



RE: RE: FW: RESPONSE REQUIRED RE: 25/01101/FUL - Land Rear Of 5 - 15 The Coppice, Burbage, Leicestershire

From Matthew Roe <Matthew.Roe@marrons.co.uk>

Date Tue 06/10/2026 12:32 PM

To Ashleigh Gade <Ashleigh.Gade@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>

Cc Evan Williams <Evan.Williams@marrons.co.uk>; Brian Mullin <Brian.Mullin@marrons.co.uk>; Zoe Massey <zoe@haywardarchitects.co.uk>

 3 attachments (5 MB)

GL3836 01 - Self-Build Unit, The Coppice, Burbage - Landscape Plan.pdf; 12 71 - P-01c - New plot_Site plan.pdf; 12 71 - P-05a - New plot_Dormer.pdf;

Good afternoon Ashleigh,

LPA ref: 25/01101/FUL

Erection of a custom build bungalow and detached garage

Land Rear Of 5 - 15 The Coppice, Burbage, Leicestershire

As per my previous email, this email sets out the Applicant's latest planning policy position having due regard to the August 2026 NPPF. I have re-attached the latest submitted plans for determination again for ease of reference, confirmed as follows:

- Proposed Site and Block Plan, drawing no. P9-01c;
- As Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations, drawing no. P-05a; and
- Landscape Plan, drawing no. GL3836 01

Background and Design Principles

The latest submitted plans have been prepared in collaboration between Zoe Massey, Haywood Architects, Jon Golby of Golby and Luck Associates, the Landscape Consultant who represented the Applicant during the determination of planning permission ref: 21/00556/FUL (associated appeal ref: APP/K2420/W/22/3297466) and the Occupant of the proposed self-build unit. Fundamentally there is no change to the description of development, but we have worked through the proposed design to reorient the proposed dwelling and address the design comments raised on our site visit, specifically the location of the proposed parking and the .

The commentary provided within the submitted Landscape Plan, drawing no. GL3836 01 sets out the amendments to the Development Proposals to deliver a design and landscape betterment over previous iterations. Fundamentally, the overall massing and scale of the self-built dwelling remains unaltered, albeit the larger of the two gables on the front elevation has been "flipped" to the opposite end of the front elevation. The massing and overall architectural style reflects the bungalow dwelling on the opposite side of the access road and matches its orientation, bringing visual continuity to the site entrance. This is also encourages an active frontage to the access road, whereas previously we had a side elevation with an access door.

The proposed dwelling has been set back from the access road and an area of enclosed garden ground is now proposed between the front elevation and the access road, reintroducing an area of green space to this part of the site and improving the setting of the bungalow from the main access road. As with the permitted dwellings on the wider site, the boundaries of this garden ground comprise new hedgerow planting, the species and

management of which can be secured via an appropriate condition. To the east of the proposed dwelling it is proposed that a species rich lawn mix is used, reflecting the landscaping and ecological strategy for the wider site, alongside three new trees within the red line boundary, again improving the setting and appearance of the site. The intention is to secure an attractive setting of open space when viewed by pedestrians approaching the property from the east. The foreground setting of grass will again be seeded as a species rich lawn mix to secure diversity and ecological interest. For pedestrians approaching from the west, dwelling will be seen actively engaging the highway forming part of a gateway street-scene at the transition between the settlement and wider setting of the Green Wedge, further enhanced by new tree planting and a species rich lawn mix.

The parking area has now been relocated away from the main access road into the site, to the rear of the dwelling and reducing the extent of hardstanding within proximity to the access road. The proposed parking arrangement fundamentally removes parked cars from the access road and the now-proposed garage will be experienced as subservient to the proposed dwelling, with the roof ridge height set well below the ridge of the proposed dwelling.

Updated Policy Position

With the adoption of the latest NPPF in August 2026 the Development Plan Framework against which the proposals should be assessed has fundamentally changed. I note from a review of the latest relevant appeal decisions for the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply, with the figure being somewhere between **3.89 years and 3.95 years as of 11 August 2026** (appeal ref: 6005892 / LPA ref: 23/00824/OUT). It is also noted that the Council are currently assessing the responses from the latest Reg. 19 consultation on the new Local Plan and as these have not been subject to examination, the emerging policies are considered to only carry limited weight at this stage.

Under the August 2026 NPPF the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out under Policy S3 applies, and directs Development Proposals within settlement boundaries to be considered under Policy S4. It is respectfully considered that we are wholly within the latest settlement boundary for Burbage, surrounded on all four site boundaries by existing residential development. Policy S4(1) states that Development proposals within settlements **should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects**, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework. Policy S4(2)(a) sets out the circumstances where the benefits will likely be outweighed by adverse effects, including allocated and safeguarded land within the Development Plan, existing recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)). The application site itself meets none of these circumstances, and it does not prohibit in any way access to the wider Burbage Common to the east of the site, beyond the managed open space delivered under planning permission ref: 21/00556/FUL).

Policy HO7 of the NPPF states that *"in applying the policies in this Framework, **substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community, as identified through needs assessments prepared for the area of the local planning authority and other relevant evidence**"*. As per the Council's own Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Monitoring Position, for the period 31 Oct 2024 - 30 Oct 2025 (the latest period with complete monitoring data), there was an acknowledged shortfall of 17 self build plots. For the period of 31 Oct 2025 to 30 October 2026, there is a cumulative need for 44 self build plots and from my own (admittedly, cursory glance) at the Council's public access register, permission has been granted for 3 new self build plots and 2 custom build plots. There appears to be a shortfall of 39 self build and custom build plots against an evidenced accommodation need. If I have misunderstood this position, please let me know.

The Council are also aware of the background to the proposals and the inherent nature of the development sought, this being specialist accommodation for the self build register applicant and her elderly father. Policy HO9 of the NPPF also applies in this instance, and it is clear that the proposals are within accessible distance of a range of local facilities and public transport services on nearby Burbage Road.

Policy L3 of the NPPF makes clear that Development Proposals should achieve appropriate densities, with L3(2)(a) stating *"within settlements, development proposals for residential and mixed-use development should contribute to **an increase in the density of the area in which they are situated**. The only exception is where*

*there is a clear justification that this is either inappropriate or not possible (for example, where the prevailing density is already very high, the nature of the accommodation required precludes higher densities, or where it would conflict with other policies in this Framework)". In considering the potential to increase densities, the **existing character of an area should be taken into account, in accordance with policy DP3, but should not preclude development which makes the most of an area's potential.** As set out in my original email to Faizal back in February 2026, the proposed self-build/custom build dwelling represents a proportionate and acceptable increase in the total number of residential units at the site of **12.5%**. As per para. 18 of the Inspector's decision for the wider site, the "Adjacent Area Density Maps" provided within the Marrons Appeal Statement of Case demonstrate unequivocally that there is a range of dwelling densities within the immediate surrounding area, from **8.8 dwellings per hectare to 12.063 dwellings per hectare**. The proposals, if approved would be part of a wider site that achieved a density of **10 dwellings per hectare**, below both the median and mean figures for the dwellings per hectare figures for existing residential development within the immediate surrounding area.*

Through utilising the fundamental design principles established through planning permission ref: 21/00556/FUL (associated appeal ref: APP/K2420/W/22/3297466) and by utilising the same palette of materials on the wider site, which is now substantially built out and being actively marketed, the proposals are also considered to accord with the key principles for well-designed places set out under Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Finally, my previous commentary on the likely amendments required to the signed U.U "green land" and the wider ecological enhancement of the site is delivered and managed via Section 106a and a deed of variation remain relevant and this process can be managed once the Council have had the opportunity to review my above commentary on the updated Policy Position and reviewed the latest revised plans.

Closing Remarks

I would appreciate confirmation of receipt of my email at the earliest opportunity. We are open to further discussions with the Council as required so as to avoid an appeal, and if a Teams meeting would be beneficial then please let me know. I would also appreciate it if this email can be discussed with Matt Jedruch, and again the invitation to further discussions is extended to him also.

We have also picked up the latest LCC ecology comments and the required amendments will be actioned today.

If there are any further queries at this stage please do not hesitate to let me know.

Kind regards

Matthew Roe MRTPI

Associate

D 0116 281 6924

M 07976 440 172

E matthew.roe@marrons.co.uk



Marrons

Marrons

1st Floor, One Colton Square, Leicester, LE1 1QH



[LinkedIn](#)

☐ *I'm empowered to work in ways that best suit the needs of our clients, colleagues and life, be that email, phone, video or in-person - which means I may work outside of traditional business hours. I do not expect that you will read, respond to, or action this email outside of your usual working pattern.*