

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 25/01058/FUL
Applicant: Halborg Limited
Ward: Hinckley DeMontfort



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley

Proposal: Extension and alterations to existing dwelling and the erection of 2no. semi-detached dwellings (resubmission of Planning Permission ref: 22/00613/FUL)

1. Recommendations

1.1. Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The application contains insufficient information with respect to ecological considerations. Specifically, a Preliminary Roost Assessment/Ground Level Tree Assessment survey has not been submitted relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected & priority species and habitats and identification of proportionate mitigation. The existing building on site and any habitat which may be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed development has not been assessed for suitability to support roosting bats, a European Protected Species. The potential ecological impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal is contrary to Policy DM6 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD 2016 and the requirements of the NPPF.
2. The application lacks information with respect to Biodiversity Net Gain. The Local Planning Authority are not satisfied that appropriate information has been provided including a baseline habitat plan and condition assessment sheets for the applicable baseline habitats on site (Native hedgerow). The proposal does not accord with The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024, The Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and the requirements of the NPPF.

2. Planning application description

- 2.1. This application seeks full planning permission for extensions and alterations to a dwelling known as Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley and the erection of two 2½ storey, four bedroom semi-detached houses on adjacent garden land to the south east. The application is a resubmission of a scheme previously approved in 2007, 2011, 2014 and 2016, 2019 and 2022, the most recent of which has now expired.
- 2.2. The scheme includes the remodelling of the existing dwelling including two storey and single storey extensions and other alterations and the provision of accommodation within the roof space.
- 2.3. Integral garage and tandem off-street car parking spaces would be provided for the existing dwelling and each of the proposed new dwellings would have one, off-street car parking space and integral garage.

- 2.4. A private garden is to be retained to the rear of the existing dwelling and also provided to the rear of each of the proposed new plots.
- 2.5. The applicant has submitted a separate application (reference 25/01059/FUL) for the erection of two additional semi-detached new dwellings on a plot of additional garden land immediately to the south east of the site that is the subject of this application and is pending separate consideration.
- 2.6. Amended plans were sought by the case officer in this instance as the plans and details provided by the applicant are considered to be very old – some date as far back as 2007. The applicant has refused to provide the requested details. The plans as submitted do not include or take account of a neighbouring residential property Number 31a Trevor Close which borders the site to the rear and was granted planning permission in 2017. Nonetheless, the Council has taken this and other recent development into account where it is a material consideration.

3. Description of the site and surrounding area

- 3.1. The application site is located on the north east side of Butt Lane Close, a private un-adopted road, within an established residential area that is characterised by dwellings of different scales and a mix of designs and styles. Ground levels fall gently from the north west to south east. The site forms garden land belonging to Moorbeck and is currently enclosed by mature hedgerows and trees.

4. Relevant planning history

- 4.1 The application site has the following relevant planning history:

07/00470/FUL - Erection of two semi-detached dwellings being one 3 bed dwelling and one 4 bed dwelling in the grounds of existing residential property - APPROVED
 07/00471/FUL - Erection of two semi-detached 4 bed dwellings in the grounds of existing residential property - REFUSED
 07/00472/FUL - Extensions and alterations to existing dwelling and erection of two semi-detached 4 bed dwellings on part of remaining site – APPROVED
 10/00066/EXT - Extension of time of planning permission 07/00470/FUL for the erection of two dwellings – APPROVED
 10/00067/EXT - Extension of time of planning permission 07/00472/FUL for extensions and alterations to existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings - APPROVED
 11/00680/FUL - Erection of two dwellings - APPROVED
 11/00681/FUL - Extension and alteration to dwelling and erection of two dwellings - APPROVED
 14/00216/FUL - Extension and alterations to existing dwelling and the erection of two dwellings – APPROVED
 14/00217/FUL - Erection of two dwellings – APPROVED
 16/00844/FUL - Erection of two semi detached dwellings (re-submission of planning permission ref 14/00217/FUL) – APPROVED
 16/00845/FUL - Extension and alterations to existing dwelling and the erection of two semi-detached dwellings (resubmission of planning permission ref 14/00216/FUL) – APPROVED
 19/01055/FUL - Two storey and single storey extension to side of existing dwelling and the erection of two semi-detached dwellings (Resubmission of planning permission ref 16/00845/FUL) – APPROVED
 19/01056/FUL - Erection of two semi-detached dwellings (Re-submission of planning permission 16/00844/FUL) – APPROVED

22/00613/FUL – Extension and alterations to existing dwelling and the erection of 2x semi-detached dwellings - APPROVED

5. Publicity

5.1. The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents and posting a site notice.

5.2. 3 letters of objection have been received from local residents and summarised below:

- Inaccurate plans
- Loss of privacy
- Concern of loss of trees and what landscaping/mitigation would be provided
- Will the garage on site remain in situ – this helps with privacy?
- Two storey dwellings would be less imposing in this location
- Parking and highway safety concerns
- Flooding and Drainage concerns

6. Consultation

6.1. No objection has been received from:

- HBBC ES Pollution
- LCC Highways (Condition requested)
- HBBC Drainage
- LLFA

6.2. LCC Ecology – Holding Objection. Are not satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application. In addition, they are not satisfied that appropriate information with regard to mandatory biodiversity net gains has been supplied for the application prior to determination.

7. Policy

7.1. Core Strategy (2009)

- Policy 1: Development in Hinckley
- Policy 16: Housing Density, Mix and Design

7.2. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- 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

7.3. National Planning Policies and Guidance

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024

7.4. Other relevant guidance

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- Highway Design Guide

- Open Space Needs Assessment (2025)

8. Appraisal

8.1. Key Issues

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon highway safety
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology
- Other issues
- Planning balance

Principle of Development

- 8.2. Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF states that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and that the NPPF is a material consideration in determining applications. Paragraph 12 of the NPPF confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the Development Plan as the starting point for decision making.
- 8.3. Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM1 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) set out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and state that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this instance consists of the adopted Core Strategy (2009) (CS) the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) (SADMP).
- 8.4. The Emerging Local Plan for 2024-45 reached Regulation 18 stage (July-September 2024) and thus can only be given limited weight at this stage as it has not been tested through examination in public. Since the Regulation 18 consultation, revised affordability ratios have been published, the Standard Housing Method housing figure for the Borough has changed, and the plan period has been extended. As set out in the Local Development Scheme the Borough Council further Regulation 18 consultation September 2025 with Regulation 19 Consultation taking place March/April 2026 with submission to the Secretary of State being November 2026. Therefore, as highlighted above little weight can be attached to the current Regulation 18 Local Plan.
- 8.5. Since the grant of the previous permission ref 22/00613/FUL it is noted that the revised NPPF 2024 has been published, the Council has published an Open Space Needs Assessment (2025) and further amendments made to Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. Biodiversity net gains is a statutory requirement set out under Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Gain in England) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This legislation was inserted into the 1990 Act by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021 and was amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024 made consequential amendments to other parts of the 1990 Act.

- 8.6. The site lies within the settlement boundary of Hinckley. The site is in a sustainable location located close to Hinckley Town Centre and a full range of services and facilities that can be accessed by sustainable transport modes where residential development is generally acceptable in principle and supported by the overarching principles of the NPPF.
- 8.7. Presently, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is triggered whereby development proposals should be approved without delay unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 8.8. Moreover, the site has previously benefitted from a number of previous planning permissions for housing development dating as far back as 2007, the most recent being 22/00612/FUL and 22/00613/FUL which have since expired. This is a material factor that weighs in favour of the scheme.
- 8.9. As such, the principle of extensions and residential development on the site are acceptable in terms of Policy 1 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the SADMP and guidance in the NPPF, subject to all other planning matters being satisfactorily addressed.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

- 8.10. Policy DM10(c), (d) and (e) of the SADMP seeks to ensure that development complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features and the use and application of building materials respects the materials of existing, adjoining/neighbouring buildings and the area generally and incorporates a high standard of landscaping.
- 8.11. The Good Design Guide SPD provides guidance upon how to design an appropriate new residential development. This includes appraising the context, creating appropriate urban structures through blocks, streets, enclosure, open space and landscaping, parking, amenity space and design detailing. The SPD advocates the use of a Building for Life Assessment.
- 8.12. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance. Local policy is considered to accord with the NPPF.
- 8.13. The layout and design of the proposed extensions and new dwellings are as previously approved. The proposed extensions would be constructed of matching materials and are designed to respect the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The extensions and alterations are considered to be acceptable in terms of their design and siting in relation to the wider street scene. Its garden area would be significantly reduced by virtue of siting the proposed dwellings and proposed extensions to the existing property but the resultant garden area is still considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 8.14. The local planning authority are aware of a neighbouring property which borders the site to the rear (31a Trevor Road) that is not included or shown on the submitted plans. The applicant has refused to provide up to date plans in respect of this property but the LPA have been able to look at GIS and the details of the

permission associated with 31a Trevor Road (17/00921/FUL) in order to establish the position/layout of this property in relation to the application site.

- 8.15. It is also noted that 31a Trevor Road was granted planning permission in 2017 (17/00921/OUT) and from council records it is known that development had commenced in 2017. As such, at this time, there were extant permissions in place for both extensions and alterations to Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley and up to 4 semi detached dwellings in the garden land of this property.
- 8.16. The proposed new four bedroom dwellings are provided with private amenity space a garage and one off-street car parking space each which, given the sustainable location close to the centre of Hinckley and its facilities, would be satisfactory to serve the development.
- 8.17. Overall the scheme is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with Policy DM10(c), (d) and (e) of the SADMP, the Good Design Guide SPD and the requirements of the NPPF with respect to design and layout considerations.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.18. Policy DM10 (a) and (b) of the SADMP states 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.
- 8.19. The Good Design Guide SPD outlines that development will need to provide high quality internal amenity space as this is critical to the quality of life of residents. The guide states that new developments should meet minimum standards of garden sizes and separation distances between dwellings. The National Design Guide also promotes a healthy, comfortable and safe internal and external environment.
- 8.20. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that decisions should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.
- 8.21. Paragraph 198 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.
- 8.22. Objections have been received from local residents and third parties. Concerns raised include residential amenity impacts. It is acknowledged that the proposal as submitted would take up a lot of existing garden land and bring development and buildings in closer proximity to neighbouring properties than when compared to the existing situation. However, as previously stated, there is significant planning history associated with this site (from 2007 onwards) and in each case, it has been considered that the proposal would not impact upon amenity to such an extent that a reason for refusal could be upheld.

- 8.23. Since 2017, a neighbouring property located directly to the rear of the application site has been granted permission/built out (31a Trevor Road ref 17/00921/FUL). The Council accepts that in this case the separation distance between this property and the proposed dwellings would not adhere to guidelines contained within the Council's design guidance e.g. 21 metres. However, the relationship between these sites has been previously approved by permissions granted since 2017 and the proposed works were the subject of an extant permission (ref. 16/00845/FUL) when 31a gained consent. Therefore, it is not reasonable that permission should be refused in this case when previously the relationship was accepted and permissions for the development for dwellings in this location have been in place since 2007.
- 8.24. As such, whilst the residential amenity impacts are not ideal and do not accord with design guidance it is considered unreasonable in this case to refuse the application on these grounds. On balance therefore, material considerations are such that subject to suitably worded conditions to help mitigate some of the amenity impacts, the application is considered to be satisfactory.

Impact upon highway safety

- 8.25. Policy DM17 of the SADMP supports development that makes best use of public transport, provides safe walking and cycling access to facilities, does not have an adverse impact upon highway safety. All proposals for new development and changes of use should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highways authority (currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG)).
- 8.26. Policy DM10(g) states that where parking is to be provided, charging points for electric or low emission vehicles should be included, where feasible.
- 8.27. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF (2024) outlines that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Paragraph 117(e) of the NPPF states development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.
- 8.28. Butt Lane Close is an unadopted road which joins the public highway at the junction with Butt Lane which is an adopted unclassified road subject to a 20 mph speed limit. Butt Lane Close is approximately 7.5 metres wide at the junction with Butt Lane. The Highways Authority have no objection to the scheme and state that the access from Butt Lane Close onto Butt Lane is safe and suitable for the proposed level of development and that the proposal will not lead to an unacceptable intensification during the AM and PM highway peak hours.
- 8.29. Whilst the LHA accept that off street car parking provision for each of the proposed dwellings does not meet the levels required in their local guidance, they note that due to the location of the site (in close proximity to the town centre of Hinckley) they do not consider the impact/reduced number of spaces to be severe. The historic permission for an identical level of parking also provide weight in support of the proposed parking arrangements. The LHA have requested a suitably worded condition in relation to the parking. The scheme provides one off road car parking space per dwelling and a garage and the local highway authority is satisfied with this development provided that the parking provision is implemented in accordance with the submitted details.

- 8.30. The proposals, as per the previous approval, will have a negligible impact on the highway network. As such, subject to the conditions recommended by the LHA, and an additional condition with respect to EV charging points, the proposal is considered to satisfy Policy DM17 and DM10(g) of the SADMP and the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 8.31. Policy DM7 of the SADMP seeks to prevent development from resulting in adverse impacts on flooding by ensuring that development does not create or exacerbate flooding.
- 8.32. Paragraph 181 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
- 8.33. The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 being at low risk of flooding and a low risk of surface water flooding.
- 8.34. HBBC Drainage has raised no objection to the scheme. No conditions are proposed. The development is therefore considered to be acceptable and will therefore satisfy Policy DM7 of the SADMP and the NPPF with respect to flooding and drainage considerations.

Ecology

- 8.35. Policy DM6 of the SADMP states that development proposals must demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation and geological value including long term future management. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that development proposals should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.
- 8.36. Applications are now required to deliver a mandatory 10% measurable biodiversity net gain, unless exempt under paragraph 17 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024. Biodiversity net gain is a statutory requirement set out under Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Gain in England) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This legislation was inserted into the 1990 Act by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021 and was amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024 made consequential amendments to other parts of the 1990 Act. The Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out how mandatory biodiversity net gains should be applied through the planning process and Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 74-011-20240214 sets out what information should be submitted as part of a planning application if the statutory biodiversity gain condition applies. This proposal is not exempt from the requirements and the Ecology Team are not satisfied that appropriate information has been provided prior to determination.
- 8.37. LCC Ecology have issued a holding objection and a request for further information in relation to bats and also biodiversity net gain.
- 8.38. With respect to bats, no ecological information has been submitted relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected & Priority species and habitats and identification of proportionate mitigation. It is indicated that the proposals include impact to the existing building on site and at least one tree is also proposed to be removed from the existing vegetated garden habitat. Therefore, the existing

building on site and any habitat which may be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed development has not been assessed for suitability to support roosting bats, a European Protected Species. Therefore, this additional information is required as part of a Preliminary Roost Assessment/Ground Level Tree Assessment survey.

- 8.39. With respect to biodiversity net gain, the Ecology Team note that a baseline habitat plan has not been provided and the condition assessment sheets for the applicable baseline habitats on site have not been provided. These are required for the Native Hedgerow habitat type in this instance.
- 8.40. The applicant has been approached for further information but refused to provide the requested details. As such, the application as submitted has insufficient information to enable an assessment of the ecology impacts/potential protected species and demonstrate the required biodiversity net gain. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of the NPPF, Policy DM6 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD 2016 and the Biodiversity Gain Regulations 2024 and is therefore unacceptable with respect to ecological considerations.

Planning Obligations

- 8.41. Policy DM3 of the adopted SADMP requires development to contribute towards the provision and maintenance of necessary infrastructure to mitigate the impact of additional development on community services and facilities. To support the provision of mixed, sustainable communities Policy 19 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to address existing deficiencies in the quality, quantity and accessibility of green space and children's play provision within settlements.
- 8.42. The request for any planning obligations (infrastructure contributions) must be considered alongside the requirement contained within the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL). The CIL Regulations confirm that where developer contributions are requested, they need to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed.
- 8.43. The Open Space Needs Assessment was published by the Council in October 2025 and comprises new standards and requirements for off-site and on-site open space contributions.
- 8.44. For this proposal, due to limited size and nature of the development proposed, off site open space contributions are being sought as provision cannot be made on site.
- 8.45. In this case, for this specific application, 2 new dwellings are proposed. The following off site open space contributions would be required and are broken down into the typologies as set out below:

- **Allotments = £124.49**
- **Amenity Green Space = £426.24**
- **Equipped Play Provision = £1,806.72**
- **Natural and Semi Natural Space = £511.68**
- **Parks and Gardens = £446.00**
- **Provision for Young People = £1,585.50**

Total off-site contributions = £4,900.92

Total off-site maintenance contribution = £3,759.48 – (across a 10 year period)

- 8.46. The extent of the Open Space and Recreation contribution and provision is directly related in scale and kind to the development and its impacts upon surrounding publicly accessible open spaces. The delivery of these obligations is policy compliant and has been applied fairly. If approved the application would be subject to a Section 106 legal agreement to secure these off-site open space contributions and associated maintenance.

Other Issues

- 8.47. Policy DM7 of the SADMP seeks to prevent adverse impacts from pollution by ensuring that development proposals demonstrate appropriate measures and remediation of contaminated land. The Council's Environmental Health team have assessed the application and raise no objections. No conditions are proposed either. The application is therefore considered to be acceptable and accords with the requirements of Policy DM7 of the SADMP.

Planning Balance

- 8.48. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70(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.
- 8.49. This application is a renewal of planning permission ref 22/00613/FUL. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. This is also a key material consideration. Therefore, currently the 'tilted' balance in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF applies.
- 8.50. However, it is considered that the ecological issues identified above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme while also failing to accord with Biodiversity Net Gain legislation. The LPA has attempted to work proactively with the applicant and requested that these details be submitted during the application process, but the applicant declined to provide them.
- 8.51. As such the application is recommended for refusal on ecological grounds for the reasons set out below.

9. Equality implications

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

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 in the consideration 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. Recommendation

10.1. Refuse Planning Permission for the following reasons:

- 1. The application contains insufficient information with respect to ecological considerations. Specifically, a Preliminary Roost Assessment/Ground Level Tree Assessment survey has not been submitted relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected & priority species and habitats and identification of proportionate mitigation. The existing building on site and any habitat which may be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed development has not been assessed for suitability to support roosting bats, a European Protected Species. The potential ecological impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal is contrary to Policy DM6 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD 2016 and the requirements of the NPPF.**
- 2. The application lacks information with respect to Biodiversity Net Gain. The Local Planning Authority are not satisfied that appropriate information has been provided including a baseline habitat plan and condition assessment sheets for the applicable baseline habitats on site (Native hedgerow). The proposal does not accord with The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024, The Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and the requirements of the NPPF.**