

Design, Access & Planning Statement.

Erection of single storey self-build custom dwelling, land north east of The White House, Bosworth Road, Wellsborough, Nuneaton, CV13 6PB (Resubmission 23/00923/FUL).

October 2024

Introduction

This statement is submitted in support of the erection of a single storey self-build custom dwelling, land north east of The White House, Bosworth Road, Wellsborough, Nuneaton, CV13 6PB (Resubmission 23/00923/FUL).

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; 2023) within Annex 2: Glossary, defines self-build and custom-build housing as:

“Housing built by an individual, a group of individuals, or persons working with or for them, to be occupied by that individual. Such housing can be either market or affordable housing. A legal definition, for the purpose of applying the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended), is contained in section 1(A1) and (A2) of that Act.”

This Statement has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Amendment) Order 2010 and Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Amendment) Order 2015.

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), the level of detail presented in this statement is proportionate to the scale and complexity of the application. References were made to the relevant planning policies. These are predominantly the adopted and saved Local Plan policies as they take primacy in the determination of such an application where they are NPPF & NPPG compliant.

Relevant Planning Policy

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning 1990 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) April 2014
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Dec 2023
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010
Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England (2011)

The Prime Minister's Independent Review to develop a plan for a major scaling-up of self-commissioned new homes – across all tenures – to boost capacity and overall housing supply August 2021.

Development Management Policies DPD

Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
Policy DM6: Biodiversity and Geological Interest
Policy DM7: Preventing Pollution and Flooding
Policy DM10: Development and Design
Policy DM17: Highways & Transportation

Principle and other material planning considerations

The Written Ministerial Statement Planning for Growth and Laying the Foundations emphasized the Government's approach to house building and the need to provide action to build more houses and to boost economic growth. Although now superseded by the NPPG, it remains fully reinforced by the NPPF (Dec 2023) where the Government's aim remains to significantly boost the supply of housing.

The NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development giving rise for the planning system to perform the roles below:

***“an economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*

***a social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*

***an environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”*

Furthermore, LP policy should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where such development should be supported when weighing all of the provisions of the NPPF2 as a complete document.

On the 30th July 2024, the Deputy Prime Minister wrote to all local authority Leaders and Chief Executives in England stating:

“Underpinning plan making – at the strategic and local level – must be suitably ambitious housing targets. That is why we have confirmed today that we intend to restore the standard method as the required approach for assessing housing needs and planning for homes, and reverse the wider changes made to the NPPF in December 2023 that were detrimental to housing supply.

But simply going back to the previous position is not enough, because it failed to deliver enough homes. So, we are also consulting on a new standard method to ensure local plans are ambitious enough to support the Government's commitment to build 1.5 million new homes over the next five years. The new method sees a distribution that will drive growth in every corner of the country.”

This conclusion was reinforced in November 2016 when the RPTI released a Policy Statement on identifying new housing development opportunities entitled: *Where should we build more homes?* Under section “land within existing built up areas will not meet all our needs” the Statement concludes:

“Even with an enhanced urban renewal and regeneration programmes of action and funding, land within existing built up areas will not meet all our housing needs in full. Some of the future housing needs will have to be met on greenfield land around our towns and cities. The experience of our members clearly indicates that this can be done without undermining the

priority to be given to brownfield sites through a planned, managed and phased approach to development.”

The Emerging Local Plan for 2020-2041 is currently at Regulation 18 stage, with the public consultation running from Wednesday 31 July to Friday 27 September 2024. The latest Local Development Scheme (LDS), was published on 08 February 2024. The update revises the timetable for production of the Local Plan and establishes key milestones for public consultations, including the Regulation 19 Consultation which is not scheduled until January-February 2025. Given the early stage of the Emerging Local Plan and outstanding evidence, the emerging policies are attributed very limited weight.

Paragraph 77 of the Framework sets out that: *“To maintain the supply of housing, local planning authorities should monitor progress in building out sites which have permission. Where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that delivery has fallen below 95% of the local planning authority’s housing requirement over the previous three years, the authority should prepare an action plan in line with national planning guidance, to assess the causes of under delivery and identify actions to increase delivery in future years.”*

The 2021/ 22 housing land monitoring statement is currently being prepared however on the basis of the previous years’ assessment, an action plan is to be implemented to set out how the Council will deal with under delivery in light of achieving 86% of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT). As such, the ‘tilted’ balance in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF applies and planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

The Former Prime Minister’s Independent Review to develop a plan for a major scaling-up of self-commissioned new homes – across all tenures – to boost capacity and overall housing supply (August 2021).

The Introduction to the Prime Minister’s Review below demonstrates what can be achieved when an applicant is enabled to direct their own resources and plan and design their future housing requirements for their specific tailored needs, instead of generic standard house types typically offered by the PLC volume house builders:

“A gap has opened up between the places we want to see and those we actually create. Instead of beauty and a natural order, we see a sterile sameness almost everywhere we look. Rather than an architecture displaying a rich array of local vernaculars we can celebrate and honour, crafted using traditional materials and skills with a distinct sense of place – and even become a way of affirming identity and belonging – we see instead a crushing of imagination, with houses designed by accountants. We are failing to create the listed buildings of tomorrow.

The consequences are stark. Quite simply, new housing is feared. In no other time in our history would housing be thought of as pollution. Our country has a growing population, an aging housing stock and a younger generation who have been priced out of home ownership – and for whom even renting a home costs far too high a proportion of their income. We need to build more new homes.

*There is of course a proper concern that we should protect our beautiful countryside – but opposition to new housing is chiefly a cri de coeur against the second-rate, the environmentally damaging and the bland. Instead of new housing that most people want, we have a soulless monoculture. One witness in my Review commented that **“the planning system rewards mediocrity”** – and people are entirely right to object to mediocrity. Yet the*

consequences are that for decades we have not built enough houses – and this is tearing deep fissures into the fabric of our society.

There is a solution. It involves creating the conditions in which customers are treated as if they matter the most, rather than – for the most part - scarcely mattering at all. And this is what happens when people themselves commission the houses they would like to see.”

Paragraph 60 of the Framework sets out that *“it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay”*.

The proposal subject to this resubmission falls squarely into the group with specific housing requirements that is not catered for in the general housebuilding industry, therefore those seeking to actively reduce this widening gap should be supported without unnecessary delay.

For decision taking, a 5yr housing land supply is a material consideration in all relevant applications for dwellings in the Borough. Despite being able to demonstrate a housing land supply, due to the age of relevant housing policies in the Core Strategy, in accordance with paragraph 11d) of the NPPF, the Council should still grant permission for housing unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. Therefore, sustainable development should be approved unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraph 63 of the Framework states that within the context of establishing the amount of housing to be planned:

“the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes)”.

Paragraph 63 is supplemented by footnote 29 that confirms:

“Under section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. They are also subject to duties under sections 2 and 2A of the Act to have regard to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand. Self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing.”

The thrust of the guidance arising from the Framework (2023) and the 2015 Act, is that Section 2A of the Act imposes on the Council a statutory **“duty”** on the LPA to grant permissions in respect of providing **sufficient suitable serviced plots** of land to meet the demand for self- build and custom housebuilding within the Borough on a rolling three year basis.

The applicant after considering the latest self-build register provided by the LPA, is firmly of the opinion that HBBC have failed to deliver enough self-build permissions to meet demand. Indeed, since the withdrawal of the original submission the LPA has not provided any evidence which would help to demonstrate that their method of qualifying permissions is robust or reliable.

Case law demonstrates that self-build housing delivery does not form part of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply and the LPA have confirmed they are likely to fall short of the ten further self-build permissions required before 30th October 2024.

Demand Assessment: Local & National

Research by McCarthy Stone found that 70% of over 65s would consider moving to a bungalow which equates to 8.4 million people across the UK. However, while demand is rising supply is falling and in the year 2000 9,347 bungalows were built compared with just 2,384 in 2019, this is equal to less than 1% of the new homes built in 2019/20.

In *“Too little, too late? Housing for an ageing population.”* the foreword by Michael Voges Executive Director, ARCO Associated Retirement Community Operators states:

“Over the next two decades, the number of people aged over 65 in the UK is expected to increase by 41% to 18 million. While over-65s often choose to continue living in their existing homes, many wish to downsize when they reach retirement – including into age friendly accommodation that has been designed to boost independence, health and wellbeing.

At present, those who wish to take this path have little to choose from. Less than 3% of the UK’s housing stock is geared towards the retirement market, much of it built as traditional sheltered housing several decades ago. Such low provision is harmful not only for older people, but our country as a whole.

High-quality retirement housing has a crucial role to play in tackling the urgent housing, health and social care challenges facing us. At a time when many young families are struggling to get on to the housing ladder, more than half of the 15 million ‘surplus’ bedrooms lie within the homes of those over 65.”

On this basis the Framework supports the efficient use of surplus residential garden land where there are clear social, economic and environmental benefits and that each application should be judged on its individual merits. As a result, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development with regards to the current proposal particularly given there is a deficit in the rolling 3 year supply of self / custom build plots.

Furthermore, the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Assessment (December 2022) states:

“32. Applying ONS household projections for Hinckley and Bosworth to the Market Bosworth population in 2011 suggests that population growth can be expected to be driven by the oldest households, with the 65+ age group nearly doubling to become the largest single group (at 49% of the total) while all other age bands grow at more modest rates.

33. In the 2021 Census Market Bosworth has a similar balance of single person to family households as is apparent at Borough and national scale. However, the NA diverges from wider averages in its larger proportion of households aged over 65 and smaller proportion of households with dependent children. While the latter group remains relatively small, it expanded by 26% since 2011. Note that the Census dataset relating to household composition is so far the only one relevant to housing that has been released for small areas.

34. As of the 2011 Census, more than 80% of households in the NA had at least one more bedroom than they would be expected to need, and 55% had at least two extra bedrooms. This is not surprising given the relatively large housing stock. Under-occupancy was most

common among couples with no children, older households and single people. While not uncommon, this might suggest that Market Bosworth's larger housing is not necessarily being occupied by households with the most family members, but by the people with the most wealth or by older people who have not chosen or been able to move to smaller properties."

Laying the Foundations document (2011) set out the previous Coalition Government's strategy to modernise the planning system.

Paragraph 67 of the strategy states:

"Custom Build Housing also brings many other benefits, providing affordable bespoke designed market housing, promoting design quality, environmental sustainability, driving innovation in building techniques and entrepreneurialism."

Paragraph 68 of the strategy states:

"But there is huge untapped potential. Only one in ten new UK homes are custom built – a very low proportion by international standards. There are over 100,000 people looking for building plots across the country and we know from recent market research that one in two people would consider building their own home if they could."

Paragraph 69 of the strategy states:

"custom housing can make a stronger contribution to economic growth. By making it easier for ordinary people to build their own homes, there is the potential to deliver wider benefits of affordable, greener and innovatively designed homes and to make a significant contribution to the number of new homes built in this country."

Paragraph 71 of the strategy states:

"The Government wants to make building your own home a mainstream housing option – an affordable way of building a place people are proud to call home. Our immediate aspiration is to unlock the growth potential of the custom homes market and double its size over the next decade, to create up to 100,000 additional Custom Build Homes over the next decade and enable the industry to support up to 50,000 jobs directly and indirectly per year."

This proposal is the very embodiment of the above policy aims where the applicant wishes to downsize from the under occupied detached family home of the White House, by utilising existing surplus residential garden land to provide custom built and age appropriate accommodation using their own resources and financing thereby releasing The White House as a large family home into the local housing supply.

On the issue of this type of local demand and in terms of the ageing population, the Former Prime Minister's review (2021) states:

"All things considered, it seems likely that true demand for CSB in England is at least 30,000 a year, as a minimum, and could conceivably be as high as 100,000 homes a year. This is also reflective of the general population survey evidence and would also be more in line with what occurs in other developed economies across the world which suggests demand as high as 120,000 homes a year. True demand is taken to mean underlying (including latent) demand that reflects the public's preferences but cannot be realised due to structural obstacles."

Local List Requirements

Due to the scale and nature of the proposal, the level of detail submitted with the application is considered proportionate. Schedule 4 of the DMPO details the statutory consultations required *before the grant of permission*. If during the determination period the statutory consultees request additional information and this is not provided by the applicant, the LPA could refuse the application for this reason. On this basis this section forms a notice under Article 12(1) (DMPO Amended July 2015) as the applicant considers the submitted information meets the requirements set out in article 34(6)(c) and any other information contained in the adopted Local List should be waived allowing the immediate validation of the application.

Relevant History

20/01095/FUL Replacement vehicular access.

Approved 6th January 2021

21/01121/FUL Outbuildings: garden storage, workshop & studio. Approved 9th March 2022

Origin and evolution of initial design.

The application was presented at the 4th June Planning Committee where it was moved by Councillor Bray and seconded by Councillor Crooks that the application be deferred for a site visit and to urge the applicant to seek advice from Design Midlands.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED and it was RESOLVED – the application be deferred for a site visit and to seek advice from Design Midlands.

The Design Midlands Review took place on Tuesday 13th August 2024 and the Panel recommended further consideration be undertaken on the items listed below:

“Additional site analysis including landscape analysis, character, identifying receptors, views to the site including PROWs – how best to place a new house within the landscape;

Provision of a clear and compelling narrative for the scheme- is there a different solution for the site which better meets the clients needs and works with the site context?

Provision of an options analysis on the overall site location and the position of the building within the site. Is this the best location for a building within the site?

Provision of a Landscape Framework for the scheme to ensure a robust relationship between building and landscape;

To further explore the building forms ie. would a building which is part two storey work better on the site and meet the clients needs than the current walled garden form;

Ensure the access and drive are in keeping with the narrative including further dialogue with County Highways on repositioning the access; - Detail on the environmental approach and performance of the building; - Supporting information including the scheme in the wider context in particular of the White House”.

The discussions with the Design Panel were very informative and The Right to Build Task Force states a self-build home is one built to the plans or specifications of the occupant on a single plot. Following the discussions and comments made by the Panel, a thorough review was undertaken on the origins of the scheme and how it could be evolved to incorporate the suggestions listed above.

The origin of the scheme was to enable the applicant to purposely design a home in which to retire into, but for it not to have the same negative connotations that are conjured up when the word “bungalow” is used to describe such proposals. This was amply demonstrated when the Chair of the Panel admitted he lived in a bungalow, but never referred to it in open conversation because of the negative imagery associated with the word “bungalow”.

To meet the criteria of Paragraph 139 of the Framework the scheme needs to demonstrate that it is *‘outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.’*

The purpose of the redesign post the Design Midlands Review, was to elevate the proposed accommodation through innovative design that will raise the standard of what can be achieved through so called *retirement or later life living accommodation* within the Borough going forward, and well above and beyond peoples expectations when the word “bungalow” is raised in everyday conversation.

The day of The Panel review visit can only be described as a perfect summers day and all the panel commented and agreed the setting as we sat in the garden was exceptional and although the dwelling could be located elsewhere within the site, the walled garden theme led to the proposal remaining in the existing location. However, upon further reflection and discussion, it was felt the proposal was somewhat dislocated from the wider setting. The former design was located within the site, but not fully incorporated within it, and not ultimately benefitting from the natural attributes the site offers.

The new driver of the design was to rework the entire internal layout to allow more natural light *in* and wider views *out* to the surrounding countryside, thereby creating a more harmonious connection between the property and its immediate natural surroundings. To enable this a topographic and tree survey were undertaken so the majority of the existing trees can be retained, and the walled garden theme can be more closely integrated and aligned with the existing private garden areas of The White House as demonstrated within the revised images.

The formal front garden of the previous design was deleted and the footprint reoriented to increase the usable private amenity space to the rear with the parking area in a courtyard area that is much less visible from public vantage points.

The suggestion of introducing a 2 storey element raised by the Panel was discounted as the “golden thread” of the proposal is to demonstrate what can be achieved with single storey accommodation when innovative design is brought to bear and it does not mean if you choose to live in a bungalow, your useful life is over and the next step is a care home, quickly followed by death! This is the overriding narrative of the scheme, it is to demonstrate people can actively choose how they live in later life and can design homes for their specific needs within the Borough and raise overall standards of all retirement accommodation of this nature.

As mentioned above, research by McCarthy Stone found that 70% of over 65s would consider moving to a bungalow which equates to 8.4 million people across the UK. However, while demand is rising supply is falling and in the year 2000 9,347 bungalows were built compared with just 2,384 in 2019, this is equal to less than 1% of the new homes built in 2019/20.

Paragraph 139 of the Framework that states:

“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or

b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”

The most recent evidence base related to the Market Bosworth NP (December 2022) suggests that Market Bosworth’s larger housing is not necessarily being occupied by households with the most family members, but by the people with the most wealth or by older people who have not chosen or been able to move to smaller properties. The self-build and custom build model offered by the current proposal has the potential to encourage other residents within the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) area to adopt a similar approach to use their own resources and surplus residential land to build suitable accommodation for their retirement needs and to aid the release of under occupied detached family homes onto the local housing market.

Policy DM4 is currently considered to be out of date in this particular respect, as the site forms the lawful domestic ancillary / incidental use of land associated with the existing dwelling in accordance with the well established case law **Sinclair- Lockhart’s Trustees v Central Land Board (1950)** that held:

“The ground which is used for the comfortable enjoyment of a house or other building may be regarded in law within the curtilage of that house or building and thereby as an integral part of the same although it has not been marked off or enclosed in any way. It is enough that it serves the purpose of the house or building in some necessary or useful way.”

The Design Panel agreed the location of the proposal falls within the existing residential curtilage of the White House, however felt the previous design had not successfully integrated the proposal within the local landscape as cohesively or robustly as was possible. The revised proposal and design has positively responded to the suggestions of the Panel and now enjoys a closer and more intimate relationship the existing built form and local landscape which it is now *integrated within*, rather than previously *placed in*.

Based on this principle and when viewed in the round, it is considered the proposal represents a high level of sustainable development and can be supported by providing additional windfall sites and be held as an achievable example that other developments can mirror whilst demonstrably and positively contributing to the LPA rolling 5YHLS and mandatory self-build register.

In the overall policy context, the scheme reflects and continues the existing residential built form and therefore represents an integrated and sustainable development that would be in accordance with paragraph 70 of the Framework that states:

“Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:

seek opportunities, through policies and decisions, to support small sites to come forward for community-led development for housing and self-build and custom-build housing;”

Access Parking & Sustainability

The comments of the Panel were noted regarding the existing vehicle access, however the new access will enable the creation of the new spinney consisting of native tree species to introduce a significant biodiversity net gain. In addition, the proposed access was already deemed acceptable as per application 20/01095/FUL. As such, parking can be accommodated within the scheme to meet the necessary requirements for the new dwelling that will include the charging facilities for the hybrid and electric vehicles to be used by the occupants.

PPG13 and associated guidance is replaced by the NPPF that states:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”

When considering the above, the modest amount of development and the percentage impacts of this traffic are considered minimal meaning the impact of the development will have effectively ‘nil detriment’ and will not therefore adversely affect the current road network capacity.

Ecology & landscaping.

The resubmission is accompanied by a PEA that concludes:

“This Phase 1 Ecology Report confirms that majority the Construction Zone is of mainly of 'low ecological value' consisting primarily of amenity grassland and early mature landscape trees. The features of highest ecological value within the development site are the native trees and hedgerows, which have moderate ecological value.”

Based on the above and with regards to the 'Bosworth Road Hedgerows' Local Wildlife Site (LWS) located at the proposed access, the applicant confirmed via email:

“the closure of the existing field gate will be secured by the planting of additional native hedgerow that will result in a “like for like” exchange between the proposed and existing access. In addition, the highway verge is of a sufficient depth that the visibility splays can be achieved without any removal of the existing hedgerow so the current status quo will be maintained and there will be nil detriment to the existing hedgerow in this respect.”

On the 4th December 2023 the County ecologist stated:

“ I can confirm that the above is acceptable to mitigate the impacts of the existing hedgerow section removal to facilitate the proposed access.”

Affordable Housing & S106 Contributions

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, Part 11, Regulation 122 provides a statutory duty in respect of planning obligations and requires them to be

necessary, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed.

Any contributions sought by the LPA will have to provide a site specific analysis of the impact of the proposed development upon on existing services. A description of how the contributions would be spent to specifically address those impacts and the timeframe will also form part of the justification.

If the LPA can demonstrate that any contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, that they are directly related, are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, then in accordance with Regulation 122, the applicant would agree to the request of the associated contributions. The contribution will be secured via a signed Unilateral Undertaking or S106 upon receipt of the detailed justification supplied to the applicant by the LPA.

Conclusion & Justification

Paragraph 3.8 of the CS recognised in 2009 that some growth is required in the rural areas of the Borough by stating:

“As with most rural areas, there is a lack of affordable housing (both market and social) in the rural villages and hamlets in Hinckley & Bosworth, particularly in the west of the borough. This, combined with an ageing population and high levels of out-commuting, provides a challenge to ensure that rural communities in the future provide a range of local services, housing and employment for people who work and live in rural areas.”

Given the current policy context the LPA fully recognise the valuable contribution minor applications such as the current scheme make towards maintaining a rolling 5YHLS as highlighted by the HBBC Windfall Study (April 2022). However, by far the most important contribution the scheme would make is releasing under occupied family homes within the specific Market Bosworth NP area, by supporting those who have access to their own resources and wish to provide for their own retirement accommodation via self-build projects so local authority and state funds can be directed to those within the area who may require additional supporting assistance in requiring suitable accommodation in their old age.

Paragraph 177 of the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Assessment (December 2022) states:

“While the VOA data mentioned above is not helpful in bringing the full mix up to date, that source helpfully splits bungalows out from the other categories. In the wider area that includes the NA, 13.7% of homes are bungalows. That is exactly the same share as across the Borough and moderately higher than the national average of 9.2%. This suggests that there is a segment of the housing stock that may hold appeal to older households and others with mobility limitations.”

The concluding comments of the Design Midlands Review Panel state:

“We trust the feedback provided within this letter will prove to be of benefit to you in seeking a successful resolution and outcome for this scheme and provide an opportunity for further discussions with the determining authorities.”

The comments made by the Panel demonstrate a positive endorsement of the proposal and with their suggestions now incorporated within the amended scheme, the scheme can be supported on this basis.

This example of self-build later living accommodation could be actively cited by the Council as an innovative design model which will promote high levels of sustainability and help raise the standard of design appropriate retirement accommodation more generally in the Borough whilst simultaneously contributing to the Council's 5 year rolling supply of housing. It is considered on balance that any perceived harm from the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the clearly identified benefits of the scheme where the ONS household projections for Hinckley and Bosworth to the Market Bosworth population in 2011 suggests that population growth can be expected to be driven by the oldest households, with the 65+ age group nearly doubling to become the largest single group (at 49% of the total) while all other age bands grow at more modest rates.

Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies in this instance and the material considerations do justify making a decision other than in accordance with certain elements of the development plan. As such the proposal represents the type of organic, integrated and sustainable development that is appropriate within the local context and is supported by the direction of travel in terms of Government policy, recent appeal decisions, the key policy objectives of the existing and emerging Core Strategy and Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan.

© Simon Cheshire Planning Ltd 2024