

Ben Glover
Senior Planning Officer
North Hertfordshire District Council
Council Offices
Gernon Road
Letchworth Garden City
Hertfordshire
SG6 3JF

21 January 2026

Dear Mr Glover,

Reference: 25/01708/OP Outline planning for Land opposite Heath Farm, Briary Lane, Royston – Harm from proposed Access to Living Conditions of existing residents of Echo Hill

We are contacting you on behalf of residents regarding the planning application listed above (hereafter referred to as Land off Echo Hill), and to share with you relevant information on a recent appeal case.

Gladman Developments submitted an outline planning request for up to 100 homes (with 40% designated as affordable), including public open space, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), a single access point, and demolition of one residential property. All details were reserved except for access. This application was for Land North of Shenton Lane, Market Bosworth, Leicestershire (Planning Reference 24/00831/OUT).

Several points connect this case (Land North of Shenton) to the Land off Echo Hill application:

1. Creating the proposed access required demolishing a single detached house located within an existing cul-de-sac.
2. Both the existing cul-de-sacs (York Close and Echo Hill) and total proposed dwellings for each project, are very similar in numbers.
3. Like NHDC, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council lacked a sufficient five-year housing supply, triggering the tilted balance during both planning and the subsequent appeal.

The Land off Echo Hill site, has additional reasons for refusal, specifically regarding gradients, transport, sustainability, flood risk, ecology, landscape/visual, and SSSI impact. We and residents have already submitted further evidence regarding these additional impacts. This letter focuses solely on how the development **will negatively affect the living conditions of Echo Hill residents**, particularly concerning noise, disturbance, and neighbourhood character.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council ultimately refused the Land North of Shenton application for the following reasons:

That the application be Refused for the reasons set out below:

1. *The proposed access results in very significant harm to the residential amenity of residents of York Close which, when afforded very significant weight alongside the other negative impacts of the development, significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the development. The development is contrary to Policy DM10 of the*

Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

2. The applicant has not entered into a Section 106 contributions for the delivery of Affordable Housing and public open space or contributions towards health, education, waste services and libraries. As such the application is considered contrary to Policy DM3 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 19 of the Core Strategy.

We have included the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Councils' Decision notice and report for ease.

Gladman Developments subsequently undertook an appeal, assessed by the Planning Inspectorate, with a hearing held on 28 October 2025 and decision made on 15 December 2025 (ref APP/K2420/W/25/3369401).

The planning inspectorate supported the Council reasons for refusal, and the appeal was dismissed, details are as follows:

*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.

The access arrangement for the Land off Echo Hill site we feel is considerably worse compared to the recent Land off York Close appeal site, due to the proximity of the access to neighbouring properties, the proposed engineering works required, proposed levels/ gradients and likely intrusion. In addition, the Echo Hill site has also been refused by Highways due to unsafe and unsustainable access. Therefore, we wish to further reinforce access as a reason for refusal, due to the **Impact and Harm the access will have to the character and living conditions of residents of Echo Hill** and specifically those that are in close proximity to the access (i.e 23 and 25 Echo Hill).

We and residents have always argued the proposed access arrangement of the demolition of Number 24 Echo Hill, in a quiet and established cul-de-sac, would demonstrably and negatively impact the living conditions for the residents of Echo Hill, especially those living closest to the proposed access (i.e 23 and 25 Echo Hill). This was sadly ignored and disregarded by NHDC during the previous application, a failure by NHDC that must not occur this time.

We are aware of the recent changes to the Planning and Infrastructure Bill and the updated NPPF for consultation but see no evidence within these changes for “development at any cost”.

Please see attached to this letter the recent appeal case report by the Planning Inspectorate to help assist you.

Should you have any queries then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Clare Swarbrick

Chair, Royston Says No To Gladman