

To: Anna Graves, Chief Executive, HDC
CC: Verina Wenham- Head of Legal Services, HDC

PLANNING COMMITTEE CALL-IN


Re: 12/00851/FUL- Gazeley UK Ltd and Stobart Group Ltd

Further to the decision of the Planning Committee of the 18th September 2012 to APPROVE the above application, under HDC Constitution, Part 3, Section B.1.4 Removal of Delegation, the following members request that this application be now determined by a meeting of the Full Council of Harborough District Council.


MEMBER

SIGNATURE


1. CLLR. ROSITA PAGE



2. GERALDINE ROBINSON



3. CHARMAIN WOOD



4. CLLR. KING



5. RICHARD BULLW

REASONS:-

1. That this application by reason of its location, buildings and hard standing would impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and conflicts and is contrary to Policies CS 14 ,
2. CS7 (f), CS11 (c) iii and CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy
3. That the decision to override this conflict by applying significant weight to the aims of objectives of 'Planning for Growth' is counter to the submission of the Council's response in summer 2011 to the PfG consultation, and that such matters such as the expansion of Magna Park was considered as part of the Public Examination of draft Core Strategy.

http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1753/planning_for_growth_consultation-harborough_district_council_response

4. In the final submission to HDC prior to adoption, the Planning Inspector determined that:-

"Taking all of these factors into account, it would be inappropriate for the Core Strategy to promote further significant expansion at Magna Park. Part j) of Policy 7 is justified therefore in making it clear that development beyond the existing footprint will not be supported, whilst safeguarding the role of the site as a strategic distribution centre accommodating large scale units."

5. *There is no material difference between the present application 12/00851/FUL and the earlier application 11/01757?FUL.*

The changes are peripheral and not significant and therefore the diametrically opposite recommendation is questionable .

6. *The reason for approval is simplistic and likely to be in error The current report recognizes that the 'new jobs' would not be 'new' but the transfer from one location to another.*

Unemployment is well below of the national level even if employment opportunities were to be generated the likelihood of the positions being filled by local people will not be great.

7. *The Governments fundamental requirement for all new developments is sustainability.*

It is evident that that the application site is not in an environmentally sustainable location for businesses

8 *As an Allocation DPD is not available the application is premature*