Delegated Report

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council

Planning Ref:	**26/00195/FUL**
Applicant:	**Mr P Siagal**
Ward:	**Barwell**
Site:	**Land at Inglenook Farm, Leicester Road, Barwell**
Proposal:	**Erection of two holiday lodges and associated works**
Case Officer:	**Ashleigh Gade (Senior Planning Officer)**

---

1. Recommendations

1.1. **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

2.1. This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two holiday lodges and associated works at Land at Inglenook Farm, Leicester Road, Barwell.

2.2. The proposed holiday lodges are located to the south and south-west of an existing pond on the application site. Each holiday lodge has a width of 12 metres and a depth of 6 metres. The proposed holiday lodges have an eaves height of 2.75 metres and a ridge height of 4.9 metres.

2.3. The proposed holiday lodges are to be clad in waney edge timber boards with timber doors and casement windows, with clay tiled roofing.

2.4. The proposal involves the planting of native hedgerow and native trees to the south and east of the holiday lodges to provide screening to the development site.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

3.1. The application site is located outside of any settlement boundary, within the designated open countryside and within the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge between the settlements of Barwell and Earl Shilton.

3.2. The application site comprises land to the south of existing retention ponds that is undeveloped and open land, currently grown over with various vegetation.

3.3. The application site forms part of the wider Inglenook Farm site, the built form of which is concentrated to the south of the application site and separated by approximately 100 metres.

3.4. The site has existing access from Leicester Road/Carrs Hill which is an adopted and classified 'C' road subject to a speed limit of 40mph.

3.5. The site is surrounded by other land within the Green Wedge, typically comprised of smaller fields surrounded by hedgerow and mature trees. To the north of the site separated by a small field are Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) Footpath U32 and U100. To the north-west are allotments and a large dog park on Dawsons Lane.

3.6. To the east of the site is green space on Carrs Hill that provides critical separation between the settlements of Barwell and Earl Shilton. To the south-west of the site are two agricultural buildings.

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 **23/00535/FUL**

- Erection of 9 accommodation pods, 4 holiday lodges, management building with associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping and surface water balancing
- Refused
- 30.11.2023

4.2 **APP/K2420/W/24/3341001**

- Appeal against Refusal of 23/00535/FUL for erection of 9 accommodation pods, 4 holiday lodges, management building with associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping and surface water balancing
- Appeal Dismissed
- 20.09.2024

5. Publicity

5.1 The application has been publicised by the posting of a site notice in the vicinity of the site and sending letters to neighbours.

5.2 No responses have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1 Leicestershire County Council (LCC) Ecology maintain a holding objection to the proposal on the basis of insufficient information having been provided to assess the impacts of the development in relation to protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.

6.2 No objections were received from the following consultees, some subject to conditions:

- LCC Highways
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) Drainage
- HBBC Environmental Services (Pollution)
- HBBC Waste

- Barwell Parish Council

7. Policy

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 6: Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge
- Policy 23: Tourism Development

7.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016):

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM7: Preventing Pollution and Flooding
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards
- Policy DM24: Cultural and Tourism Facilities

7.3 Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (ESBAAP) (2014):

- Policy 22: Development and Design

7.4 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide (2019)

7.5 Other relevant guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)
- Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge Review (2020)

8. Appraisal

8.1. The key issues in respect of this application are:

- Assessment against strategic planning policies
- Design and impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Ecology and biodiversity

Assessment Against Strategic Planning Policies

8.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that applications for planning

permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

8.2 The current Development Plan consists of the adopted Core Strategy, the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) and the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (ESBAAP).

8.3 Paragraph 3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirms that the national decision-making policies within the NPPF are material considerations in making planning decisions and should be read alongside policies in the Development Plan. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF confirms that national decision-making policies should be read as a whole.

8.4 Paragraph 15 of the NPPF identifies that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development by managing the use of development of land in the long-term public interest. Paragraph 17 details the three overarching objectives of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. However, Paragraph 18 of the NPPF confirms that these objectives are not criteria against which every development proposal can or should be judged, and that local circumstances should be taken into account when guiding development toward sustainable solutions.

8.5 Policy DM7(1) of the NPPF states that development proposals should be assessed on the basis of whether they would be an acceptable use of land. Policy L3(1) of the NPPF states that development proposals should make effective use of land, taking into account the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

8.6 Policy S5(1) of the NPPF confirms that only certain forms of development should be approved outside of settlements. Those forms of development listed in Policy S5(1) should be approved, unless the benefits of doing do would be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects, when assessed against national decision-making policies. This includes Policy S5(1)(c) for the development of rural businesses and services, including tourism, where a location outside of settlements is shown to be necessary.

8.7 Policy S5(4) of the NPPF states that development proposals which do not fall within one of the categories set out in Policy S5 should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of development.

8.8 Policy 6 of the Core Strategy states that within the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge uses will be encouraged that provide appropriate recreational facilities within easy reach of urban residents and promote the positive management of land to ensure that the Green Wedge remains or is enhanced as an attractive contribution to the quality of life of nearby urban residents.

8.9 Policy 6 of the Core Strategy goes on to list land uses that are considered acceptable in the Green Wedge, provided the operational development associated with such uses does not damage the function of the Green Wedge. These uses are:

a) Agriculture, including allotments and horticulture not accompanied by retail development

b) Recreation

c) Forestry

d) Footpaths, bridleways and cycleways

e) Burial grounds

f) Use for nature conservation

8.10 Furthermore, Policy 6 of the Core Strategy states that any land use or associated development in the Green Wedge should:

a) Retain the function of the Green Wedge

b) Retain and create green networks between the countryside and open spaces within the urban areas

c) Retain and enhance public access to the Green Wedge, especially for recreation, and

d) Should retain the visual appearance of the area

8.11 Policy DM4 of the SADMP states that to protect the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside, it will first and foremost be safeguarded from unsustainable development. Policy DM4 states that development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where:

a) It is for outdoor sport and recreation purposes (including ancillary buildings) and it can be demonstrated that the proposed scheme cannot be provided within or adjacent to settlement boundaries; or

b) The proposal involves the change of use, re-use or extension of existing buildings which lead to the enhancement of the immediate setting; or

c) It significantly contributes to economic growth, job creation, and/or diversification of rural businesses; or

d) It relates to the provision of stand-alone renewable energy developments in line with Policy DM2: Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development; or

e) It relates to the provision of accommodation for a rural worker in line with Policy DM5 – Enabling Rural Worker Accommodation.

8.12 Importantly, Policy DM4 requires that development meet five further requirements to be considered sustainable development. These are discussed in further detail in subsequent sections of this report.

8.13 Policy 23 of the Core Strategy supports tourism development for holiday accommodation including bed and breakfast accommodation, holiday lodges, and tenting fields, in suitable locations, where:

- The development can help to support existing local community services and facilities and
- Is of a design and at a scale which is appropriate to minimise impact and assimilate well with the character of the surrounding area with acceptable landscaping and
- The development adds to Hinckley & Bosworth's local distinctiveness and
- Complements the tourism themes of the borough and
- The development adds to the economic wellbeing of the area.

8.14 Policy DM24 of the SADMP states that the Borough Council will support development of new tourism facilities, where new facilities can demonstrably be accessed by a range of sustainable transport modes to reduce the reliance upon the private car.

8.15 The application site is located within the designated open countryside and within the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge, outside of and to the south of the settlement boundary of Barwell.

8.16 The Applicant has not provided any evidence with the application that demonstrates any particular need for this tourism development to occur outside of a settlement boundary. Notwithstanding that the application site is within walking distance of the outskirts of Barwell settlement, there is no evidence suggesting that reasonable tourism development could not occur within the settlement boundary. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not satisfy the requirements of Policy S5(1)(c) of the NPPF.

8.17 It is noted that within the Core Strategy and SADMP, the use of land for recreation is defined and described separately to that of use for tourism. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal satisfies any of the exemptions for development in countryside as per Policy DM4 of the SADMP or for development within the Green Wedge as per Policy 6 of the Core Strategy.

8.18 The application site is located within walking distance to the settlement of Barwell and to public transport stops within the settlement that provide access to a bus service between Nuneaton and Leicester. Barwell also provides a range of existing services

which could be accessed by visitors to the proposed development. The proposal is therefore considered to be offered some support in principle by Policy DM24 of the SADMP.

8.19 Notwithstanding this, during the assessment of previous application 23/00535/FUL concerns were raised as to the appropriateness of the site for tourist accommodation given the limited demand for tourism in the area and the lack of genuine visitor attractions within reasonable distance of the site. The subsequent Appeal Decision (APP/K2420/W/24/3341001) also concluded that the application site would not be predisposed to visitor trips, given its location alongside a busy road and its location not being near any reasonable visitor destinations that would warrant staying in the area.

8.20 It is therefore not considered that the proposal would generate any significant economic benefit or contribute to significant diversification of the existing use of the site as per Policy DM4(c) of the SADMP, nor would it satisfy the requirement for tourism development to be suitably located as per Policy 23 of the Core Strategy.

8.21 Given the above, it is considered that while the proposal benefits from some support from Policy DM24 of the SADMP, it otherwise fails to demonstrate consistency with Policy S5 of the NPPF, Policies 6 and 23 of the Core Strategy, and Policy DM4 of the SADMP, and would be unacceptable in this location in principle.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

8.22 Policy DP3(1) of the NPPF confirms that development proposals should respond to their context including the history, character and features of their site and its setting, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. Policy DP3(2) of the NPPF details the seven principles of well-designed placed that development proposals should reflect as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location.

8.23 Policy DP3(3) of the NPPF states that development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with Policy DP3(1), or relevant aspects of the principles in Policy DP3(2), or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

8.24 Policy 6 of the Core Strategy states that any land use or associated development in the Green Wedge should:

a) Retain the function of the Green Wedge

b) Retain and create green networks between the countryside and open spaces within the urban areas

c) Retain and enhance public access to the Green Wedge, especially for recreation, and

d) Should retain the visual appearance of the area

8.25 Policy DM4 of the SADMP states that development will be considered sustainable where it would not have an adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside and does not undermine the physical and perceived separation and open character between settlements. Policy DM4 also states that where development is within a Green Wedge then it should protect its role and function in line with Core Strategy Policy 6.

8.26 Policy DM10(c) of the SADMP states that developments will be permitted where they complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.

8.27 Policy 22 of the ESBAAP states that development will be permitted where there is no detriment to the character or appearance of the surrounding area, where it respect local distinctiveness of the existing landscape setting, and where the design respects the scale, proportions and height of existing buildings, neighbouring structures and the overall street scene.

8.28 The application site is located within Area C of the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge as per the Green Wedge Review. Area C is specifically identified as being important to the separation of Barwell and Earl Shilton, and the Green Wedge Review notes that any significant built development within this area would have an impact on the coalescence of the settlements as well as a significant impact on wider visual amenity due to the open views afforded by the topography.

8.29 The application site is also located in Area F: Burbage Common Rolling Farmland within the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The LCA describes the area as comprising large scale, gently rolling arable pasture and farmland with local variations in topography, medium to large scale rectilinear field patterns bounded by low hedgerows and post and wire fencing with smaller scale fields around settlements. The LCA notes the open landform and lack of tree cover that allows for expansive and distant views to and from this land from the edge of settlements, with these views being sensitive to any change or development given the potential for wider visibility.

8.30 The application would result in the construction of two holiday lodges and an associated access drive, south of existing ponds on the application site. The proposal would also involve the planting of wide screening buffers in the form of native hedgerow and trees to the south and east of the lodges.

8.31 The proposed development would introduce built form to the currently undeveloped application site. This built form, though limited to two structures, would have the potential for visibility from wider viewpoints within and outside of the Green Wedge

due to the surrounding footpaths and recreational spaces, and the wider views afforded by the topography of the area.

8.32 Furthermore, while the proposed plantings to the east and south of the development would provide screening over time, the establishment of large, clustered vegetation central to an existing field is contrary to the established landscape character of the area which is dominated by low hedgerow surrounding small, open fields.

8.33 It is not considered that the proposal would provide any contribution to the recreational character of the Green Wedge, or public access to appreciate the wider character of land within the Green Wedge, as the tourist lodges would be for private rental and would not facilitate or contribute to public appreciation of the land.

8.34 The proposed development and associated urbanisation of the land through the parking of cars associated with the tourism use, would therefore appear visually incongruous with its surrounds and cause harm to wider views over and through the Green Wedge from viewpoints outside of the application site.

8.35 Given the above, it is considered that the proposal would respond poorly to its site context and result in harm to the open character and landscape character of the countryside and to the visual appearance of the Green Wedge. The proposal would therefore be contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DP3 of the NPPF, Policy 6 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the SADMP, and Policy 22 of the ESBAAP.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

8.36 Policy P3(1) of the NPPF states that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of pre-existing conditions in its vicinity.

8.37 Policy DM10(a) and (b) of the SADMP state that development will be permitted provided that it would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings, including matters of lighting and noise and that the amenity of occupiers would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.

8.38 The Good Design Guide requires the way buildings relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity. The Good Design Guide outlines that development will need to demonstrate that it does not result in loss of amenity to neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing or noise.

8.39 The proposed development would result in two holiday lodges for overnight accommodation of visitors. The lodges are sited at an angle to one another and are separated by a minimum distance of 17 metres, which is considered acceptable in the context of the use of the site for temporary occupancies rather than permanent

residential use. The large living room windows with access to Juliet-style balconies on each lodge would not directly face the other lodge.

8.40 There are no neighbouring residential properties within 100 metres of the application site, and it is therefore not considered the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of any existing dwelling.

8.41 The proposed tourist lodges are sited 75 metres and 100 metres respectively to the west of C-road Leicester Road/Carrs Hill and 250 metres north of the A47. There will resultingly be some noise impact that may have a negative impact on tranquillity for future visitors to the site, arising from the proximity to these busy roads. Nonetheless, while this may impact the desirability of the site for prospective visitors, it is not considered the noise impacts would be severe enough to result in unacceptable amenity impacts for planning purposes.

8.42 Given the above, it is considered that the proposal demonstrates sufficient consistency with Policy P3 of the NPPF, Policy DM10 of the SADMP, and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

8.43 Policy TR3 of the NPPF states that development should be located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. Any significant adverse impacts from development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion, or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach.

8.44 Policy TR6(4) of the NPPF confirms that where development proposals would have severe adverse impact on the transport network or an unacceptable impact on highway safety, taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, that they should be refused.

8.45 To support this, Policy DM17 of the SADMP states that development proposals need to demonstrate that there is not a significant adverse impact upon highway safety, and that the residual cumulative impacts of development on the transport network are not severe. Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires that new development provide an appropriate level of parking provision.

8.46 All proposals for new development should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highway authority. Currently, this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024).

8.47 The proposal would utilise an existing agricultural access from Leicester Road.

8.48 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have advised that they are satisfied that the existing point of access can accommodate the minimum access width and hard-bound access depth as required by the LHDG, both which could be secured by way of condition.

8.49 The LHA have noted that speed surveys to determine appropriate visibility splays were undertaken in association with the previous application 23/00535/FUL. The LHA are satisfied that the required visibility splays can be achieved at the access point.

8.50 Policy TR4(1)(e) of the NPPF requires development proposals to provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development, including its connectivity, and any locally-set standards in the development plan.

8.51 Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires that new development provide an appropriate level of parking provision.

8.52 The proposal indicatively shows parking areas to the west of each tourist lodge, though the quantum of parking spaces and their proposed dimensions are not shown.

8.53 The LHA have advised that based on the requirements of Table 28 of the LHDG and the space available surrounding the proposed buildings, they are satisfied that the site has sufficient space to accommodate parking and turning facilities for two cars per tourist lodge.

8.54 It is therefore considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or the wider road network, consistent with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, Policies TR3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF, and the requirements of the LHDG.

Ecology and Biodiversity

8.55 Policy N2(1) of the NPPF requires development to minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs. Policy N2(2) of the NPPF confirms that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then the development should be refused.

8.56 Policy DM6 of the SADMP requires development proposals to demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation. If the harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against or appropriate compensation measures provided, planning permission will be refused.

8.57 LCC Ecology were consulted on the application and have advised that the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted to support the application is outdated based on CIEEM advice on the validity of ecological reports. Furthermore, LCC Ecology have identified that assessment submitted does not cover all relevant species requiring reporting.

8.58 Additional to the above, LCC Ecology have identified inconsistencies within the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) documentation provided relating to the classification of the internal access track, and have noted that the BNG details are stated to be made

on assumptions of site condition rather than assessment to ground truth existing conditions.

8.59 LCC Ecology therefore advised the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on 15 July 2026 that further information would be required pertaining to an updated ecology survey, and supportive evidence and relevant revisions to the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment. These details are required prior to determination in accordance with the relevant legislation.

8.60 The LPA contacted the Applicant regarding the LCC Ecology response and the requirement for further information on 5 August 2026. Further correspondence was sent on 20 August 2026. No responses were received.

8.61 On 3 November 2026 the LPA advised the Applicant again of the ecology information required and asked that they provide a response in writing prior to 24 November 2026, otherwise the application would be determined without these details. No response was received.

8.62 It is therefore considered, based on the insufficient information provided, that the proposal cannot demonstrate that it would not cause significant harm to biodiversity and therefore cannot demonstrate consistency with Policy N2 of the NPPF and Policy DM6 of the SADMP.

9. Equality Implications

9.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states: -

(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

9.2 Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.

9.3 There are no known equality implications arising directly from this development.

9.4 The decision has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including General Data

Protection Regulations (2018) and The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

10. Conclusion

10.1 Taking national and local planning policies into account, and regarding all relevant material considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be refused for planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Recommendations in Paragraph 1.1 of this report.

11.2 **Reasons**

1. The proposal represents inappropriate development for its location outside of a settlement boundary and within the designated open countryside and the Green Wedge. The proposal is therefore contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy S5 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026), Policy 6 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policy DM4 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

2. The proposed development would result in significant and permanent adverse harm to the rural character of the site, the surrounding area, and the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside and to the ongoing function and visual appearance of the Green Wedge between the settlements of Barwell and Earl Shilton. The proposal is therefore contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026), Policy 6 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan.

3. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to substantiate that the proposal would not harm protected species and the biodiversity of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

Notes to Applicant

1. The application has been determined in accordance with the following details, submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 26 February 2026 and 6 May 2026:

- Application Form
- Covering Letter
- Site Location Plan
- Existing Site Layout Plan, Drg No. HMD/SV/0635/01
- Proposed Site Layout Plan, Drg No. HMD/PD/0635/01
- Proposed Floor Plan, Roof Plan, Elevations, Drg No. HMD/PD/0635/01
- Environmental DNA Report – Great Crested Newt
- Response from Agent to LCC Ecology