

**PLANNING COMMITTEE: 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018**  
**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

The “Supplementary Information” report supplements the main Planning Agenda. It is produced on the day of the Committee and is circulated at the Committee meeting. It is used as a means of reporting matters that have arisen after the Agenda has been completed/circulated, which the Committee should be aware of before considering any application reported for determination.

**Correspondence received is available for inspection.**

---

Page: 1

18/00826/OUT	Outline planning permission for the residential development of 59 dwellings (Class C3), with associated access, landscaping, open space and drainage infrastructure (Access to be considered). Land at Coopers Lane, Dunton Bassett
--------------	--

**Consultation responses:**

Parish Council (18<sup>th</sup> August):

The Parish Council can find nothing in this report that favours the residents of Dunton but statistical figures to justify LCC views that the lives of Residents is unimportant.

It would appear that LCC has no objection to this development and is actually favouring moving traffic over the lives of residents.

They do not want a light controlled crossing to protect the safety of people crossing Coopers Lane or are prepared to do anything about traffic continuing to break the speed limit. The PC have tried for many years for the LCC to address the traffic and speeding issues due to the amount of accidents, petitions and vehicle statistic's have been sent to no response.

Whilst, in theory, the village accepts that some development maybe necessary to sustain the Village, surely safety must be a priority but statistics do not cater for safety but allows for technical jargon to be used instead.

On the question of a second special meeting the Parish Council feel there is no cause to have one as the residents have already recorded their objections. They have formed an anti group because of the safety issues and lack of consideration to residents after an open consultation meeting.

The figure also causes concern as this is above the recommended amount given by HDC. The facilities are not in place to cater for the existing residents alone and will not be able to meet and increased growth by this percentage.

Please could you record the objections of the Council

LLFA (22/08-2018, for full details see file):

Repeated previous comments and requested conditions. Confirmation received by email 31/08-2018 that these latest comments do relate to the amended scheme for 59 dwellings.

Severn Trent (rec'd 04/09-2018, for full details, see file):

“A developer enquiry was undertaken for this site for gravity discharge however the drainage statement with the planning application show that there will be pumped foul discharge from the site. Pump rates will be required to be submitted as a follow up to the developer enquiry and agreed with Severn Trent.

Surface water is proposed to outfall into a ditch.

For the use or reuse of sewer connections either direct or indirect to the public sewerage system the applicant will be required to make a formal application to the Company under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. They may obtain copies of our current guidance notes and application form from either our website ([www.stwater.co.uk](http://www.stwater.co.uk)) or by contacting our Developer Services Team (Tel: 0800 707 6600)." Informative note suggested.

Neighbour representation:

2 letters of objection received from two households, largely re-iterating previous comments made by these neighbours. No additional matters raised than have already been summarised at paragraph 4.27 in the report.

**Revised S106 contribution requests (following receipt of amended plans):**

Community Facilities request (15/08-2018, for full details, see file):

Number of dwellings – 59

Charge per dwelling for new build/extension/and upgrade projects in existing premises - £735

Total Community Facility Request - £43,365.00

Project to be confirmed after the time of receipt. On receipt, money will be allocated through Harborough District Council's robust, CIL-compliant grant process.

1<sup>st</sup> trigger point – 50% to be paid to HDC prior to the commencement of development;

2<sup>nd</sup> trigger point – 50 % to be paid to HDC prior to the first occupation of any dwelling

LCC Civic Amenities (15/08-2018):

The Civic Amenity Site at Lutterworth will be able to meet the demands of the proposed development within the current site thresholds without the need for further development and therefore no contribution is required on this occasion.

Future developments that affect the Civic Amenity Site at Lutterworth may result in a claim for a contribution where none is currently sought.

LCC Libraries (15/08-2018, for full details see file):

The proposed development on Coopers Lane Dunton Bassett is within 3.5km of Broughton Astley Library on Main street Broughton Astley, being the nearest local library facility which would serve the development site. The library facilities contribution would be £1,720 rounded up to the nearest £10). It will impact on local library services in respect of additional pressures on the availability of local library facilities. The contribution is sought for stock Resources e.g. books, audio books, etc. for loan and reference use to account for additional use from the proposed development. It will be placed under project no.BRO001. There is currently one other obligation under BRO001 that have been submitted for approval. Subject to change due to future priorities of the library service.

The Leicestershire Small Area Population and Household Estimates 2001-2004 gives the settlement population for Broughton Astley at approximately 8660 people. The library has an active borrower base of 1,787 people. However post code analysis demonstrates that Broughton Astley Library attracts usage from a much wider catchment of 8456 through additional borrowers who live outside the settlement area but come into Broughton Astley for work, shopping or leisure reasons.

Active users of Broughton Astley Library currently borrow on average 20 items a year. The national performance indicator NI9 measures the percentage of adults who have used a public library service in the past 12 months (the latest figure is Oct 08 - Oct 09) and for Leicestershire this figure is approximately 48%. This figure would be higher if children were factored into the equation.

Consequently the proposed development at Coopers Lane Dunton Bassett is likely to

generate an additional 82 plus users and would require an additional 198 items of lending stock plus reference, audio visual and homework support material to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development on the local library service.

The County Council consider the library contribution is justified and is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with the relevant national and local policies and the additional demands that would be placed on this key infrastructure as a result of the proposed development. The contribution requirement is directly related to the development because the contribution is to be used for the purpose of providing the additional capacity at the nearest library facility to the proposed development which is at Broughton Astley.

It is considered fair and reasonable in scale and kind to the proposed scale of development and is in accordance with the thresholds identified in the adopted policies and to meet the additional demands on the library facilities at Broughton Astley which would arise due to this proposed development.

LCC Education (15/08-2018, for full details see file):

*Primary School Sector Requirement £240,768.00 (See map attached)*

The site falls within the catchment area of Dunton Bassett Primary School. The School has a net capacity of 105 and 98 pupils are projected on the roll should this development proceed; a surplus of 7 pupil places after taking into account the 17 pupils generated by this development. There are currently no pupil places at this school being funded from S106 agreements for other developments in the area.

There is one other primary schools within a two mile walking distance of the development: Broughton Astley Old Mill Primary School

Deficit 47 (after 37 S106 funded places have been deducted)

The overall deficit including all schools within a two mile walking distance of the development is 40 pupil places. A claim for an education contribution in the primary sector is therefore justified. In order to provide the additional primary school places anticipated by the proposed development the County Council would request a contribution for the Primary School sector of £240,768.00. Based on the table above, this is calculated: the number of deficit places created by the development (16.50) multiplied by the DFE cost multiplier in the table above (14,592.00) which equals £240,768.00. This contribution would be used to accommodate the capacity issues created by the proposed development by improving, remodelling or enhancing existing facilities at Dunton Bassett Primary School or any other school within the locality of the development. The contribution would be spent within five years of receipt of final payment.

*Secondary School (11-16) Sector Requirement £164,282.00 (See map attached)*

The site falls within the catchment area of Thomas Estley Community College. The College has a net capacity of 900 and 975 pupils are projected on roll should this development proceed; a deficit of 75 pupil places. A total of 40 pupil places are included in the forecast for this school from S106 agreements for other developments in this area and have been deducted. This reduces the total deficit for this school to 35 (of which 25 are existing and 10 are created by this development). There are no other 11-16 schools within a three mile walking distance of the site. A claim for an education contribution in this sector is therefore justified. In order to provide the additional 11-16 school places anticipated by the proposed development, the County Council requests a contribution for the 11-16 school sector of £164,282.00. Based on the table above, this is calculated the number of deficit places created by the development (9.19) multiplied by the DFE cost multiplier in the table above (£17,876.17) which equals £164,282.00.

This contribution would be used to accommodate the capacity issues created by the proposed development by improving, remodelling or enhancing existing facilities at Thomas Estley Community College or any other school within the locality of the development. The contribution would be spent within 5 years of receipt of final payment.

*Post 16 Sector Requirement £35,176.78 (See map attached)*

The nearest school to the site is Countesthorpe Leysland Community College. The College has a net capacity of 1795 and 1963 pupils are projected on roll should this development proceed; a deficit of 168 pupil places. A total of 161 pupil places are being funded at this school from S106 agreements for other developments in this area which reduces the total deficit for this school to 7 (of which 5 are existing and 2 are created by this development). There are no other post 16 schools within a three mile walking distance of the site. A claim for an education contribution in this sector is therefore justified.

In order to provide the additional post 16 school places anticipated by the proposed development, the County Council requests a contribution for the post 16 school sector of £35,176.78. Based on the table above, this is calculated the number of deficit places created by the development (1.82) multiplied by the DFE cost multiplier in the table above (£19,327.90) which equals £35,176.78.

This contribution would be used to accommodate the capacity issues created by the proposed development by improving, remodelling or enhancing existing facilities at Countesthorpe Leysland Community College or any other school within the locality of the development.

The contribution would be spent within 5 years of receipt of final payment.

*Special Schools £0*

As this development is less than 250 houses with two or bedrooms a claim for a Special School contribution will not be made.

*Total Requirement: £440,226.78*

With the rapidly changing environment of Education provision in Leicestershire it is becoming increasingly difficult to state which school or schools will serve a development once it is complete. We therefore request some flexibility in the use of the S106 funding generated by this development to enable the S106 contribution to be used for the provision, improvement, remodelling or enhancement of education facilities at schools in the locality of the development which the residents of the development would usually be expected to attend.

Clarification email from Paul Limb, LCC School Place Planning Officer (rec'd 30/08-2018):

The Post 16 response increased due to an error with the original response omitting the whole school capacity of Countesthorpe Leysland Community College. The whole school capacity should have been included as forecast Secondary figures for the school impact the available capacity as well as Post 16. On review of the situation, however, we will remove the request for a Post 16 contribution.

HDC Housing Enabling and Community Infrastructure Officer (Raj Patel):

Based on this amended application the proposed mix of units which includes 5x 2 bungalows is acceptable ( on a 1 for 2 basis)

24 AH units including 5 bungalows = 19 AH units. The defined units mix for the affordable units is:

4x1bed units

9x2 bed houses / bungalows

6x3bed houses

The indicative layout shows the AH units located in three areas, and appears to show a reasonable distribution. However I think a better layout Can be achieved than that proposed.

**Corrections to officer report:**

Paragraph 6.2 should be updated, as the Council does now have a five year supply of housing. The second sentence of this paragraph should therefore read:  
“Although the Council has a five year supply of land, elements of the development plan are not up-to-date”

Paragraph 6.8 should be updated, as the Council does now have a five year supply of housing. The first sentence of this paragraph should therefore read:  
“As mentioned, the Council’s development plan policies for housing supply, including aspects of CS2 and CS17, cannot be considered entirely up-to-date/robust”

### **Suggested amended conditions:**

#### Condition 12

The agent has questioned whether the wording of this condition meets the tests, as it appears unreasonable in the light of existing and proposed development plan policy. This wording is therefore amended as follows:

“Notwithstanding the housing mix shown on the indicative layout plan, the mix of market and affordable housing to be provided pursuant to condition 2 shall be informed by the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment 2017 or subsequent approved policy document.

REASON: To ensure that the housing needs of the locality are appropriately addressed and provided for as part of this development.”

#### Condition 29

This contains factual errors, and is therefore amended as follows:

“All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from the date of first occupation of the development, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features and to accord with Harborough District Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS17”

#### Condition 14

“To facilitate the new footway proposed from the site’s access road to the westwards busstop, on the north side of Coopers Lane, a short section of existing hedgerow will need to be moved. The agent is satisfied that the existing hedge can be ‘translocated’ (ie dug up and replanted in a different position) and the condition needs to reflect this. It is therefore amended as follows:

The layout details pursuant to condition 2 shall include a minimum 5m buffer zone of open space and natural vegetation from the built development area to the existing hedgerows on site. These existing hedgerows and the trees within them shall be retained in perpetuity and in no way disturbed, except by removal of short sections to facilitate access roads and

driveways as part of the development layout, translocation or re-positioning of a small section of hedge on the south boundary to facilitate the new footway joining to the bus stop, and for necessary maintenance and management as agreed by details pursuant to condition 28.”

Additional condition arising from Severn Trent’s comments:

30 No development shall commence on site until full details of the means of foul water drainage for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory drainage of the site and to accord with Harborough District Core Strategy policy CS10.

Additional informative notes:

26 Severn Trent Water advise that although our statutory sewer records do not show any public sewers within the area you have specified, there may be sewers that have been recently adopted under The Transfer Of Sewer Regulations 2011. Public sewers have statutory protection and may not be built close to, directly over or be diverted without consent and you are advised to contact Severn Trent Water to discuss your proposals. Severn Trent will seek to assist you obtaining a solution which protects both the public sewer and the building.

27 The indicative housing mix and indicative layout as submitted are unlikely to be acceptable to the Council, were they to be submitted in their current form at reserved matters stage. The applicant is advised to engage in early pre-application discussions prior to submitting the Reserved Matters, and should propose a mix which reflects the HEDNA or most recent approved policy document and a layout which provides a satisfactory transition between countryside and the existing edge of Dunton Bassett.

**Final statement from Dunton Bassett Parish Council:**

The Parish Council objects to the application, the residents of Dunton Bassett have made their feelings very clear on the proposed number of houses.

It would appear that LCC has no objection to this development and is actually favouring moving traffic over the lives of residents.

They do not want a light controlled crossing to protect the safety of people crossing Coopers Lane or are prepared to do anything about traffic continuing to break the speed limit. The PC have tried for many years for the LCC to address the traffic and speeding issues due to the amount of accidents along this stretch of road, the pc have sent many petitions and vehicle statistic's to prove the dangers.

Whilst, in theory, the village accepts that some development maybe necessary to sustain the Village, surely safety and facilities should be taken into account.

The figure causes concern as this is above the recommended amount given by HDC which was advised as 43 since then 5 houses have been approved within the village for development. The facilities are not in place to cater for the existing residents alone and will not be able to meet and increased growth by this percentage.

The Parish Council feel this figure is unacceptable.

**Appendix A – Planning Obligations**

## APPENDIX A PROPOSED PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

Request by LCC	Obligation for Highways		
Amount / Detail	Delivery	CIL Justification	Policy Basis
<p>1. Travel Packs; to inform new residents from first occupation what sustainable travel choices are in the surrounding area. These can be provided through Leicestershire County Council at a cost of £52.85 per pack. If not supplied by LCC, a sample Travel Pack shall be submitted to and approved in writing by LCC which may involve an administration charge.</p> <p>2. 6 month bus passes, two per dwelling (2 application forms to be included in Travel Packs and funded by the developer); to encourage new residents to use bus services, to establish changes in travel behaviour from first occupation and promote usage of</p>	TBC	<p>To inform new residents from first occupation what sustainable travel choices are in the surrounding area.</p> <p>To encourage new residents to use bus services, to establish changes in travel behaviour from first occupation and promote usage of sustainable travel modes other than the car.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS12.</p> <p>Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy Adopted 3rd December 2014.</p> <p>The Framework Section 4.</p>

<p>sustainable travel modes other than the car (may be supplied through LCC at (average) £360 per pass) (NOTE it is very unlikely that a development will get 100% take-up of passes, 25% is considered to be a high take-up rate).</p> <p>3. A Travel Plan monitoring fee of £6,000 for Leicestershire County Council's Travel Plan Monitoring System</p> <p>4. Information display cases at 2 nearest bus stops on Coopers Lane (to the west of the site access); to inform new residents of the nearest bus services in the area. At £120 per display.</p>		<p>To enable Leicestershire County Council to provide support to the appointed Travel Plan Co-ordinator, audit annual Travel Plan performance reports to ensure that Travel Plan outcomes are being achieved, and to take responsibility for any necessitated planning enforcement.</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel by single occupancy vehicle and to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	
<b>Request by LCC</b>	<b>Obligation for Library Services</b>		
<b>Amount / Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	
<p>£1,720</p> <p>The contribution is sought for stock resources</p>	<p>To pay the contribution to the County Council prior to the first</p>	<p>The proposed development at Coopers Lane Dunton Bassett is likely to generate an additional 82 plus users and would require an additional 198 items of lending</p>	<p>HDC Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Jan 2017.</p>



<p>eg books, audio books etc for loan and reference use to account for additional use from the proposed development. It will be placed under project no. BRO001. There is currently one other obligation under BRO001 that has been submitted for approval. (subject to change due to future priorities of the library service).</p>	<p>occupation of the first dwelling.</p>	<p>stock plus reference, audio visual and homework support material to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development on the local library service.</p> <p>The County Council consider the library contribution is justified and is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with the relevant national and local policies and the additional demands that would be placed on this key infrastructure as a result of the proposed development. The contribution requirement is directly related to the development because the contribution is to be used for the purpose of providing the additional capacity at the nearest library facility to the proposed development which is at Broughton Astley.</p> <p>It is considered fair and reasonable in scale and kind to the proposed scale of development and is in accordance with the thresholds identified in the adopted policies and to meet the additional demands on the library facilities at Broughton Astley which would arise due to this proposed development.</p> <p>(See full consultation response dated 15/08-2018 for further information.)</p>	<p>Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy Adopted 3rd December 2014.</p> <p>The Framework Section 4.</p>
<p><b>Request by LCC</b></p>	<p><b>Obligation for Education</b></p>		
<p><b>Amount / Detail</b></p>	<p><b>Delivery</b></p>	<p><b>CIL Justification</b></p>	<p><b>Policy Basis</b></p>
<p>Total Requirement: <b>£405,050.00</b></p> <p>Broken down as:</p>	<p>10% prior to the commencement of the development</p>	<p>“With the rapidly changing environment of Education provision in Leicestershire it is becoming increasingly difficult to state which school or schools will</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS12.</p> <p>HDC Planning Obligations</p>

<p>Primary School Sector Requirement £240,768.00</p> <p>Secondary School (11-16) Sector Requirement - £164,282.00</p> <p>Post 16 Sector Requirement - £0.00</p>	<p>45% prior to the first Occupation of 25% of the dwellings</p> <p>45% prior to the first Occupation of 50% of the dwellings</p>	<p>serve a development once it is complete. We therefore request some flexibility in the use of the S106 funding generated by this development to enable the S106 contribution to be used for the provision, improvement, remodelling or enhancement of education facilities at schools in the locality of the development which the residents of the development would usually be expected to attend.”</p> <p>See 15/08-2018 consultation response from LCC Education for full comments, together with associated email correspondence..</p>	<p>Supplementary Planning Document Jan 2017.</p> <p>Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy Adopted 3rd December 2014.</p> <p>The Framework Section 4</p>
<b>Request by LCC</b>	<b>County Council Monitoring Cost Contribution</b>		
<b>Amount / Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	<b>Policy Basis</b>
Likely to be 2% or £300 of the total value of each contribution in favour of the County Council (whichever is the greater)		It is appropriate for the County Council to recover costs associated with the negotiating, production and subsequent monitoring of developer contributions. This covers any costs associated with obtaining independent or specialist advice to validate aspects of the contributions and the costs of monitoring the payment and implementation of schemes and funding.	Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy Adopted 3rd December 2014.
<b>Request by HDC</b>	<b>Obligation for Public Open Space</b>		
<b>Amount / Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	<b>Policy Basis</b>
<b>£106,145.00</b>	To comply with an agreed Schedule.	The site is considered to be in rural location for semi natural and natural greenspace. Sports and Allotment provision are in oversupply in the local area, however it will be necessary to provide an off site contribution for	Provision for Open Space Sport and Recreation (HDC, 2015).  Core Strategy Policy CS12; Appendix 2

		<p>suitable projects at local clubs or community groups.</p> <p>Dunton and Broughton Rangers have identified within the Playing Pitch Strategy that general pitch improvements are required, the clubhouse needs new showers, walkway and car parking. Dunton Bassett CC has also identified works required to the club house and practice nets. A contribution towards greenways and the provision or enhancement of existing walking, cycling or horseriding routes within 1.6km of the site will be required.</p> <p>An off site contribution for provision of burial space will be required for sites within 2km of the development site (see consultation response 14/08-2018 for full details)</p>	<p>(Infrastructure Schedule).</p> <p>The Framework Section 4.</p> <p>HDC Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Jan 2017.</p>
<b>Request by HDC</b>	<b>Obligation for Affordable Housing</b>		
<b>Amount / Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	<b>Policy Basis</b>
<p>40% Affordable Housing.</p> <p>“Our tenure split requirements are for the affordable requirement to be provided as 60% Affordable rented and 40% to be provided as intermediate or shared ownership. We will be flexible on our tenure request.”</p> <p>“Based on this amended application the proposed mix of units which includes 5x2</p>	<p>Fifty percent (50%) of the Affordable Dwellings shall be ready for Occupation prior to the first Occupation of Fifty percent (50%) of the Market Dwellings; and</p> <p>The remaining Fifty percent (50%) of the Affordable Dwellings shall be ready for Occupation prior to the first Occupation of Seventy Five</p>	<p>Consultation Response received 08/08-2018 and 30/08-2018 from Raj Patel (HDC Housing Enabling and Community Infrastructure Officer); a CIL compliant justification is judged to be satisfied therein.</p>	<p>Policy CS3.</p> <p>This policy aims to increase provision of affordable housing, particularly in rural settlements, in order to meet the high need across the District demonstrated in HEDNA.</p> <p>HDC Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Jan 2017.</p>

bungalows is acceptable (on a 1 for 2 basis). 24 AH units including 5 bungalows = 19 AH units. The defined units mix for the affordable units is:  4x1bed units 9x2 bed houses / bungalows 6x3bed houses”	percent (75%) of the Market Dwellings.		
<b>Request by HDC</b>	<b>Community Facilities</b>		
<b>Amount / Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	<b>Policy Basis</b>
<b>£43,365</b> / for new build / extension projects or upgrading of existing premises in the Parish of Dunton Bassett	50% to be paid to HDC prior to the Commencement of Development.  50% to be paid to HDC prior to the First Occupation of any dwelling.	HDC consider the Community Facilities request to be necessary in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. The request accords with thresholds identified in adopted policies and would meet the additional demands on Dunton Bassett Community Facilities which would result from the development.  (See full consultation response 30.08.18 for full justification.)	HDC Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Jan 2017.  The Framework Section 4.
<b>Request by HDC</b>	<b>Obligation for Performance Bond</b>		
<b>Amount /Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	<b>Policy Basis</b>
District contribution – 15% of application fee or £250 per Contribution.	TBC	It is appropriate for the Council to recover costs associated with the negotiating, production and subsequent monitoring of developer contributions. This covers the legal costs of creating agreements, any costs associated with obtaining independent or specialist advice to validate aspects of the	HDC Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Jan 2017.

		contributions and the costs of monitoring	
<b>Request by NHS</b>	<b>Obligation for East Leicestershire and Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group</b>		
<b>Amount /Detail</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>CIL Justification</b>	<b>Policy Basis</b>
The contribution which is likely to be requested is £16,422.12	TBC	<p>The population of Dunton Bassett is served by The Orchard Medical Practice in nearby Broughton Astley. This surgery also has a branch surgery at Ullesthorpe nearby. It can be expected that the patients residing within the proposed development will seek registration from The Orchard Medical Practice.</p> <p>The area of Broughton Astley and the surrounding villages have seen a significant number of new developments within the past 5 years. Several of which have now commenced which means The Orchard Medical Practice as a result is seeing a significant rise in demand which is expected to continue for some time. Their current premises have been extended as far as the premises footprint will allow. The surgery is currently working with architects to plan a internal refurbishment to rearrange internal walls with a view to increasing the number of clinical rooms and also upgrading current clinical rooms with electronic lift couches and</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS12.</p> <p>Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy Adopted 3rd December 2014.</p> <p>The Framework Section 4.</p>

		<p>additional equipment to make each room multifunction consulting/treatment rooms. These changes are expected to increase the number of clinical rooms by one and increase the range of services available to patients.</p> <p>They would therefore propose to use any S106 healthcare contribution resulting from this new development to be put towards that project.</p> <p>The indicative size of the premises requirements has been calculated based on current typical sizes of new surgery projects factoring in a range of list sizes recognising economies of scale in larger practices.</p> <p>NB: The cost per sq.m has been identified by a quantity surveyor experienced in health care projects.</p> <p>See 13/08-2018 Consultation Response for full justification.</p>	
--	--	---	--

17/01270/FUL 17/01271/LBC	Demolition of existing farmhouse and erection of replacement dwelling; conversion of former manor house/hall to residential ancillary accommodation; conversion and erection of single storey side extension to farm office/barn to form single dwellinghouse; demolition of agricultural buildings and structures and erection of 8 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping. Knaptoft Hall Farm, Welford Road, Knaptoft
------------------------------	---

Additional letter from Agent, and viability consultant received today (04/09/18) at 11.45am (also addressed to Councillors);

Refers further to the non-viability of the schemes previously approved.

Emphasizes that “ Notwithstanding that the remains of the Hall is not on the formal ‘At Risk’ register, Forum Heritage Services considers that the building today should be regarded as a Building at Risk and thus a use which will remove the threat of neglect and decay that is currently present should be welcomed as a public benefit” Considers that “ the opportunity to affect the necessary repairs on the building and provide an appropriate use represents a substantial public benefit”.

Public benefits are recognised by Historic England and Conservation Officer.

“In terms of the landscape, the proposed redevelopment of the farmstead will lead to a significant enhancement to the immediate setting of the character of the countryside as it reflects the defining characteristics of traditional farmsteads in the Leicestershire Vales”.

Refers further to the viability of the previous scheme and considers that the scheme represents acceptable enabling development, required to undertake the scheme, as a whole.

Agent considers that “Despite the isolated location in the countryside, paragraph 79 of the Framework confirms circumstances where homes should be permitted where:  
*b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;*  
*c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;*

*e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: - is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.*

This Committee therefore has a planning policy basis under paragraph 79 bullet points (b), (c) and (e) to approve the scheme”.

A further letter also sent from Fisher German (viability consultants), concludes that:

In relation to the enabling role of the current scheme before the committee, the Aspinall Verdi Report states "I can confirm that the consented scheme is unviable and cannot meet the cost of restoration of the Listed Hall and that new dwellings are required to improve the scheme viability". It is therefore clear to me that the current facts of the case are not being clearly represented in the committee report put forward to Harborough District Council. Therefore, HDC should approve the current scheme.

A further illustrative site plan has also been submitted, following a request by Member sat the site visit.

**Officer comment:**

The report recognises the benefits of the scheme, as clearly set out in the Planning Balance/Conclusion on pages 83 and 84 of the report (and throughout). The viability conclusions form part of the report and overall conclusions.



17/01805/FUL	Erection of three dwellings with vehicular access. White House, Main Street, Ullesthorpe
--------------	---

## **Additional Consultation Responses**

### **LCC Forestry Team Leader**

The Ecolocation tree management plan largely accords with our earlier discussions, in that the larger 'landscape' trees area retained which contribute to the ambience of this part of the village. Crown-raising and removal of deadwood/defective stems are the main works on the large trees, with smaller shrubs being coppiced and only small elderly or inconspicuous trees being removed.

### **HDC Conservation Officer**

The revised plan has decreased the footprint of houses 2 & 3 and introduced a number of hipped roofs in place of gables.

The south elevations of plots 2 & 3 would be visible from within the conservation area when approaching the site from the south. I think there is a slight labelling error on plot 2 - as the south-facing elevation is labelled 'east elevation'

In both cases the mass of the south-facing elevation has been reduced, but the ridge height remains the same. The amendments will have some impact in reducing the prominence - but I can't really make an assessment of this without a street scene or a cross section showing the level difference between the road level and the site.

I can't speak for the previous officer, but notwithstanding the design revisions, I consider the proposed dwellings would be prominent on the site when viewed from the south and in that respect would not preserve or enhance the significance of the conservation area.

### **Further representations**

**Cllr Page** On behalf of several residents, the UPC and indeed -I am still concerned in regards of the access provision of this development and echo some of the points raised by Mrs.Edgley.

1 letter of neighbour representation

This development is not sustainable, not appropriate and not a requirement for this area and under CS17 and impact on Highway safety should be refused planning consent.

- 25 local households who live and breath the road have all highlighted our grave concerns about the safety of this development's access point.

- Highways desktop analysis and his ex colleague Matt Lennon's report produced for the applicant suggests they are unfamiliar with the road and the way that it works and the report should be seen as reporting bias.
- Distractions to drivers entering and leaving Manor Road including the drive of Hillcrest Cottage
- Removal of hedgerow will encourage an increase in traffic speed. This is a recipe for disaster.
- Highways state vehicles should enter/leave the site forward facing. Home delivery lorries on tight schedules will have Insufficient turning space provided – There will be insufficient space outside on the road to safely unload , single track and limited visibility is a heightened risk to highway users on foot and in vehicles due to the speed at which many would be leaving the site.
- There is still no safe direct access to the doctors' surgery and butcher's
- Trees – land/base of the trees are in fact level, and above, with the top of the wall. Children falling off the ends? -> Fencing will go up -> Lack of light in the gardens -> being heavily pruned/ removed = gardens more pleasurable by bringing light into the garden and houses.
- Remove hedging will have a material negative effect on the character of this part of the village within a designated Conservation Area.
- Current plan - areas already under development in the village by far exceed requirement for development in Ullesthorpe.
- Upcoming new local plan - figure for development in Ullesthorpe is ZERO supporting the fact that there is no overriding requirement for further development to be granted in our village.
- Current Supply exceeds demand illustrating there is no justification in the Conservation area being marred by such a development on a prominent site visible from the top of Manor Road and fields to the south of the plot whilst increasing highway risk and dangers to pedestrians in particular in Manor Road.

18/00871/PCD	Discharge of conditions 4 (hard and soft landscaping), 6 (landscape management plan), 10 (construction method statement), 14 (tree protection) and 16 (refuse storage) of 16/01355/FUL. Land At Fleckney Road, Saddington
--------------	--

### **Consultations and Representations**

HDC Public Open Spaces Officer

*Final Response:* Thanks you for the revised LMP; I am now satisfied that it meets the requirements for play area inspections

### **Material Planning Considerations**

Para 5.5 – Neighbourhood Plan

Saddington's Neighbourhood Plan is due to go to Referendum on the 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019

18/00944/OUT	Outline application for the demolition of existing building, erection of 2 and 3 storey residential development (of up to 10 flats) including associated car parking, landscaping and other external works (access to be considered). Swiftway Community Centre, Central Avenue, Lutterworth
--------------	---

18/01015/LBC & 18/01014/FUL	Erection of a single storey extension with frameless glass link to newly formed doorway opening to side gable and new space to contain relocated family kitchen and garden room. Yew Tree House, Burton Overy, Leicestershire
-----------------------------------	--

Additional information from case officer:

#### Site History

2.5 – Application 17/01836/FUL was approved in December 2017 for the Erection of a detached garage and alterations to the driveway and landscaping at the front of the property.

The driveway and landscaping element have been completed, but the garage has not been yet been built.

#### Other Considerations

- Additional information -

Should the garage be constructed it would obscure views of the house from the public highway.

Notwithstanding this, I do not consider this would mitigate the harm caused to the significance of the listed building. The character of the building is not defined by its visibility from the public highway and the extension would remain prominent when viewed from within the site.

18/01070/FUL	Change of use from a dwelling to a mixed use comprising residential use and use of indoor swimming pool and associated areas to provide swimming lessons (retrospective). August Cottage, 3 The Lindens, Station Road, Broughton Astley
--------------	--

Supporting Statement from Applicant

The applicant has submitted a lengthy supporting statement counter arguing the points made in the Officer's recommendation report of refusal to Committee. The statement also includes three additional letters of support from neighbouring residents on Lea Close and a list of clients' proximity and method of transport details has also been included.

A copy of this statement was sent by email from the applicant directly to Members and the full document is available to view if required. .

Neighbour Representations

Support:

A previous objector now wishes to rescind their objection and support the application, due to being satisfied that the use no longer has an adverse impact on parking around Lea Close. Support has also been raised for the principle of the use, stating that it is of service to the local community.

Support:

From a client, stating their support for the use and that they try not to park discourteously.

Objection:

Object to the application due to parking concerns. However, not opposed to the principle of the business use.

Photos have been provided and are included in the accompanying PowerPoint presentation.

18/01080/FUL	Erection of a dwelling. Land Opposite 65 Meadowbrook Road, Kibworth Beauchamp
--------------	--

Update to Paragraph 4.10:

Following the publication of the Committee Report a further 1 no. representation from the local community has been received. In this case, the representation received supports the proposed development.

Accordingly, to date, 15 no. letters of representation had been received in connection with this planning application; 13 no. of which add support to the proposed development, whilst 2 no. of which object to the proposed development.

Update to Paragraph 4.11:

Notwithstanding the above, a further representation has been received from one of the objectors to the proposed development. This objector had wished to speak at Planning Committee; however, due to being away, he/she did not receive the letter until their return and as such missed the deadline for registration to speak at Planning Committee. The following comments were provided within this latest representation:

*“Unfortunately I was on holiday and did not receive the letter until I returned. I mentioned to Jeremy Eaton that I would like to speak but had to wait for the letter so I could register.*

*As one of the two people to object to this application I want to make sure the committee is aware of my concerns and that they would be taken into account.*

*After the proposers canvassed the area and requested people for their support I want to make sure the committee has the opportunity to hear my objection and be able to question the people directly affected and live within the vicinity.*

*Most of the people who have supported the application do not live within the direct vicinity and will not be affected in any way.*

*If the committee have sight of my objection and understand that I would have liked to speak but I was unable to reply in time then I would be happy.*

*I would not wish for them to think that I did not take this matter seriously enough to reiterate my concerns at the meeting.*

*I will be attending the meeting even if I do not have the opportunity to speak.”*

Insertion of Paragraph 4.12:

In respect of the letters of support received, a summary of the key points raised, in no particular order, is provided below:

- The proposed development will result in the increased usage of an under-utilised plot of land;
- The erection of the proposed dwellinghouse will make a positive contribution to the street;

- The design of the proposed development will not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the neighbouring residential properties, and as such would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the local area, including the streetscene to Meadowbrook Road;
- The proposal is not considered to result in any adverse harm in respect to matters of highway safety;
- The proposed development is considered to meet the needs of the Applicant, the street and the wider local community; and
- It is suggested that this application should be approved, especially as other new houses are being built locally within the village of Kibworth Beauchamp.



18/01136/OUT	Outline application for the erection of a dwelling and associated works (all matters reserved). Tanglewood, Snows Lane, Keyham
--------------	---

### **Consultee Comments**

Comments have been received from the Keyham Village Chair on behalf of the Keyham Conservation Committee stating:

“We support the current Harborough District Planning Policy concerning sustainable development and note that the proposed development is in breach of it. Accordingly we have reservations about the application as it breaches the policy and there are no exceptional circumstances with respect to the application that would warrant a deviation from current policy.

We note that whilst 33 residents have signed a petition in support of the application it must be pointed out that the other 88 residents of the village have not. No ability to object or answer in the alternative were provided to the villagers when this petition was presented during a door to door exercise.

Finally we note that a letter detailing the demand for housing in Keyham as noted in the Local Housing Register records that of 992 applicants on the list, only 1 specified Keyham as a preferred location. As such therefore there is no demonstrable demand for expansion of housing capacity within the village even if it were permissible under the above stated Planning Policy Framework.”

### **Comments from Ward Councillor Michael Rook**

“As local Ward Councillor I visited the location at the invitation of the applicant. The proposal lies within the curtilage of the village and follows the relaxed building line of the properties on Snows Lane. The Lane itself is banked and has a unique form of driveways and frontages overlooking open countryside. This Proposal fits perfectly into that building line and vernacular. Neither is the outline plan cramped or overdeveloped on its plot. I see no reason therefore to refuse the proposal on "sustainability issues" as the proposal fits perfectly well into a village that survives perfectly well on own transport, and has a well defined village life. There is nothing out of place or at odds with the neighbourhood I note that there is a ground swell of support, and no comparable written counter arguments against a new home in this location. I note too that an encampment development was passed by HDC Planners only a couple of years ago without "sustainability" being an issue. Consistency of process therefore dictates that this development should be allowed.” [sic]

### **Report Correction**

Paragraph 4.11 states “A petition of support signed by 39 individuals (including the two occupiers of Tanglewood) has been received.

It should state “signed by 41 individuals”.

### **Additional Signatures on Petition**

5 additional signatures have been received.

## Planning Committee Speakers List – 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018

Speakers please note that the Council's constitution requires evening meetings to end after three hours, unless the Committee votes to continue the meeting. If a meeting does adjourn, remaining business will be considered at a time and date fixed by the Chairman or at the next ordinary meeting of the Committee and the existing speakers list will be carried forward.

Application	Parish	Speaker	Type
18/00826/OUT	Dunton Bassett	Liz Smith Michelle Kazakavics Mark Doherty Tom Collins Cllr Neil Bannister	O O O AG WM
17/01270/FUL	Knaptoft	William Young Aaron Smith Mrs Kim Hall	S AG A
17/01271/LBC	Knaptoft	William Young Aaron Smith Mrs Kim Hall	S AG A
17/01805/FUL	Ullesthorpe	George Burton Lawrence Brown	AG A
18/00871/PCD	Saddington		
18/00944/OUT	Lutterworth		
18/01015/LBC	Burton Overy	Richard Norwood Gareth Dyer Cllr James Hallam	AG A WM
18/01014/FUL	Burton Overy	Richard Norwood Gareth Dyer Cllr James Hallam	AG A WM
18/01070/FUL	Broughton Astley	Robert Greaves Amanda Kane Lea Kane Peter Thompson	O A S AG
18/01080/FUL	Kibworth Beauchamp	Peter Ponsford	A
18/01136/OUT	Keyham	Richard Taylor Nicola Millicheap Tony Johnson	S S S

**Key to Speaker Type: O = Objector, S = Supporter, PC = Parish Council, A = Applicant/on behalf of applicant, AG = Agent, WM = Ward Member**