

Delegated Report

Planning Reference 24/01142/FUL
Applicant(s) Mr Farhad Tailor
Ward Ambien



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

Application Site Oldlands, Fenn Lanes, Dadlington
Proposal Proposed erection of agricultural building
Case Officer Sullivan Archer (Senior Planning Officer)

1. Recommendations

1.1. Refuse planning permission subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This planning application seeks full planning permission for the erection of an agricultural building to accommodate sheep at Oldlands, Fenn Lanes, Dadlington. The application documents do not claim that the site is part of a wider agricultural holding.
- 2.2. The proposal externally measures 7m in width by 20m in depth and is constructed with a 4.5m high barrel-roof form and dark grey sheet metal cladding. The development is sited within the field west of the access drive to the site, on land partly occupied by a small glasshouse which is removed from the site within this proposal.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is to the north of, and outside of the identified settlement boundary of, Dadlington in the designated open countryside and the Stoke Golding Rolling Farmland Landscape Character Area. The site is located to the south of Fenn Lanes and approximately 182m east from Fenn Lane's junction with Shenton Lane. The site is wholly surrounded by open agricultural fields and Ashby De La Zouch Canal, and its associated Conservation Area and Public Right of Way (Footpath U75) are approximately 160m to the south of the site.
- 3.2. The site is located within the Battle of Bosworth Registered Battlefield, which was designated in recognition of its national importance due to its historical importance, topographic integrity, archaeological potential, and technological significance. Despite changes in agricultural practices, the Battlefield does remain rural in

character, largely undeveloped, and retains a topographic integrity which enables the observer to appreciate key views.

- 3.3. The application site itself comprises an agricultural field that is located to the north of, and is associated with, the Oldlands complex to the south of the site. Oldlands is not included with the red or blue line boundary of the current application. Oldlands consists of a group of buildings, including a two-storey dwelling and an associated swimming pool and a range of outbuildings, to the south and an uncovered manège to the northeast of the site. The site benefits from well-established hedgerows and trees along its northern boundary, which help to screen the site from Fenn Lanes.

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 22/00009/PP

- Indoor menage building
- Appeal Dismissed
- 23.09.2022

4.2 20/01003/FUL

- Indoor menage building
- Refused
- 14.06.2021

This planning application was refused for the following reason:

“By virtue of the scale, form, and siting of the proposed indoor menage, it is considered that the development would result in less than substantial harm and would result in an unjustified and unsustainable development with moderate adverse effect on the battlefield. Therefore, contrary to Policies DM11, DM12 and DM13 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016), and Paragraphs 189, 194 & 196 of the NPPF.”

4.3 08/00011/FUL

- Creation of menage
- Permitted
- 13.03.2008

5. Publicity

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by posting a site notice within the vicinity of the site.
- 5.2 No responses have been received.

6. Consultation

Sutton Cheney Parish Council

- 6.1 Sutton Cheney Parish Council objected to the development as it was not considered that the application site benefitted from an existing agricultural use, nor that the proposed development was for the purposes of agriculture.

The Battlefields Trust

- 6.2 The Battlefields Trust objected to the development as the scheme lies within the site of the Registered Battle of Bosworth Battlefield, which is a designated heritage asset. The Battlefields Trust stated that due to the scale and position of the proposed development, the scheme would detract from the open and rural character and appearance of the heritage asset, which would be visually prominent from the Public Footpath to the west and along Fenn Lanes and cause less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. Should planning permission be granted, the Battlefields Trust strongly recommended that an archaeology condition is attached to the consent.

Archaeology

- 6.3 Given the significance and sensitivity of the site and the wider area, Historic England raised concerns that the construction of the development is likely have a physical impact on any retained archaeological evidence relating to the battle that may survive within the site, which is likely to cause harm to evidence that contributes to our understanding of the Bosworth Battlefield. In light of these concerns, Historic England advised that the Local Planning Authority should seek further advice from their in-house archaeological advisors.
- 6.4 Leicestershire County Council's Historic and Natural Environment Department (HNET) requested that the planning application is deferred until an Archaeological Impact Assessment for the proposals including a field evaluation by appropriate techniques, has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This is to ensure that an informed decision can be made on the determination of the planning application in accordance with Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6.5 The Applicant confirmed on 01 July 2025 that their response to these concerns is contained within their Heritage Impact Assessment and requested that the application be determined on the basis of the submitted information.

Other Consultee Responses

- 6.6 Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC)'s Conservation Officer, Environmental Services Department, nor Waste Management Department, or

Leicestershire County Council (LCC)'s Ecology Department objected to the development proposals. Leicestershire County Council as the Local Highway Authority referred to standing advice. No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- N/A.

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

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM7: Preventing Pollution and Flooding
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Policy DM12: Heritage Assets
- Policy DM13: Preserving the Borough's Archaeology
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

7.4 Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (2017)
- 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 historic environment
- Design and impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Paragraph 2 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. Paragraph 3 of the NPPF confirms that it should be read as a whole.
- 8.3 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. However, 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.
- 8.4 The current Development Plan consists of the adopted Core Strategy and the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP).
- 8.5 Both the Core Strategy and the SADMP are over 5 years old and were adopted prior to the publication of the current NPPF. Paragraph 34 of the NPPF states that policies in local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years and should then be updated as necessary.
- 8.6 Nevertheless, in accordance with Paragraph 232 of the NPPF, existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the NPPF. Due weight should be given to existing policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 8.7 Chapter 11 of the NPPF promotes an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. This demonstrates that safeguarding and improving the environment is an effective use of land.
- 8.8 As a result, outside defined settlement boundaries, the countryside is not regarded as a sustainable location for new development. Chapter 15 of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment. Paragraph 187(b) specifically highlights that this should be achieved by:

“Recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services.”

- 8.9 Policy DM4 of the SADMP, which states that the Council will protect the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside from unsustainable development.
- 8.10 To ensure this, Policy DM4 of the SADMP only considers development in the countryside sustainable where:
- (a) It is for outdoor sport or recreation purposes (including ancillary buildings) and it can be demonstrated that the proposed scheme cannot be provided within or adjacent to settlement boundaries; or
 - (b) The proposal involves the change of use, re-use or extension of existing buildings which lead to the enhancement of the immediate setting; or
 - (c) It significantly contributes to economic growth, job creation and/or diversification of rural businesses; or
 - (d) It relates to the provision of stand-alone renewable energy developments in line with Policy DM2: Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development; or
 - (e) It relates to the provision of accommodation for a rural worker in line with Policy DM5 - Enabling Rural Worker Accommodation.
- 8.11 The submitted Planning Statement suggests that the scheme is required to provide accommodation for sheep. The Applicant stated on 01 July 2025 that the scheme was associated with a, *“Start up, small-scale agricultural operation.”*
- 8.12 However, no further information has been submitted to support this statement, nor that the Applicant or the existing site have any history with, or are associated with, any agricultural units, uses or businesses. Notably, the Application Form states that the Applicant owns a used car dealership company.
- 8.13 As a result, it is considered that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the scheme shall be utilised for the purposes of agriculture in these site-specific circumstances. In addition, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the scheme shall significantly contribute to economic growth, job creation, or the diversification of a rural business.
- 8.14 Therefore, the proposed development does not relate to, or comply with, any of the criteria above in Policy DM4 of the SADMP, but this does not mean that the development is not sustainable. Importantly, Policy DM4 of the SADMP also requires that development meets five further requirements to be considered as sustainable development. These are discussed in detail further in the report.
- 8.15 Given the above, the Council considers that the proposal is offered no support by Policy DM4 of the SADMP and is considered to represent new and unjustified development in the designated open countryside, which is considered to result in harm to its intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character in

principle. As such, the application does not accord with Development Plan Policy and is unacceptable in principle, subject to the assessment of all other material considerations. Other material considerations are set out within the next sections of the report.

Impact upon the Historic Environment

- 8.16 Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework provides the national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
- 8.17 Therefore, in determining applications, Paragraph 212 of the NPPF requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated assets and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
- 8.18 Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP seek to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets. Policy DM12 of the SADMP confirms that all developments affecting heritage assets and their setting will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the proposals are compatible with their significance and their setting.
- 8.19 Policy DM11 of the SADMP requires all developments proposals which have a potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting to demonstrate:
- (a) An understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting; and
 - (b) The impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset and its setting, including measures to minimise or avoid these impacts; and
 - (c) How the benefits of the proposal will outweigh any harm caused; and
 - (d) Any impacts on archaeology in line with Policy DM13 of the SADMP.
- 8.20 Paragraph 14.16 of the SADMP confirms that the Borough's archaeological heritage is a valuable educational and community resource for understanding our past but in many cases are highly fragile and vulnerable to damage and destruction. Archaeological remains above and below ground level are important surviving evidence of the Borough's past, and once removed they are lost forever
- 8.21 As a result, Policy DM13 of the SADMP requires developers to set out in their application an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where applicable, the results of a field evaluation detailing the significance of any affected asset. This is in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 207 of the NPPF.
- 8.22 The Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) confirmed that the application site lies within the Registered Battle of Bosworth Battlefield and therefore an area of significant archaeological interest. In addition to this, the

- application site is adjacent to the route of the Roman road from Leicester (Ratae Corieltavorum) to Mancetter (Manduessedum). Therefore, the site therefore contains a potential for significant buried remains relating to the Battle of Bosworth, including burials, and relating to the Roman period.
- 8.23 In addition to this, as the nature of the archaeological record within the site is not currently fully understood, the level of harm to these existing archaeological features cannot be accurately determined, and the loss of significance to the Battlefield cannot be determined.
- 8.24 It is appreciated that Paragraph 9 of the Appeal Decision against the refusal of planning application 20/1003/FUL within the wider site suggested that, based on the evidence before the Inspector, the archaeological concerns with the site could be addressed by planning condition. However, it is noted that Leicestershire County Council's Historic and Natural Environment Team were not consulted on the previous planning application.
- 8.25 In summary, the application site is in an area of significant archaeological interest and contains a potential for significant buried remains relating to the Battle of Bosworth and the Roman Period. Based on the submitted information, the development's level of harm to the archaeological remains within the site cannot be determined. As a result, the scheme's impact on the loss of significance to the Battlefield cannot be determined.
- 8.26 It is therefore considered that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development shall not result in any significant adverse impacts to the existing archaeological remains within the site. Given the above, the application is contrary to, and in conflict with, the requirements of Policies DM11, DM12, and DM13 of the SADMP and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.
- 8.27 Notwithstanding the above, Paragraph 8 of the Appeal Decision against the refusal of planning application 20/1003/FUL within the wider site stated:
- "To varying degrees, from these viewpoints I consider that introducing this large building into the landscape would detract from its open, rural character and appearance. As a result, the development would further change the landscape from its state at the time of the battle. Therefore, it would not better reveal the historic significance of the area or even have a neutral impact in this regard, but rather it would erode, diminish, and impede an understanding and appreciation of the events. I therefore find it would cause harm to the asset's significance. However, the building's extent means I consider this harm would be less than substantial."*
- 8.28 In comparison to the previous appeal proposal, the new development is 13m narrower in width, 20m shallower in depth, and has a ridge height that is 1m lower.
- 8.29 Due to a combination of the distance, topography, and existing built form and vegetation, the development is not considered to be visible from the Public Rights of Way associated with Ambion Hill to the north of the site, nor looking north of the Public Footpath associated with the Ashby Canal to the south of the site.

- 8.30 Therefore, the scheme is not considered to have a material visual effect on the setting of the Ashby Canal Conservation Area.
- 8.31 Although there may be glimpsed views of the development when vegetation is not in full leaf from the canal bridge on Shenton Lane, the proposal is still considered to be substantially screened and barely perceptible. There may also be occasional fleeting views of the upper sections of the development over the existing hedgerow field boundaries when traveling along Fenn Lanes to the west.
- 8.32 Given the above, the provision of a barn in this location is considered to introduce a minor extent of change within the Battlefield, which is only perceptible from a limited number of locations within close proximity to the application site. Following discussions with the Council's Conservation Officer, it is not considered that there is likely to be any material reduction in the ability to understand and appreciate the events of the battle or any key components of its heritage significance where views of the scheme are possible.
- 8.33 By virtue of these factors, the development is not considered to have more than a negligible adverse impact upon the significance of the Registered Battle of Bosworth Battlefield, and it is considered to preserve the significance of the Ashby Canal Conservation Area. However, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development shall not result in any significant adverse impacts to the existing archaeological remains within the site. Given the above, the application is contrary to, and in conflict with, the requirements of Policies DM11, DM12, and DM13 of the SADMP and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

- 8.34 Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design (as contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code), taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
- 8.35 Chapter 12 of the NPPF confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality, beautiful, and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places.
- 8.36 Policy DM4(i) of the SADMP states that development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where it does not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside.
- 8.37 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.

- 8.38 Whilst it is acknowledged that agricultural buildings can be appreciated within common views of the countryside, the proposal is not considered to be for an agricultural purpose, nor is it connected to an established agricultural unit.
- 8.39 Importantly, Part 6 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) confirms that agricultural development on units of five hectares or more benefit from Permitted Development Rights for the creation of new agricultural buildings that are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. Therefore, if the proposal was reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, the Applicant could have sought prior approval from the Local Planning Authority.
- 8.40 Therefore, and as highlighted at Paragraph 8.15 of this Report, the development is considered to represent new and unjustified development in the designated open countryside. This is considered to cause harm to the character of the surrounding area and the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the designated open countryside and the rural character of the Stoke Golding Rolling Farmland Landscape Character Area. This harm is exacerbated by the considerable size and scale of the proposed development. Whilst it is appreciated that this current development is smaller in size and scale in comparison to the previously dismissed scheme, that does not suggest that the new scheme is now acceptable.
- 8.41 In addition, based on the Proposed Block Plan, the proposal is isolated and separated from the existing cluster of development at Oldlands by 42m. This therefore extends the built form of the site further north, which is not considered to complement, enhance, or consolidate the existing collection of buildings within the site. Therefore, the development results in the significant and permanent urbanisation of the rural character of the site and the surrounding area. Although the proposal is unlikely to be visually prominent from wider views of the site, this is not considered sufficient justification to overcome the harm to the character of the site caused by the development.
- 8.42 To justify their development, the Applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA), which concludes that the development results in a minor/neutral effect on the character of the site and the surrounding area, which is considered to have a low landscape sensitivity.
- 8.43 Table 1 of the LVA confirms its scale when assessing the landscape sensitivity of a site. It is noted that a 'low' sensitivity site is described as undesignated landscape. However, the LVA then suggests that an example of a 'medium' landscape sensitivity site would include areas within National Parks or Areas of National Outstanding Beauty. This is a significant increase in the requirements that assess the landscape sensitivity of sites and significantly underplays the importance of the designated open countryside as confirmed by Chapter 15 of the NPPF and Policy DM4 of the SADMP.
- 8.44 Furthermore, Table 3 of this LVA confirms the scale associated with the assessment of the impact of the proposed development. To be considered to have

- a high magnitude effect on the character of the landscape or visual character of the area, a development would have to be, “*Extremely damaging*,” and have a, “*Major permanent/ long term change in the existing view*.” This is considered to be a very high bar for assessing the impact of development on the character of the surrounding area, which downplays the actual impact of the proposal.
- 8.45 Ultimately, even if a development was considered to result in extremely damaging and major permanent long-term change in an area of low sensitivity, the assessment criteria within the LVA would only consider that proposal to result in moderate to minor harm to the character of the surrounding area.
- 8.46 Based on the LVA’s framework for assessing development, the previously dismissed scheme would have also resulted in minor to neutral effect on the character of the site and the surrounding area. This is in direct conflict with the Inspector’s assessment of the scheme, which was dismissed because it would detract from the open, rural character and appearance of the designated open countryside and would erode, diminish and impede on the understanding and appreciation of the significance of the Bosworth Battlefield.
- 8.47 In light of the above, it is clear that the submitted Landscape Visual Assessment significantly underplays the impact of the development on the character of the site and the surrounding area.
- 8.48 By virtue of these factors, the scheme is considered to represent new and unjustified development in the designated open countryside, which results in significant and permanent harm to the rural character of the site, the surrounding area, and to the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside and the rural character of the Stoke Golding Rolling Farmland Landscape Character Area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the SADMP, as well as Paragraph 135 and Chapters 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.49 Policy DM10(a) and (b) of the SADMP states that development will be permitted provided that it would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings, including matters of lighting and noise and that the amenity of occupiers would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.50 There are no residential properties within the vicinity of the site, with the exception of the residential property at Oldlands to the south of the proposed development.
- 8.51 The Application Form states that the Applicant lives at this address, and it is noted that the Applicant was also the applicant for householder planning application 19/01177/HOU within the site. Therefore, to prevent any significant adverse noise, odour, disturbance, or light or air pollution impacts to the residential amenity of the occupants of the residential property at Oldlands, a planning condition can secure

that the proposed structure is only utilised by and in association with the occupiers of this adjacent residential property.

- 8.52 By virtue of these factors, the proposal is not considered to result in any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM10 of the SADMP.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.53 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.
- 8.54 Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision. Any reduction below minimum standards will require robust justification.
- 8.55 The scheme utilises an existing access onto Fenn Lanes, which is an adopted and classified 'C' road that is subject to a 50mph speed limit.
- 8.56 However, the site access currently only serves an existing residential property and its associated incidental outbuildings and structures. For example, Condition 02 of planning permission 08/00011/FUL restricts the use of the existing outdoor manège to the Applicant's own livestock, and no commercial use of the site is permitted. In addition, no information has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority to suggest that the Applicant or the application site is associated with an existing or historic commercial agricultural operation.
- 8.57 The current development creates a new commercial development within the application site. In spite of this, the Application Form suggests that the proposal shall not benefit from any employees. No further details have been provided to clarify the extent of the proposed use. Given the above, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal does not significantly intensify the use of the site, nor that the proposed use is provided with sufficient off-street parking provision.
- 8.58 By virtue of these factors, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal does not result in a significant adverse impact upon highway safety. Therefore, the application is considered to be contrary to, and in conflict with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the of the SADMP, and the LHDG.

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 is refused.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

11.2 Reasons

1. The development represents new and unjustified development in the designated open countryside, which results in significant and permanent harm to the rural character of the site, the surrounding area, and the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside and the Stoke Golding Rolling Farmland Landscape Character Area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), as well as Paragraph 135 and Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

2. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development shall not result in any significant adverse impacts to the existing archaeological remains within the site. Therefore, the application is contrary to, and in conflict with, the requirements of Policies DM11, DM12, and DM13 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
3. The development creates new commercial development within an existing residential site, and the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal does not significantly intensify the use of the existing site access, nor that the scheme is provided with sufficient off-street vehicular parking. Therefore, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that proposal does not result in a significant adverse impact upon highway safety. By virtue of these factors, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), and the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (2024).

a. **Notes to Applicant**

1. The application has been determined in accordance with the following submitted details:
 - Application Form (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - BNG Metric (submitted: 20.12.2024)
 - BNG Report (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - Heritage Impact Assessment – Proposed Indoor Menage (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - Heritage Impact Assessment – Proposed New Sheep Barn (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - Landscape and Visual Appraisal (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - Proposed Floor Plan, Elevations, Sheet 2 of 2, Drg No. 19.3744.14A (submitted: 18.12.2024)
 - Proposed Site, Roof Plan, Site Location Plan, Block Plan, Sheet 1 of 2, Drg No. 19.3744.13 (submitted: 18.12.2024)