

Design, Access, & Planning Statement.

Demolition of existing C3 dwelling and ancillary buildings, to form a replacement C3 self-build residential dwelling and creation of private amenity space, garaging and parking associated with Hissar House, Leicester Road, Barwell, LE9 8BB.

October 2026

Introduction

This statement is submitted in support of the demolition of existing C3 dwelling and ancillary buildings, to form a replacement C3 self-build residential dwelling and creation of private amenity space, garaging and parking associated with Hissar House, Leicester Road, Barwell, LE9 8BB.

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 (Aug 2026) & 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.

Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 16: Housing Density, Mix and Design

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 DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Aug 2026)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2024)
- Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

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 (2026) 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:

- a. An economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b. A social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible community facilities, public service infrastructure and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- c. An environmental objective – to support efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy; and to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, and minimising waste and pollution.

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 Framework (Aug 2026) as a complete document. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the government's policies for plan-making and for making decisions on development proposals in England and is a material consideration of critical importance.

The Government is committed to ensuring the planning system should not act as an impediment to housing provision. All Local Authorities need to significantly boost the supply of housing irrespective of the status of the immediate 5 YHLS. Chapters 2 and 3 of the New NPPF set out general procedural policies for plan-making and decision-making. The subsequent chapters contain policies on thematic issues, separated in each case into policies for plan-making and those for decision-making. Taken together, the policies for decision-making (both procedural and thematic) comprise a set of national decision-making policies.

Local List Requirements & the NPPF (Aug 2026) DM2: Information requirements:

1. To ensure a clear and consistent approach to the information required to determine development proposals, local validation lists setting out the information required in support of an application for development should include the information specified in the relevant national decision-making policies (summarised in Annex C).
2. Local validation lists should only include additional information requirements if there is a policy in the development plan requiring a specific further assessment. Any such additional information requirements should not be applied equally to all applications but should be proportionate to the scale of development and its potential impact. Where appropriate, the

requirements should clearly distinguish between what is required for major, medium and other types of development proposal.

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.

Planning History

87/00366/4 | STANDING OF ONE 7 500 KG GROSS HEAVY GOODS VEHICLE AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDING FOR STORAGE OF CLEANING APPLIANCES AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT: Approved 02.06.87

Current Policy Context post NPPF 17th August 2026

Appendix 1 of this supporting contains an appeal decision issued on the 13th March 2025 for a development of 95 homes within the Green Wedge adjacent to the settlement boundary of Barwell under PINS reference APP/K2420/W/24/3348387, Land East of The Common, Barwell, LE9 8BR which is in very close proximity to the current site.

At paragraphs 12 and 41 the Inspector states:

“The lack of five-year supply, the continuing delay with previously identified sites coming forward and the uncertainty over the timescale of examination and adoption of the emerging local plan are factors to which substantial weight needs to be given. Consequently the Core Strategy adopted in 2009 has to be regarded as out-of-date as the development strategy put forward has not been achieved. This reduces the weight that can be given to Core Strategy policies which restrict development including on sites in a Green Wedge.”(My emphasis)

And

“On the main issues I have found that the principle of development in this area of countryside conflicts with SAMD policy DM4 but this only carries limited weight because of the Council’s HLS position. The proposal would cause some moderate harm to the rural landscape character of the area and to a limited geographical area but it would not result in a significant adverse effect which is the test set out in criteria (i) of Policy DM4 and criteria (a) of Policy DM10.”

The conclusions of the Inspector and the acknowledgement the entire 2009 CS and the policies contained within it are out of date, are significant material considerations that are directly applicable to the appeal submission. In addition, the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan 2024 to 2045 consultation ran from Friday 17th October 2025 and closed on Friday 28th November 2025. The latest Local Development Scheme (LDS) outlines further public consultation on the submission Draft Plan (Regulation 19) in 2026, however given its early stage of preparation, the Emerging Local Plan is attributed no weight at the current time.

Following the release of the NPPF (Aug 2026), the land is considered PDL and falls under

S5: Principle of development outside settlements:

“c. The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building²⁵. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not disproportionately larger than the one it replaces;

“d. The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential).”

Chapter 6 of the New NPPF “Delivering a sufficient supply of homes” states:

“2. At the most appropriate level, development plans should also take into account an assessment of the size, type and tenure of housing or other accommodation needed for different groups. These groups include, but are not limited to:

i. People wishing to commission or build their own homes.”

HO5: Meeting the needs of different groups

1. The development plan should, at the most appropriate level, set out policies to address the housing needs of different groups (including, but not limited to, those assessed under policy HO1). This should include:

“c. Identifying sites which can provide specific types of accommodation where there is an identified need, including (but not limited to):

ii. Plots for self and custom build housing and community-led development;”

Principle of development

Within the Glossary of the Framework the definition of previously developed land is defined as below:

“Previously developed land: Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). It also includes land comprising large areas of fixed surface infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed”.

The inclusion of "lawfully developed" into the definition of Previously Developed Land (PDL) in the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Aug 2026) ensures that land is only considered brownfield, if its previous development was authorized. On this basis, the revised definition specifically links "lawfully developed" to permanent structures and hardstanding created by the implementation of the lawful operational development associated with the planning history of the site.

With the introduction of policy **S5: Principle of development outside settlements**, this type of small, bespoke, custom housing represents appropriate development within the countryside and is in line with policies HO1 and national decision-making policy HO7 of the Framework. Particularly relating to the fact Local Authorities carry a statutory duty to assess

and register the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area and if a council fails to grant enough suitable permissions to match demand on its self-build register, any shortfall clearly demonstrates evidence of an unmet local housing demand. Under such circumstances the provision of self-build proposals represent a specific benefit which attracts substantial weight for any LPA in maintaining an up to date and robust legally required Self-Build Register in accordance with policy **HO5: Meeting the needs of different groups**.

The Planning and Infrastructure Bill consultation paper on the “**Reform of Site Thresholds**” is applicable to schemes such as the current proposal. The consultation paper acknowledges that the planning process itself has become “**disproportionate**” for self & custom house builders in bringing forward bespoke development sites of this nature.

There is a clear recognition that small and medium sized house builders play a vital role in maintaining locally based build out rates. However, such local builders continue to face challenging circumstances where around a third of such enterprises have ceased operating in the last twenty years. Increasingly this results in the national volume housebuilders accounting for almost 90% of growth, and the often significant and extended implementation periods associated with such major housing developments. Additionally, the proportion of planning permissions granted on sites of up to 9 units has fallen from 21% in 2010/11, to 9% in 23/24 showing the continuing decline of the small local builders. Equally important is the fact these local builders are often the very businesses that train and nurture new entrants to the building profession and help fill the significant skills gap that currently exists in all building trades across the development industry within the UK.

Given the Local and Neighbourhood Plan policy support for the proposed scheme, **THE RIGHT TO BUILD TASK FORCE** is unequivocal in its support for such proposals:

“Balancing desire to manage settlements, neighbourhood and infrastructure with statutory requirements to support self/custom build housing can be done. A single dwelling or small minor development, brought forward by/for local residents is the type of small-scale organic growth which was historically a cornerstone of English housing. Approving proposals for minor development of a few modest homes outside but proximate to a settlement, or supporting family homes in urban backland or gardens, are unlikely to jeopardise strategic spatial strategy or strategic policies(My emphasis).”

The proposal will complement the existing built form and residential use of the site, whilst making efficient use of the surplus previously developed land, and will be wholly in accordance with **Policy L2: Making effective use of land** that states:

“1.Substantial weight should be given to the benefits where a development proposal would achieve one or more of the following:

b. Making better use of vacant and underutilised land and buildings (such as: by bringing back into residential use empty homes and other suitable buildings;”

Amount, Layout & Design

To support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, and the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.

In terms of Policy DM4, its stated policy aim is not to provide a “blanket ban” on all residential development currently outside settlement boundaries, rather it is to protect rural

areas from unsustainable development, and now needs to be weighed in terms of Policy L2 above.

In recent years the LPA accept that minor residential schemes (less than 9 units) carry similar weight or benefits to larger residential schemes especially when viewed cumulatively on an annual basis. Such windfall sites materially often make a significant contribution to the 5YHLS as demonstrated by the: Windfall Study An assessment of the case for including windfall in the five year housing land supply (1 April 2020) that states:

“A thorough analysis of completion data for the last ten years has shown that windfall makes a consistent contribution towards total completions and small site completions in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough; on average approximately 18% of the total completions were small windfall sites and approximately 76% of small site completions were windfall. The evidence presented in this report provides a strong case for the inclusion of windfall within the Council’s development trajectory and more specifically the five year housing land supply.”

The conclusions of The Common appeal Inspector (Appendix 1) and the acknowledgement the entire 2009 CS and the policies contained within it are out of date, are significant material considerations that are directly applicable to the current submission, particularly as the 2009 Core Strategy expires this December 2026. The CS sought to meet overall housing needs up to 2026 and the settlement boundaries were drawn up to accord with that plan period and not beyond it. Moreover, housing land supply is calculated across the whole of the Council’s area and is not based on any particular settlement.

The minimum housing target expressed in the CS over the plan period up to December 2026 will not be met and is exacerbated by the continuing shortfall in the 5YHLS, therefore it is inevitable and accepted by the Council, that permission for housing will need to be granted on unallocated PDL sites. The LPA are currently working on a new Local Plan which will set out land allocations and planning policies for the period 2024 to 2045. The implication of this is that there will not be a strategic plan in place to lead development in HBBC for the foreseeable future, and more importantly there will be no plan led mechanism to rectify the existing 5 year housing land supply and self-build register shortfall.

Any redevelopment of PDL in locations adjacent to existing settlement boundaries for new housing will give rise to landscape and visual change. The fact that change will occur is not in itself harmful or adverse, and it is inevitable that some of the most appropriate locations for new homes, of the scale required up to 2045, will be in the ‘open countryside’, abutting settlements such as Barwell and Earl Shilton. This is a matter which HBBC has explored in order to direct growth to the most appropriate locations in terms of the emerging Local Plan.

With reference to the redevelopment of PDL sites for new housing, on the 6th August 2025, the LPA issued the delegated approval related to application 24/01155/FUL for the erection of a dwelling (self-build) with associated parking and landscaping Upper Grange Farm, 1A Ratby Lane, Markfield, Leicestershire, LE67 9RJ. For ease of reference, the application documents are included in **Appendix 2**.

Paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 of the delegated report associated with application 24/01155/FUL state the below:

“8.4. The Planning Policy team are currently reviewing the revised NPPF and implications for the Council’s Five-Year Housing Land Supply. A revised position will be published in the coming months once the monitoring for the 2024/25 year has been completed. It is however likely that, with the revised need figure of 682 dwellings per annum from the Dec 2024 NPPF (649dpa + 5% buffer as per Para 78a), that the Council will be unable to demonstrate a Five-Year Housing Land Supply once the revised position is published.

8.5. Therefore, the application should be determined against Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework whereby permission should be granted unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.”

And paragraph 8.11 states:

“It is acknowledged that, through its intentions to implement the Core Strategy through its approach to the countryside and settlement boundaries, Policy DM4 is considered out-of-date. Nevertheless, the emphasis of Policy DM4 is to promote sustainable development proposals within the countryside and to safeguard it from unsustainable schemes.”

In the determination of application 24/01155/FUL above, it was the designation of the application site as PDL that weighed heavily in favour of the approval, which is equally applicable in the current circumstances since the release of the Revised NPPF.

The case of **DLA Delivery Ltd v Baroness Cumberlege of Newick and another [2018] EWCA Civ 1140** highlights and reinforces the critical need for consistency in decision making in terms of following previous decisions, or to give clear reasons for reaching a different view.

Appendix 3 contains an appeal decision issued on the 17th June 2026 related to 59 Kennel Lane, Witherley, Leicestershire CV9 3LJ and the erection of a pair of semis on PDL consisting of a vacant, two-storey, brick barn sat in an area of gravel and hardstanding. In allowing the appeal the Inspector concluded:

“18. The uncontested position of the appellant is that the Council has a housing land supply of 3.55 years. In these circumstances footnote 8 of the Framework advises that the policies that are most important for determining the application are out of date. Consequently, the Framework advises that 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.

19. The scheme is well designed and would not cause material harm to the character of the settlement or countryside. It would make effective use of land and would contribute to addressing the shortfall in housing land supply in the District. The social and economic benefits that would result from the development attract moderate weight in favour of the scheme.

20. Taking all these matters into account, I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Consequently, the proposal constitutes sustainable development as defined in the Framework, and material considerations indicate that planning permission should be granted for development that is not in accordance with the development plan.”

Planning policies and decisions should promote 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 where the existing and proposed built form is and would be set back from Leicester Road, so as not to generate formal ribbon development.

As such, the delegated report and appeal decision cited above confirm Policy DM4 is out of date and it should not be treated as blanket protection to resist all countryside proposals, only those that are deemed to represent unsustainable development. In the current context,

both Local and National policy explicitly supports the re-development of PDL for housing via Policy S5: Principle of development outside settlements.

Policy **DP3: Key principles for well-designed places** states:

“1. Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3.”

The supporting structural survey accompanying the application states the original building is over a hundred years old constructed of solid brick walls and has deteriorated over many decades and has suffered from subsidence in areas. The professional opinion is, it would require extensive renovation to restore it to the minimum modern-day standards, where even the minimum level of works required would essentially make the undertaking financially unviable.

In accordance with Policy DP3 and LP policy, the residential replacement of Hissar House and creation of the residential curtilage will allow the productive recycling of a former local landmark building to be reinstated alongside the former setting of the site. Through careful design and use of sympathetic materials and design cues, the accompanying CGI images illustrate the proposal will be read as a cohesive and spatially balanced development of residential built form with corresponding and commensurate areas of private garden amenity space.

The new built form will consist of an area of 547sqm that will replace 360sqm of existing built form, where both the quantitative and qualitative considerations result in a cohesive and spatially balanced development of new residential built form that is harmony with the local context, thereby respecting and maintaining the semi-rural setting and provides a vital “living link” with the local history of the site.

On this basis, the proposal represents the type of organic, integrated and sustainable development that is appropriate within the local context as supported by the direction of travel in terms of the NPPF (2026) and emerging Local Plan policy. Therefore, the proposed new modern family home cannot be reasonably considered disproportionately larger than the one it replaces, particularly given the 100 years that has elapsed since the original was constructed. Comprehensively and thoughtfully designed and future proofed as a result, the replacement dwelling can remain unaltered and equally stand for another 100 years as a further evolution of the same local landmark residence.

Access, Parking & Sustainability

The existing access will be utilised and parking can be accommodated within the scheme to meet the necessary requirements of the dwelling that will include charging facilities for electric vehicles.

NPPF Policy **TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations** states:

“In rural areas, opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and enhance the connectivity of an area should be taken where they exist and can be supported by the development proposed.”

Both National and Local policy continues to support new residential development in semi rural areas. In terms of access to certain services such as food shopping, whilst it is acknowledged that residents seeking to undertake their weekly shop at a supermarket will not be able to do so in the immediate vicinity of the site, weekly shops are less significant in terms of vehicle trips by virtue of their less frequent nature. The Framework also envisages that sustainable development is achievable in rural areas which means that the lack of a shop or supermarket in the immediate vicinity cannot of itself mean that a site is not a sustainable location for development.

The objective of ensuring “the fullest possible use” of sustainable transport does not mean rejecting development in rural areas on the grounds that towns and cities will always be better. Given the likely low levels of traffic associated with one dwelling, the environmental effects would be minimal and under the specific circumstances, the conflict with the principles under Policy TR3 would be limited.

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.

Therefore, even when the conflict with the spatial strategy and accessibility requirements in the LP are weighed in the planning balance, the proposal is for a form of development which should be approved as the benefits of doing so are not substantially outweighed by the adverse effects in this particular instance, when assessed against the national decision-making policies introduced on the 17th August 2026 and specifically Policy TR3.

BNG & Biodiversity

As a self-build proposal, the BNG 0.2ha exemption applies and the application is accompanied by a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment and Bird Survey concluding:

“The survey determined that the main building is not being used as a bat roost site. The buildings overall were categorized as negligible bat roost potential (BRP) in respect of potential use by bats. In accordance with BCT guidance (2023) no further bat surveys will be required in order to determine any potential use.”

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 contributions will be secured via a signed Unilateral Undertaking or S106 upon receipt of the detailed justification supplied to the applicant by the LPA.

A signed and completed UU will be submitted during the determination period to secure the dwellings as genuine self-build undertakings that can be duly added to the LPA self-build register that must be kept available for public inspection at all times.

Conclusion & Justification

The Framework (Aug 2026) indicates that planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and states that planning policies and decisions should promote 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.

It is considered the proposal represents sustainable development and can be supported as a windfall site that demonstrably and positively contributes to the LPA rolling 5YHLS and will assist to achieve and maintain an up to date mandatory self-build register, where Section 123 of the Act amends section 2A of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 to ensure that only land permissioned explicitly for self-build and custom housebuilding will qualify towards a relevant authority's statutory duty to meet demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority's area.

Related to this matter, the Right to Build Task Force Custom and Self-Build Planning Guidance PG3.3: NPPF and Right to Build legislation - Delivering appropriate permissions (January 2024 - Version 3) states:

"Where there are no policies and/or LPAs are not meeting their duty in relation to provision of CSB plots, the fact of an application delivering CSB plots should be given significant weight in the planning balance. Where there are no planning harms, it is possible that meeting the LPA's statutory duties will be sufficient to indicate an approval, even in the case of a minor departure in relation to a local policy.

However, notwithstanding the above, where a council cannot demonstrate that plots are being secured there is an increased risk of approval by appeal and this should be considered in the context of the approach taken in terms of planning for sites and granting permissions. Availability of CSB plots should be a factor in the determination of the application and given significant weight in the planning balance."

Where there is an acknowledged shortfall in the LPA self & custom build register, THE RIGHT TO BUILD TASK FORCE guidance is directly aimed to assist the LPA in relation to addressing an undersupply of self-build plots states the below:

"18. The basics of the statutory duties for delivering self/custom build homes are set out in the Task Force Guidance note PG3.3: National Planning Policy Framework and Right to Build legislation Delivering appropriate permissions. Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to consider the demand for custom and self-build (CSB) homes in plan making and decision taking. Councils are required to consider self-build in planning, housing, land disposal, and regeneration functions. This legal responsibility is set out in (s2(1)) of the Self and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015.

19. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 introduced the specific legal duty on authorities to provide at least a number of permissions for self/custom build homes based on a figure linked to the self-build register. Subsequent legislation, such as the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) 2023 (s123) and the Biodiversity Gain Requirements regulations make it clear that there is ongoing commitment to this housebuilding sector. Significantly the LURA makes it clear that any past under-supply of permissions is rolled forward. This

clarifies that simply taking people off the self-build register does not eliminate the requirement to provide at least an equivalent number of permissions.

20. While the legislation refers to the custom and self-build register as a primary consideration, councils are encouraged in policy to consider the wider strategic demand for self/custom build housing. Where there is a mismatch between the target dwelling types of those joining the register and the housing demand profile in an area, councils can help enable delivery of more size-appropriate and well-located plots through policies and actions. Attempting to meet demand through suppressing the self-build registers is not helpful in ensuring delivery.”

Both LP and National policy makes reference to the fact it is necessary to meet an identified Borough wide housing need, or local housing need as evidenced through a housing needs survey neighbourhood plan, or legally required LPA Self-Build Register.

The specialist self-build nature of the proposal means by definition, the applicant has designed the proposal to meet their own personal specifications and requirements, however to also respect and maintain the links of the past the original building has within the immediate locality and landscape.

In summary, the proposal is in accordance with the policies set out above in the HBBC Local Plan (2009), the NPPF (Aug 2026) and the specific the guidance provided to all local Government Authorities via THE RIGHT TO BUILD TASK FORCE, therefore can be supported without delay subject to the imposition appropriate conditions.

© Simon Cheshire Planning Ltd 2026