

## **Extras Report – 17 August 2023**

**Item No. 5a**

**Pages 8-50**

**Planning Application Number P/21/2639/2**

**Site Address: and off Barkby Road, Syston**

### **Updates**

No updates to report.

**Item No. 5b**

**Pages 51-69**

**Planning Application Number P/23/0003/2**

**Site Address: 18 Beaumanor Gardens, Woodhouse**

### **Updates**

1. Further representations have been received from the Council's Senior Conservation Officer in response the revised plans received on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2023. The Officer confirms that the amended scheme addresses previous concerns in terms of the scale and impact on the distinctive character of this later 20<sup>th</sup> century development. The reduction in size of the garage and its revised arrangement also addresses previous concerns over the impact on the sense of openness to the front of the development and their previous objection is withdrawn.
2. Further representations received 9<sup>th</sup> August 2023 have been made by the applicant's agent in response to the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted by the neighbour received on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2023. The agent responds by generally agreeing with the survey findings that daylight/sunlight to the neighbouring secondary study window is already affected by the existing dwelling at No. 18. The difference in impact, following the construction of the development proposed amounts to a reduction in light of one hour per day (in March each year) and less during summer months. The agent reaffirms that the affected window does not serve a principal room in that dwelling.

The agent has also reviewed the published agenda and comments that paragraph 9.4.4 appears to suggest that there is a 1.5 hours difference between the existing and proposed scenarios but the agent clarifies that this one hour (as assessed in March) with less during summer months.

The agent also points out that at paragraph 9.4.5 of the committee report, it is concluded that the 45 degree 'angle of light' line is breached in the vertical which the agent does not consider is the case.

3. Further neighbour representations have been received which allege that the committee report does not explain the increase in proportions, form and mass of the proposed extensions and how they meet planning guidelines. It is also claimed that the harm to neighbour amenity is underestimated in terms of light, overbearing impact and loss of privacy and loss of amenity. It is claimed that approving the development will harm the Conservation Area and set a precedent. A fence is shown to be replaced but this is within the ownership of the occupier of No. 16 Beaumanor Gardens. It is claimed the level of objection is under-reported in that there are 39 letters of objection and not the 10 reported in the officer report.
4. Further representations have been received from Councillor Snartt referencing the Senior Conservation and Design Officer's comments on Page 58 of the committee report which details concerns. This appears to Councillor Snartt that the amendments to the application do not overcome the concerns of the originally submitted plans. There is also concern that the latest comments of the Senior Conservation Officer are not able to be reported until the publication of the 'extras' report as impact to the Conservation Area is most important. Councillor Snartt suggests that the application should be deferred.

### **Officer Response**

1. It is considered that these comments corroborate the assessment of the application as set out in Section 9.5 of the committee report which conclude that the proposal would result in no harm to the setting of the wider Conservation Area. Condition 4 would seek the submission of details of all proposed materials in order to ensure they are appropriate for the Conservation Area setting.
2. In terms of the impact to the neighbours, this is set out in the committee report and the submitted information from the neighbour which has been assessed by the agent and the local planning authority confirms that impact on daylight and sunlight will be negligible.
3. In reply to the additional neighbour representations received on 14<sup>th</sup> August, the officer would respond and state that a full explanation of the impacts of the development is set out in Section 9.4 of the committee report based on the amended plans received on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2023 which members will have familiarised themselves with. It is considered that whilst the proposed extensions represent large additions to the original house, these are considered acceptable, given the size of the plot and the characteristics of the area. The number of letters received takes account of addresses consulted on both the originally submitted and the revised plans, with concerns being repeated but reported at section 7.1 of the officer report. The report is clear that twelve letters of objection were received from eleven addresses on the originally submitted plans, but a correction is made that nine letters from nine addresses were received in response to the amended plans as one of these was a joint letter from three addresses where two signatories also responded individually.

4. To clarify, the comments in the table on Page 58 relate to the second iteration of the submitted plans which are now superseded. The comments of the officer reported at point 9.5.6 relate to the latest plans which members will consider at the Plans Committee meeting. Paragraph 9.5.6 was based on internal comments made between officers which allude to the fact that previous concerns are overcome in the final scheme. Due to extended annual leave, it was not possible to obtain the detailed comments of the officer prior to the publication of the agenda and, as confirmed in the report, these more detailed comments are reported at (1) above.

It is considered that the officer report includes the appropriate assessment of the application and covers all the relevant issues and, together with the late representations summarised in the extras report will provide members with sufficient information to be able to determine the application without the need for a deferral.

### **Recommendation**

No change to the recommendation.

### **Item No.5c**

#### **Pages 70-104**

#### **Planning Application Number P/22/2229/2**

#### **Site Address: Land East of Iveshead Road, Shepshed**

### **Updates**

1. Paragraph 5.13 is to be moved to be read under the Development Plans Section 4.13 – correction of error.
2. Charnwood Open Spaces Response – clarification received that payments would apply to allotments, play spaces and sports pitches in Shepshed only – table of heads of terms refer to sites in Shepshed throughout.
3. Rework 9.2 as follows:

The provision of affordable housing, at 20%, meets the adopted plan % for Shepshed, but is below the emerging policy requirements of 30% but is considered acceptable by the housing department given an independent viability report, and so falls within the viability exemption of the policy. As such the scheme is fully policy compliant with the development plan and there is no objection from the local highway authority.
4. 30 emails in support of the development have been received from local residents in Shepshed via the 'Just Build Homes' campaign group to the Agent.

5. Request from Cllr Lawrence to list distance to nearest bus stop on Ashby Road. This is measured at around 720m which is a similar distance to other sites on the southern fringe of Shepshed which has been considered acceptable in the emerging local plan and on appeal in Southern Shepshed.

## Recommendation

In Recommendation refer to the “Head of Planning and Growth” and the “Head of Governance and Human Resources” rather than “Head of Planning and Regeneration” and “Head of Strategic Support”.

### Item No. 5d

Pages 105-145

Planning Application Number P/23/0191/2

Site Address: 97 Gynsill Lane, Antstey

## Updates

1. Further comments have been received from the County Obligations Team. It is confirmed that a mistake was made at the County in terms of housing numbers proposed in their initial consultation response dated 21<sup>st</sup> July 2023. The updated and increased obligations are:

**£603.95** towards Waste Mountsorrel HWRC – as opposed to Recommendation A in the officer report of **£334.18** towards waste management at the HWRC at Whetstone HWRC

**£1,033.40** towards funding the enhancement of Antsey Library, as opposed to Recommendation A in the officer report of **£422.77**

The agent has confirmed agreement to the increased obligations towards Waste and Libraries to be secured in the S106.

## Officer Response

1. It is considered that the increased obligations are acceptable and CIL compliant and the increase makes no change to the officer recommendation of approval. It is considered that the officer report includes the appropriate assessment of the application and covers all the relevant issues and, together with the late representations summarised in this extras report will provide members with sufficient information to be able to determine the application without the need for a deferral.

## Recommendation

In Recommendation refer to the “Head of Planning and Growth” and the “Head of Governance and Human Resources” rather than “Head of Planning and Regeneration” and “Head of Strategic Support”.