

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 19 August 2014**  
**LIST OF LATE ITEMS RECEIVED AFTER PREPARATION OF MAIN AGENDA:**

---

**ITEM 01**

**14/00674/FUL**

**Charles Church North Midlands**

**Introduction:-**

Additional representations have been received since publication of the agenda. They are appraised below.

**Consultations:-**

CPRE supports the objections of the Neighbourhood Forum as this application takes no account of the efforts of the NDP to plan development in areas that residents have agreed on. In addition, this proposal would jeopardise the Neighbourhood Plan process and would greatly affect the views and vistas and character of the area.

County Councillor Ould objects to the proposal for the following reasons:-

- a) environmental impact of the application
- b) site lies outside of settlement boundary
- c) premature to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan
- d) impact upon Churchill's business.

Bloor Homes have objected to the proposal on the grounds that no decision should be made until the appeal in September is determined. In addition the draft Neighbourhood Plan proposes an alternative site to the south of Station Road which Bloor are bringing forward. A recently issued ministerial statement re-emphasises the governments commitment to Neighbourhood Planning and that appeals above 10 units are likely to be recovered by the Secretary of State. Furthermore, if this application were to be approved this would jeopardise the delivery of the mixed use scheme on the south side of Station Road and a key employment component that it contains.

Market Bosworth Society have raised additional comments stating that the site should be classed as a local heritage asset given that Captain Churchill who founded the adjacent Churchill's factory site used to land his WW2 fighter plane on the field.

The Conservation Officer has responded to this representation as follows:-

- a) The Churchill's factory and the field opposite (to the north of Station Road) both have some historical significance due to their historical association with the Churchill directors and the roles both they, and the factory, played in the second world war. This significance is of a local level, and therefore the factory and the field are worthy of being considered as local heritage assets (non-designated heritage assets in NPPF terms).
- b) The factory played a key role in the development of the jet engine during the war, so the building is clearly a historical asset. The field was the location for a landing strip utilised by Group Captain Churchill DSO DFC when visiting the factory during 1941 and 1942, so is part of this historic association and should also be considered a local heritage asset. However, confirmation of the exact location of where Captain Churchill landed his aircraft in the field would be useful to tightly define the boundaries of the asset. There appears to be traces of a landing strip visible from the latest aerial photography, which I believe was most recently used for flying by the occupants of Wharf Farm. If this landing strip was also the same as that utilised by Captain Churchill then the location may be clear. This southern section of this strip appears to be located within the western section of the application boundary.
- c) There should be recognition of the valuable contribution the community of Market Bosworth made during the war, including the role of the Churchill factory and the two directors, with this recognition made in an appropriate manner.

A letter of objection has been received from Freeths Solicitors representing JJ Churchill Limited, the adjacent factory site stating that the development would introduce conflicting land uses and would also prevent the future expansion of the Churchill's site. The letter states that the committee report is wrong to ascribe little weight to the emerging Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan and that the emerging plan should not be considered to be premature. The letter states that the written ministerial statement published in July 2014 states that Neighbourhood Plans should be given significant weight. The letter advises that the committee report fails to acknowledge or understand the business needs of Churchill's in respect of its potential for future expansion and that the noise levels from the Churchill's factory would impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed dwellings which could limit Churchill's operations in the future. Concern has been raised that no account has been taken of Churchill's as a defence contractor.

In addition two further letters of objection have been received from local residents raising concerns as listed in the committee report.

#### **Appraisal:-**

The Conservation Officer has agreed to work with the Market Bosworth Society in providing an appropriate memorial to recognise the war efforts made by Captain Churchill and particularly the contribution the factory made to the war. It is considered that the factory and site opposite that was used as a landing strip could be considered to be local heritage assets, however it is considered that as the factory made the most significant contribution to the war over the use of the landing strip, the loss of the field would not impede overall on the significance of the Churchill's site or its heritage value.

The points and objections are noted in the letter from JJ Churchill's. However for the reasons discussed in the committee report the emerging Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan is at a draft stage and as such the weight that should be applied to it as a material consideration at this stage is limited and as such prematurity is not considered to be a significant factor. The potential for conflicting land uses has been considered and similar to many areas of the Borough, residential land uses and commercial/industrial land uses take place side by side. Appropriate mitigation methods to reduce any potential noise impact upon future occupiers has been secured by condition and the repositioning of dwellings further back into the site would adequately deal with any future impacts. The proposed development is not considered to limit or impact upon the satisfactory operation of Churchill's either at present or in the future should the business wish to expand its operations.

The additional representations received have been noted and considered.

#### **Recommendation:-**

It is considered that the representations raise no additional issues that have not already been taken into consideration in the Committee report. It is therefore recommended that Members accept the recommendation and grant planning permission subject to conditions and the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations.

---

**ITEM 02**

**14/00262/OUT**

**Morris Homes (East) Limited**

#### **Introduction:-**

Additional representations have been received since publication of the agenda. They are appraised below.

**Consultations:-**

An additional eight letters of objection have been received from local residents raising the following issues:-

- a) no need for further dwellings
- b) village has already filled its requirement for new housing
- c) roads too crowded
- d) greenfield site
- e) separation between Stoke Golding and Dadlington would be lost
- f) impact upon quality of life of elderly residents
- g) drainage issues.

**Appraisal:-**

The additional representations received have been noted and considered. No issues have been raised that have not already been appraised in the committee report.

**Recommendation:-**

It is considered that the representations raise no additional issues that have not already been taken into consideration in the Committee report. It is therefore recommended that Members accept the recommendation and grant planning permission subject to conditions and the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations.

---

**ITEM 03****14/00360/FUL****Mr Chris Butler****Consultations:-**

Ratby Parish Council - Have concerns regarding vehicle movement as it is a storage/distribution proposal. Also concerns regarding dust.

---

**ITEM 05****14/00580/FUL****Mr Jeff Penman****Introduction:-**

Additional representations have been received since publication of the agenda. They are appraised below.

**Consultations:-**

A letter of objection has been received from a local resident raising the following issues:-

- a) Subway already have an outlet in Hinckley
- b) if Screwfix was allowed it would lead to unemployment in Hinckley and Nuneaton hardware outlets
- c) traffic queuing at traffic lights at Coventry Road, Long Meadow Drive and the entrance to Tungsten Park
- d) retail outlets should only be allowed in town centres or trading parks away from residential areas.

**Appraisal:-**

The majority of issues raised have been covered within the appraisal of the committee report.

However, it should be noted that the fact the retail outlet already has an outlet within Hinckley town centre is not a material planning consideration and that the particular operators of the proposed units are not for consideration. The application is being assessed on whether or not the principle of B8 (storage and distribution) and A1 (retail) uses are acceptable.

**Recommendation:-**

It is considered that the representations raise no additional issues that have not already been taken into consideration in the Committee report. It is therefore recommended that Members accept the recommendation and grant planning permission subject to conditions and the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations.

---

**ITEM 06**

**14/00594/FUL**

**Mr Nigel Salt**

**Consultations:-**

Peckleton Parish Council objects to the application on the following grounds:-

- a) the proposed building is out of scale with adjacent properties
- b) the proposed building will have an overbearing effect on the existing surroundings
- c) there is insufficient car parking provision
- d) there is too much fenestration at the rear.

An additional letter has been received from an adjoining neighbour objecting on the following grounds:-

- a) the height and density are unacceptable and out of scale to the area
- b) negatively impact on the open space
- c) have an adverse impact on highway safety
- d) previous refusal for two houses on the site should be applied.

**Recommendation:-**

The concerns of Peckleton Parish Council and the adjoining neighbour have been considered and raise similar points to those already raised by objectors in the main report.

The application site has the benefit for a comparable single dwelling on the site which is extant and capable of being implemented. Having considered the proposals carefully it is considered that the proposals would be in keeping with the scale and mass of the previous permission and the character of the area.

It is considered that the proposals would not impact on the open space or have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. The comments on the design and fenestration are noted however a more contemporary approach is not resisted and innovation in architecture is encouraged by policy.

The proposals include a double garage and space on the driveway for 3 cars. It is proposed that there is sufficient car parking provided by the proposals and that this would be an acceptable level of parking.

---

**ITEM 09**

**14/00573/FUL**

**Twycross Zoo**

This item has been withdrawn.

---

**ITEM 10**

**14/00657/HOU**

**Mr & Mrs M Jennings**

**Introduction:-**

Since publication of the agenda further representations have been received as detailed below.

**Consultations:-**

An additional letter of objection from a neighbour has been received on grounds of loss of light to the kitchen.

**Appraisal:-**

The representation relates to the loss of light to the side of No. 33 The Fairway, particularly a toilet window, a half glazed side door and a kitchen window. In respect of loss of light to the kitchen which is deemed a habitable room, the proposed extension would be built on the boundary and some loss of light would be experienced to this window particularly later in the day resultant of the orientation of the sun with the proposed extension.

The window affected is to a room which has more than one window serving it. However, given that there is an existing 2 metre high timber fence to the boundary which will have an existing impact on this window reducing light, it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of light to sustain a reason for refusal in this case. Accordingly the proposal would have not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property in accordance with Policy BE1 criteria i.

**Recommendation:-**

It is considered that the additional representation raises no additional issues that have not already been taken into consideration in the Committee report. It is therefore recommended that Members accept the recommendation as contained within the report.

---

**ITEM 11****14/00592/CONDIT****Goodman Developments Ltd On  
Behalf Of DPD UK (GeoPost).****Consultations:-**

No objection received from Directorate of Chief Executive (Archaeology).

---

**ITEM 12****14/00633/CONDIT****Mr And Mrs Nino And Carmela Puglisi****Introduction:-**

For clarification, the new access and driveway have already been implemented under the existing permission and completed.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**19 AUGUST 2014**  
**SPEAKERS**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Speaker(s)</b>	<b>Applicant/ objector</b>
01	14/00674/FUL	Mr Pope	Objector
02	14/00262/OUT	Mr Mayes Mr Robson	Objector Agent
04	14/00536/FUL	Mr Lees	Objector
05	14/00580/FUL	Mr Bailey	Objector
06	14/00594/FUL	Mr or Mrs Gould	Objector
08	14/00371/FUL	Mr Smith	Objector
10	14/00657/HOU	Mr Ward	Objector