

PLANNING COMMITTEE 23 July 2013
LIST OF LATE ITEMS RECEIVED AFTER PREPARATION OF MAIN AGENDA:

ITEM 01

13/00170/CONDIT

Mr Patrick Reilly And Others

Appraisal:-

Amended Paragraph:

a) the existing level of local provision and need for site

The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Needs Assessment 2006-2016 identifies a need for 42 residential pitches for the period up until 2016 within the Borough. The assessment informed the requirement for 42 pitches included within Policy 18 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Since the Accommodation Needs Assessment was adopted in April 2007, a total of six sites have received permanent planning permission within the Borough, a total of eight pitches at Winter Oaks (formerly The Paddock), Higham on the Hill, one pitch at Stoke Lane, Higham on the Hill, three permanent pitches and eight transit caravans at Hydes Lane, Hinckley one pitch at Heath Road, Bagworth (allowed on appeal), 4 pitches at Whitegate Stables Caravan Park, Copt Oak and 10 pitches at Dalebrook Farm Earl Shilton. Accordingly, the approval of these pitches has reduced the Borough Council's requirements to 15 permanent pitches. The ten temporary pitches, the subject of this application are not included in these calculations and their use in any case expired on the 18 March 2013.

As there is a deficit of 15 permanent pitches within the borough, there is clearly an insufficient level of local provision and a need for this site having regard to the requirement within the Core Strategy. Should approval be forthcoming on this application, the 10 pitches would go towards meeting the current shortfall in pitches.

Recommendation:-

Amend recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION:- Refuse for the following reasons and serve an enforcement notice requiring site vacation within 9 months and site clearance within 12 months of the notice taking effect.

Amended reason for refusal no .2:

The site is located in a prominent and elevated position in a predominantly undeveloped rural landscape. The development fails to assimilate within the landscape and has an adverse effect on the appearance of the countryside contrary to the requirements of Policies 18 and 21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and therefore results in an un-justified harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside contrary to the requirements of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

ITEM 03

13/00223/FUL

Mr David Wilson

Consultations:-

One letter of objection has been received objecting to the proposal on the grounds of inadequate parking and the consequences this will have on the nearby residents, including loss of property value. The letter also states that the dwellings will not sell.

The lack of parking is considered within the main report.

Appraisal:-

Since the report was finalised, the Employment Land and Premises Review has been updated and adopted.

With regards to this application site, the 2013 study states that the area is vacant and appears to be falling into dereliction. The priority is to bring this land back into productive operation and viable proposals for alternative uses should be considered on their merits. It classifies the site as category C and suggests that 100% of the site can go for other uses.

The proposal is still considered to be in accordance with the 2013 study.

Saleability of the proposed dwellings and loss of value of neighbouring residential properties were raised through a representation. It is down to the developer to determine what they can sell and this is not a consideration for the Local Planning Authority.

Loss of value of neighbouring properties is not a material planning consideration.

ITEM 04

13/00056/FUL

Mr Michael Gisborne

Appraisal:-

Employment Land and Premises Study (2013)

Since the report was finalised, the Employment Land and Premises Review has been updated and adopted at Executive.

With regards to this application site, the 2013 study requires the feasibility of converting a portion of the site into small business units to be considered and seeks to retain 50% of the site for employment use whilst supporting change of use for the other 50% of the site.

The proposal equates to approximately one third of the site and therefore is still considered to be in accordance with the 2013 study.

Viability

Further clarification was requested of the developer with regard to discrepancies in costs between the sales and affordable housing, and the marketing costs. The applicant has provided additional information stating that the costs of the market and affordable housing is calculated separately. This has resulted in a discrepancy between the two housing elements principally due to half of the market properties facing Station Road and connecting directly into that sewer and there not being the contamination issues with these properties as with other parts of the site.

The other point of clarification related to the marketing costs. This was cited at being £7,000 per dwelling. To justify this, the applicant has provided a breakdown of costs. Whilst this is still considered high, this figure is consistent with other developments the developer has recently put forward which have been accepted by this Authority.

This additional information was sent to the independent consultants who still considered that the costs were high. However the development profit margins are considerably lower than usually acceptable and it would not be unreasonable for any additional profit to increase this rather than go towards other S106 contributions. This estimated additional profit would not bring the profits up to an acceptable level. It is considered that given the low profit margins, and the consistency between the costs of other schemes, that have been accepted, the viability appraisal is considered acceptable and lack of contributions are considered acceptable in this instance.

Introduction:-

Landscaping plan received 11.07.13 - Drawing no. JBA 12/362-01 Rev A.

Consultations:-

One further letter of representation from neighbour. Raising concerns over:

- a) Vehicle access/exit from plot 18 along shared driveway only achievable in forward facing mode during access
- b) Insufficient clearance for a vehicle to reverse past the building line to exit in a forward mode; especially if 2 vehicles are parked adjacent
- c) Impact on safety from above issues on users of public footpath
- d) The current hedging that separates plots 17 & 18 from no.40 should be retained for both privacy and amenity value

Appraisal:-

With regards to vehicles exiting from the parking at Plot 18, there is sufficient room to the rear of the parking space to enable a car to reverse and turn to enable exit from the shared drive in a forward motion.

The hedging between the site and No 40 is located on the application site, but the developer has confirmed that this is to be retained.

A public footpath (U65) crosses the site. However, this is unaffected by the proposal.

PLANNING COMMITTEE**23 JULY 2013****SPEAKERS**

Item	Application	Speaker(s)	Applicant/ objector	Give out number?
01	13/00170/CONDIT	Mr Ould Mr Reilly	Objector Applicant	
03	13/00223/FUL	Mr Astill	Agent	
05	13/00147/FUL	Mr Flavell	Objector	