

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9 October 2012
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

12/00711/FUL – CARLTON CURLIEU	Erection of one wind turbine (102m to tip of blade) and associated ancillary infrastructure. Land OS 6256, Main Street, Carlton Curlieu, Leicestershire
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION LIST:

Representations:

2 additional letters of representation from residents in Burton Overy and Tur Langton raising the following concerns – 1) Strongly oppose a wind turbine as it will have a significant impact on the local landscape, character and historic landscape (CS9 iii), blot on the landscape aesthetically and would not conserve or enhance the local area. Would stick out like a sore thumb in an area of overwhelming natural beauty, close to a conservation village. 2) Prowind's assurances that it would be 'financially and technically unviable' to erect more turbines once one has been allowed are not very reassuring. Once precedent is set, a door has been opened which cannot then be closed. 3) Privileged to live in such a beautiful part of the world. Please let us not destroy it with these ugly monsters.

12/00900/OUT – LUTTERWORTH	Erection of 130 dwellings, creation of a cemetery, and provision of associated infrastructure including public open space (outline application - all matters reserved) Leaders Farm, Coventry Road, Lutterworth, Leicestershire LE17 4JF.
----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

Additional comment from objector refers to comments made (page 25/26) and specifically point 6) Would like it made clear that **all** the Gazeley land (eastern triangle) is outside the established limits to development. This is referred to on page 26 of the report under Principle of development. It is considered that, though outside of the limits, the land is well related to the existing built form of development and given its location is not considered rural in character of particularly attractive (as recognised by the Landscape Capacity Study which identified the land as green “high capacity for development). It is also noted that approximately half of this triangle is shown as detention basin and rough grassland for ecological purposes.

Revised Highways Comments (received 26/09/12):

I have been in discussions with the Consulting Engineers WSP in respect of the access. As the application is in outline with all matters reserved, I am content to deal with the proposed access at the reserved matters stage. I have amended my observations accordingly.

Since submitting the Highway observations dated 29 August 2012, further discussions have taken place with the applicant's consulting engineers WSP, in respect of the proposed access, and the highway observations are revised accordingly.

The application is outline with all matters reserved (including access). The Highway Authority (HA) would comment on the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) as follows:

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

4.2 Site Access Arrangements

It is proposed to access the site from Coventry Road through the provision of a simple priority controlled junction. Before the form of access junction can be agreed, the applicants should provide additional data at the reserved matters stage to support the proposed access arrangements. Such data to include traffic counts and vehicle speeds on Coventry Road in the vicinity of the proposed access. Traffic counts should include daily traffic flows as well as peak hour traffic flows.

There is no footway/cycleway along the frontage of the development. A footway should be provided on Coventry Road along the frontage of the development between the access and Cunningham Drive and a footway/cycleway should be provided on Coventry Road along the frontage of the development between the

access and the existing footway/cycleway at the junction of Coventry Road with Brookfield Way.

5.4 Baseline Traffic data

2006 traffic flows should not be used in the assessment. Up to date traffic counts should be undertaken and used in the assessment and submitted at the reserved matters stage.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT UNIT COMMENTS

Transport Assessment

Paragraphs 3.5.14 and 3.5.18 – distances to the site entrance are approx 260m; however from the furthest homes on site this is approximately 750m, which is in excess of what LCC would recommend for a 'reasonable' walking distance in order to encourage use of public transport and assist in modal shift away from SOV trips. We would therefore proposed that 2 x new bus stops are located as close as safely possible to the site entrance, this could then reduce walking distances to the further most homes to around 470m, still in excess of the 400m we would recommend but a lot better than 750m. The reduction in walking distance to the next nearest bus stops would also benefit people visiting the cemetery.

Travel Plan

5.2.1 – The proposal to provide travel packs is welcomed. It should be agreed / acknowledged that it will be an ongoing task [of the TPC?] to keep the contents of the packs up to date.

5.2.2 – we feel the free bus pass offer should be extended to 6 months as a greater time period to fully imbed changes to travel habits. These could be offered on an 'either / or' basis with the cycle incentive vouchers mentioned in 5.4.3..

S106 Contributions

To comply with Government guidance in NPPF the following contributions would be required in the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site, achieving modal shift targets, and reducing car use:

Travel Packs; to inform new residents from first occupation what sustainable travel choices are in the surrounding area (can be supplied by LCC at £52.85 per pack).

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 sustainable travel modes other than the car (can be supplied through LCC at (average) £325.00 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).

2 x new bus stops, as close as safely possible to the site entrance on Coventry Road – including:

Raised and dropped kerbs to allow level access); to support modern bus fleets with low floor capabilities. At £3263.00 per stop.

Information display cases at 2 nearest bus stops; to inform new residents of the nearest bus services in the area. At £120.00 per display.

Bus shelters at 2 nearest bus stops; to provide high quality and attractive public transport facilities to encourage modal shift. At £4,908.00 per shelter.

However if the configuration of the site should change, we would expect to be consulted again.

The above requirements are made on the basis of information made available to the Sustainable Travel Group on the above date. Any variation from the submitted information may result in a change in requirements.

TRAVEL PLAN

Section 1.2

A Travel Plan should really commit to its purpose which is to reduce the number of single occupancy car trips to and from the development by promoting alternatives. With this in mind the phrases such as 'The plans provide a package of measures that can be tailored....' 'A travel plan should be a living document' need to be stronger. These phrases should show intent of the travel plan to make a difference.

Section 2.3 relating to Sustainable Travel Links, Walking links

From looking at the site drawing Appendix A and referring to Walking links. The site is surrounded by sufficient footways, however the plan shows that there is only one entry/exit to the site onto Coventry Road. Realistically, we would like to see better walking links incorporated into the design of the site to reduce walking times and inconvenience. For example, someone who lived in the South East corner of the development is less likely to walk through the whole development to reach Coventry road to then walk a further distance to amenities. This is the same for the Western end on the footway through the Cemetery, ideally there should link through to the roundabout to allow pedestrians and cyclists a shorter route to Magna Park.

Section 4 Targets and Indicators

Section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5- Relating to the 10% over 5 years. Typically we ask for developers to stretch themselves to set targets of 15%.

In terms of Peak Hour traffic 10% reduction only equates to 7 cars in the AM peak and 8.4 cars in the PM peak. In reality 5% of those cars are still on the road- so peak flows would be 3.5 and 4.2 cars at AM/PM and it is considered that this is a weak target and easily achievable over 5 years.

Section 5.2 Sustainable Travel Measures

5.3.2 It is proposed that car sharing is promoted using Leicestershire..... Car sharing will actively be promoted through Leicestershire. Needs to be more certain.

5.4.5 Dedicated and secure provision of Cycle Parking on site for the use of residents- is this 10 cycle hoops or full covered cycle shelter to keep bikes out of the weather with CCTV and key access? Details should be provided and also and where it would be located within the site.

Section 5.5

With regard to broadband provision, ideally high speed fibre optic broadband should be provided to each household by the developer.

There is no mention of local Bike Users Groups (BUG) or community walking clubs etc.

Section 6 Management

A travel plan co-ordinator should be appointed and his/her details made public to residents before they move in. Ideally the TPC should be available on the signing of the contracts for the property to introduce themselves and address any questions.

With regards to handing over to a resident group when the developers TPC post comes to an end. How long are the proposed to be in post? Will the resident group receive the correct training?

What is of concern is that the developer agrees to monitor the TP for 5 years. If the TPC post finishes after 2 years and the responsibility of monitoring is handed to the residents group then there is no real obligation for the resident group to provide monitoring of the TP as this was agreed on the part of the developer. Therefore, the developer will not have fulfilled their obligation to monitor the development for 5 years which they agreed to as part of the TP.

Section 7 Marketing

The Travel Plan and its information should be made available in a summary form to residents. All residents should be able to access electronic copies of the Travel Plan online and be kept up to date with the progress of the travel plan.

For the Travel Plan to be successful, it needs engagement from everyone.

Section 8 Monitoring

Monitoring and review of the travel plan is crucial to its success and without it a TP would have no meaning.

With regards to 8.1.4, 'A contribution'....it would be good to know what kind of contribution, in kind, financial?

The TP states that it will be the Travel Plan Co-ordinator's responsibility to conduct monitoring 1,3,5 years after completion? As mentioned before the TPC would hand responsibility to a residents group following the end of the TPC post. This surely contradicts the statement in 8.1.5. It is of concern that the monitoring may become weak or non existent if this was the case.

8.1.7 Mentions the target of 10%. As mentioned previously, this target is considered to be easily achievable.

8.1.8 relating to remedial measures if the TP is not successful in meeting its target.

Concern is raised with the following "If after monitoring the FTP, the targeted mode share is not achieved at year five, then the developer could commit an amount equivalent to providing one bicycle per household (at an equivalent cost of £150 per household.)

The word could is not fully committing and engaged. Secondly, the remedial measures need to be stronger to show a stronger commitment from the developer to make the TP work.

Subject to conditions in respect of the proposed access, a footway/cycleway link from the development site through to Coventry Road as near as possible to the roundabout junction with the A4303, a footway; a footway/cycleway along the frontage of the development and s106 contributions in respect of public transport, the HA has no objections to the proposed development.

Conditions as per 4-8 on page 31 of report.

Notes To Applicant

S106 CONTRIBUTIONS

To comply with Government guidance in NPPF the following contributions would be required in the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site, achieving modal shift targets, and reducing car use:

Travel Packs; to inform new residents from first occupation what sustainable travel choices are in the surrounding area (can be supplied by LCC at £52.85 per pack).

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 sustainable travel modes other than the car (can be supplied through LCC at (average) £325.00 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).

2 x new bus stops, as close as safely possible to the site entrance on Coventry Road – including:

Raised and dropped kerbs to allow level access); to support modern bus fleets with low floor capabilities. At £3263.00 per stop.

Information display cases at 2 nearest bus stops; to inform new residents of the nearest bus services in the area. At £120.00 per display.

Bus shelters at 2 nearest bus stops; to provide high quality and attractive public transport facilities to encourage modal shift. At £4,908.00 per shelter.

However if the configuration of the site should change, we would expect to be consulted again.

The above requirements are made on the basis of information made available to the Sustainable Travel Group on the above date. Any variation from the submitted information may result in a change in requirements.

12/01043/REM – HUSBANDS BOSWORTH	Erection of three dwellings (reserved matters of 09/00623/OUT) 13 Church Lane, Husbands Bosworth, Leicestershire LE17 6LS.
----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NO ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

12/01087/FUL – LUBENHAM	Conversion and extension of dairy buildings to form dwelling; alterations and extension of existing agricultural shed to form stables and workshop,. Church Farm, Laughton, Leicestershire LE17 6QE
-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Additional comments have been received on behalf of the Applicant and the objectors regarding the proposed conditions (full copies available on file and summarised below):

From Applicant's Agent:

Proposed Condition 4 - The business floor space of the live/work unit shall not be used for any purpose other than the making, maintenance, cleaning and repair of leather goods including saddlery and other equestrian equipment, and ancillary storage. There will be no ancillary or incidental retail sales from the premises (except by prior visitor appointment).

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of amenity and in accordance with the Policies CS10 & CS17 of the Core Strategy.

Justification – We are seeking this amendment to ensure that there is no ambiguity in interpretation, and to enable Mr Whitehead's business use to continue in its existing format. The applicant is a (rural) craftsman which by its nature is entrepreneurial, and with the wording as you have proposed, he would not be able to mend or alter the fabric, stitching or webbing of say a horse rug . He also needs to wash materials from time to time, as explained at the Village Meeting to enable the maintenance / repair / cleaning & handmaking processes to be completed. It may be easier for me to explain all of this to you over the telephone – although it is relevant that the village meeting seemed to be entirely content with every part of the process which he explained.

Proposed Condition 5 (3) - The residential floor space of the live/work unit shall not be occupied other than by a person solely or mainly employed, or last employed in the business occupying the business floor space of that unit, a widow or widower of such a person, or any resident dependents.

Justification – We are seeking a small amendment here through deletion of the word "saddlery" from the 2nd part of the sentence – as the nature of the business is already

100% explicit from other Conditions, and we are concerned that any ambiguity is likely to lead to confusion in the future so far as occupation of the house is concerned, which must be avoided wherever possible.

Proposed Condition 6 - The opening hours of the business will be limited to 0800hrs to 1800hrs Monday to Friday. The business will not trade on Saturdays, Sundays and bank holidays (except by prior visitor appointment).

Justification – Again for clarification purposes only.

Proposed Condition 7 - The use of the stables, equestrian facilities and ménage shall be restricted to private use and at no time shall be utilised for any form of commercial equestrian activity.

Justification – we have removed the word ‘recreational’, again to avoid confusion and ambiguity. For example, if the applicant wished to take his horse to a competition (eventing, show-jumping, dressage, endurance riding etc) and then ultimately sell the horse on to enable it to move beyond the level which he was comfortable to compete at himself, such action could easily be construed as not being a ‘private recreational use’ – but perhaps a private competitive use in those circumstances. Removal of the word “recreational” does not impact on the overall status or position of his equestrian activity, which will be entirely and solely private.

Amendment to Condition 11 – we are concerned at your request for a further ecological survey on top of the 2 ecological surveys which have already been provided. This is particularly in the light of the most recent survey which we forwarded to you, and the findings of the previous survey – which concluded that there was no evidence of any bat roosts in the buildings (due to the deterioration in their condition), and no evidence of any barn owls either in keeping with the earlier survey. There is no evidence of any badgers or badger activity on the site, as reported in the original survey and re-confirmed recently. The latest survey was carried out on 22nd September, which we are strongly advised is an acceptable date and recognised time to monitor and observe bats, owls and badgers. The requirement for a further ecological survey is putting the applicant to unnecessary additional expense over and above that already incurred, in respect of species which have been confirmed as not being present on site. I understand that the latest survey has been forwarded to Sue Timms, the CC’s Senior Ecologist (in the absence of Kirsty Gamble who is currently on leave) and she may contact you to confirm that all is in order which would enable this condition to be dropped altogether. However should that not happen in sufficient time for your report and by way of an alternative, can I suggest that the applicant is required to appoint (or re-appoint) a qualified ecological consultant to advise on and agree any necessary/required ecological mitigation measures (such as bat boxes etc) with the County Council’s Planning Ecologist immediately prior to building works commencing. This would therefore avoid the need for a further expensive survey of the site.

Proposed Condition 14 - The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be selected by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall either match, in material, colour and texture, to those used in the existing building or represent an improvement to the visual amenity of the site through the use of

traditional and conservation materials. REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area and to accord with the Harborough District Council Core Strategy Policy CS11.

Justification – one of the existing buildings is currently constructed of common brick, and is by common consent extremely unsightly. There is a proliferation of other “farm-based” materials, surfaces and colours on site – and consequently this proposed amendment will greatly improve the visual amenity of the site, albeit under the strict control of the LPA to avoid undesirable materials and surfaces reappearing.

Response from Marrons (on behalf of objectors):

The agent’s suggested amendments could be construed as an attempt to dilute the controls intended by the conditions. The conditions outlined in the Committee report are considered to be justified and reasonable, and allow the Council a sufficient degree of control over the operation of the saddlery business, in the interests of surrounding residential amenity. The agent’s previous comments in respect of ‘financial viability’ of the project undermines the policy justification for the proposal as a bona fide ‘live work’ unit. This has given rise to considerable concern that the live work unit may be used for an alternative business purpose if the applicant’s saddler business ceases to trade from it. The agent’s suggested amendments do not serve to diminish these concerns.

PROPOSED CONDITION 4 - The suggested amendments to condition 4, could be construed as an attempt to remove ‘saddlery’ as the principal use of the live work unit, which would open the use to general leather manufacture (i.e. B2 Class unrestricted – Shoe/Furniture/Clothes Factory). To ensure that the primary use remains as saddlery, whilst offering the applicant reasonable flexibility, it is considered that the condition should read:

4. The business floor space of the live/work unit shall not be used for any purpose other than the making, maintenance, cleaning and repair of saddlery and *associated* leather goods and other ancillary equestrian equipment, and ancillary storage. There will be no ancillary or incidental retail sales from the premises.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of amenity and in accordance with the Policies CS10 & CS17 of the Core Strategy.

PROPOSED CONDITION 5: The agent states that they seek ‘*a small amendment here through deletion of the word saddlery*’. The attempted explanation which follows is not clear, and the suggested deletion would serve only to dilute the conditions and potentially allow an unrestricted B Class manufacturing use on the site, as stated above. This use would be unrelated to the applicant’s stated business and contrary to the planning policy justification for the live work unit. It is imperative that the principal nature of the saddlery business is made explicit in the wording of the condition in order for it to remain sufficiently precise and compliant with Circular 05/05 ‘Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions’.

PROPOSED CONDITION 6: The agent suggests the insertion of “(except by prior visitor appointment)”. We suggest that prima facie, this might allow visitors to arrive unrestricted to make appointments at any time. It is recognized that a degree of flexibility is required and therefore we suggest that the wording states “(except by prior appointment)”.

PROPOSED CONDITION 7: The agent requests removal of the word “recreational”. However, any use of the site not associated with the business operating from the live

work unit must be *incidental* to the enjoyment of the main dwelling. As such, the word 'recreational' should be retained, as its removal infers that the ménage could be opened as a commercial premises for other horses belonging to paying customers to train for competition. The site may operate as a riding school. Were any of these outcomes to happen, a planning permission would require to be sought. We therefore recommend the condition is not diluted to suggest only 'private' use without reference to the need for it to remain recreational (and therefore not commercial i.e. providing a service paid for by visitors).

PROPOSED CONDITION 11: The agent's attempts to avoid further bat survey are considered to be ill-advised. With only limited exceptions, the breeding season for bats is widely accepted to end in August, and evidence suggests that the vast majority of maternity roosts disperse at this time. To sufficiently protect the applicant from carrying out development which may harm the habitat of bats (or other protected species), the agent should be referred to English Nature's Bat Mitigation Guidelines (P29-33 – link provided).

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/69046>. This provides reasoned and justification for the LPA's condition. The condition should be retained.

PROPOSED CONDITION 14 – The suggested amendments to condition 14 are considered to be justified and reasonable.

There are considerable concerns that no traffic monitoring or noise limiting conditions have been recommended by officers, as with our previously suggested conditions. Where a business operates in proximity to established residential areas, it is reasonable to attach such condition to a planning permission to protect against undue intensification, noisy activities and detrimental impact on residential amenity. We would be grateful if members are asked to consider attaching conditions to limit traffic and noise levels.

Following due consideration of the additional information above, the following amendments are recommended:

Condition 4:

4. The business floor space of the live/work unit shall not be used for any purpose other than the making, maintenance, cleaning and repair of saddlery and *associated* leather goods and other ancillary equestrian equipment, and ancillary storage. There will be no ancillary or incidental retail sales from the premises.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of amenity and in accordance with the Policies CS10 & CS17 of the Core Strategy.

Condition 6: add (except by **prior** appointment)

Condition 14: The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be selected by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall either match, in material, colour and texture, to those used in the existing building or represent an improvement to the visual amenity of the site through the use of traditional and conservation materials. REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area and to accord with the Harborough District Council Core Strategy Policy CS11.

In response to the points made regarding traffic and noise monitoring, it is considered that the conditions already suggested will serve to ensure that the use remains

compatible with the surrounding residential area. Any further conditions are not felt to be necessary in this case given the nature of the proposal.

A further comment has been received from the Environmental Health Officer raising no objection and requesting additional informatives.

One additional informative is considered necessary regarding manure storage. If manure is to be stored on an impermeable surface a tank will need to be provided for the collection of contaminated run-off. Such a tank must accord with the standards laid down in the 'Control of Pollution (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) Regulations'. The disposal of manure should be carried out in accordance with the DEFRA 'Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Water 1998'.

12/01128/FUL – TILTON ON THE HILL	Erection of six affordable dwellings including car parking and access details. Land OS 3000 Melton Road Tilton On The Hill Leicestershire
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Additional representation

I received an invitation to attend tomorrow's planning committee meeting by post at the end of last week from Mark Patterson.

To my significant frustration (you have my e-mail and phone information) this invitation arrived too late for me to rearrange an evening teaching commitment in London. So I will be teaching students rather than presenting the case against the proposal at the planning committee meeting tomorrow.

I would have been pleased to present a 3-minute argument against this development. For the record, and perhaps for the meeting I would like it to be known that:

* 24 Marefield Lane residents felt strongly enough to put their names to the statement you have received in opposition to the development within 24 hours of being notified of the need to object to these plans. Many of us benefit from an outlook that allows us to see plants and pheasants and cattle and rabbits rather than car parks and houses. We'd like it to stay that way.

* the four houses directly opposite the development have been designed to take advantage of the light and space afforded by the rural outlook to the west. These semi-detached properties are enclosed by other houses to the rear (east) and receive most of their light from the west. They are below the proposed development and their key light source will be compromised and evening light will be severely diminished. We get lovely low evening light at this time of year and will lose this completely in our houses and front gardens. We use the front gardens a lot because of the lovely evening sunlight.

* the case for these developments is unproven. Zoopla shows average prices of £123K, £141K and £170K for flats, terraced and semi-detached properties in our postcode respectively. This is not pocket-money, but neither are these excessive amounts and the sums are far less than many surrounding villages. There is quite a lot of property for sale in the village at present and it is not unaffordable in local terms.

* the site itself is bad place to house young families. The road is noisy and the fumes are considerable when vehicles labour up the hill. It seems bizarre and inappropriate to build houses for young families right next to part of the main road just where traffic is accelerating.

I hope these views can be represented at the meeting in my absence.

12/01159/FUL BEAUCHAMP	– KIBWORTH	Erection of 154 dwellings comprising phases 3, 4 and 5 of existing consent Land Off Warwick Road Kibworth Beauchamp Leicestershire
---------------------------	------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Parcel 1	Parcel 2	Parcel 3	Parcel 4	Parcel 5	Total
1 bed	28	14	9	4	6	61
2 bed	50	60	30	34	34	208
3 bed	84	54	40	71	46	295
4 bed	29	34	3	5	0	71
5 bed	13	12	0	0	0	25
Total	204	174	82	114	86	660

Clarification of Housing Numbers

Table 1: Original Approved House type Schedule (660 Dwellings)

Built / Approved / Proposed Housetype Schedule (to date) (549 Dwellings)

	Parcel 1	Parcel 2	Parcel 2 Barratts	Parcel 3	Parcel 4	Parcel 5	Total
1 bed	28	0	2	8	4	0	42
2 bed	51	1	24	23	4	5	108
3 bed	88	21	45	42	17	11	224
4 bed	29	36	5	3	43	22	138
5 bed	13	13	2	0	3	6	37
Total	209	71	78	76	71	44	549

Table 2-Affordable Housing provision

Parcel	Total No. of Dwellings		No. of Affordable Dwellings	
	Original Approval	Current	Original Approval	Current
1	205	209 Current Approval	67	67
2	174	71-DWH 78-Barratt Current Approval	45	DWH-0 Barratt-32
3	82	76 Proposed	37	37
4	114	71 Proposed	25	16

5	86	44 Proposed	26	13
Total	661	549	200 (30.25%)	165 (30.0%)

Table 3-Density of Development

Parcel	Current No. of Dwellings	Site Area (Ha)	Density (per Ha)
1	209	5.6	37.32
2	DWH-71 Barratt-78 Total-149	4.51	32.82
3	76	1.72	44.19
4	71	2.43	29.22
5	44	2.13	20.66
Total	549	16.39	33.44

Consultations

LCC Ecology (2nd set of comments)

The ecological survey submitted in support of this application (fpcr, October 2012) is satisfactory. No evidence of protected species was discovered on the application site. We would, however, recommend that the applicant's attention is drawn to the recommendations detailed in section 4.11 and 4.12 of the report.

Additional Note to Applicant

1. The applicant's attention is drawn to the recommendations detailed in section 4.11 and 4.12 of the Ecological Report undertaken by fpcr, October 2012)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th October 2012

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Application No.	Parish	Name	
12/00711/FUL	Carlton Curlieu	Mr N Jones Cllr Feltham	Objector County Cllr.
12/00900/FUL	Lutterworth	Mr Allen Mr J Knight	Objector Objector
12/01043/FUL	Husbands Bosworth	Miss R Cox Ms H Shepherd Mrs K Raven Mr W Kay	Objector Objector Objector Applicant
12/01087/FUL	Laughton	Mrs Whitehead Mr P Cowen Mr R Whitehead Ms A Lomas	Objector Agent Applicant Laughton Planning sub-committee
12/01128/FUL	Tilton on the Hill	Ms C Hewitt Cllr Rook	Applicant Ward Member
12/01159/FUL	Kibworth Harcourt	Mr Deacon	Agent