

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 7th December 2021
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: 9

21/01871/REM	Application for approval of appearance, landscape, layout and scale in respect of the western part of Zone A/B at Magna Park South, Lutterworth
--------------	---

Amended Conditions

Condition 1 should be amended to read as follows:

1 Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:

- MPS-SGP-07-ZZ-DR-A-121027 Rev D – Site Location
- MPS7-SGP-07-00-DR-A-121101 Rev A – Ground Floor Plan
- MPS7-SGP-07-ZZ-DR-A-121102 – Floor Plans
- MPS7-SGP-07-RF-DR-A-121103 Rev A – Roof Plan
- MPS7-SGP-07-ZZ-DR-A-121201 – Sections
- MPS7-SGP-07-ZZ-DR-A-121301 Rev B – Elevations
- MPS7-SGP-07-ZZ-DR-A-121401 – Gatehouse details
- 21118-BGL-XX-XX-DR-S-00260 P1 – General Arrangement (Plot A)
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-DR-L-1100 P01 – General Arrangement MPS7
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-DR-L-1301 P02 – Landscape Sections
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-DR-L-5201 P02 – Typical Woodland Planting Layout Plan
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-DR-L-5301 P02 – Typical Woodland on bund Planting Maturation Detail
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-DR-L-5501 P02 – Typical Softworks Details
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-RP-L-0001 P03 – Landscape Statement
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-SP-L-9000 P02 – Landscape Specification
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-RP-L-5000 P03 – Landscape Management Plan
- DBS545-GRA-10-XX-SC-L-5000 P02 – Softworks Schedule
- 10366-EXT-100B MPS7 – MPS7 Incoming External services layout
- 10366-PL-100 MPS7 – MPS7 External Lighting Lux Level Plot
- 10366-SR-100 Issue 02 – KTA Sustainability Report

Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the scheme takes the form agreed by the authority and thus results in a satisfactory form of development and for the avoidance of doubt.

21/01613/FUL	Change of use of fitness centre to dance and performing arts school (Sui Generis) (Retrospective) at 1 Angel Court, High Street, Market Harborough
--------------	--

Application Withdrawn by applicant (email 6th December 2021)

Information received from applicant 26.11.2021

The window that has been advised to soundproof is the upstairs window that overlooks the courtyard.

We have this week had sound insulation installed over the window which is 100mm thickness... however we have doubled the thickness so there is in fact 200mm.

We have boarded over the insulation which will be turned into shelving once we finish for Christmas and we have a suitable time to get workmen into the building.

I still feel like it would be beneficial for somebody to attend the courtyard during busy periods to assess the situation first hand and advise further on how we can improve noise leaving the building when there is currently no noise coming from the building, I'm at a loss.

Officer comments

These measures demonstrate potential and alternative mitigation measures may exist but there are apparent differences on interpretation of implementing advice and uncertainty over its effectiveness. The recommendation to refuse the application remains the same due to these differences and uncertainty.

20/02044/FUL	Change of use of agricultural land for the siting of 25 camping / touring pitches, Agricultural Barns at Sibbertoft Road, Husbands Bosworth
--------------	---

21/01094/FUL	Erection of 8 dwellings (revised scheme of 20/00838/FUL) The Causeway, Church Causeway, Church Langton
--------------	--

Additional Information Received

06/12/2021, an updated preliminary Ecological Appraisal was received, together with updated biodiversity net gain calculations. Following a review by the Applicant's ecologist. The BNG area has increased to 8,500sqm, which has been reflected in an updated Site Plan (Rev G).

LCC Ecology

The provision of the biodiversity offsetting on the adjacent site is acceptable. I am still concerned that a buffer hasn't been provided between the garden boundaries and the hedgerow to the west. If they are insisting on not providing this then we need to know how they can guarantee that the hedgerow will be maintained for its biodiversity value and its value as wildlife corridor.

Cllr King

I would like the full comments from to be sent to all members of the committee, as having read the report, I consider that important contextual information has been omitted.

Before making this submission, as one of the ward members, I can say that I have read both the HLP, the ELNP and have also walked around the village in the last few weeks to appraise myself of the topography and spatial relationships. I can say that whilst the applicant is known to me, he and I have not discussed this application, although I have received communications from his appointed agent.

My comments are:-

In the Harborough Local Plan(2019), under policy H1 Provision of new housing there is a minimum requirement for 30 homes in the Church and East Langton villages, excluding any windfalls, since it's a selected rural village. Although no sites were allocated, there is a permitted site for 17 homes, 18/00904/OUT and 19/00953/REM which only received final consent in May 2021. Other sites have been brought forward elsewhere over this time period and rejected on appeal to the planning inspectorate. I don't think it can be ignored that this permitted scheme is directly opposite the applicants site on Church Causeway. However, because the permitted scheme now requires visibility splays 25Mx 2.5M each side of the entrance, to ensure safe access to this development, this fundamentally alters the characteristic of the street scene and surroundings.

This permitted scheme is also on land that is currently agricultural fields, growing crops and which is designated as separation land under the adopted East Langton Neighbourhood Plan (ELNP) 2018, a plan which made no allocations .

Whilst according to the adopted ELNP, the applicants land is also designated as separation land, it is clear from a visual inspection from the road, that it is enclosed and part of his residential curtilage, unlike the permitted scheme opposite which is open agricultural fields.

The proposed site is highly sustainable- it is on the local bus route, in fact a few metres from the bus stop. There is a pavement and it is within easy walking distance of the Church Langton Primary school and also the Hanbury Community centre and it's pre-school, local

pubs and other community facilities such as Parish Church, cricket ground, and also employment sites in both villages, in particular East Langton at Back Lane on Astley Grange where various businesses employ around 100 people.

Further having looked at the current ELNP, which is committed to sustainable development that supports people living and working locally, the only policy which I can find that this would breach is ENV6 the area of separation- which in my mind was fatally breached when the decision was made to allow 18/00904/OUT- which if you recall I was opposed to on such grounds.

In respect of other ELNP 2018 policies, I can find no other policies why this site shouldn't be permitted for a limited in-fill type of development as put forward by the applicant. Whether the design and layout is suitable are issues that I fully expect can be resolved by further dialogue or conditions with the applicant.

If you are however minded to refuse, then on the basis of the reasons I have laid out, I am obliged to ask for this to be referred to the Planning Committee for consideration.

East Langton Parish Council (2nd Response)

East Langton Parish Council strongly objects to the above planning application as it breaches Policies H2: Windfall Sites and ENV6: Area of Separation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy H2: states – “Small scale development proposals for infill housing will be supported where: a) It is within the existing built-up area of the villages of Church Langton and East Langton.”

This site is outside the built area of the village as there is a paddock between the site and the centre of the village to the north.

Policy ENV6 states “Development proposals which would reduce the separation of Church Langton and East Langton and between East Langton and West Langton Parish boundary will not be supported”.

The Plan supports this policy by saying “The Parish is made up of two villages - Church Langton and East Langton. Each has its own history, identity and character. Consultation shows that maintaining the separation of the two communities is important to ensure that the distinct identity and character of these two villages is maintained.

The Neighbourhood Plan, ‘Made’ by referendum in 2018, reflects the feeling of the residents to further development in the introduction to section 7.2 Housing Provision, “The Parish has already been the subject of some house building. The Plan recognises that further limited housing building will take place, primarily in Church Langton, however, consultation has shown that many local residents are concerned about this. They value the rural nature of the Parish and consider that it should remain so and not become a larger settlement. They are also concerned about the type and style of new housing, and that the Parish's infrastructure is not keeping up with housing growth.”

The Parish Council has taken into account the comments on Regulation 14 and now the latest amendment to the plan which shows 3 affordable housing units (a bungalow and 2 semi's), but the Parish Council still objects to the proposal as outlined in the comments above

Managing Director, Yourlocale (and resident of Church Langton)

I object to this planning application because it is in conflict with the Made Neighbourhood Plan for East Langton Parish and the submitted Neighbourhood Plan Review.

The proposed development site is in land designated as an Area of Separation in the Made Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the Development Plan for Harborough and approving this application would therefore represent a conflict with the District Council's Development Plan documents.

Policy ENV6 of the Made Neighbourhood Plan says, 'Development proposals which would reduce the separation of Church Langton and East Langton and between East Langton and West Langton Parish boundary as shown on the map (figure 8) and the Environmental Proposals map (fig 9) will not be supported'. This policy is retained in the Review version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

It is my view that approving this planning application would be at odds with the aims and intentions of the Neighbourhood Plan process, which seeks to establish a shared vision for the development of the Plan Area and ensure that development meets local needs and also that it takes place in the most appropriate and sustainable locations.

Over the past few years, in conjunction with local residents and other stakeholders, the Parish Council has undertaken extensive consultation to gather the views of the community about how the parish should develop over the coming years in support of the Neighbourhood Plan. This includes a range of well attended consultation exercises and community questionnaires.

As part of the review of the Neighbourhood Plan, an exercise was undertaken to encourage landowners to put sites forward for residential development and eight landowners came forward to have their land assessed. From this exercise, two sites were selected to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan and in so doing the Parish has met its housing requirement for the Plan period.

The site which is the subject of this planning application did not score sufficiently well to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as an allocation. Other sites were chosen which are considered more sustainable and do not conflict with the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Approving this planning application in these circumstances would be contrary to the spirit and intentions of the Localism Act 2011 which aims "to make the planning system more democratic and more effective, and to ensure that decisions about housing are taken locally".

If approved, this application would not only undermine the aims and policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan, but also send a negative message to communities across Harborough not only to those engaged in the development of Neighbourhood Plans but all those that wish to see decisions about housing and other forms of development guided by and responding to local needs and priorities.

It would also call into question the benefit of having a Neighbourhood Plan in the East Langton Parish and run a significant risk that the referendum on the Review Neighbourhood Plan would fail to secure a majority in favour as people would, with some justification, say 'what is the point - Harborough District Council will disregard it in any event'.

I urge the Planning Committee to reject this application and to support the Neighbourhood Plan for East Langton.

Additional Neighbour Comments (following publication of the Agenda)

11 x additional comments of objection received. In summary:

- The policy in the Neighbourhood Plan establishing an area of separation is completely ignored by this application and must not be approved if the Neighbourhood Plan is to have any weight or credibility at all.
- It has been suggested that a precedent has already been set with the approval of 17 dwellings behind Thornton Crescent. This is incorrect. The development here contains dwellings that are not within the area of separation. The provision of an access point from Church Causeway does not reduce the area of separation and therefore the integrity of the policy is retained.
- I am objecting to this planning application on the basis it breaches policy ref ENV6 of the local Neighbourhood Plan. The rural area between the two villages, Church Langton & East Langton would be reduced considerably and give licence for further development in years to come.
- Approving this planning application completely undermines the aims and policies of the neighbourhood plan. What is the point of the neighbourhood plan and the parish councils work if you are just going to ignore it and do whatever you like
- The design of these proposed houses do not fit with the rest of the village, and I am concerned they will take away from the charm and history of Church Langton. The houses are also too tightly packed on such a small plot.
- This planning application does not comply with the Neighbourhood Plan. The villagers of East and Church Langton have put a great deal of effort and consultation into constructing both the existing plan and the proposed review of the plan. It would be totally wrong to approve this application as it is outside the area of separation of the villages which is an important element of the plan. Whilst I am not opposed to further housing the review of the plan has already identified suitable sites for development and this was particular site was not deemed suitable
- I object to this 'called-in' planning application. I am persuaded by all the aspects of the persuasive assessment made by the Planning Officer (in the papers for Planning Committee for Dec 7th) which make it clear that the application conflicts with a raft of local council policies as well as with the 'made' East Langton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (itself part of local district plans now).
- The papers document that for ' calling-in' the application, Cllr King's main grounds are that the application's clear contradiction to ENV6 of the Neighbourhood Plan does not, in effect, count against it - because to "(his) mind" a key relevant aspect of the Neighbourhood plan "was (already) fatally breached when the decision was made to allow 18/00904/OUT". I believe this is simply as a matter of fact not the case. But even if it were, in the old adage, "two wrongs do not make a right"!
- There appears to be no pressing need for this new housing since the parish already has more than enough capacity to meet its building requirements within the District Plan (as argued in the revised Neighbourhood Plan).
- I hope that the Planning Committee will follow the clear well-founded recommendations of the council's own Planning Officer, reject the application, and in so doing respect and support both its own policies & plans, and the Neighbourhood Plan for East Langton.

- Members (and Officers) of Harborough District Council will recall that the East Langton Neighbourhood Plan was democratically approved in a parish referendum held on 21 June 2018. A 'yes' vote was emphatically returned with 132 out of the 147 persons who voted, voting "to use the Neighbourhood Plan for East Langton to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area".
- If this application were to be approved by the Planning Committee, then it would undermine the legitimacy of democratically adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- For the long months of work and debate in putting the plan together to be ignored in such a flagrant way I find quite frankly staggering. Perhaps at some point members of our elected local council might like to explain why on the basis of the other comments and valid objections listed here we are even having this debate
- With the work being done across the road on Thornton Crescent, which is already creating noise, mess and disturbance, if building was to start on the opposite site as well, it's as if the entire village is going to become one big building site.
- I worry about the countryside being damaged, along with the wildlife it supports. The footpath leading to the meadow behind the pub is a pleasant walk, with fields and trees supporting birds, insects, rabbits and more. Unfortunately this will no longer be the case if the houses are built.
- The rural area between the two villages, Church Langton & East Langton would be reduced considerably and give licence for further development in years to come
- It has been suggested that a precedent has already been set with the approval of 17 dwellings behind Thornton Crescent. This is incorrect. The development here contains dwellings that are not within the area of separation. The provision of an access point from Church Causeway does not reduce the area of separation and therefore the integrity of the policy is retained.
- This planning application does not comply with the Neighbourhood Plan. The villagers of East and Church Langton have put a great deal of effort and consultation into constructing both the existing plan and the proposed review of the plan. It would be totally wrong to approve this application as it is outside the area of separation of the villages which is an important element of the plan. Whilst I am not opposed to further housing the review of the plan has already identified suitable sites for development and this particular site was not deemed suitable.

21/01286/FUL& 21/01287/LBC	Removal of conservatory and external terraced area, replacement of existing courtyard and north facing windows and internal alterations to the existing cafe area, erection of a rear single storey extension, addition of single storey reception area, works to car parking areas, erection of bin store and reinstatement of existing Public House signage (part retrospective), The Nevill Arms, Medbourne
-------------------------------	--

Cllr Rickman

I was requested to call in the application initially by Mr and Mrs Hall, prior owners of the Nevill Arms and residents and proprietors of Waterfall Cottages, a business adjoining the pub.

Subsequently concerns have been raised by the Parish Council and the points are below.

- We very much wish to see the Nevill Arms succeed as a thriving village pub/restaurant. However, we have significant concerns that the ambitious scope for the development of the Nevill Arms completely outstrips the ability of the Village to safely support this venture in terms of parking in relation to current and certainly future parking spaces in particular those on roads nearby. Certainly any decisions taken should not be to the detriment of residents.
- The parking Survey detailed in Highway Reference Number: 2021/1286/03/H/R1 is not clear on the 'parking stress' implications/substance. One of the survey times {Saturday 1500-1600} is not at all representative of the most stressful time for parking in the Village. This needs to be done at the busiest times of the pub being open, namely evenings.
- The amount of on-street parking available in the village needs to be viewed in context. The report states "266 on-street parking spaces are available within 500m of the pub". The number of spaces may be correct, but the availability is not. Before any 'spare' capacity of the 266 places within 500m of the pub is considered, account needs to be taken of a number of enduring and underlying calls on that capacity. These are; residents of the village who only have access to on-street parking for their property; users of the well- used and busy Village Hall, which also is a daytime pre- school (in very close proximity to the Pub) who require on-street parking, both in daytime and evening, plus other visitors such as walkers and cyclists (of which there are many due to the multiple listed walks) to this popular Village. Once this is properly assessed then the figure of many of those 266 places that are still available will reduce considerably, especially taking into account that pub patrons are unlikely to walk 500m.
- Highways response does not provide any substantive detail on the location and extent of proposed highway marking (double yellow lines).
- We have grave concerns regarding the use of double yellow lines in a rural conservation village. Not only will this be ruinous to the aesthetic, but they will also only serve to displace the problem of insufficient parking to other parts of the village. In short, the use of double yellow lines is both deleterious to the village and will not contribute to the parking solution. It is also not clear the extent of the

proposed lines, especially on Ashley Road as there is a granted planning application in close proximity.

- The detail provided regarding the number of employees who do not require parking because they live in the village (and can walk to work) is contested. It is assessed that the number of employees who live out of the village and require parking is much higher. A definitive and independent survey/assessment needs to be conducted.

On dwg L342-BRP-00-ZZ-DR-A-0102-P02 the parking space labelled as No 5 is understood to be Highways land, as shown on the Location Plan, so cannot be counted in the extra parking spaces provided

- Highways' Condition No 1 refers to a "turning space" but none of the application plans show a turning space.

These points have been put together by the Parish Chair Mr Seb Kendall, Cllr Shaen-Carter, herself a conservation architect and myself as ward councillor.

We think they are all valid points we request the committee to consider when making a decision on the application in a conservation village, and as a precedent would mention the Red Lion pub in Great Bowden and the resultant problems in that village with parking post development.

LCC Highway Response to Cllr Rickman's email

- The parking survey was carried out on Friday 24th & Saturday 25th of September during the hours of 12:00-24:00. During the Friday survey period the maximum parking stress was recorded between 20:00 to 21:00 hours and during the Saturday survey period the maximum parking stress was recorded between 15:00 to 16:00 hours – This doesn't refer to the duration the survey was carried out.
- However as noted in our comments the parking areas surveyed were kerbside and did not include any formal on-street parking spaces and their appears to be no review of the highway network surveyed in order to determine its 'appropriateness' for on street parking, particularly given Main Street and Ashley Road are classified 'B' roads.
- The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for 'no waiting at any time' (NWAAT) restrictions is to prevent any on street parking in close proximity to the junctions, and to protect visibility at the junctions. If vehicles are currently parking here they are probably contravening the highway code.
- As advised in our comments the scheme should cover the following areas: Junction of Waterfall Way and Ashley Road; Both junctions of Ashley Road with Main Street; and Full length of the Main Street 'triangle' to the junction of the car park on both sides of the carriageway; and the junction of the car park on Main Street.
- It's probably worth mentioning the TRO will go through a public consultation process, and they will have a chance to comment during that process.
- As to the number of employees who live in the village – and the validity of those figures this would be for the applicant to answer.
- As to the parking space labelled as No 5 it has not been considered as an additional space, given the applicant stated it was existing space. The two extra parking spaces are to be provided at the gravel car park.
- The LHA is satisfied there is sufficient turning space within the gravel car park, and it should be surfaced in hardbound material as per the condition advised.

It's important to consider the trip generation based on the TRICS database which identified for the proposed use an increase of circa 3 (two-way) movements in the busiest two peak hour periods throughout the day, which is low, and when considering the additional two parking spaces, it would be difficult to object to this application on highway grounds. As

advised in our comments *'Therefore, in view of the low trip generation and NWAAT restrictions to mitigate the impact of overspill parking at the junctions of Waterfall Way, Main Street, and Ashley Road, the LHA does not consider the shortfall in car spaces to be of a severe impact to the highway in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework'*

Applicant Response to Cllr Rickman's email

The parking space no.5 was incorrectly indicated as being included within the red line boundary as an error on the site plan drawing, this has now been removed. Our intention is to retain the existing spaces at this point therefore 4no. parking spaces are retained as an existing condition within the red line boundary. As discussed in the Supplementary Technical Note the area outside of the redline is used as an informal space by pub patrons historically.

MAC Supplementary Technical Note (response to each of the points made)

Over a two-day period, on Friday 24th and Saturday 25th September 2021, the survey was undertaken over a 12-hour duration between 12:00-00:00 hours which includes the busiest opening times associated the Nevill Arms. During the evening periods between 6pm 12pm the recorded number of cars park on-street within the village was 52 (representing a level of parking stress of 20%) and 56 (representing a level of parking stress of 21%) during the Friday and Saturday survey periods respectively. During these peak evening occupancy periods there are therefore between 214-210 on-street car parking spaces available within the village for other road users, residents, and visitors

The industry standard Lambeth car parking methodology for commercial development required a 500m walk distance from an identified location to be surveyed. The measured area is not a circle with a 500m radius, but the actual walking distance measured along all roads up to a point 500m from the site. Furthermore, guidance on walking distances to local amenities is provided in the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) "Providing for Journeys on Foot" (2000). The Guidelines indicate that a walking distance of 400m is acceptable for trips within town centres and that a distance of 800m is acceptable elsewhere.

The response from the Local Highway Authority, Leicestershire County Council, dated 25th November 2021, states that parking restrictions should be considered at: The Junction of Waterfall Way and Ashley Road Both junction of Ashley Road with Main Street Full length of Main Street Triangle to the junction of the car park on both sides of the carriageway, and the junction of the car park to Main Street

The information provided on the number of full and part-time staff is based on data provided by the Nevill Arms at the time of submission of the planning application. If required, a Travel Plan could be conditioned within a planning permission. The Travel Plan for the Nevill Arms would undertake both staff and customer travel surveys to establish modes of travel. Subject to the outcome of the survey, sustainable travel measures could be implemented in the future by the Nevill Arms to promote single occupancy car use. For example, this could comprise a car share database for staff members

The existing turning space at Waterfall Way currently functions as space for deliveries and refuse vehicle collection associated with the Nevill Arms. The proposals make no alteration to this existing turning area provision and will remain in perpetuity. Furthermore, associated deliveries and refuse collection occurs outside of the opening hours of the Nevill Arms

In summary, the Local Highway Authority, Leicestershire County Council, have concluded the impacts of the development on highway safety would not be unacceptable, and when considered cumulatively with other developments, the impacts on the road network would not be severe. Based on the information provided, the development therefore does not conflict with paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

21/01320/OUT	Outline application for the demolition of existing dwelling and commercial buildings and for the erection of nine dwellings (access to be considered) - 33 Dunton Road, Broughton Astley
--------------	--

Cllr Liquorish (5th December)

I will declare an interest due to my involvement over the years as a county councillor with issues on Dunton Road and Station Road. I ask for a deferment for a planning visit due to traffic using the road from south to north and its steepish incline at the point of site access.

Cllr Golding cc Cllr Graves (1st December)

Regarding the attached list of site visits planned for next Monday.

One item on next week's Planning Committee agenda relates to application 21/01320/OUT which was originally called in by Cllr Graves and supported by me. In view of the contentious nature of this application, and the fact that it is recommended for acceptance by officers, I am more than surprised that it is not included on the list of potential sites to be visited prior to discussion at committee.

Officer comment

This proposal was not identified as necessary for a site visit and not therefore put forward for such a visit by officers. It was impractical to add late to the list of site visits that were undertaken. It can be a matter for discussion by planning committee if it considers a site visit necessary to inform a decision.

The comments from Cllr Liquorish regarding the types of dwelling are noted, and whilst we could put the request forward for bungalows, we could not insist on this given that minimum distances are mainly met in accordance with Supplementary Planning Guidance, and that surrounding properties are also predominantly two-storey. In any event, details of design are subject of further reserved matters application. Regarding the point raised on highway safety and access suitability, The Local Highway Authority are satisfied with the proposed access following the submission of an access junction layout and vehicle swept path analysis for refuse vehicles (subject to recommended conditions).

Amended conditions

Condition 2

The previous condition incorrectly allowed only two years for the commencement of development following approval. It now reads:

The development hereby approved shall commence either before the expiration of three years from the date of this Outline permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

REASON: To accord with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Condition 7

The condition now includes the drawing numbers relevant to the condition and reads:

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as the access arrangements, visibility and off-site highway works shown generally on drawing number ADC2495-DR-001 – Revision P2 (Proposed access junction layout) have been implemented in full.

REASON: To ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site may pass each other clear of the highway, in a slow and controlled manner, in the interests of general highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Condition 11

This has been removed, as the hedgerow on the eastern boundary is to be retained and does not form part of the proposed gardens backing on to this boundary.

21/01493/FUL	Erection of 10 dwellings with associated landscaping, access and parking, Land at St Wilfrid's Close, Kibworth
--------------	--

Appendix A – Correction

Request by LCC Education is missing from Appendix A. They have requested the following amount(s), which have justified within their formal response. The contribution has been agreed by the Applicant

Primary School Sector Requirement £55,068.00. This contribution would be used to accommodate the capacity issues created by the proposed development by improving, remodelling or enhancing existing facilities at Kibworth Church of England Primary School or any other school within the locality of the development.

Secondary/Post 16 Sector/Special Schools £0

PCT Request – to be spent at South Leicestershire Medical Group. Practices include Kibworth Medical Centre; Fleckney Medical Centre, Great Glen Surgery, Old School Surgery, Kibworth, Market Harborough Torch Way, Fleckney Duck Pond Surgery – £2,195.51

Amended Conditions

Condition 6 – the wording of the condition should be amended so the landscaping details to be submitted also include details of how the western hedgerow will be improved/enhanced

Condition 3 – the wording of the condition should be amended so the CMS includes details of how the site will be accessed by construction vehicles due to existing on street parking, which reduces the width of the access, making it difficult for larger construction vehicles to access. i.e. it may need to have smaller construction vehicles.

Additional Conditions

Condition 29 – pedestrian visibility splays

Condition 30 – erection of garden sheds to comply with NP Policy

Condition 31 – removal of Permitted Development Rights.

Condition 32 – notwithstanding submitted boundary treatment plan, details to be submitted

Condition 33 – the open space and footpath link should be provided prior to 1st occupation

21/01485/FUL	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension at 48 Main Street, Medbourne
--------------	---

21/01488/FUL	Siting of a storage container – Harborough Market Hall
--------------	--

21/01066/FUL & 21/01067/LBC	Ventilation installation and associated building works; The Symington Building, Adam and Eve Street, Market Harborough
--------------------------------	--

21/01538/FUL	Conversion of a garage to a dwelling (Land At Plowmans Yard, Coventry Road, Market Harborough)
--------------	--

21/01541/FUL	Installation of 1 CCTV mounted on a 6m post Recreation Ground, Scotland Road, Market Harborough
--------------	--

Planning Committee Speakers List – 7th December 2021

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	Time (mins)
21/01871/REM	Lutterworth	Louise Steele	AG	3
21/01613/FUL APPLICATION WITHDRAWN.	Market Harborough	N/A		
20/02044/FUL	Husbands Bosworth	Peter Garner	A	3
21/01094/FUL	East Langton	Rosalind Folwell Derek Doran Ranjit Sagoo Cllr Phil King	PC O AG WM	3 3 6 5
21/01286/FUL& 21/01287/LBC	Medbourne			
21/01320/OUT	Broughton Astley	Nick Cox Cllr Mark Graves	AG WM	3 5
21/01493/FUL	Kibworth Beauchamp	Geoff Armstrong Cllr Phil King Cllr Simon Whelband	AG WM WM - STC	3 5 5
21/01485/FUL	Medbourne			
21/01488/FUL	Market Harborough			
21/01066/FUL 21/01067/LCB	Market Harborough			
21/01538/FUL	Market Harborough			
21/01541/FUL	Market Harborough			

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2020/21

Councillors Mrs Ackerley, Mrs Burrell, Champion (Chairman), Elliot, Frenchman, James, Liquorish, Modha (Vice-Chairman) and Nunn.

Please note – any Councillor unable to attend a meeting can be substituted with prior notice being given. Any substitutions will be announced at the start of each meeting.

