



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2026 by Ellie Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2026

Appeal Ref: 6009220

Land SW Sibson Road, Sheepy Parva CV9 3RE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Morley against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00883/OUT.
 - The development proposed is described as outline planning permission (access only) for the erection of a C3 self-build dwelling and associated amenity space and parking land south west of Sibson Road, Sheepy Parva, Leicestershire, CV9 3RE (Easting 433254 Northing 301328)(Resubmission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matters

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal, which seeks outline planning permission, with all matters reserved except for access and follows the refusal of a previous application and dismissal of a subsequent appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a grass field/paddock with a dense hedgerow to the Sibson Road boundary. It is immediately south of a cluster of houses on the edge of Sheepy Parva. Forest View, a large detached dwelling, sits opposite. Meadowside is another, single storey, dwelling further south where Sibson Road bends through ninety degrees. Save for other buildings making up Sheepy Parva to the north, the appeal site's surroundings are overwhelmingly rural, characterised by open agricultural fields which, along with the undeveloped nature of the appeal site itself, contribute positively to the intrinsic open feel and uninterrupted quality of the countryside.
5. Whilst an outline scheme, the proposals would introduce a dwelling to the appeal site, accessed directly off Sibson Road. Built form here, hardstanding and the establishment of a residential curtilage would all introduce works which would alter the character of the appeal site and unacceptably erode the quality of its open feel. The obviousness of a building would be further emphasised by the removal of

some of the boundary hedge to create a workable and safe access. Along with the existing dwellings south of the northern cluster, the appeal scheme would contribute to a ribbon of housing stretching away from the established containment of the small settlement.

6. The appeal site occupies a smaller proportion of a much more expansive undeveloped and distinctly rural space between the southern edge of Sheepy Parva and the closest next dwelling to the south (Meadowside). I do not agree therefore that a single dwelling would be classed as an infill plot.
7. With this and the above in mind, the appeal scheme would lead to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the countryside. Such that it would conflict with Policies S1 and S8 of the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019 (NP) and Policies DM4 and DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2016 (DPD). Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure development is in the right location to protect the special character and qualities of the countryside in the interests of both sustainability and of it being of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance.

Other Matters

8. Manor Farmhouse and the barns at Manor Farm are grade II listed and located on the opposite side of Sibson Road, close to the Mill Lane junction. They are a complex of traditional agrarian structures in brick and tile, forming a yard type cluster on the edge of Sheepy Parva. The Council concluded that the proposal would be acceptable in this respect given that an assessment of the impact of the proposal on their significance would be required at the reserved matters application stage. Given the separation of the appeal site from the buildings, their contained and yard relationship, lack of clear connection between the appeal site and the buildings and the other more modern development in and around this edge of the settlement, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions.
9. In regard to appeal reference 6004626, the Inspector found that a distinctly separate proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, as was the case in 24/01155/FUL for the Council. A different conclusion to this appeal. For 3348387, the Inspector considered the relevant policies in regard to a much larger strategic scheme for new housing. In regard to 3360649, there were matters of the principle of the proposed location considered by the Inspector, but there were also others, including a discussion on previously developed land. The appeal site was also in a different Council area.

Planning Balance

10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) addresses, amongst other things, the principle of development outside settlements (Policy S5). It is suggested that only certain forms of development 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 of the Framework.
11. The Council is unable to demonstrate the supply of housing sites that the Framework requires and, as is the Council's position on the location of the appeal scheme, the appeal site is well related to an existing settlement. In principle therefore, there is some support for the proposals.

12. There would be some harm arising out of the main issue in the appeal which would lead to conflict with the development plan and whilst the Council does not object to the accessibility of the appeal site, the NP does not support the proposals by virtue of their location. Given the extent and longevity of the harms and in principle nature of the development plan conflict here and in regard to the main issue, I ascribe these matters significant weight. There would also be conflict with the other decision making policies of the Framework in regard to the main issue, namely DP3 in regard to well designed places.
13. There would be numerous benefits to the proposals. It would meet a need for more self and custom build plots (for which there is a completed planning obligation) and contribute towards the Council's housing supply more generally. The scope and extent of benefits would however be constrained by the scale of the appeal scheme as a single unit. They would therefore, collectively, be worthy of moderate weight. I am also aware of the stance of Policy S6 of the Framework which, notwithstanding the support and substantial weight found in Policy HO7 and, by association, HO1, explains that where the presumption applies to applications involving the provision of housing, development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects.
14. It is clear from the evidence that, notwithstanding the appellant's view on the status of the NP in light of other matters pertaining in part to the supply of self build and custom plots which I have taken account of above, the NP became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which this decision is made and it contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. There may be a pending review to the NP on the horizon, but in its current guise it remains part of the development plan and has primacy as such.
15. With this and the above in mind, the benefits of granting permission for the appeal scheme would be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision making policies of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ellie Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR