



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 28 October 2025

Accompanied site visit made on 28 October 2025

Unaccompanied site visit made on 29 October 2025

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/25/3369401

Land off York Close, Market Bosworth CV13 0ND

(Grid Ref Easting: 440192; Grid Ref Northing: 302649)

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00831/OUT.
 - The development proposed is outline planning application for the erection of up to 100 dwellings (including 40% affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) a vehicular access point and the demolition of one residential dwelling. All matters reserved except for means of access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for means of access. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis, treating the submitted Development Framework plan as only being indicative.
3. A signed and dated Section 106 Planning Agreement (the S106) was submitted following the Hearing. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to the lack of S106 contributions for the delivery of affordable housing and public open space as well as contributions towards highways, health, education, waste services and libraries. After a short discussion on the use of a Management Company regarding open space, it was agreed at the Hearing that the Draft S106 addressed the second reason for refusal. On the basis that the completed S106 reflects the Draft S106 discussed at the Hearing, the second reason for refusal has therefore fallen away. The S106 meets the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and I have had regard to it accordingly.
4. The Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan (MBNP) was made in July 2025. This replaces a previous neighbourhood plan for the area. Both main parties were aware of this and this matter is addressed in the Statement of Common Ground. I have had regard to the made MBNP in reaching my decision.

5. It was requested that I view the appeal site from properties adjacent to it, including 29, 33 and 37 York Close. It was also requested that I view the access route leading to the site from a number of other properties on York Close. I was able to do so at my visit.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of residents of York Close with regard to noise, disturbance and character; and
- Other considerations relevant to the planning balance.

Reasons

Living Conditions

7. Vehicular access to the appeal site would be provided via the residential cul-de-sac of York Close. The proposal includes the demolition of a dwelling at 35 York Close, with an access road and adjacent footpath leading from York Close into the appeal site via the gap created by the demolished dwelling.
8. Although York Close is a residential cul-de-sac, the extent of the road leading from the junction with Tudor Close serves a relatively large number of dwellings with commensurate traffic movements. However, the proposed access to the appeal site would be located at the head of the cul-de-sac, where the number of vehicle movements in this extent of York Close would be very low as it would primarily consist of the vehicles of residents and visitors. At the Hearing, it was set out that the existing peak hour movements from dwellings to the west of the proposed access would be approximately 3-4 vehicles, and for the cluster of properties at the head of the cul-de-sac it would be approximately 6-7 vehicles.
9. There would also be a number of pedestrian and cycle movements, including those associated with a public right of way which leads to the surrounding countryside, but I consider that this would reflect the quiet suburban character of York Close even allowing for the movements associated with the right of way.
10. The extent of York Close closest to the proposed access is of a quiet suburban character, and includes some properties which have rear gardens overlooking an area of countryside of a rural and peaceful character.
11. The traffic movements generated by the proposal would follow a relatively convoluted route. Vehicles entering the site from York Close would descend down the slope of the highway and then make an 'S' turn to enter the new junction. Vehicles would then ascend up a slope into the site. Vehicles leaving the site would reverse this route, albeit with the further potential for pausing and queuing at the junction. This would introduce noise from braking, accelerating and tyre noise from manoeuvres.
12. The appellant has submitted a Noise Impact Assessment¹ (NIA) which states that the proposal would introduce up to 473 vehicle trips during the day and 12 at night². The appellant also states that the development would result in approximately an

¹ sharps acoustics, York Close, Market Bosworth, Noise Impact Assessment, 21 August 2024.

² Para 4.1 of NIA.

additional 55 to 65 vehicle movements in the peak hours and an additional 45 pedestrian trips from the appeal site. Compared to the existing traffic flows on York Close, this would lead to a very significant increase in traffic movements, particularly in respect of the properties closest to the proposed access.

13. This would materially change the character of this area of York Close from a quiet cul-de-sac to a busy route leading to a housing estate of up to 100 dwellings, with the associated noise and disturbance from vehicular and other highway movements. Given the change in the noise environment as well as to the character of the head of the cul-de-sac, I consider that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of residents in the vicinity of the access.
14. In particular, the proposal would introduce traffic movements in close proximity to 33 and 37 York Close, which are located on either side of the dwelling to be demolished. The proposal would lead to a significant increase in traffic movements and manoeuvres to the front of these properties, and would introduce new highway movements to the side and extending to the rear which would contrast significantly with the existing environment. The change in the immediate environment of these properties and the associated increase in noise and disturbance would be dramatic, with commensurate harm to the amenity of residents. I am not persuaded that the provision of a fence adjacent to the new access road would be sufficient to mitigate this harm, and indeed this may raise other concerns regarding visual impact on the streetscape and the outlook from adjacent properties.
15. The Council has not challenged the appellant's technical evidence, and the Council's Environmental Health Officer has not objected to the proposal. However, there were some elements of the NIA which I queried prior to the Hearing and at the Hearing itself.
16. The appellant's NIA is based on library data, and prior to the Hearing I queried whether this was representative of the nature of traffic movements generated by the appeal proposal. The appellant emphasised that the library data is a reasonable proxy to the movements generated in the vicinity of the junction, and in the lack of substantive evidence to the contrary I have no reason to disagree.
17. However, I have other concerns in respect of the NIA which were discussed at the Hearing.
18. The NIA is based on an assessment period of 16 hours during the day, and 8 hours at night. However, a significant potential noise impact would be at the peak hours of traffic movements, and this may not be represented by the long daytime averaging period used in the NIA. The night averaging period may also not represent the impact of the individual and distinct nature of noise events from traffic movements, particularly compared to the existing context of the rear of dwellings and rear gardens facing onto a quiet area of countryside. The IMEA Guidelines³ emphasise the potential for a long averaging time masking a potentially significant effect. Although the monitoring periods used in the NIA may be standard practice when assessing traffic noise, I am not persuaded that they are a robust approach to assessing the particular circumstances of the appeal proposal, including the nature of the traffic movements and the comparative change from the existing noise environment.

³ Guidelines For Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, Institute Of Environmental Management & Assessment, Version 1.2 (November 2014).

19. Furthermore, the NIA is based on a noise survey with a monitoring location at the front of No 35. The existing noise climate set out in the NIA refers to vehicles on York Close and people passing at the front of the dwelling rather than the rear. However, the built form of the dwellings provides a degree of acoustic shielding for the rooms and gardens to the rear. The rear rooms and gardens would have a more secluded character with a noise environment more representative of the quiet area of countryside that they look onto. The reliance on a monitoring location to the front of the dwellings does not represent a robust basis to assess noise impacts to the rear.
20. It is common that access to new housing development is taken through established residential areas, as is reflected in the Farnham Appeal Decision⁴ referred to by the appellant. However, based on the evidence before me, the Farnham development would generate traffic movements that would pass along an existing route and lead directly into the appeal site with minimal need for manoeuvring. Although direct access such as the Farnham development may lead to a significant increase in traffic, it would not lead to the convoluted traffic movements that would result from the appeal proposal before me. I am also mindful of the circumstances of the Spode Close Appeal Decision⁵ referred to by the Council, which was dismissed due to harm to living conditions even though the Local Planning Authority had not disputed the technical evidence.
21. The appellant refers to other dwellings in the area which are located close to highways, and I observed a number of these on my site visit. However, these are part of planned estates and do not represent the circumstances of the appeal proposal in respect of the scale of change as well as the contrived nature of the access. The consideration of other dwellings does not therefore lead me to a different conclusion based upon what I have seen and read.
22. I acknowledge that the Council's concerns on this issue are relatively subjective, compared to the technical evidence provided by the appellant. However, for the reasons stated previously, it is the appellant's evidence in respect of living conditions that I consider is not robust, and it is the concerns of the Council as well as residents of York Close which I consider to be well-founded.
23. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to substantial harm to the living conditions of residents at the head of the cul-de-sac due to noise and disturbance as well as due to the change in the character of the quiet residential area of this part of York Close due to the very significant increase in traffic movements. Rather than having a limited impact on residential amenity as referred to by the appellant, I consider that this would be equivalent to or greater than a Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level within the terms of the Noise Policy Statement for England, with commensurate substantial adverse effects on residents in the vicinity of the access.
24. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD 2016 (SADMP) which requires that development would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents including the matter of noise amongst other things. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to achieve a high standard of amenity.

⁴ APP/R3650/W/24/3353124 Land at Old Park Lane, Farnham

⁵ Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/A/14/2220297 Land at Spode Close, Stone, Staffordshire

Other Considerations

25. Table 3 of the appellant's Statement of Case summarises the weight it considers should be given to the benefits and harms of the proposal. There is some disagreement between the main parties as to the scale of weighting to be used. In effect, this relates to whether 'substantial' weight is the same as 'significant' or 'very significant' weight. The Council refers to the *Ward*⁶ judgment which it considers found that the word 'substantial' does not denote a greater quantum of weight than 'significant'. However, this depends on the context of the Appeal Decision that the *Ward* judgment related to. Within the context of the appeal before me, either of the suggested scales of weighting are appropriate, as long as any ambiguity or uncertainty is avoided. In the interests of clarity, I have used the scale of weighting as stated by the appellant, in that reference to 'very significant' weight is the same as 'substantial' weight.
26. The Council's latest published housing land supply position is 3.89 years. Market Bosworth is a sustainable location for housing growth, with key services and facilities to meet the needs of future residents and which can be accessed by safe walking routes. The proposal would provide up to 60 **market dwellings** which are capable of being delivered within the next 5 years. Given the Council's housing land supply as well as the sustainable location, the provision of these dwellings carries significant weight in favour of the proposal.
27. The proposal would also provide up to 40 **affordable homes**, which the appellant considers should be given very significant weight. The Council contends that this should only be given significant weight, and has referred to a number of appeal decisions in support of that weighting. However, the appellant's evidence⁷ indicates that the shortfall in the provision of affordable housing is proportionally greater than the shortfall in the wider housing land supply. On that basis, I consider that commensurately greater weight should be given to the provision of affordable housing and that this therefore carries very significant weight in favour of the appeal. I have had regard to the Appeal Decisions referred to by the Council but it has not been demonstrated that those Inspectors were presented with the same evidence which is before me.
28. The proposal would generate **economic benefits** including construction spend, job creation and household spending. However, the construction period would only be for a limited time. Even allowing for the scale of the development, the job creation and household spend would not be of a significant degree, particularly in the context of a settlement the size of Market Bosworth. The proposal would generate New Homes Bonus payments, but rather than being a benefit it is paid to mitigate the additional demand of new residents on services in the area. Rather than the significant weight afforded by the appellant I consider that the economic benefits would carry only moderate weight in favour of the proposal. This reflects the conclusion reached by the inspector on a previous appeal⁸ on the site, which included a greater number of dwellings.
29. The appellant refers to the provision of areas for **public open space and recreation**, including the provision of allotments. I have had regard to the Development Framework plan submitted by the appellant, however this is

⁶ Ward v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities & Anor [2024] EWHC 676 (Admin)

⁷ Including Section 4.8 and Table 2 of the Statement of Case.

⁸ Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/23/3317090

indicative and these benefits would be considered in detail at the Reserved Matters stage. Furthermore, based on the evidence before me, these benefits would primarily cater for residents of the appeal proposal and therefore carry only limited weight as a wider public benefit.

30. The appellant also refers to **biodiversity** improvements at the site through new hedgerow, tree and other planting as well as the provision of gardens and open spaces. Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) could also be provided off-site through credits. However, in their decision on the previous appeal, the inspector concluded that the site is already well served by green infrastructure, and even allowing for the potential BNG provisions, they gave this limited weight as a benefit. It has not been demonstrated that the appeal before me would deliver significantly greater biodiversity benefits compared to the previous scheme, and on that basis I give this limited weight as a benefit.
31. The **S106 contributions** would primarily address issues arising from the development itself, and I therefore give this limited weight as a benefit.
32. Turning to the harms arising from the proposal, with regard to the matter of **character and appearance** including the effect on the landscape, the appeal site is not the subject of any open space or landscape designations. The proposal would introduce new development into open fields but it would not intrude significantly into the countryside around the town. The area of built development would be well-contained within existing field boundaries and would be viewed as a logical extension to the built extent of the settlement.
33. Residents of many properties overlooking the site would see a significant change in their aspect, with open countryside being replaced by housing. However, this effect could be mitigated to a degree through the use of appropriate separation distances, boundary treatments and open space. The visual effect on properties on Shenton Lane would be minor adverse reducing to negligible in the long term as set out in the appellant's Landscape and Visual Appraisal. Nevertheless, the impacts on properties on York Close, Stanley Road and Northumberland Avenue would be major/moderate adverse, and for some properties this is unlikely to reduce.
34. In views from the south and southwest on the Site Visit Route provided at the Hearing, the development would largely be seen within the context of the built extent of the settlement with some screening by existing landscape features and the undulating topography. A viewpoint on Priors Lane/Tinsel Lane is identified as an Important Vista in the MBNP, but even allowing for the importance of this vista the effect on it would be moderate-minor adverse reducing to minor adverse in the longer term. The development would be apparent in views from Public Right of Way S72/6 (PRoW), but the visual effects would be moderate adverse reducing to minor adverse in the long term.
35. Shenton Lane is of a rural character on an approach to the village. However, the proposed dwellings would be separated from Shenton Lane by a field and located behind an established hedgeline. Although roofs of the houses may be visible, the screening and separation of the built development from Shenton Lane would be a significant mitigation. The Council refers to the urbanising effect of a play area and footpath located on the field between the extent of housing and Shenton Lane, as shown on a Framework Plan. However, these details are indicative, and the

location and extent of the play area would be addressed by the Reserved Matters. The provision of a footpath to Shenton Lane falls within the remit of the appeal before me, but the reserved matters would consider issues such as layout and landscaping which may mitigate harm arising from this new pedestrian route.

36. In summary, the proposal would impact on views of the countryside from residential properties overlooking the site, but given suitable mitigation this would not be of a sufficient degree to warrant the refusal of planning permission. The impacts on views from the wider area, including an Important Vista, PRoW and Shenton Lane would also not be sufficient to dismiss the appeal. In particular, within the terms of Policy CE3 of the MBNP, the development would not have a significant adverse impact on an important view, vista or the character of the Parish.
37. On the matter of **heritage** assets, Shenton Lane contributes to the setting of the Market Bosworth Conservation Area (CA) as it provides an approach of a countryside character to the CA. As set out in the CA Appraisal, the countryside around Market Bosworth and its relationship with the entrance roads is a major factor in the appreciation of the character of the settlement. This setting is an important component in the significance of the CA.
38. The extent of the proposed housing would be separated from Shenton Lane by an existing field. Although the roofs of the houses would be visible, due to the degree of separation and screening from vegetation the effect on the countryside character of Shenton Lane would be limited. The effect of the proposed pedestrian link could also be mitigated at the reserved matters stage through the consideration of issues such as layout and landscaping. Reference is made to a play area on the field adjacent to Shenton Lane, but this is indicative and does not fall within the scope of the appeal before me. Due to the visibility of the roofs of the dwellings and the potential effect of the footpath, the proposal would harm the countryside character of the approach to the CA along Shenton Lane. However, this harm would be less than substantial and would be at the lowermost level of the spectrum of harm. Nevertheless, the Framework recognises the potential for harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset from development within its setting and it requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of the CA as a designated heritage asset, I attribute this harm considerable importance and weight.
39. There are extensive areas of ridge and furrow earthworks within the site, which are part of surviving ridge and furrow across the parish of Market Bosworth and which is collectively identified as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposed residential development would result in the total loss of most of the ridge and furrow earthworks within a significant extent of the site, although part may be retained on the field adjacent to Shenton Lane. However, the proposal would result in the loss of only part of the wider ridge and furrow present around the town. Considered in respect of the non-designated heritage asset as a whole, the proposal would result in only minor harm to its significance. On that basis, I give this harm limited weight.
40. The harm to the designated heritage asset, which I found to be very much less than substantial but which nonetheless attracts considerable importance and weight, would be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposal. The appellant has also undertaken an archaeological desk-based assessment and trial trenching which uncovered no significant archaeological remains. On that basis, the proposal

would not conflict with the heritage and archaeology requirements of Policies DM11, DM12 and DM13 of the SADMP and Policy BD4 of the MBNP.

41. The proposal would lead to some noise and disturbance during the **construction phase**, however this would be for a short-term period. I understand the concerns expressed by residents in respect of potential construction traffic movements through York Close. However, it may be possible to provide a temporary access in another location. On that basis, and subject to mitigation by conditions, I give the harm arising from the construction period very limited weight.
42. In respect of **planning policy conflict**, Policy DM4 of the SADMP sets out forms of development in the countryside which are considered to be sustainable, subject to a number of wider criteria at DM4(i-v). The proposal does not fall within the forms of development listed in the policy and it would therefore conflict with it.
43. The appellant considers that the conflict with Policy DM4 should be given limited weight. In part, this stems from the appellant's contention that the Council seeks to apply the policy as a blanket protection of the countryside, which is not consistent with the Framework. However, the policy does include forms of development within the countryside which are considered to be sustainable, and on that basis I do not consider it to represent a blanket ban. Policy DM4 supports forms of development which it considers to be sustainable, and on that basis I consider that it is in broad compliance with the Framework.
44. I have had regard to the comments of the Inspector in the previous appeal where he concluded that Policy DM4 sought to 'protect' the intrinsic value of the countryside whereas the Framework refers to it being 'recognised'. They considered that the wording of the Policy is more restrictive than the Framework and gave the conflict with the Policy moderate weight. I note that Policy DM4 in safeguarding the countryside seeks to "*protect its intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character*". However, given that the Policy identifies development in the countryside which is considered to be sustainable, I consider that the policy is in effect a recognition of the character and beauty of the countryside rather than a blanket protection. The previous appeal does not therefore lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the broad compliance of Policy DM4 with the Framework, and this reflects other Appeal Decisions in the area referred to by the Council.
45. However, the Council's housing land supply position has worsened since the previous appeal. Both main parties agree that settlement boundaries are required to flex for the Council to meet a five year housing land supply. I am also mindful that the proposal would not conflict with the wider criteria of Policy DM4(i-v), and in particular that it would not lead to a significant adverse effect on landscape character and the countryside. On that basis, I consider that the conflict with Policy DM4 should be given limited weight in the circumstances of the appeal proposal.
46. Policy CE5 of the MBNP refers to development outside the development boundary, and sets out that any housing proposal adjacent to the existing settlement boundary will be considered positively providing it is accompanied by an up-to-date housing needs assessment. The proposal was accompanied by such an assessment, and given the identified housing need in the area the proposal would comply with this element of Policy CE5. However, Policy CE5 also refers to national

policy and the development plan for the area as well as that any adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits of the development, and I shall return to this later.

47. Paragraph 14 of the Framework sets out provisions where if the presumption at paragraph 11(d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This includes where the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan within five years or less (the MBNP was made in 2025), and where it contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement.
48. Although the MBNP includes a housing site allocation, the Examiners Report states that “...*there will be a need to review the housing allocations for the NP area, in the near future. Until such a review of the NP takes place, and the housing need for the area has progressed sufficiently through the Local Plan process to a point where it carries weight, windfall development proposals will not be resisted*”. This is reflected in the flexible wording of Policy CE5 of the MBNP which requires that any housing proposal adjacent to the settlement boundary should be accompanied by an up-to-date housing needs assessment. This flexible approach to windfall development indicates that the housing needs for the area have not been formally identified. Therefore, although the MBNP has been made within the last 5 years, it does not contain policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. The provisions of Paragraph 14 of the Framework are therefore not triggered.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

49. Due to the Council’s housing land supply position the ‘tilted balance’ of paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is triggered unless (i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or (ii) 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.
50. In respect of paragraph 11(d)(i), although I have identified harm in respect of heritage assets, this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Although the ridge and furrow is of archaeological interest, the submitted evidence shows that it is not of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument. Therefore, the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, such as designated heritage assets and other heritage assets of archaeological interest, does not provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. The provisions of paragraph 11(d)(i) of the Framework therefore do not prevent the application of the tilted balance.
51. With regard to paragraph 11(d)(ii), the contribution of the development to the supply of market housing would be a significant benefit. The contribution to the supply of affordable housing would be a substantial benefit. When considered cumulatively, these and other benefits arising from the proposal would be of substantial weight. The proposal would also comply with key policies for directing development to sustainable locations and providing affordable homes, and other than the effect on the residents of York Close it would represent an effective use of land. However, due to the harm to the living conditions of residents of York Close, the proposal would not secure a well-designed place.

52. The appellant emphasised at the Hearing that it is impossible to develop sites without some harm to amenity. The Framework supports the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, and the appellant emphasised at the Hearing that the tilted balance should be given some 'teeth'. However, this should not lead to development at any cost. Compared to the substantial weight to be given to the benefits of the development, it would lead to disproportionate harm to the living conditions of the residents of York Close located closest to the proposed access. Within the terms of the appellant's scale of weighting, I give 'full weight' to the harm to the living conditions of these residents, and this is the decisive issue in this appeal.
53. Despite the limited number of properties closest to the access, the harm to the residents of these properties would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
54. I have concluded that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM10 of the SADMP in respect of the living conditions of nearby residents. It would also conflict with Policy DM4 in respect of development in the countryside, although I have previously concluded that this conflict should carry only limited weight. The proposal would also conflict with Policy CE5 of the MBNP as the adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits of the development. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
55. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR

Appearances

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Philip Robson	Counsel
Megan Streets	Planning Manager, Gladman Developments Limited
Simon Helme	Ashley Helme Associates Ltd

FOR THE COUNCIL:

Tim Hartley	Planning Consultant
-------------	---------------------

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr John Wastenev	Market Bosworth Parish Council
Nigel Brewster	Market Bosworth Community in Action
Valerie Cheshire	
Shirley Warner	
Christopher Ball	
Christopher Kitson	

Documents Submitted at the Hearing

1. Spode Close High Court Decision - BDW Trading Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 886 (Admin)
2. Spode Close Court of Appeal - Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government v BDW Trading Ltd [2016] EWCA Civ 493
3. Market Bosworth Conditions Comparison Table
4. Ward High Court Decision - Ward v SSLUHC [2024] EWHC 676 (Admin)
5. York Close, Market Bosworth – Site Visit Route

Documents Submitted Following the Hearing

1. A Report to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council of the Examination of The Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan Review 2020-2039; Dr Louise Brooke-Smith, OBE, FRICS, MRTPI; Independent Examiner; March 2025.
2. Completed Section 106 Agreement

Richborough