



Appeal Decision

Hearing held 22 – 23 September 2022

Site visit made on 22 September 2022

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/W/20/3264047

Land off Sycamore Street, Blaby, Leicestershire LE8 4FX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martin McDonagh against the decision of Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0140/FUL, dated 30 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is the use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 2 no. Gypsy pitches, together with the formation of hardstanding and utility/dayroom ancillary to that use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for a partial award of costs was made by Mr Martin McDonagh against Blaby District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. For this appeal, the relevant development plan policies comprise those of the Core Strategy¹ (CS), the Delivery Plan² (DP) and Blaby Neighbourhood Plan³ (BNP). The National Planning Policy Framework⁴ (the Framework), and the Planning policy for traveller sites⁵ (PPTS) read in conjunction with this, are also important material considerations.
4. The PPTS applies to Gypsies and Travellers as defined for planning purposes in its Annex 1. The two households seeking to occupy the proposed pitches meet this definition. This relates to 'persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily...'.⁵
5. Since the Hearing, the Court of Appeal made its judgment over *Smith v SSLUHC & Ors* [2022] EWCA on 31 October 2022, over the interpretation of the

¹ Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document adopted February 2013.

² Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document adopted February 2019.

³ Made February 2018.

⁴ As last updated 20 July 2021.

⁵ August 2015 Department for Communities and Local Government.

PPTS and the application of that policy to gypsies and travellers who have ceased to pursue nomadic lifestyles. Although the proposed occupiers in this case meet the PPTS definition, I have accounted for this judgment in regard to future assessment of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs, having first considered further comments made by the main parties in respect of this.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in the appeal concern the effects of the proposal on:
- the character and appearance of the area, including Blaby Conservation Area (CA) and the setting of Blaby Hall and its Ice House;
 - highway safety;
 - and flood risk.

Reasons

Character and appearance, including CA and setting of Blaby Hall and Ice House

7. Blaby is a compact settlement, forming one of the large suburban areas south of Leicester. The Gypsy pitches would occupy a segment of the thickly vegetated area along Sycamore Street, opposite the main settlement edge and fronting the grounds to Blaby Hall and Bouskell Park. The site once contained allotments, which have since become overgrown with vegetation. Some trees, protected by the CA, had been removed in 2018. The Council served a Tree Replacement Notice requiring the re-planting of nine of these, which came into effect on 17 June 2019. Action on this is deferred, pending the outcome of this appeal. However, the proposal includes the replacement of these trees around the two Gypsy pitches.
8. The wooded area the appeal site occupies is a prominent townscape feature in the centre of Blaby, located between a main road and Bouskell Park. It emphasises the division between the suburban settlement and open parkland east of Sycamore Street, comprising an influential part of the area's character and appearance.
9. The new access serving the Gypsy pitches would interrupt the seamless green frontage running between the existing entrances to Blaby Hall and Bouskell Park, opening up views of the block paved area accommodating the proposed mobile homes, touring caravans and plainly designed dayroom. Replacement trees and supplemental landscaping would surround the hardstanding, with the caravans and dayroom sited hard up to its edge. Other than at the site entrance, the surrounding vegetation would help screen the proposal, although it would remain discernible from other viewpoints, particularly during winter months with less leaf cover and more use of external lighting.
10. The Council's refusal reasons include a failure to demonstrate the proposal would not significantly harm the health of the existing and proposed trees within and adjacent to the site. Although replacement trees are to be planted around the hardstanding containing the Gypsy pitches, by occupying a gap where these had been removed, the proposal would preclude the same natural spread of trees as in the remainder of this wooded area. Perpetuating this treeless gap is a factor bound up with an overall adverse impact on the

character and appearance of the area, given the townscape importance of this woodland as a foil to the dense development opposite.

11. This proposal would be entirely discordant with the otherwise undeveloped and thickly vegetated character of this prominent stretch of land fronting the grounds to Blaby Hall and Bouskell Park. The Gypsy pitches would comprise a highly incongruous feature, out of keeping with their surroundings and unrelated to the prevailing pattern of development. As such, there would be substantial harm to the townscape character of this prominent and sensitive part of Blaby.
12. There is acknowledgement from the appellant, with which I agree, that the Gypsy site would not be completely hidden from view and should not be so. The PPTS advises that weight should be attached to not enclosing a Gypsy and Traveller site with so much hard landscaping that this gives the impression the occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community. Nevertheless, I disagree with visibility in this case equating to a lack of harm, for the reasons given.
13. The proposal would be contrary to Policy CS2, in failing to respect the distinctive local character of this area. There would also be conflict with Policy BNP1, through it failing to create a sense of place appropriate to this location. The adverse visual impact on the townscape in this part of Blaby would fail criterion b) of Policy CS9, required to support a new Gypsy site. Within an area designated as countryside, the proposal fails to meet Policy CS18 by having a significantly adverse effect on the appearance and character of the landscape. For broadly the same reasons, the proposal conflicts with DP Policy DM2 and Policy BNP3, as these relate to development in the countryside.
14. The appeal site falls within both the CA and the settings of grade II listed Blaby Hall and its Ice House. I have respective duties under sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of these listed buildings and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
15. I find the significance of the CA to derive from it defining Blaby's historic form. This comprises the early development concentrated to the north of Church Street and the contrastingly open parkland laid out around Blaby Hall to the south. In subsequent years, development has condensed within the northern historic core and spread outwards. However, this subsequent growth has preserved the open parkland around Blaby Hall, which endures as an important feature of the settlement's historic morphology. The creation of Bouskell Park has safeguarded the long-term future of a large part of this parkland landscape and it has become a well-used public amenity, allowing many more people to experience and better appreciate these historic surroundings.
16. As former allotments, the appeal site was evidently not part of the Blaby Hall curtilage. However, a series of maps show that over time this area has remained undeveloped and become absorbed into the woodland fringes of this historic parkland. Because more recent development has skirted this undeveloped area, the Gypsy pitches would comprise a starkly anomalous feature within this parkland setting.

17. The combination of hardstanding, mobile homes, touring caravans, a day room and any associated domestic paraphernalia would appear entirely out of context in this sensitive location. Such an isolated incursion into the verdant fringes of this historic parkland would bear no relation to the prevailing pattern of development and the general manner in which Blaby has grown. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance either the character or the appearance of the CA and be harmful to its significance as a heritage asset, insofar as it would erode the verdant fringe to the historic parkland. Whilst the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, it remains at a highly adverse level within such a scale. This is a matter to which considerable importance and weight must be attached in order to reflect the section 72(1) duty.
18. The significance of the grade II Blaby Hall relates to the expansive grounds which provide a setting befitting a grand nineteenth century country house. There is no evidence to substantiate the current office use of Blaby Hall diminishing this significance. The grade II listed Ice House, recently the subject of restoration and interpretation, is a feature associated with the historical running of a large country house. It is located within the former grounds of Blaby Hall, now part of the publicly accessible Bouskell Park. This public open space allows Blaby Hall and its Icehouse to be appreciated within a formally landscaped setting, screened by wooded surroundings from the suburban parts of the settlement.
19. There might be no inter-visibility between the appeal site and either Blaby Hall or the Icehouse. However, by impinging upon the setting of these listed buildings, the proposal affects how both are experienced as designated heritage assets. Whilst the resulting harms would again be less than substantial, these would again be significantly adverse, most particularly in relation to the significance of Blaby Hall, and should be given considerable importance and weight reflective of the section 66(1) duty.
20. I find the factors argued in mitigation of the proposal's heritage harms far from persuasive. The appellant considers the Gypsy pitches would be comparable in appearance to the car parking area provided for Bouskell Park. However, this is a functional necessity to make this public open space accessible to all visitors and is quite appropriately located at the site entrance. The car park lies to one side of this entrance, from which there is a pleasing vista into the public open space and across to Blaby Hall. It is not reasonably comparable with the appeal scheme, which would open up an area of woodland to less attractive views of the mobile homes, touring caravans and dayroom.
21. The appellant also claims a greater harm caused in permitting the Hall Farm residential development adjacent to Blaby Hall, thereby diminishing its heritage significance and that of the CA. The Hall Farm scheme was nearing completion at the time of my site visit. It bears little relationship with the appeal proposal for various reasons. This housing has not replaced an area of undeveloped woodland, but modern farm buildings. It was allowed in place of an extant consent for a three-storey office scheme. The buildings are designed to reflect local character and compliment the historic setting. None of the above applies to the appeal scheme and, whilst Historic England had still found the Hall Farm proposals to cause less than substantial heritage harm, the factors at play in the overall balance leading to this approval do not equate to those in this appeal.

22. I do not find it reasonable to infer any tacit approval of this scheme by Historic England just because, unlike with the Hall Farm scheme, it had not commented and left this to the Council's own Conservation Advisor. The Council considers the Gypsy pitches would cause a greater degree of heritage harm compared to the housing allowed at Hall Farm and I would concur. In any case, the effects of this new housing do not amount to justification for the further harm that would be caused by this proposal. Whatever harm the Hall Farm scheme might have caused, this is not indicative of any limited degree of significance of the designated heritage assets affected, which remain of national importance and as such benefit from an appropriate level of statutory protection.
23. This proposal would fail to preserve the character or the appearance of the CA or the settings of the listed Blaby Hall and Icehouse, bringing the scheme into conflict with Policy CS20, DP Policy DM12 and Policy BNP8. This is insofar as these policies seek a design of development which protects the historic environment within Blaby, including its designated heritage assets.
24. DP Policy SA4 sets the broad locations for accommodating those Gypsies and Travellers in Blaby meeting the PPTS planning definition. This is permissive in locations immediately adjoining Blaby's defined Settlement Boundaries and outside either a Green Wedge or Area of Separation. This would be unless, under part d), a proposal was demonstrated to cause adverse effects to protected areas. Such adverse effects have been found in respect of the CA and the settings of the listed Blaby Hall and Icehouse and so Policy SA4 provides no support to these proposed Gypsy pitches.
25. Paragraph 199 of the Framework requires that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
26. In paragraph 202, the Framework requires that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Such less than substantial heritage harms have in this case been found highly adverse.
27. I acknowledge the difficulties faced generally by Gypsies in gaining planning permission for culturally appropriate accommodation. In this context, the social benefits of housing two Gypsy families on caravan pitches would amount to a general public benefit, but nonetheless one of a relatively modest scale. The considerable importance and weight I must attach to the heritage harms identified would, in this case, clearly and decisively outweigh these public benefits.

Highway safety

28. The Council's third reason for refusal was over a failure to demonstrate a two Gypsy pitch layout that would provide sufficient space for vehicles towing caravans to stand clear of the highway and manoeuvre within the site so that they could exit in a forward direction. Whilst such turning space might not be available, I agree that touring caravans would likely be manoeuvred by hand, some with motorised assistance available for this. This would avoid the need

for turning within the site whilst being towed or recourse to a reverse exit onto Sycamore Street. On this basis, I am satisfied the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and thus satisfy policies CS9 and DP DM8.

Flood risk

29. The appeal site is located approximately 6m from a watercourse running between it and the grounds to Blaby Hall and Bouskell Park. This is culverted further north, before flowing into the River Sence. The Environment Agency's on-line map shows the shading indicative of higher risk Flood Zones 2 and 3 ending abruptly roughly where this water course enters the culvert. This on-line map gives no indication of the likely extent alongside the appeal site of these Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, these are mapped as part of the 2014 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The red line of the appeal site is within Flood Zone 1 based on this map, which corresponds to a low probability of flooding.
30. A revised site-specific flood risk assessment⁶ was provided by the appellant a few weeks prior to the hearing, relating to all sources of flooding required by the Framework. No detailed modelling of the watercourse has been undertaken in respect of this proposal and so the assessment is based on secondary sources. Mitigation measures are proposed to address the risk of surface water flooding, including relocating the storage sites for the touring caravans.
31. The appellant has demonstrated reasonably, through the revised site-specific flood risk assessment, that the proposal would be safe in terms of flood risk, with that from surface water managed and mitigated for the lifetime of the development. As such, the scheme satisfies policies DP SA4 and CS22 and no negative impacts in regard to flood risk weigh in the overall balance.

Planning Balance

32. Paragraph 11 of the Framework establishes the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking, this means
 - c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or*
 - d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
 - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.*
33. Footnote 7 of paragraph 11 d) i clarifies that the policies it refers to include those in the Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to designated heritage assets. For the reasons given above, the application of Framework policies that protect the CA, and the listed Blaby Hall and Icehouse in respect of their settings, provide a clear reason for dismissing the appeal.

⁶ GeoSmart Information Ltd 28 March 2022

Irrespective of the arguments made over the application of footnote 8 regarding five year housing land supply, or other reasons the most important policies for determining the appeal might be out-of-date, these heritage grounds dis-engage the so-called 'tilted' balance in paragraph 11 d) ii.

34. The planning balance becomes that required under planning law, whereby this appeal should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise⁷. The conflict with the development plan is not one in principle over the proposal being in countryside. Immediately adjoining Blaby's defined settlement boundary, occupants would have good access to shops and other services. However, the harm to character and appearance and to the designated heritage assets affected are fundamental matters and mean the proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. The material circumstances relate in this case to whether the development plan is failing to meet a need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and, if so, whether the benefits of the proposal in helping to address this shortfall outweigh any harm that would arise, so as to indicate the appeal should succeed, despite the conflict with policy.
35. In the context of delivering a sufficient supply of homes, footnote 27 of the Framework refers to the PPTS setting out how the housing needs for those covered by Annex 1 definition should be assessed. In this regard, the PPTS refers to local planning authorities making their own assessment of need, identifying sites to meet this, promoting more private traveller sites and increasing the number of permitted in appropriate locations, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply. Paragraph 10 of the PPTS requires local plans to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth against their locally set targets.
36. Blaby Core Strategy was adopted in February 2013, prior to the publication of the PPTS in 2015. Policy CS9 sets targets for the amount of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers based on a 2013 Assessment that predates the revised definition in the PPTS. The key change is that the PPTS definition now excludes Gypsies and Travellers who have ceased to travel permanently. Policy CS9 is clear that the most up-to-date Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) will be used to inform the provision through the development management process and a subsequent DP.
37. This DP was adopted in February 2019, having been examined in the context of both the 2015 PPTS and most recent May 2017 GTAA⁸. The Examining Inspector accepted the evidence that the current supply of unimplemented planning permissions was sufficient to meet the 2016-2021 accommodation needs for households meeting the PPTS definition, including the proportion of those where this was presently then unknown. To cater for the 83 unknown households identified in the GTAA, which the Inspector found could give rise to a further 2-23 meeting the PPTS definition, Policy SA4 was subject to a main modification removing reference to 'need'. This was to address the uncertainty over the extent of unknown households and ensure the policy provided for all households coming forward meeting the PPTS definition.

⁷ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

⁸ Leicester City and Leicestershire (excluding Hinkley and Bosworth) Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment – Opinion Research Services, Final Report May 2017

38. Therefore, the DP was found to be sound on Examination in respect of unimplemented permissions meeting the PPTS requirement, without making any specific site allocations for Gypsies and Travellers. However, like Policy CS9, DP Policy SA4 is predicated upon the most up to date GTAA. Whilst that is currently the 2017 version, the Council confirmed in advance of the Hearing that it is shortly to publish an updated report to underpin its emerging Local Plan. This will indicate an elevated need of around 24 pitches.
39. The appellant finds the 2017 GTAA to under-estimate the need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. A number of reasons are given, including DP Policy SA4 applying only to Gypsies and Travellers meeting the PPTS definition for planning purposes and excluding those who had ceased to travel permanently. The GTAA does separately assess there to be a need in Blaby for 6 pitches in the period up to 2036 for travellers not meeting the planning definition. However, the needs of this cohort are addressed by the general housing policies in the development plan and do not benefit from the support provided through Policy SA4.
40. Since the Hearing, the Court of Appeal⁹ has found the planning definition for Gypsies and Travellers unlawfully discriminatory to those who for health needs or old age have ceased to travel permanently. Although this decision leaves the PPTS intact, it lends weight to the appellant's calculation of a higher accommodation need, embracing this 'non-definitional' subset of the Gypsy and Traveller population.
41. The Council has rebutted the GTAA inaccuracies found by the appellant, which include the base date quantum of consented pitches, the level of doubled up, concealed or overcrowded households, those in bricks and mortar seeking caravan accommodation and future demographic growth. However, were I to entirely accept the appellant's calculations of an outstanding need in Blaby for 63 additional pitches by 2021 and 110 pitches by 2033, this adds positive weight to the proposal in the planning balance.
42. The degree of weight given to this outstanding need rests with the decision maker. In a case cited by the appellant the circumstances were such that this had been given significant weight by the Secretary of State¹⁰. In two other cases quoted, the Secretary of State had given the failure to provide enough Gypsy sites significant¹¹ and considerable¹² weight respectively. In another appeal¹³, the Inspector gave separate and cumulative weighting to unmet need, the lack of a five-year supply and these factors being indicative of policy failure. However, the weighting given depends on the circumstances in each appeal case. In my view, two further pitches would in this instance make only a relatively small contribution towards the under supply of traveller accommodation in Blaby as calculated by the appellant. In this context, the benefits of this proposal are afforded only a moderate degree of weight in the planning balance. As material considerations these benefits would not be

⁹ Smith v SSLUHC & Ors [2022] EWCA

¹⁰ Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/A/12/2169062 etc. Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Sections 78 And 174 Appeals by Mr Roy Amer, Ms Susan King, Mr Simon Doherty, Mrs Rose Doherty and Mr Charlie Doherty - land at the Glade, Oakview, Yew Tree And Wood Lodge, River Lane, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 0AY.

¹¹ Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/A/11/2153741/NWF Land at Tullochside Farm, Hemel Hempstead Road, Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7AJ

¹² Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590

¹³ Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/15/3065767 Land at Shortwood Road, Pucklechurch, Bristol BS16 9PQ

enough to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

43. Further to a general need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, there is the two families' personal need to weigh in the balance. In this regard, I am accepting there to be no alternative sites available to meet this. The two families comprise those of the appellant and his brother, both of whom have wives also from travelling backgrounds. The appellant's family currently occupy local authority accommodation and his brother's family lives in a privately rented home, both in Leicester. It would appear that the children's educational and the families' health needs are being catered for where they currently reside. However, the occupation of bricks and mortar accommodation is causing distress, particularly to both the mothers, and this is having health repercussions.
44. In relation to this personal need, I have accounted for Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights as this relates to a respect for private and family life. Dismissing the appeal would interfere with this right by denying an opportunity for the two brothers and their families to live together in culturally appropriate caravan accommodation on a site suitable to their Gypsy and Traveller status. However, this is a qualified right and interference with the exercise of this in accordance with planning law is here necessary in a wider public interest to protect the character and appearance of the area.
45. The Article 8 rights include those of the four children, with their best interests being consistent with those of the two mothers in this case. No other consideration must be regarded as more important or given greater weight than the best interests of the children. It appears to me that the health, education and general welfare needs of the four children are currently being adequately met in Leicester. The same opportunities would likely be available at this site in Blaby, with the benefit of culturally more suitable accommodation benefitting the well-being of both mothers who provide child care. However, in this context, the adverse impact of dismissing the appeal on the interests of the children would not be proportionate with the high level of public harm to the character and appearance of the area.
46. Given that the proposed occupiers are Irish travellers and thus have that protected characteristic of race under the Equality Act 2010, I have had due regard to the public sector equality duty imposed under section 149(1). This includes applying the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and to advance equality of opportunity, as well as foster good relations, between persons who share this protected characteristic and do not share it. However, the evidence before me is that, whilst the location of the appeal site would allow close integration with the adjacent community, the planning harm is not specific to Gypsy and Traveller occupation but in relation to considerations of character and appearance that any other kind of development might cause. Therefore, the public sector equality duty would be satisfactorily met in the event of the appeal not succeeding.
47. The personal need would be insufficient to outweigh the substantial harm to character and appearance and the considerable importance and weight given to heritage harm in this balance. In the event I found the harm caused by the proposal outweighed the case for it gaining permanent planning permission,

the appellant seeks I consider grant of a temporary consent, which would need to be for five years.

48. Paragraph 27 of the PPTS states that, if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five-year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission. It is not clear to me that the Council can show this required supply, and so significant weight is given to an option to allow the appeal on a five-year temporary basis. Although permission granted on such a temporary basis would reduce the harm arising from the proposal, which I have found to be substantial, this would still remain considerable. Therefore, I consider a temporary rather than permanent consent insufficient to tip the balance in favour of allowing the appeal.

Conclusion

49. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the resulting harm would not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, even applying the personal need and any mitigation provided by consent being temporary. For the reasons given and having taken into account all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR

DOCUMENTS

Witness statements of Martin and Michael McDonagh updated and submitted at the Hearing

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Matthew Green BA – Director, Green Planning Studio Limited
Ruth Reed BA DipArch MA PGCertEdP HonAIA FRIAS PPRIBA – Director, Green Planning Studio Limited
Mike Piotrowski - Principal Hydrologist, GeoSmart Information Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jack Smyth - Barrister No. 5 Chambers
Ed Stacey - Blaby District Council (BDC)
Nicola Shepherd - BDC
John Sharpe - BDC
Gemma Yardley - BDC
Steve Jarman – Head of Traveller Assessments, Opinion Research Services Limited

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Councillor Geoff Welsh - BDC
Councillor Paul Hartshorn - BDC
Councillor Marion Broomhead - Vice-Chair Blaby Parish Council
Tim Shattock – business occupier of Blaby Hall
Ian Warner – local resident
Laura McHale – local resident
Gayatri Jani – local resident
Steven Murphy – local resident
Rob Turnbull – local resident
Tony Banham – local resident
Andrea Cooper – local resident
Gary Waterfield – local resident