
Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 16 - 19 September 2025

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/W/25/3365777

Land off Oak Road, Littlethorpe LE19 2HZ

- 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 Blaby District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0527/OUT.
 - The development proposed is up to 155no. residential dwellings (including affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "up to 155no. residential dwellings (including affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point" at Land off Oak Road, Littlethorpe LE19 2HZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0527/OUT, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal scheme is submitted in outline with details of access only and all other matters reserved. I have amended the description of development in the banner heading above to remove reference to the outline nature of the proposals in the interests of clarity and because it is not development.
3. The appellant has submitted a number of plans identified as being of illustrative only. I have not included these plans in the condition specifying the approved plans and where I have had regard to the plans it is on the basis that they are illustrative only.
4. The parties entered into a comprehensive Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and amongst a number of matters the parties agreed that the council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 years housing land supply and that the shortfall is significant, there being only 2.45¹ years supply. Accordingly, the tilted balance of paragraph 11d of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) is engaged²
5. Moreover, the parties have agreed an addendum SoCG amending the council's position such that the parties now agree that, "applying the tilted balance the harms identified, whether adjudged on the basis of the Council's assessment or the

¹ Paragraph 2.6.7 Planning Statement of Common Ground

² Paragraph 2.8.2, Planning Statement of Common Ground

Appellant's, do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing at a time when the Council has a substantial shortfall against the requirement to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land."

Main Issues

6. The main issues are

: The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Planning Policy Context

7. In this instance the Development Plan (DP) consists of the Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document³ and the Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document⁴.
8. The appeal site is located outside of the limits to built development defined in the Development Plan, Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy is therefore relevant and while the policy does not specifically preclude development in the countryside it is subject to the requirement that development does not have a "significantly adverse effect on the appearance or character of the landscape" and clearly acknowledges "the need to retain Countryside would be balanced against the need to provide new development (including housing) in the most sustainable locations".
9. Policy DM2 of the Delivery DPD, refers to development in the countryside and supports development proposals consistent with Policy CS18 subject to several criteria being met.

Character and Appearance

10. Littlethorpe appears as a pleasant village, where twentieth century development has expanded from an older historic core along Station Road and the Square. Most of the buildings in the village are two storeys in height, with single storey dwellings to the western edge adjacent to the appeal site. The village is separated from Narborough by agricultural fields and public open space that run alongside River Soar and the railway line.
11. The parties agree⁵ that the appeal site is situated in a sustainable location for development and based on my observations at the site visit I agree, the site is located near to and with good links to a range of services and facilities in the local area. The parties also agree that the appeal site is not situated within a valued landscape⁶ and does not contain any unique or notable landscape features, beyond those representative and characteristic of the surrounding landscape⁷.
12. The appeal scheme would see the development of agricultural farmland to a residential development of up to 155 dwellings, including open space and landscaping outside of but immediately adjacent to the edge of the settlement. The edge of settlement location is a significant influence on the character and appearance of the area and the appeal site itself.

³ Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2013)

⁴ Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document (2019)

⁵ 3.4.7 Statement of Common Ground

⁶ Paragraph 3.16.2, Planning SoCG. also paragraph 14, Landscape SoCG

⁷ Paragraph 13, Landscape SoCG.

13. The parties agree that these effects are primarily related to the appeal site and that the effects diminish with distance from the appeal site as screening vegetation and other features intervene and based on my observations at the site visit, I agree.
14. In visual terms the change would predominantly be experienced by residents on Beachwood Road and Chestnut Close and by users of BOAT 43 that traverses the appeal site. Users of the public right of way west of Lodge Farm, pedestrians on Coventry Road (B4114) to the west of the appeal site and residents on the western part of Oak Road would experience a lower level of effect as a result of the appeal scheme. This is not at dispute between the parties⁸.
15. I saw at the site visit that when viewed from the west, outside of the settlement, the appeal site is seen with the backdrop of existing built development and on the basis of the evidence before me I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would appear as part of this built development.
16. Views to the west and Croft Hill are illustrated in viewpoints 1 and 2 of the LVIA⁹ were identified by the council as being important and this appears to be supported by representations from local residents. I am satisfied that views out of the site to the west from the BOAT and public rights of way and public open space within the appeal site could be incorporated into the proposed development.
17. The submitted plans show that landscaping within and to the boundaries of the proposed development once established can, based on the evidence before me, substantially soften the appearance of the appeal scheme and aid its integration into this landscape that is already significantly influenced by the adjacent built development.
18. Moreover, the submitted plans show, and I saw at the site visit that the appeal scheme would not result in the coalescence between Littlethorpe and Narborough. Though I note it would elongate but not narrow the existing green gap separating the two settlements and I do not consider this to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
19. Referring to the Design and Access Statement, the appellant's planning witness detailed that the appeal scheme would, while maintaining a proposed density of 35 dwellings per hectare with a mix of housing, create a more considered transition from the current hard edge of the settlement to more rural landscape beyond, with the creation of a new settlement edge with high quality green infrastructure. I consider that this is not always reflected in the evidence before me, in particular the illustrative plan, shows terraced properties to the periphery of the site as opposed to a reduced density in such locations. Nonetheless the appeal is in outline form, and I am satisfied that it has been demonstrated that such details can satisfactorily be resolved as part of the reserved matters.
20. While there would be a long-term minor/moderate adverse effect on the character of the Appeal Site itself and this would primarily effect local residents and users of the byway, the effect on the local character area would be minor adverse overall as a result of the appeal site being physically and visually well contained, its location adjacent to the existing settlement, and because the area is already heavily influenced by built development.

⁸ Paragraph 25 Landscape Statement of Common Ground

⁹ In XX Mr. Collinge confirmed that these were the viewpoints.

21. Therefore, I do not consider that the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the local landscape. As such, a significantly adverse effect on the appearance or character of the landscape, the key test of policy CS18, does not occur and there is no conflict with that policy in this regard. Consequently, there is no conflict with the provisions of policy DM2.

Other Matters

Flooding

22. Local residents submitted evidence, including photographs, of flooding events in the local area and identified flooding as a serious concern in the local area. The Framework seeks to direct development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding and not to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. It is readily apparent that the local area has experienced recent and severe flood events that have impacted upon the local highway network and land around Littlethorpe.
23. However, I note that the redline boundary of the appeal site does not follow the field boundaries currently seen on site and have been drawn such that the land to be developed for housing is within Flood Risk Zone 1 (the lowest risk flood zone) only, excluding the adjacent land (farmland, brooks and River Soar) that lies within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3.
24. The appellant's flood witness¹⁰ noted that none of the many photographs submitted by local residents showed flooding on the appeal site, while acknowledging that flooding around the appeal site was readily apparent. At the site visit I was able to positively identify that one photograph referred to by a local resident being a photograph of the appeal site from Beechwood Road was in fact taken from a property on Sycamore Way and the image, showing flooded fields, did not include the appeal site. The local resident confirmed this at the Inquiry.
25. The evidence submitted by the appellant demonstrates that there would be a betterment to the widely recognised flooding issues elsewhere around Littlethorpe through the reduction in the surface water runoff rates¹¹ from the appeal site. Although I understand this would make little material difference wider are because of the scale of the flooding locally.
26. I note that there is no objection to the appeal scheme from either the council, Environment Agency or the Lead Local Flood Authority and I am satisfied that the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) demonstrates that the appeal site is not at risk of flooding and would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This is in accordance with the provisions of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Highways

27. At the Inquiry, local residents described existing concerns they had with regards to the local highway network and the effect of the appeal scheme on the local highway network. These included construction traffic travelling through residential areas,

¹⁰ Mr. Matthew James Travis BSc (Hons), MSc, MCIWEM, C.WEM, CEnv, CSci

¹¹ Table 6.2 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) & Drainage Strategy report by Enzygo dated June 2024, Core Document 1.8 and paragraph 2.10 of Mr M Travis Proof of Evidence.

delays at the railway level crossing between Littlethorpe and Narborough, additional traffic on Oak Road and Sycamore Way.

28. The Framework refers¹² to preventing development where there would “be unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe”.
29. At the site visit I observed the operation of the railway level crossing for freight trains, trains that stopped at the adjacent station and those that did not. On each occasion a short queue of traffic formed on either side of the barrier, at no stage did it appear excessive to the point of that it would be detrimental to highway safety and generally appeared as being at most an inconvenience to drivers. I have no substantive evidence before me that would lead me to a different conclusion.
30. The appellant referred¹³ to circa 1 additional northbound vehicle and circa 2-3 south bound vehicles being added to the existing vehicles queuing at the level crossing as a result of the appeal scheme during all time periods, I do not consider this increase to be material or detrimental to highway safety. I also noted that there is a pedestrian crossing bridge meaning that able bodied pedestrians can cross the railway line without delay.
31. The main access route to the site is via Station Road, Sycamore Way and Oak Road. These roads are predominantly residential in character with housing fronting onto the road. I note that a short section of Oak Road is proposed to be widened to 5.5m as part of the proposals. The Transport Assessment identifies just over 1 additional vehicle per minute is likely to be on these local access roads, this represents a very small change in the character and usage of these roads.
32. Turning to the effect of construction traffic accessing the site, it is likely that construction traffic would utilise similar local roads to those referred to above. Construction traffic could be managed by the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). I am satisfied that such details could be controlled by a suitably worded condition.
33. I note that the Local Highway Authority and the council's Active Travel Officer have not objected to the proposed development. For the reasons detailed above I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would not result in any unacceptable impact on highway safety, nor would the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, be severe.

Non-designated heritage asset (Lodge Farm)

34. To the west of the appeal site is Lodge Farm, a non-designated heritage asset, described as a “complex of farm buildings and farmhouse believed to date back to the mid-19th century, the setting of which is immediately bordering the application site's western boundary”.
35. Clearly, the development of housing on the agricultural fields situated between the existing settlement edge and the farm would change the of the farm setting. Nonetheless, a clear relationship between the farm and the adjacent agricultural land would remain. Moreover, the submitted plans show a clear separation between the proposed dwellings and the farm buildings. In heritage terms, ‘less

¹² Paragraph 116, National Planning Policy Framework

¹³ Paragraph 7.5.2 Highways Proof of Evidence

than substantial' harm was identified by the parties¹⁴ and that this harm was overcome¹⁵ by the public benefits of the appeal scheme, including the provision of housing, and I have no substantive evidence before me that would lead me to conclude otherwise.

36. I note that the parties agree that the appeal site is not within the vicinity of any designated heritage assets and does not harm the setting of the Narborough Conservation Area¹⁶. I have no substantive evidence before me that would lead me to conclude otherwise.

Conditions and planning obligation

37. Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 57 of the Framework details that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for a development if the obligation meets the three tests detailed in the legislation.
38. There is broad agreement¹⁷ between the parties in respect of the need for planning obligations towards local infrastructure and services to mitigate the effects of the proposed scheme. Nonetheless there was some dispute with particular regards to the contribution to Leicestershire Police. The council's CIL compliance statements sets out the detailed background and justification for each of the obligations.
39. In terms of affordable housing, the obligation secures the provision of 25% of the units as affordable housing. This is in line with policy CS8 of the Core Strategy. There are number of education contributions secured, providing funds for early years education, primary and secondary SEND provision, secondary education and towards library services.
40. Contributions are also secured for the management of the public right of way, outdoor sports and on and off-site biodiversity net gain provisions in accordance with, amongst other policies, CS15 and CS19. The obligation also includes contributions relating to a travel plan, bus passes, refuse bins and waste strategy and health care provision in accordance with policies CS23, CS11, CS12.
41. In terms of the Police, the obligation includes provision for a sum of £7,750.55, being £5,813.05 towards additional police vehicles and £1,937.50 towards identification technology, the need for which arises from the Development, to be used within the locality of the development. I consider that the detailed breakdown¹⁸ of the costs and their purpose provided by the Police, while lacking some detail is nonetheless sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the regulations in this instance.
42. Finally, the obligation also secures monitoring fees in respect of the District Council and County Council, including Biodiversity Net Gain.

Overall, on the basis of the evidence before me I am satisfied that the planning obligations are related to requirements of development plan policies and are all necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They are all directly related to the development, are fairly and reasonably related in scale and

¹⁴ Paragraph 9 Landscape Statement of Common Ground

¹⁵ Which Ms. Hill agreed in XX is "overcome".

¹⁶ Paragraph 8 Landscape Statement of Common Ground

¹⁷ Paragraph 3.18.1 Statement of Common Ground

¹⁸ Leicestershire Police letter dated 19/09/2024

kind to the development, and are in place to mitigate the effects of the development where appropriate. The planning obligations therefore comply with the tests set out in the Framework, the advice in the National Planning Practice Guidance and with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (CIL). As a result, I have taken the obligations into account as part of my overall conclusion that the appeal should be allowed.

43. Turning to conditions, I have considered the conditions agreed between the parties in light of the relevant guidance contained within the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG). Where necessary, I have amended them in the interests of precision and so that they meet the relevant tests as set out in the Framework. With regard to Section 100ZA of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the appellant has expressed agreement to the pre-commencement conditions discussed at the Inquiry and where I have modified these it has had no material bearing on their function.
44. In order to define the permission and to control the timescales for the submission of reserved matters, I have included conditions relating to reserved matters, the life of the permission and the timescale to submit reserved matters applications and the approved plans. For the same reason I have included a condition to control the maximum number of dwellings that can be developed under this permission.
45. To ensure that the proposed development provides a mix of house types and tenures to meet the local planning authorities identified needs and in accordance with policy CS8 I have included a condition requiring the submission details of the housing mix plan prior to or with the first reserved matter.
46. To provide an appropriate proportion of accessible and adaptable homes in accordance with policy DM11 I have included a policy requiring 5% of the dwellings to meet building regulations part M4(2).
47. In the interests of the living conditions of local residents, the environment and highway safety I have included a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Method Statement covering various matters including the management of the public right of way on the site and the routing of construction vehicles.
48. In the interests of the environment and in the interests of the living conditions of future residents, I have included a condition relating to contaminated land, remediation works and a validation statement.
49. In the interests of the environment, I have included a condition that requires a tree protection plan, a condition to control landscaping implementation, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, and a Construction Environment Management Plan. For the same reason I have included a condition to control the submission of surface water and foul drainage details.
50. In the interests of archaeology, I have included a condition in respect of archaeological field work and safeguarding.
51. In the interests of highway safety, I have included a condition requiring the implementation of the access works in accordance with the proposed access strategy prior to the occupation of the development. In the interests of the environment, I have required the submission of a travel plan.

52. To reduce the risk of flooding and in the interests of clarity I have included a condition restricting development considered more vulnerable to areas of the appeal site that are flood zone risk 1 in accordance with the Framework.
53. In the interests of the living conditions of future residents I have included a condition relating to internal and external noise levels and for the same reason I have required the submission and implementation of a waste collection strategy.
54. I have not included a condition specifically excluding the indicative plans from the approved plans condition because it is not necessary. Also, I have not included a condition restricting the number of storeys of properties allowed by the appeal to 2.5 storeys. The parameters of the appeal clearly identify the dwellings as being “predominantly 2 storeys in height with pitched roofs, with a maximum height of 2.5 storeys”. Moreover, the scale of the proposed development is a reserved matter.
55. Furthermore, I have not included a condition relating to lighting, external materials and site levels because I do not consider it to be necessary given the outline nature of the appeal scheme. In particular lighting is referred to in the appearance reserved matter.

Conclusion

56. I have found no conflict with policies CS18 of the Core Strategy and of the DM2 Delivery DPD and there is compliance with the Development Plan as a whole. Even if I were to conclude otherwise, there is a clear lack of 5-year housing land supply, the tilted balance detailed in the Framework is engaged, and the most important policies are out of date. The appeal scheme would provide open market and affordable housing among other positive factors that weight in favour of the appeal scheme. The council accepts it cannot overcome the application of the tilted balance, and I have no substantive evidence before me that would cause me to conclude otherwise. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed:
 - : Location Plan - D10228.001G
 - : Proposed Access Strategy - P23103-001D
- 5) The quantum of residential units to be constructed for the development hereby approved shall be limited to up to 155 dwellings.
- 6) Prior to or as part of the first reserved matters application a housing mix statement and plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall have regard to the District Council's Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment, and any other evidence of District need.
- 7) A minimum of 5% of the dwellings shall be constructed to meet the building regulations Part M4(2) standard or any superseding standard.
- 8) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - v) wheel washing facilities;
 - vi) measures to control the emission of noise, dust and dirt during construction;
 - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - viii) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.
 - ix) Routing of construction, including delivery, traffic.
 - x) A piling method statement, if piling is proposed.
 - xi) Surface water management.
 - xii) The management of the Public Right of Way on the siteThe approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 9) No development shall commence until:
 - a) A site investigation scheme shall be designed for the site using the information obtained from the desktop study (Enzygo Environmental Consultants, ref: SHF.1132.148.GE.R.001.A, December 2018). This shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on the site.
 - b) The site investigation shall be undertaken in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must enable a detailed risk assessment relating to all receptors to be undertaken and refinement of the conceptual site model. The information must then be used to inform an options appraisal exercise written in accordance with the Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) framework and other relevant standards.
 - c) A remediation method statement detailing the remediation requirements and how it is to be undertaken, including any areas of soft landscaping, using the information obtained from the site investigation shall be submitted to the District Planning Authority. This shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on the site.
 - d) A verification plan providing details of the information that would be collected in order to demonstrate the works set out in the remediation method statement are complete, including identification of any requirements for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance, and arrangements for contingency action, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval.
- 10) Prior to commencement of any above ground development, the approved remediation works shall be completed in accordance with the approved remediation method statement to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. A verification report for the remedial scheme written in accordance with the approved verification plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval.
- 11) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved from the outset of all works for the duration of the construction programme.
- 12) The landscaping details required under the reserved matters condition shall be carried out within one year of completion of the development and any trees, hedges, shrubs or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
- 13) No development shall take place (including ground works or vegetation clearance) until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has

been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall include the following details:

- i) Description and evaluation of the features to be created/managed.
- ii) Aims and objectives of management.
- iii) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- iv) Prescriptions for management actions.
- v) Work schedule.
- vi) Species/seed mixes to be planted/sown.
- vii) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The approved plan would be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 14) No development shall take place (including ground works or vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environment Management Plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The CEMP include the following details:

- i) Identification of potentially damaging construction activities.
- ii) Identification of biodiversity protection zones.
- iii) Practical measures and sensitive working practices to avoid or reduce impacts during construction.
- iv) Timing of works to avoid harm to nesting birds.
- v) Responsible persons for overseeing sensitive works.
- vi) Use of protective fencing where required.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period.

- 15) No development shall commence until drainage plans and a timetable for the provision for on-site foul and surface water drainage have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use.

- 16) No development shall take place until:

- (i) An archaeological field evaluation has been carried out in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
- (ii) Safeguarding measures to ensure the preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording identified in the archaeological field evaluation have been undertaken in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority

- 17) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 16.

- 18) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as the access arrangements shown on Prime Transport Planning drawing number: P23103-001, Revision D, dated 18 September 2024 have been implemented in full.

- 19) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until an amended full Travel Plan including measures for active travel which sets out actions and measures with quantifiable outputs and outcome targets has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the agreed Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 20) The reserved matters, pursuant to Condition 1 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following:
 - : All 'more vulnerable' development, comprising new dwellings and access to the site, would be located within Flood Zone 1 only.
 - : No built development or ground raising shall be located within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the main river.
- 21) Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, a scheme for achieving the external and internal noise levels outlined in BS8233:2014 and World Health Organisation Guidelines shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall be implemented as approved prior to the occupation each dwelling.
- 22) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until a Waste Collection Strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which demonstrates how each property on the development would be accessed by waste and re-cycling collection vehicles and how the waste re-cycling bins would be stored at each property on the development and presented to these vehicles on the respective waste collection day. The development shall be constructed to incorporate the features contained in the approved waste collection strategy.

End of Schedule

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mrs. Leanne Buckley-Thomson (No.5 Chambers), instructed by Mr. Stuart Carvel (Gladman)

Mr. Jason Tait BA (Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI

Ms. Silke Gruner BHons (Landscape Architecture) CMLI

Mr. David Schumacher MSc, DipMS, CMILT, MCIHT

Mr. Matthew James Travis BSc (Hons), MSc, MCIWEM, C.WEM, CEnv, CSci

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms Stephanie Hall (Kings Chambers), instructed by Blaby District Council

Ms Michelle Hill BA(Hons) MSC PDdip (cons) MRTPI

Mr Adam Collinge CMLI, AMIEnvSci

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr David Obington-Crighton

Mrs Vicki Turner

Mr David Wilson

Mr Ian Carruth

Cllr Janet Forey Blaby District Council

Cllr Eleanor Turner Narborough Parish Council