Design and Access Addendum (revision D)
- CD2.3 Illustrative Masterplan (revision H)
- CD2.4 Illustrative Layout (revision E)
- CD2.5 Illustrative Site Sections (revision B)
- CD2.6 Site Sections (revision B)
- CD2.7 Land Budget (revision K)
- CD2.8 Policy 9 Wildlife and Green Corridors – Illustrative Masterplan Overlay (revision D)

CD2.9 Building Heights Plan (revision F)
CD2.10 Landscape Strategy (revision H)
CD2.11 Movement Strategy (revision C)
CD2.12 Watling Drive Site Access (revision A)
CD2.13 Economic Benefits Statement Addendum
CD2.14 Employment Market Assessment Update September 2020
CD2.15 Ecology Addendum (revision B)
CD2.16 Landscape Addendum (revision B)
CD2.17 Transport Note (TN05)
CD2.18 Flood Risk Assessment Addendum
CD2.19 Surface Water Drainage Strategy (revision C)
CD2.20 Arboricultural Addendum (revision A)
Documents submitted during the determination of the planning application
CD2.21 EDP Response to Ecology Officer Comments
CD2.22 Sketchley Lane Site Access Rev B
CD2.23 Sketchley Lane Site Access Rev C
CD2.24 Sketchley Lane Site Access Vehicle Movements Plan Rev A
CD2.25 LCC Highways Response Technical Note 43859-5501-TN03
CD2.26 Framework Travel Plan (Revision B)
CD2.27 Open Space Provision Breakdown
CD2.28 Environmental Health Officer Comment Responses Technical Note
CD2.29 Archaeological Evaluation Report (issue 1)
Updated Appeal Submission and Consultation Documents following CMC
CD2.30 Appeal Scheme Changes for Consultation (revision c)
CD2.31 Illustrative Masterplan (revision I)
CD2.32 Illustrative Layout (revision F)
CD2.33 Illustrative Site Sections (revision C)
CD2.34 Land Budget (revision L)
CD2.35 Policy 9 Wildlife and Green Corridor – Overlay (revision E)
CD2.36 Building Heights Plan (revision G)
CD2.37 Landscape Strategy (revision K)
CD2.38 Movement Strategy (revision E)
CD2.39 Ecology Addendum (revision C)
CD2.40 Economics Benefit Statement Addendum (revision A)
CD2.41 Landscape Addendum (revision C)
CD2.42 Arboricultural Addendum (revision C)
CD2.43 Consultation Letter February 2021
CD2.44 Original scheme for clarification of changes Plan (revision A)
CD2.45 Amended scheme for clarification of changes plan (revision A)
CD2.46 Flood Risk Assessment Addendum – 3 February 2021
CD2.47 Transport Note TN05 – 4 February 2021
CD2.48 Consultation Email 5 February 2021
CD2.49 Amended Scheme Consultation Site Notice
CD2.50 Amended Scheme Consultation Press Notice
CD2.51 Amended Scheme Consultation Website screenshot

CD3 Committee Report and Decision Notice

CD3.1 HBBC Committee Report 19 May 2020

CD3.2 HBBC Committee Supplementary Agenda 19 May 2020

CD3.3 Decision Notice 20 May 2020

CD3.4 HBBC Committee Report Pack 2 February 2021

CD3.5 Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 19 May 2020

CD4 The Development Plan and evidence base for the current development plan and emerging development plan

The Development Plan

CD4.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2009)

CD4.2 Hinckley and Bosworth Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

CD4.3 Hinckley and Bosworth Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2011)

Evidence Base for the current development plan and emerging development plan

CD4.4 Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA (2014)

CD4.5 Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA (2008)

CD4.6 Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Needs Study (2019)

CD4.7 Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA (2017)

CD4.8 Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy Inspector's Final Report (2009)

CD5 Emerging Development Plan

CD5.1 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan

CD5.2 Burbage Neighbourhood plan Referendum Version June 2020

CD5.3 Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Submission Document

CD5.4 Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report 16 April 2020

CD5.5 Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement 18 May 2020

CD6 Relevant Appeal Decision

CD6.1 2141564 – Sandbach – 29 September 2011

CD6.2 2140255 and 2143265 – Sandbach – 6 December 2012

CD6.3 2141564 – Sandbach – 17 October 2013

CD6.4 2195900 – Galley Common – 22 November 2013

CD6.5 2203924 – Offenham – 7 February 2014

CD6.6 2209757 – Launceston – 11 April 2014

CD6.7 2199426 – Pulley Lane – 2 July 2014

CD6.8 2208318 – Sketchley House, Burbage – 18 November 2014

CD6.9 2222789 – St Austell – 20 February 2015

CD6.10 2215276 – Tysoe – 13 March 2015

CD6.11 2224465 – Barnstaple – 19 May 2015

CD6.12 2222641 – Corsham – 27 May 2015

CD6.13 3001706 – Twyning – 13 July 2015

CD6.14 3011886 – Shrewsbury – 19 January 2016

CD6.15 3007980 – Shepshed – 8 February 2016

CD6.16 3144248 – Lower Sydenham – 2 August 2016

CD6.17 3137161 – Ludlow – 10 November 2016

CD6.18 3067553 – Newington – 9 January 2017

CD6.19 3150985 – Oldmixon Road – 10 April 2017

CD6.20 3161733 – Lower Shiplake – 2 August 2017

CD6.21 3165228 – Oving Road – 18 August 2017
CD6.22 3142524 – Long Crendon – 25 August 2017
CD6.23 2218921 – Lydney – 7 November 2017
CD6.24 3191477 – Coalpit Heath – 6 September 2018
CD6.25 3208772 – Bedford – 21 January 2019
CD6.26 3213122 – Bromsberrow Heath – 17 April 2019
CD6.27 3206346 – Rothersthorpe – 17 May 2019
CD6.28 3214451 – Woodville – 25 June 2019
CD6.29 3206569 – Dylon – 26 June 2019
CD6.30 3222850 – Crabtree Farm, Barwell – 2 July 2019
CD6.31 3180729 – Hatfield Peverel – 8 July 2019
CD6.32 3192918 – Birmingham – 24 July 2019
CD6.33 3216104 – Sturry – 3 September 2019
CD6.34 3228086 – Great Glen – 9 September 2019
CD6.35 3227970 – Rudgwick – 16 September 2019
CD6.36 3230103 – Gamlangay – 23 September 2019
CD6.37 2212671 – Darnhall – 4 November 2019
CD6.38 3234530 – Takeley – 31 January 2020
CD6.39 3238460 – Great Torrington – 18 March 2020
CD6.40 3238048 – Nine Mile Ride – 9 April 2020
CD6.41 3230827 – Oxford Brookes – 23 April 2020
CD6.42 3169314 – Woburn Sands – 25 June 2020
CD6.43 2197529 and 2197532 – Nantwich – 15 July 2020
CD6.44 3247136 – Euxton – 11 August 2020
CD6.45 3255350 – Whittington – 20 November 2020
CD6.46 3253661 – Braintree – 14 December 2020
CD6.47 3243291 – Drakelow Tunnels – 8 January 2021
CD6.48 3210193 – Morpeth – 9 September 2019
CD6.49 3128707 – Sandbach – 31 October 2016
CD6.50 2226987 – Hassocks – 16 March 2017
CD6.51 3235401 – Desford – 18 December 2019
CD6.52 3188949 – The Common, Barwell – 20 July 2018
CD6.53 3248038 – Tiptree – 18 August 2020
CD6.54 2117379 – Holsworthy – 13 May 2010
CD6.55 2226342 – Burghfield – 17 March 2015
CD6.56 2228089 – Burghfield – 6 July 2015
CD6.57 3245077 – Aviation Lane – 7 October 2020

CD7 Relevant Judgments

CD7.1 Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [1982] JPL 37
CD7.2 Cawrey v SSCLG [2016] EWHC 1198 (Admin), [49]-[50]
CD7.3 Bloor Homes Limited v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWHC 745 (Admin); [2017] PTSR 128
CD7.4 Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Developments Ltd [2017] UKSC 37; [2017] 1 WLR 1865
CD7.5 Gladman Developments v SSHCLG & Central Bedfordshire Council [2019] EWHC 127 (Admin); [2019] PTSR 1302
CD7.6 Wavendon Properties Limited vs SSHCLG and Milton Keynes Council [2019] EWHC 1524 (Admin); [2019] PTSR 2077

CD7.7 Monkhill v SSHCLG [2019] EWHC 1993 (Admin) | [2020] PTSR 416
CD7.8 Peel Investments North Ltd v SSHCLG [2019] EWHC 2143 (Admin); [2020] P.T.S.R. 503
CD7.9 Gladman Developments Ltd v SSHCLG and Uttlesford [2020] EWHC 518 (Admin); [2020] PTSR 993
CD7.10 R (Oxton Farm) v Harrogate Borough Council [2020] EWCA Civ 805
CD7.11 Peel Investments North Ltd v SSHCLG [2020] EWCA Civ 1175
CD7.12 Corbett v Cornwall Council [2020] EWCA Civ 508, [34]-[43]
CD7.13 Paul Newman v SSHCLG [2021] EWCA Civ 15, [44]-[48]
CD7.14 Stroud DC v SSCLG [2015] EWHC 488 (Admin)
CD7.15 Asda v Leeds City Council [2021] EWCA Civ 32
CD7.16 Gladman Developments Limited v SSHCLG and Corby Borough Council and Uttlesford District Council [2021] EWCA Civ 104

CD8 Appeal Correspondence

CD8.1 Inspector request for further information
CD8.2 Inspector's Agenda
CD8.3 Inspector's Case Management Conference Note
CD8.4 Stantec letter to PINS 19th January 2021

CD9 Planning

CD9.1 Examination Hearing Statements in Relation to Land off Sketchley Lane, Burbage
CD9.2 HBBC Planning Committee 19 May 2020 Full Transcript
CD9.3 HBBC Planning Committee 2 February 2021 Full Transcript
CD9.4 Stantec PBS for Barwood comments on Burbage NP Submission Plan
CD9.5 Stantec PBS for Barwood response to Inspectors hearing questions

CD10 Five Year Housing Supply

CD10.1 Residential Land Availability Monitoring Statement 2019-2020
CD10.2 Residential Land Availability Monitoring Statement 2019-2020 Addendum
CD10.3 Residential Land Availability Monitoring Statement Appendices 2019-2020
CD10.4 Windfall Assessment: 1 April 2020
CD10.5 Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Needs Study 2019
CD10.6 Updated Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Land Supply Position (9 February 2021)
CD10.7 BBC Briefing: Housing (February 2020)
CD10.8 Market Bosworth NDP

CD11 Affordable Housing

CD11.1 HBBC Residential Land Availability Monitoring Statement 2019-2020
CD11.2 HBBC Residential Land Availability Monitoring Statement 2019-2020 Appendices
CD11.3 Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 2018-2023
CD11.4 Hinckley and Bosworth Corporate Plan 2017-2021
CD11.5 Leicestershire Sustainable Community Strategy 2008

CD12 Self-Build Housing

CD12.1 Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act (2015)

CD12.2 Extract from Chapter 2 of Housing and Planning Act (2016)

CD12.3 Self-build and Custom housebuilding (Time for compliance and fees) regs (2016)

CD12.4 PPG Self-build and custom housebuilding section

CD13 Commercial/Employment

CD13.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Employment Land and Premises Review (February 2020)

CD13.2 Hinckley and Bosworth Economic Regeneration Strategy 2016-2020

CD13.3 Hinckley and Bosworth Economic Regeneration Strategy Background Action Plan 2016-2020

CD13.4 Leicester and Leicestershire Housing & Economic Development Needs Assessment 2017 [*Duplicate of CD4.7*]

CD13.5 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study Part A

CD13.6 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study Part B

CD13.7 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study Part C

CD13.8 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Labour Market Dashboard December 2020

CD13.9 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Business and Economic Intelligence Update 2021

CD13.10 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership COVID-19 Economic Recovery Action Plan December 2020

CD13.11 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Leicester Logistics Operations, June 2020

CD13.12 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Local Industrial Strategies Economic Review, June 2019

CD13.13 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Local Industrial Strategies Policy Prospectus, October 2018

CD13.14 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Local Industrial Strategy Prospectus July 2018

CD13.15 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Logistics Infographic

CD13.16 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Logistics & Distribution Sector Growth Action Plan, May 2015

CD13.17 Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan 2014-2020

CD13.18 HM Treasury, Forecasts for the UK Economy no. 401 December 2020

CD13.19 House of Commons, Briefing Paper 8866 Coronavirus Economic Impact

CD13.20 House of Commons, Briefing Paper 8898 Coronavirus Impact on the Labour Market

CD13.21 A5 Transport Partnership, Strategy Supporting Growth & Movement in the Midlands 2018-2031

CD13.22 Bank of England, Monetary Policy Report, November 2020

CD13.23 Midlands Engine, Midlands Engine Vision for Growth, September 2017

CD13.24 Midlands Engine, Midlands Engine Strategy, March 2017

- CD13.25 Midlands Engine, Prospectus 2016, December 2015
- CD13.26 Midlands Connect, Strategy, March 2017
- CD13.27 NOMIS, Hinckley & Bosworth Labour Market Profile
- CD13.28 ONS, Coronavirus and the latest indicators for the UK economy and society
- CD13.29 ONS, GDP quarterly national accounts, UK July to September 2020, December 2020
- CD13.30 ONS, Hinckley Bosworth Labour Market Dashboard, December 2020
- CD13.31 ONS, Labour market overview UK, December 2020
- CD13.32 ONS, The impact of the Coronavirus so far, 9 December 2020
- CD13.33 ONS, Statistical Bulletin Retail sales Great Britain, November 2020
- CD13.34 ONS, Coronavirus and the impact on output in the UK economy, November 2020
- CD13.35 BPF, Delivering the Goods in 2020, February 2020
- CD13.36 MAKE UK, Reviving Regional Economies The Midlands and East, November 2020
- CD13.37 MAKE UK, Reviving Regional Economies through Manufacturing, November 2020
- CD13.38 MAKE UK, BDO Manufacturing Outlook Q3 2020, September 2020
- CD13.39 MAKE UK, BDO Regional Manufacturing Outlook, July 2020
- CD13.40 Prologis, COVID-19 Special Report, June 2020
- CD13.41 Prologis, UK Employment Paper Tech Insight, September 2020
- CD13.42 Savills, Big Shed Briefing, January 2021
- CD13.43 KPMG, The Future of Towns and Cities Post COVID-19, January 2021
- CD13.44 Resolution Foundation, Jobs Jobs Jobs, October 2020
- CD13.45 The Guardian, Covid and Brexit UK manufacturers bringing it all back home, 23 November 2020
- CD13.46 Industrial Strategy: building a Britain fit for the future (November 2017)
- CD13.47 Hinckley & Bosworth Employment Land Availability Monitoring Statement (April 2019 – March 2020) (1 April 2020)
- CD13.48 Prime Minister Economy Speech, 30 June 2020
- CD13.49 European Manufacturing Outlook – Autumn 2020, Savills
- CD13.50 Business Secretary Calls with Business Leaders, 11 January 2021
- CD13.51 The Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee February 2021 report
- CD13.52 The Crisis in Retailing: Closures & Job Losses (February 2021)
- CD13.53 Centre for Retail Research: Who's Gone Bust in Retail? (Feb 2021)
- CD13.54 Prologis, European E-Commerce, E-Fulfilment and Job Creation, February 2021

CD14 Ecology

- CD14.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 1)
- CD14.2 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 2)
- CD14.3 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 3)

- CD14.4 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 4)
- CD14.5 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 5)
- CD14.6 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 6)
- CD14.7 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 7)
- CD14.8 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 8)
- CD14.9 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Phase 1 – Habitat Study of Proposed Allocation Sites (Part 9)
- CD14.10 Guidelines for the selection of Local Wildlife Sites in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland

CD15 Landscape

- CD15.1 Landscape Character Assessment 2017
- CD15.2 Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2017
- CD15.3 LCA Rugby Sensitivity and Condition
- CD15.4 Dunsmore LCA 1993
- CD15.5 Dunsmore LCA 1993 – Map
- CD15.6 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition, Landscape Institute and IEMA, 2013
- CD15.7 Burbage Parish Walks Leaflet (Leicestershire County Council, Reprinted 2009) – attached
- CD15.8 Landscape Assessment of the Borough of Rugby, Sensitivity and Condition Study (April 2006)

CD16 Heritage

- CD16.1 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) 2019 Planning Practice Guidance: What are Non-designated Heritage Assets
- CD16.2 Historic England. 2018a Introductions to Heritage Assets: Field Systems (London)
- CD16.3 Wilson, D.R. 2000 Air Photo Interpretation for Archaeologists (London)
- CD16.4 Taylor, C. 1975 Fields in the English Landscape (London: JM Dent)
- CD16.5 Hall, D (1982) Medieval Fields (Shire Archaeology)
- CD16.6 Wade-Martins, S & Williamson, T (1999) Roots of Change: Farming and the Landscape in East Anglia, c.1700-1870 (British Agricultural History Society)
- CD16.7 Williamson, T. 2003 Shaping Medieval Landscapes: Settlement, Society, Environment (Oxford: Oxbow)
- CD16.8 Historic England (HE), 2012, A project brief for the Turning the Plough Update Assessment 2012, London
- CD16.9 Historic England (HE), 2018b. Designation Selection Guide: Agriculture
- CD16.10 Hall, D. 2001 Turning the Plough: Midland open fields, landscape character and proposals for management. (English Heritage / Northamptonshire County Council)

- CD16.11 Gloucestershire County Council 2012, NHPP 2D1: Agriculture and Forestry Impacts Project No.6468, Turning the Plough Update Assessment 2012 – Summary Report for English Heritage, Version 3 Final Gloucester
- CD16.12 SUMO, 2019, Geophysical Survey Report: Land off Sketchley Lane, Leicestershire unpublished
- CD16.13 Oxford Archaeology, 2019. Sketchley Lane, Sketchley: Archaeological Evaluation Report Unpublished
- CD16.14 Email from Sophie Clarke, Senior Planning Archaeologist at Leicestershire County Council dated 22 November 2019

CD17 Highways

- CD17.1 The Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, Manual for Streets 2 Wider Application of the Principles, 2010
- CD17.2 Department for Transport, Manual for Streets, 2007
- CD17.3 Leicestershire County Council, Leicestershire Highways Design Guide, 2018
- CD17.4 Highways England Response to Planning Application dated 6 March 2020
- CD17.5 Leicestershire County Council Local Highway Authority Response to Planning Application dated 24 January 2020
- CD17.6 TN04 Technical Note 'Responses to LCC Comments'
- CD17.7 LTN 1/20 – Cycle Infrastructure Design
- CD17.8 Inclusive mobility
- CD17.9 Gear Change – A bold vision for cycling and walking
- CD17.10 Transport Note (TN03)
- CD17.11 LCC Consultation response to the TA dated 7 October 2019