

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 11th June 2024
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: 15

24/00200/REM	Reserved Matters for the construction of a new Category B prison of up to 82,555sqm within a secure perimeter fence, together with access, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works (appearance and layout to be considered, pursuant to outline planning permission ref: 21/01600/OUT (access, scale and landscaping)) Land Adj HM Prison, Welland Avenue, Gartree
--------------	---

Neighbour Representations

1 additional letter of representation has been received (from a property from which representation has already been reported) making the following points:

I have read the comments on deferral and am surprised that nothing has been learnt from last month's deferral and the application remains unchanged.

The plans submitted are not addressing concerns of residents regarding Welland Avenue and the safety of the part of it that runs through the application site. The applicant seems to use the claim that 'access has been granted' and that they do not need to listen to the fact that the measurements are wrong and they have changed the LAYOUT on the plans that the Secretary of State said they should build to in Condition 4. In moving the impediments to traffic travelling north along Welland Avenue they have changed the LAYOUT.

It shocks me that they openly make the statement:-

“it is not possible to extensively change the layout of the proposed new prison as to do so would necessitate the submission of a new outline planning application. Therefore, the layout design is unamended from the committee meeting of 14th May 2024”

This highlights how little regard for the rural setting and the needs of the local community they have. Only concerns for the inside of the prison .

If it can't be suitably changed to ensure safety of road users through the site without a new outline planning application then a new planning application it will need to be!

24/00244/PCD	Condition 13 (Levels), 14 (Ventilation), 15 (PRoW), 21 (Foul Water Drainage), 22 (Watercourses), 23 (Archaeology), 28 (Sound Insulation) and 29 (CEMP)
24/00299/PCD	Condition 7 (Detailed Landscape Plan) and 8 (Landscaping Management Plan)
24/00409/PCD	Conditions 19 (Surface Water Drainage) and 25 (Land Contamination)
24/00489/PCD	Condition 16 (Pre-Development Condition Survey) Land Adj HM Prison, Welland Avenue, Gartree, Lubenham

Neighbour Representations

2 additional letters of representation have been received against 24/00244/PCD (from 1 property from which representation has already been reported) making the following points:

I note from the committee report that there are proposals to return some of the conditions to delegated powers - this should not be the case. Having agreed to send all to committee this agreement should be upheld. Such items as the CTEMP have raised many questions and this should not be delegated to an officer decision. This comment also applies to other conditions being considered that relate to 21/01600/OUT

I have read the latest amendments to the CTEMP and note that the applicant states that tree works on Welland Avenue are dealt with in condition 18.

This cannot be true as this part of Welland Avenue is not included in the outline application 21/01600/OUT the red line boundary showing the development site excludes the access from Foxton Road to Welland Avenue.

Surely conditions applied to a consent cannot refer to an area outside the stated application site. In order to carry out these proposed works a further outline application is required to show the extent of proposed widening of Welland Avenue, removal of trees and the construction of the bell mouth mentioned at 7.1.6 (final sentence) of the CTEMP - this part of the road is not included in the application site for 21/01600/OUT. Furthermore no details are submitted for this highway change.

22/02188/FUL	<p>Demolition of existing agricultural buildings, conversion of vacant outbuildings to 6 residential dwellings and erection of 5 new build dwellings, new double garage to Grange Farmhouse and new driveway to Manor House Farmhouse, in addition to the delivery of public open space, traffic calming measures, creation of a new access and alterations to existing accesses, drainage infrastructure and landscaping improvements.</p> <p>Manor House Farm, Main Street, Cranoe</p>
--------------	--

Report Corrections

p.142

Overall Consultation Expiry Date: “07.06.2024”

p.149

View of North and South Cottage, Red Barn and “The Manor House”

p.156 para 3.8

March and April 2023 – should read February and April 2024

Rebuttal to objection – the rebuttal consisted of two emails from the Applicants Planning Consultant. The first was received on the 22nd February 2024 and the second on 29th April 2024.

p.172 para. 6.17; first sentence should read as follows:

“The 5 new dwellings provide a good housing mix offering of 2 x 2 bed dwellings; **2** x 3 bed dwellings and 1 x 4 bed dwelling”

p.183 Para 6.83 “separation distance of **30m**”)

Additional Consultee Comment

A letter of support has been submitted on behalf of the Village Meeting

I am writing on behalf of Cranoe Village Meeting to provide our support for the above planning application

The Parish have been consulted extensively by the Brudenell Estate over approximately the last seven years (including engagement from Mark Coomb, James Youatt and Simon Hickling, as well as involvement from the Estate's appointed architects and planning consultants).

We understand, as a Parish that the development of the proposals to deliver the proposed housing development is legally supported by the Class Q fallback position. The strategy to justify the delivery of this development, has been clearly explained by the Estate in Parish meetings and discussions, from an early stage. The Parish are not supportive of delivery of the approved Class Q developments, but did not object to the Class Q applications, on the basis that there would be a subsequent application to deliver a higher quality, preferred proposal. The Brudenell Estate has clearly worked with Harborough District Council to deliver a high quality and positive outcome.

On this basis, the Parish are supportive of the current application. The Brudenell Estate's objectives have been explained to the local community. We understand that the development needs to be feasible and also safeguard the future tenancy of the associated farming units.

The Parish Council are therefore supportive of this application to deliver the no. 5 new build sustainable dwellings and no. 6 residential conversions (including their extensions), in addition to the

delivery of highways improvements and village open space with pedestrian linkage between School Lane and Church Lane. We are also supportive of (and encouraged by) the Brudenell Estate deciding to take on maintenance of the associated open space and pedestrian linkage in perpetuity as part of its broader Estate Management plans.

We do not wish to see the fallback position being delivered. We support the Officer recommendation to approve this proposal. Whilst the scheme will deliver change, we regard the scheme positive for the village. We would ask the Members of the Planning Committee to approve the scheme on this basis.

Request for Deferral

The Agent representing the objectors of 2 x properties in Cranoe has requested the application is deferred to allow time for the following information referred to within the Committee Report to be considered:

- Applicants Planning Consultant response to January objection and February addendum objection;
- Financial Viability Assessment Information and
- Amended Plans (received 29th May 2024)

This request was followed by a 10th June 2024 letter including: *If the deferral is not granted it may amount to a legal error for procedural impropriety and we are seeking legal advice from counsel on the same*

OFFICER ADVICE

Officers have considered this deferral request and whilst satisfied there is no procedural error or unfairness advise it is appropriate that this matter is deferred to the next Committee meeting.

24/00453/FUL	Erection of a two-storey side extension and new brick boundary wall 38 Lathkill Street, Market Harborough, Leicestershire
--------------	--

24/00488/FUL	Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of residential self-build dwelling and garage/cart lodge Firs Farm Main Street Illston On The Hill
--------------	--

Letter of support from Applicant as unable to attend Committee

“Dear Planning Committee

We are the applicants of the proposed self-build at Firs Farm, Illston.

Unfortunately, due to health reasons, we are unable to attend in person. However, we would appreciate your support this evening.

We have worked very hard to get the best design possible as this will be our forever home. Due to my restricted movements, I was very pleased when the architect drew out the plans which allowed me to have my living accommodation on the ground floor.

Once we gained approval last year we went about meeting with builders and it was only then that we were told about the difference in costs when building an annex as opposed to a self-build.

We have put our dream house on hold as the costs are a serious factor in our future plans.

In the officer’s report approving our most recent application (23/01455/FUL) for the exact same design (albeit an Annex) the following were noted:

- The site benefits from a large residential curtilage*
- The proposal preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area; given its set back from Main Street and has a 3m high established hedge with good design and scale and therefore meets Policy HC1.*
- Each application is judged on its individual merits*
- The proposal given its scale will preserve the setting of the Church*
- The proposal will not affect parking provision and would not harm highway safety*
- The heart of NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development.*
- The proposal satisfies Policies GD3, GD8 and HC1.*

In cases where it has been determined that a proposed development will result in less than substantial harm there is provision within paragraph 202 of the NPPF to weigh this level of harm against the public benefits of the proposed development, which is reiterated in the PPG and also reflected in Local Plan Policy HCL. It is therefore considered that the provision of a new self-build dwelling in this location, where there is a recognised shortfall in the provision of self-build plots within the District, offers a tangible public benefit that offsets the modest degree of harm resulting from our proposed development.

The potential public benefit from our proposal would be the social dimension of being close enough to family who will care for us in years to come, therefore reducing the need for state care.

Thank you for your time.”

Additional Local Community Comments

2 letters of support from 2 separate properties in Illston on the Hill have been received raising the following points:

- Principle has already been granted for a house
- A recent housing needs assessment relating to another application showed that there was a requirement for self-builds in the village.
- The proposal will remain the same as its original.
- We doubt very much that the owners of Firs Farm would wish for anyone other than their parents to live immediately next door to them.
- A single self-build such as this, has no real impact, as it is proposed on the footprint of an existing building. It won't bring in a big influx of vehicles on our already congested road as the plot has adequate off-road parking for one or two extra cars.
- The needs for Mr. & Mrs. Saigal to be close to their family, in a modest property, completely outweighs any negative impact the property would have on the village.

Report correction

Para 2.2

23/01455/FUL (Expires 15.12.2026)

