# **Public Document Pack**

**Bill Cullen** MBA (ISM), BA(Hons) MRTPI Chief Executive

Date: 29 March 2017



To: Members of the Planning Committee

Mr R Ward (Chairman) Mr C Ladkin Mr BE Sutton (Vice-Chairman) Mr LJP O'Shea Mr PS Bessant Mr RB Roberts Mrs MA Cook Mrs H Smith Mrs GAW Cope Mrs MJ Surtees Mr WJ Crooks Miss DM Taylor Mrs L Hodgkins Ms BM Witherford Mr E Hollick Ms AV Wright

Mrs J Kirby

Copy to all other Members of the Council

(other recipients for information)

Dear Councillor,

Please see overleaf a Supplementary Agenda for the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** on **TUESDAY**, **28 MARCH 2017** at **6.30 pm**.

Yours sincerely

Rebecca Owen

**Democratic Services Officer** 

### PLANNING COMMITTEE - 28 MARCH 2017

## **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

#### 11. 16/01159/HOU - 68 LANGDALE ROAD, HINCKLEY

Following a decision of 'minded to refuse' at the previous meeting, this application is brought to this meeting for decision.

Late items:

#### Consultations:-

One further letter of representation has been received raising the same concerns as previously set out in the Committee Report.

One additional message to Members of Planning Committee raising the following concerns and as previously set out in the Committee Report:

- 1) Car parking and traffic
- 2) Waste
- 3) House valuations
- 4) Noise and anti-social behaviour

### Appraisal:-

Revised existing ground floor plans and site plans to show the existing layout and formation of the property have been submitted.

For clarity the proposed single storey rear extension would project approximately 3.5 metres along the boundary with No. 66 and would then step in, away from the boundary, projecting approximately a further 1.5 metres with a width of approximately 5.6 metres. The proposed extension would have a flat roof, measuring approximately 3 metres in height. The proposed single storey rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and as a result of the subservient and stepped in nature would not impact upon the character of the host dwelling.

The proposed rear extension by virtue of its single storey nature and tapered boundary with the adjacent property, no. 66, would not have an adverse impact upon the residential amenity of no. 66 or any neighbouring properties and would not result in a loss of light, a loss of privacy or an adverse overbearing effect. The proposal would also step in from the boundary of the site, alleviating any further impact upon the residential amenity of no. 66.