

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 26/00255/OUT
Applicant: Mrs Hatson
Ward: Earl Shilton



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Site: 16 Equity Road East. Earl Shilton

Proposal: Outline planning permission for the erection of 2 new dwellings
(all matters reserved except access and layout)

1. Recommendations

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

- Reasons outlined at the end of this report

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This planning application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 2 new dwellings with all matters reserved except for access and layout.
- 2.2. The development proposal has been accompanied by a site plan, showing the layout of the dwellings confirming that they are intended to be 2-3 bed bungalows located to the rear of 16 Equity Road, East. The site is proposed to be accessed from Equity Road East, between No. 16 and No. 20.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is located to the rear of 16 Equity Road East, Earl Shilton. The area consists of residential dwellings which are often two storey in nature, and a mix of semi-detached and detached, within the inclusion of a bungalow located adjacent to the proposed access.
- 3.2. The location of the proposed development sits at a marginally lower land level to the existing dwellings which front onto the highway, with plot 2 likely to be visible from the highway along the proposed access.
- 3.3. The rear of the site (east), is currently well screened with mature trees and hedgerows, with arable fields to the east. To the north east of the site is Townlands Primary School, and associated school playing fields.
- 3.4. The development site is not located within a conservation area, or within the setting of a listed building. The development site is located in Flood Zone 1.

4. Relevant Planning History

No planning history.

5. Publicity

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by sending out letters to local residents and a notice posted within the vicinity of the site.
- 5.2 Three no. letters were received from three separate addresses in objection to the scheme, the reasons for objection are summarised below:
- Overdevelopment of the site
 - Out of character with the area
 - Amenity issues for neighbouring residents
 - Danger to bats and newts
 - Issues with consultation process
 - Construction phase disruption
 - Highways and parking issues

6. Consultation

LCC Highways

- 6.1 LCC Highways have confirmed the following:
- 6.2 “The Local Highway Authority advice is that, in its view, the impacts of the development on highway safety would not be unacceptable, and when considered cumulatively with other developments, the impacts on the road network would not be severe.
- 6.3 Access to the site is from an existing access from Equity Road which is an adopted unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. Table 13 of the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (LHDG) states that for accesses for two to five dwellings, there should be a minimum effective width of 4.25m. The LHA is satisfied from Proposed site and block plan (Drawing Number 02d) that the proposed access is in accordance with Table 13 of the LHDG. The LHA will seek to secure the access by way of condition below. Whilst vehicular visibility splays have not been demonstrated on a scaled drawing, the LHA is satisfied that 2.4 metre by 43 metres splays can be achieved in both directions of the site access in accordance with Table 6 and Figure 7 of the LHDG.
- 6.4 Two Personal Injury Collisions (PICs) have been recorded in the locality in the last five years that occurred within 500 metres in either direction of the proposed access. These were classified as ‘slight’ in severity. The LHA has considered the circumstances of the above PICs and is satisfied that the development proposal would not exacerbate the likelihood of further such incidents occurring.
- 6.5 The LHA note from the proposed site plan (drawing number 02d) that the Applicant is proposing two to three bedrooms for each plot. Table 28 of the LHDG states that

for dwellings with up to three bedrooms, two off-street parking spaces should be provided. The LHA is satisfied that the Applicant has provided sufficient provision for both plots. The LHA will therefore seek to secure the off-street parking via condition below”.

- 6.6 The highways authority have recommended 2no. planning conditions and one note to applicant to be included if the application is minded for approval.

HBBC Pollution

- 6.7 No objections.

HBBC Waste

- 6.8 HBBC Waste have confirmed they have no objections.

LCC Minerals

- 6.9 No objections.

HBBC Arboriculture

- 6.10 The Arboricultural officer has confirmed the following:
6.11 “At this stage, I have no substantive comments, other than to request submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) for the site. Where appropriate and feasible, tree planting proposals should also be provided to replace any tree stock lost during construction.”
6.12 It is considered that this could be secured as a planning condition if the application was minded for approval.

HBBC Drainage

- 6.13 No objections, and recommended note to applicant in relation to the below:
6.14 Surface water should be managed by sustainable methods, preferably those which disperse runoff by infiltration into the ground strata: i.e. soakaways, pervious paving, filter drains, swales, etc. and the minimisation of paved area, subject to satisfactory porosity test results and the site being free from a contaminated ground legacy. If the ground strata are insufficiently permeable to avoid discharging some surface water off-site, flow attenuation methods should be employed, either alone or in combination with infiltration systems and/or rainwater harvesting systems.
6.15 Any proposed access drives, parking and turning areas, paths and patios should be constructed in a permeable paving system, with or without attenuation storage, depending on ground strata permeability. On low-permeability sites surface water dispersal may be augmented by piped land drains, installed in the foundations of

LCC Ecology

- 6.16 LCC Ecology have no objections in principle, yet retain a holding objection on the application relating to an inconsistency between the BNG report and BNG metric.

7. Policy

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 2: Development in Earl Shilton

7.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (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 Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (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)

8. Appraisal

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

- Principle of development
- Impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Ecology
- Flood risk and drainage

-
- Planning balance

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Paragraph 3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material planning consideration in planning decisions.
- 8.3 Paragraph 15 of the NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The three overarching objectives of sustainable development (economic, social, and environmental) are detailed within Paragraph 17 of the NPPF.
- 8.4 Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy (2009) relates to Key Rural Centres. Barlestone is identified as an anomaly within Policy 7, in that it does not have employment provision, however, is considered a sustainable location which the council will support housing development within the settlement boundary that provides a mix of housing types and tenures.
- 8.5 Policy DM1 of the SADMP confirms that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, in that planning applications that accord with the policies in the local plan, and, where relevant, within policies in neighbourhood plans, will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Development shall be granted permission unless any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, or specific policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted.
- 8.6 Policy S3 of the NPPF (2026) relates to a presumption in favour of sustainable development, meaning that Policy S4 of the framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements.
- 8.7 The development is located within the defined settlement boundary of Barlestone, and as such, Policy S4 of the NPPF (2026) is engaged. Policy S4 of the NPPF, confirms that development proposals within settlement boundaries should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would:
- a) Have a substantial adverse impact in relation to:
 - i. The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or

-
- ii. The application of the policies in this Framework for 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)).
 - b) Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for a cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or
 - c) Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.
- 8.8 The development is therefore considered acceptable in principle, subject to satisfying the sections a-c. The development does not have adverse impacts on sections a and b, and Policy S4(c) shall be assessed within the wider sections of this report, alongside additional material planning considerations. The development also complies with Policy 2 of the Core Strategy, and Policy DM1 of the SADMP, in that the development is located within the settlement boundary and is therefore a sustainable location for development of this nature.
- 8.9 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.
- 8.10 The Council's latest Five Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) statement confirms that for the period of 2026-2031 the council can demonstrate 4.48 years housing land supply, equating to a deficit of 388 dwellings.
- 8.11 As such it is considered that the provision of two additional dwelling towards the evidenced unmet need would be attributed moderate weight, and that the development is in accordance with the development plan and NPPF in principle.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

- 8.12 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.
- 8.13 Policy DP3 of the NPPF relates to key principles for well-designed places. It confirms that development proposals should respond to their context (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. Development proposals should be refused if, without clear, justification they conflict with policy DP3 or with any explicit

design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans).

- 8.14 Policy 22 of the ESABAAP confirms that developments will be permitted so long as there is no detriment to the character or appearance of the host building or the surrounding area, and that the siting and density respect the character and layout of the area, alongside additional criteria.
- 8.15 The HBBC Good Design Guide 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 Good Design Guide provides specific guidance for both backland and infill sites, the guidance confirms that building plots should be of similar size and shape to the wider context, allowing sufficient space between buildings. Built development should be of similar footprint, plot position and layout to the wider context, allowing sufficient space between buildings and not adversely impacting upon the prevailing grain of development. Built development should also be of similar scale, mass and roof form to the wider context, allowing it to sit comfortably within the streetscene. Backland development will require clear and convincing justification in relation to its context. Proposals will need to demonstrate that they would not result in the over-densification of land, leading to a loss of character.
- 8.16 The development consists of two proposed dwellings located to the rear of No.16 Equity Road East, Earl Shilton. The dwellings are to be accessed via a gap between No. 16 and No. 20, and would constitute backland development. Equity Road East is a residential area with the eastern side of the Road consisting of two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings, forming a linear row of single depth properties.
- 8.17 Within the Good Design Guide relevant guidance on backland sites is identified confirming that where an existing plot is proposed to be subdivided to create additional development in 'backland' locations, this will require clear and convincing justification in relation to its context. It also confirms that development should respect wider building lines and not back onto the street.
- 8.18 Whilst it is acknowledged that the dwellings would largely only be visible from the proposed access point, this would allow views of the two dwellings to the rear of the site. There are no other examples of backland development in the area, and the proposal would be at odds with the built form and arrangement of the surrounding buildings which are characterised by the street frontage and large, long rear gardens. Whilst scale is a reserved matter, it is indicatively suggested that the dwellings would be bungalows which would reduce their visibility, but this does not mitigate the harm attributed by the lack of integration of the dwellings within the surrounding street.
- 8.19 The submitted layout shows a staggered layout for the two dwellings. When comparing this with the linear form and spacious plots in the immediate area, the layout appears cramped and contrived as opposed to reflecting the character of the area. Policies L2 and L3 of the NPPF relate to the effective use of land. With regards

to policy L2 the development would not fall within the categories of development benefitting from substantial weight. Policy L3 highlights that 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. In this case conflict with policy DP3 is identified and the development is not judged to be make the most of the area's potential. This additional higher density development is not part of a comprehensive development and would be at odds with the character of the area and the lack of compliance with Policy DP3 is judged to outweigh the desire to increase densities in this case.

- 8.20 The layout suggests that existing trees to the rear of the site could be retained, albeit an arboricultural method statement has not been submitted. Plot 1 in particular would be located very close to a number of Category B trees, the silver birch is located very close to the rear elevation and in the centre of the rear garden meaning much of this elevation and the garden itself would be shaded when considered alongside the trees along the southern and eastern garden boundaries. Whilst the trees are shown to be retained, it is considered that there would be substantial future pressure for the removal of these trees which would be at odds with the verdant character along the eastern boundary of Equity Road.
- 8.21 Overall, Equity Road East is shown as a linear form of development, and in this instance, it is considered that the proposal for the two backland units, would create a cramped and contrived layout which would be out of character and would fail to integrate, respect or enhance their context.
- 8.22 As such the development fails to comply with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy DP3 of the NPPF, Policy 22 of the ESABAAP and the general principles of the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.23 Paragraph 14.2 of the SADMP states that new development should be located and designed in such a way that the amenity of both existing residents and occupiers is fully considered when assessing planning applications.
- 8.24 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.

-
- 8.25 The Good Design Guide SPD outlines that development will need to demonstrate that it will not result in loss of amenity to neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, overshadowing or noise.
- 8.26 Policy 22 of the ESABAAP confirms that developments will be permitted so long as the amenity of occupiers of the proposed development would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.27 Policy P3 of the NPPF (2026) relates to living conditions and pollution. Within both P3 (1) and (2), it is confirmed that development proposals should provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate light.
- 8.28 The proposed development for 2no. dwellings located to the rear of No. 16 Equity Road East. The application relates to access and layout. The proposed layout of the dwellings is shown on 'Proposed site and block plan Drg No. 02d', and shows plot 1 located behind No.16, with plot 2 located further eastwards to the rear of the site. No details of elevations are to be considered at this stage and therefore any assessment is based on layout.
- 8.29 It is confirmed that within the Good Design Guide that as a basic principle, a habitable room within a rear elevation should ideally not be less than 8m from the blank side of a single storey neighbouring property; this can be achieved as shown on the site plan, where the distances between the existing dwellings and proposed exceed this.
- 8.30 The development from the proposed site plan shows the properties as 2-3 bed bungalows. As outlined within the Good Design Guide, the garden proportions afforded to 3-bedroom houses would be required to be a minimum of 80sqm with a garden length of 7m. It is confirmed that both plots 1 and 2 would be able to achieve these proportions, and the existing dwelling of No.16 would also retain sufficient garden amenity space as part of the proposal.
- 8.31 It is considered that whilst indicatively shown as single storey dwellings, located behind two storey dwellings, that owing to the proposed orientation and distance from the existing dwellings that impacts of overlooking/loss of privacy, and overbearing impacts are unlikely to be experienced for future occupiers of the dwellings. It is also considered that overbearing and loss of privacy impacts for the existing residents would likely to be significantly impacted, given the single storey nature of the proposed dwellings, and the existing boundary treatments on site.
- 8.32 The elevations of the proposed dwellings have not been provided however, when considering the orientation of the proposed dwellings, it is considered highly unlikely that the dwellings could be built out, without creating detrimental impacts on the future occupants of both plots, due to a conflict with the 45-degree rule. The resultant impact would be adverse overdominance and some loss of light as a result of the relationship and outlook between the front/west elevation of Plot 2 and side/north elevation of Plot 1 which for design and internal layout purposes would contain habitable room windows.

-
- 8.33 The development is therefore considered to be in conflict with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Policy P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and the Good Design Guide (2020).

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.34 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.
- 8.35 Policy TR4 relates to street design, access and parking, outlining criteria in which development must adhere
- 8.36 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 highway authority (currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG)).
- 8.37 The Highways authority have confirmed that in their view the impacts of the development on highway safety would not be unacceptable. The LHA have accepted that whilst visibility splays have not been demonstrated on a scaled drawing that this could still be achieved in both directions, in accordance with the LHDG, and as such would provide a safe and suitable access to the site.
- 8.38 In addition to the above, the LHA are satisfied that the development would provide sufficient off-street parking provision to each dwelling, in line with the LHDG. Two conditions have been recommended by the LHA in the event that the application is minded for approval, relating to the access and parking provision.
- 8.39 The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and Policy TR4 of the NPPF (2026)

Ecology

- 8.40 Policy DM6 of the SADMP states that proposals must demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation and geological value including proposals for their long-term future management.
- 8.41 On site features should be retained, buffered and managed favourably to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. The removal or damage of such features shall only be acceptable where it can be demonstrated the proposal will result in no net loss of biodiversity and where the integrity of local ecological networks can be secured.
- 8.42 Proposals which are likely to result in the loss or deterioration of an irreplaceable habitat would only be acceptable where:

-
- a) The need and benefits of the development in that location clearly
 - b) It has been adequately demonstrated that the irreplaceable habitat
 - c) Appropriate compensation measures are provided on site wherever possible and of site where this is not feasible.
- 8.43 If the harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against or appropriate compensation measures provided, planning permission will be refused.
- 8.44 LCC Ecology have been consulted as part of this proposal and have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal in principle. They have confirmed within their consultation response that they are satisfied with the additional information provided in relation to Great Crested Newts, alongside confirming a suite of conditions relating to adherence to the relevant submitted report, CEMP, BNG Plan, Lighting scheme and precautionary working method statement; if minded for approval by the LPA.
- 8.45 The Ecology team have confirmed they do retain a holding objection, confirming ,”we have reviewed the above ecology documents and the email correspondence from the ecologist (dated 27/08/2026). The email from the ecologist has clarified the situation in relation to the hedgerows, nevertheless, based on the comments provided it is our understanding that the length of hedgerow referred to in the BNG report still requires updating”. In this instance it is established that the hedgerow measurements are agreed and accepted by the County authority, and the failure to update the BNG report to reflect this would not warrant a refusal of planning permission. Clarification could be provided through conditions and through the submission of the BNG Plan as a post permission matter.
- 8.46 As such it is considered that there would be no harm to Ecology, subject to a planning condition as a post permission matter, if minded for approval, and as such would be in accordance with Policy DM6 of adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016).

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 8.47 Policy DM7 of the SADMP confirms that development should prevent adverse impacts from pollution and flooding.
- 8.48 Policy F7 states that development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 8.49 The application site is located in Flood Zone 1, and HBBC Drainage have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal on drainage grounds. The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DM7 of the SADMP and Policy F7 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance

- 8.50 Annex A of the NPPF confirms that the policies within the framework are material considerations which must be taken in account in decision-making. It goes on within

section 2 to state that development plan policies which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies should be given very limited weight, except where they have been examined and adopted against the updated framework (2026). Other development plan policies should be given reduced weight simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of this framework.

- 8.51 Section 3 of Annex A states that where a local planning authority can demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer) and where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing is more than 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years, for the purposes of policy S5(1)(j), if the most up-to-date local housing need figure (calculated using the standard method set out in Annex D) is greater than the housing requirement set out in adopted development plan policies, this should not be considered as evidence of unmet need, for a period of five years from the date of the plan's adoption.
- 8.52 In this instance the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and as such the provision of 2no. dwelling to the evidenced unmet need would be attributed moderate positive weight, in line with Policy HO7 of the NPPF.
- 8.53 The development would benefit from marginal economic benefits through the construction of 2no. dwellings which would be afforded limited positive weight, alongside minor social benefits of providing 2no. dwellings, which also would be afforded limited positive weight.
- 8.54 Policy DP3(3) of the NPPF states that development proposals should be refused if without clear justification, they conflict within DP3(1) or (2). As established within the design and character of the area of this report, the development would create an incongruous form of development which fails to respect the wider context of the area, specifically regarding the linear form of development. In addition the development would not achieve acceptable amenity standards for future occupants. The development is therefore contrary to National Decision Making Policy DP3, Policy DM10 of the SADMP and Policy 22 of the ESABAAP which would be afforded significant negative weight.
- 8.55 In applying Policy S4 the benefits of approving the development are substantially outweighed by the adverse effects caused by the development to the character of the area and the clear policy conflict with both the NPPF and local plan policies. Developments which fail to comply with national decision making policies should be refused in specific circumstances. As such the development is recommended for refusal on this basis.

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.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Reasons detailed at the end of this report

11.2 **Reasons**

1. The proposal introduces an incongruous form of development which fails to respond to, integrate with or enhance the wider context and linear form of development on Equity Road East, creating detrimental impacts to the character of the area. The benefits of the development are substantially outweighed by the adverse effects. The development is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policy 22 of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (2014), Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and the Good Design Guide (2020).
2. The proposal would cause detrimental impacts to future occupiers of the proposed development through conflict with the 45 degree rule, creating impacts on light and

outlook on habitable rooms, therefore contrary the Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policy P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and the Good Design Guide (2020).