



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 29 November 2022

Site visit made on the same day

by Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/W/22/3303898

Land at Sutton Lane, Sutton in the Elms, Broughton Astley, Leicestershire LE9 6QF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Davico Properties Limited against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00826/OUT, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for the erection of up to 9 dwellings (all matters reserved except for access).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of up to 9 self-build dwellings, on land at Sutton Lane, Sutton in the Elms, Broughton Astley, Leicestershire LE9 6QF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00826/OUT, dated 22 April 2021, subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Davico Properties Limited against Harborough District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposed development is described on the application form as an 'outline planning application for the erection of up to 9 dwellings (all matters reserved except for access)' omitting the term 'self-build'. However, from the documentation submitted at application and appeal stage, which includes the statement of common ground, it is evident that the appellant proceeded on the same basis as the Council determined the application, namely that the application was for self-build dwellings. Accordingly, I have dealt with the proposal on this basis.
4. The application was submitted in outline, with only access to be determined at this stage. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis and I have taken the layout of development shown in the submitted 'layout, access and visibility' plan (ref P1603/11) into account as indicative in relation to my consideration of the principle of the development on the appeal site.
5. At application stage Leicestershire County Council advised that if planning permission was to be granted financial contributions would be sought from the developer in relation to affordable housing and education. However, that request has now been withdrawn and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

6. At the site visit I was approached by a number of local residents who wanted to make verbal representations regarding the proposed development. I explained that as the hearing had been closed that this was not possible. Some of the residents said that they had not been notified of where and when the hearing was to take place and so had not been able to attend and participate.
7. In advance of the hearing, I was provided with copies of Harborough District Council's letters that notified that an appeal had been made and where and when the hearing was to take place. In addition, I was provided with the list of persons to whom these letters had been sent. This list included those who objected to the application. As a result, I am satisfied that the appeal and details of the hearing were properly notified. In any event, in determining this appeal I have taken into account the representations that were submitted at application and appeal stage.

Main Issues

8. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - whether the location of the proposed development would comply with the spatial strategy of the development plan, including in relation to the provision of self-build and custom-build dwellings;
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the accessibility of services and facilities from the appeal site by sustainable modes of transport; and,
 - the self-build and custom housebuilding duty.

Reasons

Location of development

9. The development plan for the area includes the Harborough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 ('Local Plan'), adopted in 2019 and the Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2028 ('Neighbourhood Plan') that was made in 2014.
10. The Local Plan has established a settlement hierarchy which identifies the settlements which are the most suitable in sustainability terms to meet the development needs of the District. At the top of the hierarchy is the urban area around the edge of Leicester followed by Market Harborough which is classified as a Sub-Regional Centre. As a Key Centre, Broughton Astley is located within the third tier. Sutton in the Elms is a small village separated from Broughton Astley by Broughton Way and has been placed in the category of 'other villages and rural settlements' which is the sixth and lowest tier of settlement. This category of settlement is considered by the Local Plan to be the least sustainable location for growth. As a result, new housing development is strictly controlled in such settlements.
11. Policy GD2 of the Local Plan in certain circumstances supports new housing on sites adjoining the built up area of Key Centres such as Broughton Astley. However, the appeal site is located towards the far end of Sutton in the Elms furthest away from Broughton Astley. In addition, an area of separation forming land with permission for a golf course separates the end of the village where the appeal site is located from the site adjacent to Broughton Way that has permission for a mixed use development. As a result, the appeal site is not adjacent to the committed built up area associated with Broughton Astley and the scheme would be contrary to policy GD2 of the Local Plan.

12. Policies GD3 and GD4 of the Local Plan relate to development including housing in the countryside and 'other villages and rural settlements' such as Sutton in the Elms. These policies support new housing on small sites of up to 4 dwellings that meets a local need for housing evidenced through a rural housing needs survey or a neighbourhood plan. The proposed scheme is for up to 9 self-build dwellings and the evidence of need for this type of dwelling does not originate from the sources specified. It forms no part of the appellant's case that the proposed scheme would benefit from the other types of housing that would be eligible for permission under policy GD4 or under policy H3 of the Local Plan which relates to rural exception sites for affordable housing. As a result the proposal would also be contrary to policies GD3, GD4 and H3 of the Local Plan.
13. As the appeal site is not an allocated housing site it is contrary to policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan supports small, well designed residential windfall sites that do not harm the surrounding area or neighbouring properties subject to such development having a direct highway frontage. Guided by the second criterion of this policy, and policy GD4 of the Local Plan, I have taken 'small' to mean less than 5 dwellings. Hence, the proposal would also be contrary to policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
14. Given the location of the appeal site, the number of dwellings and the market tenure proposed the appeal scheme conflicts with the spatial strategy of the development plan, namely policy SS1 of the Local Plan. As a result, it would also be contrary to policy H5 of the Local Plan which, amongst other matters, is supportive of self-build and custom build housing in locations suitable for housing.
15. The location of the proposed residential scheme would therefore be contrary to the development plan and harm its spatial strategy. Although the Local plan and the Neighbourhood Plan predate the current National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), the thrust of the development plan's spatial strategy, which focuses development on urban areas and settlements with a reasonable range of services and facilities, whilst seeking to protect the character and appearance is consistent with the Framework. As a result, the policies of the development plan that are the most relevant and relate to these two main issues, namely Local Plan policies SS1, GD2, GD3, GD4, GD5, GD8, H3, H5 and Neighbourhood Plan policies H1, H3 are not out of date.

Character and appearance

16. Of the various development plan policies cited in the reason for refusal in relation to this issue, I consider policies GD5 and GD8 of the Local Plan to be the most relevant. Sutton in the Elms is a small settlement separated from Broughton Astley by the Broughton Way bypass. As a result, it has its own separate identity. The justified reasoning to Policy SS1 explains that other villages and rural settlements' such as Sutton in the Elms are considered to be countryside.
17. The village is characterised by linear development of closely spaced dwellings. On the western side of the village is an area of separation that creates a break between built development in the settlement and land where permission has been granted for a mixed use development along Broughton Way to the south. On the eastern side of the village are agricultural fields.
18. The appeal site is an area of grassland located to the rear of dwellings on the northern side of Sutton Lane towards its north western end. In recent years the character and appearance of this part of the village has changed. Gaps between

houses have been filled and backland development has taken place. As a result of the new houses in front of the site on Elm Crescent off Sutton Lane, the appeal site is completely enclosed by development on two sides and partly enclosed on two of its remaining sides. Consequently, in public views from Sutton Lane, other than for glimpsed views along the proposed site access, development of the appeal site would be screened from view.

19. From the public right of way to the rear, the roofs of the new houses in front of the appeal site can be seen above the height of the site's rear boundary hedge. With development extending beyond the north western side of the appeal site, and newly built housing consolidating development in depth close by to the south east, for all practical intents and purposes in views from the footpath the appeal site appears to be land within the built framework of the village rather than open countryside. An appropriate setback of dwellings on the site from the rear boundary would help the transition to the open countryside to the east, where the public right of way is located, and avoid a hard edge to the scheme.
20. As a result, whilst in policy terms the proposal would result in the loss of countryside to development, in practice, with the control that can be exerted at reserved matters stage and by condition, development of the site could complement the character and appearance of the village rather than cause harm.
21. Reference has been made to an outline application for nine dwellings on the opposite side of Sutton Lane that was dismissed on appeal in 2019. However, that proposal related to a site that was unenclosed by existing housing and so its development would have protruded into the countryside without integrating with the village. As a result, its context is quite different from that of the appeal site and reference to this appeal decision has not altered my assessment of the proposal before me.
22. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that whilst the proposal would result in the loss of countryside to development, with the control that can be exerted at reserved matters stage, the scheme would complement the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it would comply with policies GD5 and GD8 of the Local Plan which require the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features.

Accessibility of services and facilities

23. Whilst Sutton in the Elms is in the lowest tier of the Local Plan's development settlement hierarchy a number of services and facilities available in the Key Centre of Broughton Astley are within approximately 1km by road of the appeal site. This includes a primary school, post office and medical practice. A footway to the village centre with a crossing point and central reservation on Broughton Way at the end of Sutton Lane enables these services to be safely accessed on foot from Sutton in the Elms and the appeal site. Whilst the three services I have named are further than the 800m distance referred to in Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3, as they are within a walking time of approximately 10 minutes they are within a reasonable walking and easy cycling distance.
24. In relation to public transport, regular bus services to towns in the county during the daytime Monday to Friday stop on Broughton Way near to Sutton Lane.
25. Permission for a mixed use development on land adjacent to Broughton Way to the south west of Sutton in The Elms has also been granted. If built out in accordance with the outline permission this development will provide some facilities and

services that will be accessible on foot from the appeal site without crossing the bypass.

26. Taking all these matters into account, I therefore conclude that services and facilities are accessible by sustainable modes of transport from the appeal site to an extent that is more akin to a location within a larger settlement higher up the settlement hierarchy of the Local Plan. This is a consideration that weighs in favour of the appeal.

Self-build and custom housebuilding duty

27. Notwithstanding Local Plan policy H5, the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended) ('the Act') places a statutory duty on the Council to keep a register of persons who are interested in acquiring a self-build or custom-build plot, and to also grant enough suitable development permissions for serviced plots to meet this demand. The demand registered in each 12 month base period from the end of October 2015 onwards must be met by 30 October 3 years after the end of each period. The Council's Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Corporate Policy details its approach to this type of housing.
28. The current position, as of 30 October 2022, is that since the introduction of the Act 3 plots have been provided to meet the demand for 48 plots. This leaves an unmet demand for 45 plots. This is a considerable shortfall. It was agreed by the parties at the hearing that with permission having been granted for the Lutterworth East Strategic Development Area (SDA) that an additional 15 plots will be provided. However, as the Council's appeal statement notes, these plots are not yet available and so cannot be included.
29. It is anticipated that permission may well be granted in 2023 for the Scraftoft SDA which in time will provide 10 self-build plots. Considerably more plots though than those provided by the SDAs will be needed to address the burgeoning demand. Next year with the inclusion of register entries from 2019 – 2020 demand will almost double and in the following two years demand will continue to increase by significant amounts.
30. I recognise that the absence of a Community Infrastructure Levy has caused difficulties for the Council in identifying applications that could qualify as self-build plots. Nevertheless, in the absence of further submitted evidence in relation to this matter, my assessment of this issue must be based on the published figures produced by the Council.
31. The proposed scheme in providing up to 9 self-build dwellings would make a significant contribution to addressing the current shortfall in provision.

Other Matters

Highway safety

32. The planning application was partly refused on the grounds that information supporting the design of the proposed access, and a road safety audit demonstrating that the access would be safe, had not been received by officers. The Council has confirmed that the required information has now been received and addresses their concerns. In terms of highway safety, the highway authority has no objection to the proposal subject to further details regarding the site access shown on the submitted plans. Similarly, the highway authority has not raised any objections regarding the effect of the proposal on the capacity of the local highway

network. On the basis of what I have read and seen, I have no reason to disagree with these positions.

Living conditions – outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance

33. The outlook across the appeal site from neighbouring houses is currently of open grassland enclosed by a hedge with cultivated fields beyond. Development of the site would change this outlook. However, there is no right to a view. I have found no material harm in terms of the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and with the control that exists at reserved matters stage regarding layout and scale, development of the site would not be overbearing, overly dominant or harmful to privacy.
34. The proposed access would pass between two dwellings. Sufficient space would exist for suitable boundary treatments and landscaping to avoid this resulting in noise and disturbance to the occupiers of these properties. Development and construction can generate noise and disturbance. However, this could be addressed by a Construction Environmental Management Plan which, amongst other matters, controls the hours of operation and requires that measures are taken to control noise. Such a plan could be required by condition.
35. For all of these reasons, I am therefore satisfied that the proposed scheme would not cause material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

House prices

36. There is concern that loss of the view of open grassland and fields beyond to development will devalue houses around the site. Planning Practice Guidance though states that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. As a result, the protection of purely private interests, such as the impact of a development on the value of neighbouring properties, is not a material consideration¹. For this reason, concerns regarding the effect of the development on the value of neighbouring houses has not altered my assessment of the development.

Ecology

37. One of the Council's reasons for refusal of the application related to a failure to demonstrate that the scheme would not adversely affect ecology. In particular, the site was considered to have the potential to support great crested newts, bats and badgers. Since then the necessary surveys have been carried out and progress has been made in relation to obtaining the appropriate licence from Natural England in relation to great crested newts. As a result, subject to the receipt of a copy of the license, the implementation of the approved wildlife mitigation strategies, and measures to enhance ecology on the site, the Council is satisfied that ecology has been properly addressed. I see no reason why such requirements could not be complied with and I have no reason to disagree with those conclusions.

Planning Balance

38. Applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the reasons I have set out earlier, the location of the proposed development would be in conflict with the spatial strategy of the development plan. As a result, the

¹ Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306

proposal would be contrary to policies GD2, GD3, GD4, H3 and H5 of the Local Plan and policies H1 and H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan which seek to focus new development on the largest settlements in the District in order to further sustainability objectives. In so doing the proposal would be contrary to the development plan considered as a whole.

39. Although placed in the category of 'other villages and rural settlements' in the Local Plan the location of Sutton in the Elms adjacent to Broughton Astley means that there is acceptable access on foot and by bicycle to a number of services and facilities within this Key Centre. A regular bus service also provides reasonable access to towns in the county. As a result of the accessibility of services and facilities from the site by such sustainable modes of transport, only moderate harm would be caused by the proposal to the spatial strategy of the development plan. In terms of the character and appearance of the countryside, as the appeal site is largely enclosed by existing development it appears to fall within the built framework of the village and is of only limited landscape value. The proposed development would therefore complement the village and no material harm to the character and appearance of the area would occur.
40. Taking all these matters into account, I attach moderate weight to the policy conflict between the proposed scheme and the development plan.
41. The statutory duty of the Council to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding is an important material consideration. The Council is failing by a very large margin to meet this demand and the submitted evidence indicates that it will fail to do so in forthcoming years by an even larger extent as more recent register entries feed through into the base period calculations. I attach considerable weight in favour of the appeal to the contribution that the appeal scheme would make in helping to address this shortfall.
42. Having regard to all the merits of this case, I conclude that the Council's poor performance against its statutory duty in relation to self-build and custom housebuilding outweighs the scheme's conflict with the development plan. As a result, material considerations indicate that in the particular circumstances of this case planning permission should be granted for development that is not in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

43. To take into account the self- build and custom housebuilding nature of the scheme the standard reserved matters conditions have been revised. In order to comply with the policy of the Local Plan in respect to the provision of affordable housing, the scheme needs to make provision for affordable housing should the combined gross floorspace of buildings on the site exceed 1000sqm. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings that the development is to be carried out in accordance with.
44. To ensure that dwellings built on the site help meet the demand for self-build and custom housing evidence in relation to each unit needs to be submitted. As a self-build or custom house is exempt from a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) unless it changes hands within 3 years of being first occupied a section 106 obligation is usually necessary. However, as the Council does not have a CIL a condition is appropriate in this instance. Given the potential for inconvenience and disturbance, a Construction Environment Management Plan is also necessary.

45. To protect wildlife on the site construction materials need to be stored off the ground, further details on biodiversity enhancement need to be provided and the development need to be carried out in accordance with an ecological report. Confirmation of a district level licence from Natural England also needs to be provided in order that the effect of the development on Great Crested Newts is mitigated.
46. To ensure that the development complements its surroundings and caters for biodiversity housing needs to be set back from the rear (northern) boundary of the site and trees and hedges protected. Further details on site levels and boundary treatments are also required so that development complements surrounding development. In the interests of highway safety, further details on the design of the access are necessary.
47. I have required all these matters by condition, revising the conditions suggested by the Council where necessary to reflect the advice contained within Planning Practice Guidance.
48. A condition was suggested requiring that details of foul and surface water drainage are provided for approval. However, as this would duplicate statutory Building Regulations such a condition is unnecessary. A condition was also suggested regarding the provision of a footpath as shown on the plans that define the development. However as layout is a reserved matter the only point at which a footpath needs to be considered is at the point at which the access to the site is formed over the existing footpath along Sutton Lane. As this matter is covered by a different condition relating to site access arrangements which includes the design response to the stage 1 Road Safety Audit this additional condition is unnecessary.

Conclusion

49. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector

Schedule

- 1) Within two years of the date of this planning permission an application for approval of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") insofar as they relate to the initial phase of the development which involves all elements of the scheme not comprised within the individual dwelling plots, shall be submitted, to include the following details:
 - the layout of the internal access road, footway and any shared surfaces;
 - all car parking facilities and manoeuvring areas to be provided within the site - in accordance with Leicestershire County Council's standards (Leicestershire Highway Design Guide or any superseding document);
 - any external lighting in these areas;
 - site boundary treatments and structures;
 - landscaping not incorporated within a residential plot curtilage including any shared open space and associated tree planting; and

- the identification of plot boundaries.

Approval of the details of the reserved matters in relation to the initial phase of development shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development on the site commences. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

All subsequent reserved matters for each individual plot or plots must be submitted not later than three years from the date of this planning permission and development must be begun not later than two years from the date of the approval of the last reserved matter for the initial phase.

- 2) Approval of the details of the reserved matters within any particular plot shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development of the dwelling on that plot is commenced. The development of each plot shall be carried out as approved.
- 3) In the event of the total gross floorspace of the reserved matters submissions for the individual plots exceeds 1,000 sqm, a scheme for the provision of 40% affordable housing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the first occupation of any dwelling. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 21009 003, P1603/11 but only in respect of those matters not reserved for later approval.
- 5) Each residential unit ('unit') in the development hereby permitted shall be constructed as a self-build dwelling within the definition of self-build and custom build housing in the 2015 Act:
 - i.) The first occupation of each unit in the development hereby permitted shall be by a person or persons who had a primary input into the design and layout of the unit and who intends to live in the unit for at least 3 years;
 - ii.) The Council shall be notified of the persons who intend to take up first occupation of each unit in the development hereby permitted at least two months prior to first occupation.
- 6) No development (including any site clearance/preparation works) shall be carried out until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Details shall provide the following, which shall be adhered to throughout the period of development:
 - a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - b) loading/unloading and storage of construction materials ;
 - c) a detailed reactive and proactive road cleaning schedule, incorporating the use of road sweepers, on-site wheel wash facilities and the use of hand brooms on wheels and roads where necessary;
 - d) measures to control the emission of dust and noise during construction;
 - e) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from site preparation and construction works;

- f) hours of construction work, site opening times, hours of deliveries and removal of materials;
 - g) full details of any piling technique to be employed, and the control of hours of use if relevant;
 - h) location of temporary buildings and associated generators, compounds, structures and enclosures;
 - i) routing of construction traffic and indication of signage locations to assist those delivering to the site;
 - j) Contact details for site manager, including how these details will be displayed on site;
 - k) full details of preventative measures to avoid surface water run-off during construction.
- 7) No development shall be carried out until a copy of the Great Crested Newt District Provisional License in relation to the appeal site and proposed development, countersigned by Natural England, has been submitted to and accepted in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 8) Prior to any works for the construction of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the enhancement of the site for biodiversity purposes, in accordance with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework, to include timescales for implementation and future management, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme of enhancements shall be implemented and managed in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) Prior to the installation of foundations for the dwelling, details of existing and proposed ground levels and finished floor levels of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) Prior to first occupation of each dwelling, details of its boundary treatment including elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of each dwelling concerned.
- 11) Notwithstanding the submitted plans, details of the site access arrangements including width, visibility splays, gradient, surfacing and the design response to the stage 1 Road Safety Audit, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved site access arrangements shall then be implemented in full prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.
- 12) All materials associated with the carrying out of the development hereby approved shall be stored off the ground (for example on pallets) throughout the course of the development, including prior to the commencement of development, and all spoil/waste materials shall be removed from the site at the end of each working day, or stored in a skip.
- 13) All trees and hedges to be retained on the site shall be protected by fencing (and ground protection where necessary) which complies in full with "BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction Recommendations". The fencing (and ground protection) shall be installed before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be

maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any fenced area, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval.

- 14) The rear (northern) boundary hedge shall be retained and have buffer zones of natural open space alongside them of at least 5 metres depth from the centre of the hedge, and existing field boundary hedges shall not form boundaries to the curtilages of private dwellings.
- 15) The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the Ecological Report from Crestwood Environmental dated 11.03.2022, including the pre-commencement check for badgers which shall be carried out within 3 months prior to site clearance. If the development does not commence within 18 months of the date of the surveys carried out in the report dated 11.03.2022 then before development commences an updated report based upon updated surveys shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

-----End of Conditions Schedule-----

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Nugent MRTPI FCMI	Brown Shore Management
----------------------	------------------------

FOR THE LOCAL AUTHORITY:

Mrs Finch MRTPI	Harborough District Council
Mrs Hague MRTPI	Harborough District Council
Mr Eastwood MRTPI	Harborough District Council

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1 Garmin Accessibility route 1
- 2 Garmin Accessibility route 2
- 3 Delegated report on planning application for the erection of up to 7 dwellings (all matters reserved) on land at Sutton Lane, Sutton in the Elms (ref 16/01914/OUT)
- 4 Planning committee report on an outline application for the erection of up to 5 dwellings on land adjacent to 54 Sutton Lane, Sutton in the Elms (ref 16/01703)
- 5 Letter (dated 09/12/21) and plan (ref P1603/11) from the appellant's highway engineers to Leicestershire County Council regarding access serving the proposed development application site.
- 6 Enlarged Block Plan (ref 21009 003)
- 7 Proposed Block Plan (ref 21009 002)
- 8 Site Location Plan (ref 21009 000 Rev C)
- 9 Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3, Local Transport Planning in Leicestershire 2011-2016, Leicestershire County Council
- 10 Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Corporate Policy, Harborough District Council