



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 29 November 2022

Site visit made on 1 December 2022

by S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/22/3301735

Land off Sketchley Lane, Burbage, Hinckley

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Barwood Development Securities Limited against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01131/OUT, dated 5 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing poultry and cattle buildings and a residential development of up to 150 dwellings with vehicular access from Sketchley Lane (outline – vehicular access only).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and outline planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing poultry and cattle buildings and a residential development of up to 150 dwellings with vehicular access from Sketchley Lane (outline – vehicular access only) on land off Sketchley Lane, Burbage, Hinckley in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01131/OUT, dated 5 September 2021 and the plans submitted with it subject to the conditions contained in the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters other than means of vehicular access reserved.
3. The second reason for refusal (RfR) has 2 parts. The first part refers to an adverse effect on highway safety. The second part refers to the impact of traffic calming measures on the character of Sketchley Lane. The Highways Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) confirms that with traffic calming, the proposal would not have a severe impact on highway safety. The local planning authority (lpa) did not pursue the first part of RfR 2.
4. Figure 21 of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) May 2021 shows most of the proposed residential area washed over as Local Wildlife Sites and subject to BNP Policy 8. The lpa confirmed that these allocations were included in error and that the site is not the subject of any local wildlife designations.
5. The inquiry was adjourned to allow for the S106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to be completed and closed in writing on 12 December 2022. The UU provides for affordable housing (AH), the appointment of a travel plan coordinator, the submission of a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan (BLMP) and financial contributions towards highway improvements, travel

packs, bus passes, bus stop improvements, civic amenity facilities, health care facilities, library services, off-site open space, on-site open space maintenance, early and special needs education facilities and monitoring.

6. The obligations have been reviewed in light of guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). PPG advises that where a matter could equally be dealt with by way of a condition or a planning obligation, the decision maker should use a condition. All, bar the submission of a BLMP, which is also the subject of a suggested condition, are reasonable, necessary, and consistent with R21 of the CIL Regulations¹. Accordingly, in coming to the decision, the relevant obligations have been taken into account.
7. I have had regard to appeal decisions referred to me, particularly APP/K2420/W/20/3260227. This appeal, dismissed in May 2021, related to the current appeal site and adjoining land and was for the extension of the adjoining Business Park and the erection of 140 dwellings with access from Sketchley Lane.

Main Issue

8. The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

9. The Inspector in the May 2021 appeal decision started his consideration with a succinct description of the site, its nature, and sensitivity to development. Rather than attempting to reinvent the wheel, I have repeated much of his comment, albeit tailored to reflect the materially different nature and scale of the current proposal.
10. The Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Assessment 2017 locates the site within Landscape Character Area (LCA) F: Burbage Common Rolling Farmland where the site comprises, several fields used for grazing cattle and horses. Most of LCA F lies to the east of Hinckley and to the south-east of Burbage. The appeal site lies within a pocket of LCA F to the south of Burbage and north of the A5 trunk road. The relevant characteristics of LCA F as they relate to the site include a medium to large scale field pattern with smaller scale pasture fields around the settlement, urban fringe influences, along with major transport corridors. A key characteristic of the adjoining UCA² 1: Burbage is as a ridgetop settlement where the village character is enhanced by the proximity to countryside to the south-east.
11. In describing the appeal site as having "*...some of the attributes of a semi-rural area...with significant parts... subject to substantial urban influences and is a transitional zone between existing industrial premises and residential uses*", my colleague chose his words very carefully. Here, the adjoining uses, some of which are at a higher level, comprise an extensive Business Park with tall utilitarian buildings, a sprawling hotel complex, substantial housing areas to the north, east and south and the heavily trafficked A5. Together these elements exert a very significant influence on the character of the site resulting in the site displaying a classic urban fringe character. That said, the relative openness and size of the site does form a visual break from built

¹ The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

² Urban Character Area.

development, albeit highly localised, and makes a limited contribution to the setting of Burbage.

12. In coming to this conclusion, I have regard to the suggestion that in some glimpsed views, the commercial buildings would be read as agricultural sheds, thus limiting the influence they have on the character of the site. Whilst an interesting thought, it has, in my view, little merit. The public vantage points where the buildings might be seen from, do not form part of a long distance footpath that would be traversed by people unfamiliar with the area. Even if walkers are unfamiliar with the area, the scale of the buildings are such that it would be hard to read them as agricultural buildings.
13. The site forms part of Sensitivity Area 07: Sketchley in the 2017 Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LSA), where it is judged to have a low sensitivity to residential development. In terms of perceptual qualities, the LSA notes that the fields, particularly around the Sketchley Grange Hotel, retain some rurality, where well-treed field boundaries combine with mature specimens within the field to create a distinctive local landscape from the rest of the area. Whilst little appears to have changed in the area to alter the conclusions of the LSA, it is prescient to note that the later BNP does not identify land to the west of Burbage as an area of landscape sensitivity or list important views. The BNP reserves those identifications for land on the eastern edge of Burbage (BNP Figure 27).
14. The visual break referred to in the 2021 appeal decision and the medium distance views to beyond the A5 are largely appreciated from the southern third of the bridleway on the eastern boundary of the site. It is in the localised views from The Spinney, that the ridge and furrow earthworks contribute to the landscape character of the site. From the remainder of the bridleway to the north, views out are, even in winter, limited by the dense planting on the western edge of the bridleway to brief glimpses of the agricultural buildings and small parts of the field in the foreground.
15. Additional views to the west and a closer appreciation of the ridge and furrow earthworks could be obtained from the second bridleway that crosses the site from the north-eastern corner of The Spinney. However, there is no access to it, a situation that appears to have existed for some considerable time. That part of the bridleway is unsigned, the southern entrance is blocked by a mature hedge/fencing and a significant change in levels and the northern entrance off Sketchley Lane is constrained by housing. It appears that no one, including the highway authority (HA), the Borough and Parish Councils or interest group, has sought to reopen this path.
16. In the May 2021 decision, a key building block of my colleague's conclusion was, that the loss of the sense of separation and openness between industrial and residential uses would be a fundamental and adverse alteration to the landscape resource. With the retention of the fields to the north of The Spinney, to the south-west of the hotel, to the south-east of the industrial estate and to the north of the A5 as public open space and the large field immediately to the west of The Spinney in open use, separation and openness would be retained. These features, as would the longer views over the A5, would be retained and apparent from the bridleway on the eastern boundary and the existing open space north of The Spinney. Moreover, the proposed

area of open space coincides with the identification of the area within the BNP as a Wildlife and Green Corridor (Figure 25).

17. The housing to the south and east of the hotel would result in a permanent change in the landscape character of that part of the site. However, with careful treatment of the layout particularly the disposition of building heights and the choice of boundary and internal landscaping, both of which would be the subject of reserved matters applications, the effect on landscape character would be moderate adverse at Year 1 reducing to minor as the landscape planting matured. Overall, the harm to landscape character would be minimal and not significant.
18. In concluding on landscape character effects, I have had in mind the submission that the use of most of the site for public open space would result in the "municipalisation" of the landscape and the effect this would have on the semi-rural attributes of the site. This conjures up a vision based on the park keepers' approach to landscaping, where planting is formal, waling on the grass is forbidden and mown within an inch of its life. Thankfully, landscape design has moved on and as landscaping is a reserved matter, it is not beyond the wit of the developer and the lpa to create/approve a scheme for this area that retained the semi-rural attributes of the site.
19. The visual impacts of the development would be experienced from the eastern bridleway, the open space to the north of The Spinney, the A5 and the access onto Sketchley Lane. The distinguishing feature of all these views are that they are highly localised and contained. Along the northern two-thirds of the eastern bridleway, there are intermittent and glimpsed views into the site. As such the development would have limited visual impact. From the southern third of the bridleway, the open space to the north of The Spinney and from various points on the footpath along the northern side of the A5, the development would be noticeable albeit against the backdrop of the hotel. Whilst the ground rises from the northern edge of the proposed open space, with careful attention to the detail of the layout, the disposition of building heights and landscaping, overall, the development would not appear unacceptably intrusive.
20. The access onto Sketchley Lane would occupy an area between Sketchley Lodge Farmhouse and substantial houses on the northern side of the lane between the junctions of Sketchley Old Village and The Stables, a cul-de-sac of several large dwellings. Here, houses are prominent in the street scene giving the lane a distinct urban character. The access would result in the loss of a wooden boundary fence where vegetation has been extensively cut back at the direction of the HA and several trees of limited amenity value. Whilst the development would be noticeable it would be consistent with the existing urban character of this part of the lane. With appropriate landscaping and layout, the development would not be unacceptably obtrusive.
21. The starting point for the lpa's concerns about the impact of the traffic calming measures on Sketchley Lane is that it is a "rural lane", and the works would have an "urbanising impact". Again, I believe my colleague in the 2021 chose his words carefully when he said, "*...Sketchley Lane has the feel of a semi-rural lane...*" and it is not just a matter of semantics to highlight the material difference between something being rural or semi-rural.

22. Moving east from the site, Sketchley Lane has footpaths, street lighting and residential development on both sides, albeit views of the housing on the southern side is heavily filtered by roadside planting. I had the opportunity to travel along Sketchley Lane regularly and I formed the clear opinion that part of the lane to the east of the site has a distinct suburban character. The traffic calming measures involving selective road widening and road narrowing features along with appropriate signage. The works are modest and would have a limited impact on roadside vegetation and trees. Indeed, as highlighted above, the HA has required roadside planting to be cut back where the site abuts the highway and it appeared to me that along the southern side of Sketchley Lane the verge and associated vegetation has been cut back at various times. In this context, the traffic calming measures and the additional traffic generated by the scheme would not have a material adverse effect on the character or appearance of Sketchley Lane.

Other Matters

Highway Safety

23. I have no reason to disagree with the conclusion of the HA or the agreed position between the parties that traffic generated by the proposal would not have a severe effect on the highway network.

Agricultural Land

24. The site contains Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land classified as being amongst the Best and Most Versatile (B&MV). Whilst the proposal would result in the permanent loss of some B&MV land, albeit on a materially smaller scale than that previously proposed, I have no reason to disagree with my colleague or the lpa that its loss would represent an adverse effect of minor significance.

Heritage

25. The BNP identifies the ridge and furrow earthworks as non-designated heritage assets. However, as a feature, they are not unique within the plan area. The quality of the earthworks varies across the site and the housing development would result in the loss of an area of distinct ridge and furrows. That said, I have no reason to disagree with my colleague's conclusion that, the remnant ridge and furrow has lost much of its original context and the lpa's conclusion that it is appreciated more as a landscape feature than for its heritage significance. It is agreed that heritage considerations could be addressed by imposing a recording condition.

Benefits

26. It is acknowledged that the proposal would bring several social and economic and benefits. The lpa accepts it cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites and, as far as I am aware there are no constraints that would prevent the early implementation of this proposal. Indeed, the appellant would accept a significant reduction in the time limits attached to the submission of reserved matters. The provision of up to 120 (80%) market homes would be consistent with the objective of boosting the supply homes. Similarly, whilst the scale of AH proposed is policy compliant, the early provision of up to 30 (20%) would address the acknowledged acute need for affordable housing in the district. Economic benefits include, amongst other things, job creation during the construction stage and

increased local expenditure from new residents. These matters attract significant weight.

27. Environmental benefits include biodiversity net gains, the creation of a substantial area of public open space, achieving the wildlife corridor and the infilling of a major link in the Round Burbage Walk identified in the BNP. The proposal would provide for the reinstatement of the bridleway across the site and, if considered appropriate, its diversion through the open space avoiding potential vehicle/horse conflict within the development. The combination of these environmental benefits attracts significant weight.
28. Whilst the obligations contained in the UU are generated because of the development, improvements to local services and facilities could result in some wider public benefit. I attach limited weight to those benefits.

Planning Balance

29. The development plan includes, the Core Strategy (CS) adopted in 2009, the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (DPD) adopted in 2016 and the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) made in 2021. Although there is an emerging local plan, the lpa confirmed that it was unlikely to be adopted before 2025. No party has given the emerging plan any weight.
30. The parties agree that, as the lpa cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land and as the CS and the DPD rely on an out-of-date evidence base, the most important policies for determining this appeal are out of date and Framework paragraph 11d(ii) is engaged. Thus, where the policies most important for determining a proposal are out-of-date, the decision maker should grant permission unless, any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
31. There is no conflict with the CS and DPD Policy DM17 - Highways and Transportation and, given my conclusions on the impact on the traffic calming measures on Sketchley Lane, no conflict with BNP Policy 12 – Important Trees. The site lies outside the settlement boundary and for the application of development plan policy is countryside. BNP Policy 1 is supportive of residential development on land within or adjacent to the settlement boundary subject to compliance with other development plan policies. These policies are broadly consistent with the Framework.
32. The remaining relevant policies are DPD Policies DM4 – Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation and DM10 – Development and Design. Policy DM4 seeks to protect the intrinsic value, beauty, open and landscape character of the countryside by safeguarding it from unsustainable development and where it does not have a significant adverse effect on the value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside. Policy DM10c indicates that development will be permitted where it would complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area, having regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials, and architectural features.
33. The scheme would have a moderate adverse landscape and visual effect at Year 1 reducing to minor as the landscaping matures and the development, particularly the traffic calming measures, would not have an adverse effect on the character of Sketchley Lane. This harm falls well below the threshold

required by DPD Policy DM4 to conflict with the policy i.e., a significant adverse effect. As layout, design and materials are all reserve matters, I have no reason to conclude that the proposal would conflict with DPD Policy DM10. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan read as a whole.

34. Notwithstanding the above, even if the degree of landscape and visual harm did exceed the threshold set by DPD Policy DM4, the adverse impacts of the development, including loss of B&MV agricultural land and some ridge and furrow earthworks, do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Conditions

35. For the reasons set out in the agreed list of conditions and having regard to PPG, the suggested conditions are reasonable and necessary. Where necessary in the interests of precision and enforceability, I have reordered and reworded some of the suggested conditions.

Conclusion

36. For the above reasons, and having taken all other matters into consideration, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule of Conditions.

George Baird

Inspector

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. Details of the layout, scale, appearance, landscaping, and access other than vehicular access (hereinafter called the reserved matters) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.
2. Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to the dwellings shall be made within 18 months from the date of this permission and the development shall be begun not later than one year from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
3. The plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in the above conditions shall include details relating to the:
 - a) appearance of the development, including the aspects of a building or place that determine the visual impression it makes, including proposed materials and finishes,
 - b) landscaping of the site including treatment of private and public space to enhance or protect the site's amenity through hard (boundary treatments) and soft measures and details of boundary planting to reinforce the existing landscaping at the site edges,
 - c) layout of the site including the way in which buildings, circulation routes and open spaces are provided and the relationship of these buildings and spaces outside the development. This should include a design statement that sets out how consideration has been given to lower density to edges of site and higher density along main routes. It should also include a scheme for the treatment of the Public Right(s) of Way within the site, including provision for their management during construction, surfacing, width, structures, signing, landscaping and details of suitable crossings and safe segregation between equestrian users and vehicular traffic, in accordance with the principles set out in Leicestershire County Council's Guidance Notes for Developers,
 - d) scale of each building proposed in relation to its surroundings,
 - e) non-vehicular access for pedestrians, cycles and equestrian users.
4. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted application details, as follows:

Site Boundary Drg No epd4824_d002h received 08/09/21
Demolition Plan Drg No epd4824_d043c received 08/09/21
Sketchley Lane Site Access Drg No 50711/5501/002 received 08/09/21
Building Heights Drg No edp4824_d015k received 08/09/21
Land Budget Drg No edp4824_d037n received 08/09/21.
5. Any reserved matters application relating to scale or layout shall be accompanied by a scheme which details the proposed housing mix for the development which should be in accordance with the first paragraph of Policy 16 of the Core Strategy 2009. Development shall then be completed in accordance with the approved details.

6. Any reserved matters application relating to scale or layout shall be accompanied by full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floors of the proposed buildings in relation to existing ground levels. The details shall be provided in the form of site plans showing sections across the site at regular intervals with the finished floor levels of all proposed buildings and adjoining buildings. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
7. Reserved matters applications relating to layout, scale and appearance shall be accompanied by a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from noise from the road network and the nearby hotel. The agreed scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of any dwelling.
8. The layout submitted at Reserved Matters shall provide a natural vegetation buffer zone of at least 5m alongside all retained hedgerows within the application site.
9. No development shall commence until representative samples of the types and colours of materials to be used on the external elevations of the proposed dwellings and garages have been deposited with and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
10. No development shall commence above damp proof course level until a scheme for provision of electric charging points to dwellings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
11. Notwithstanding the recommendations within the Phase 1 Ground Condition Assessment, no development shall commenced until a scheme for the investigation of any potential land contamination on the site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme shall include details of how any contamination shall be dealt with. The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and any remediation works so approved shall be carried out prior to the site first being occupied.
12. If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, no further development shall take place until an addendum to the scheme for the investigation of all potential land contamination and implementation is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, which shall include details of how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. Any remediation works so approved shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed implementation period.
13. No development shall commence until details of all trees, shrubs, and hedges to be retained, including any trees located outside but adjacent to the site boundary, together with the means of protecting them from damage during the carrying out of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved means of protection shall be installed prior to the commencement of development and shall remain in place until after the completion of the development.
14. During the construction period, none of the trees or hedges indicated to be retained shall be cut down, uprooted, or destroyed, nor shall be topped or

lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans, without the written approval of the local planning authority. If any of the trees or hedges to be retained are removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, a replacement shall be planted at the same place and that tree or hedge shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

15. No development shall commence until details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme should include infiltration testing to confirm (or otherwise) the suitability of the site for the use of infiltration as a drainage element and should ensure that surface water does not drain into the Public Highway. The submitted scheme should also include details of the management of surface water on site during construction of the development. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
16. No development shall commence on site until details of the long term maintenance of the sustainable surface water drainage system within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
17. No development shall commence on site until a scheme that makes provision for waste and recycling storage and collection across the site has been submitted in writing to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details should address accessibility to storage facilities and adequate collection point space at the adopted highway boundary. The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.
18. No development shall commence on site until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the approved details shall then remain in force throughout the construction period. The CEMP shall detail how, during the site preparation and construction phase of the development, the impact from dust, odour, noise, smoke, light and land contamination on existing and proposed residential premises and the environment shall be prevented or mitigated. The CEMP shall detail how such controls will be monitored and a procedure for the investigation of complaints.
19. No development shall commence on the site until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), including, as a minimum, details of the routing of construction traffic, wheel cleansing facilities, vehicle parking facilities and a timetable for their provision, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The construction of the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved CTMP and timetable.
20. No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a Level 2 Historic Building Survey and Topographic Survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the land and structures that are included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and:

- the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works,
- the programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

No development shall then take place other than in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation.

21. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of a scheme for the provision of electronic communications networking to serve the development, including full fibre broadband connections (unless evidence is submitted to demonstrate this is not available for the site) to each dwelling, and a timetable for implementation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable.
22. No part of the development shall be occupied until the offsite works shown on Stantec drawing number 332010596-700-001 Rev A or a subsequent amended design that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority have been implemented in full.
23. No part of the development shall be occupied until the access arrangements shown on drawing 50711/5501/002 have been implemented in full.
24. No part of the development shall be occupied until vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 45 metres have been provided at the site access. These shall thereafter be permanently maintained with nothing within those splays higher than 0.6 metres above the level of the adjacent footway/verge/highway.
25. The agreed Travel Plan (dated September 2021) shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
26. No trees and shrubs shall be removed on site during the bird nesting season (1 March – 31 July inclusive).
27. Site preparation and construction work shall be limited to between 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays. There shall be no working on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Paul G Tucker KC and Arevik Jackson, instructed by Mr B Greep, Stantec UK Limited.
He called:

Dai Lewis, BA (Hons), PG Dip LA, CMLI.
Director, The Environmental Dimension Partnership Limited.

Bernard Greep, BA (Hons), BTP, MRTPI, MIED.
Director, Stantec UK Limited.

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Hugh Richards of Counsel, instructed by the Head of Legal Services, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.

He called:

Dr David Hickie BSc (Hons), MA, PhD, CMLI, MIEMA, IHBC.
Principal Consultant, David Hickie Associates.

Andrew Gray MSc TP, MRTPI, MSc, UP&R, MIED.
Associate Planning Director, Aitchison Rafferty, Chartered Town Planning Consultants.

Interested Persons

Mr Rooney
Local Resident.

Cllr. B Walker
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough and Burbage Parish Council.

Cllr R Fleming
Burbage Parish Councillor & Chairman, Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Working Party.

Cllr P Williams
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.

Documents Submitted at the Inquiry

- | | | |
|-------|---|---|
| Doc 1 | - | List of conditions. |
| Doc 2 | - | Certified copy of the S106 Unilateral Undertaking. |
| Doc 3 | - | Submissions by Mr Rooney. |
| Doc 4 | - | Submissions by Cllr. Walker. |
| Doc 5 | - | Submissions by Mr Fleming. |
| Doc 6 | - | Submissions by Cllr. Williams. |
| Doc 7 | - | Statement of Common Ground – Local Wildlife Sites. |
| Doc 8 | - | Agreed distances for public open space gaps. |
| Doc 9 | - | Agreed area where proposed housing development not visible. |