

## PLANS COMMITTEE –21ST NOVEMBER 2019

### Additional items received since the report was drafted.

**Page 9**  
**Item No. 01**  
**P.A. No. P/19/0524/2**

**Site Address** Land West of Snells Nook Lane,  
Loughborough

---

#### Further Representations

Five letters of objection have been received from nearby residents, including two from the Nanpantan Ward Residents' Group. The objections are available to read in full on the planning file. They raise the following concerns:

- The proposals for altering Snells Nook Lane will not reduce queuing traffic length;
- Changing the traffic light sequencing at Prior Crossroads will not mitigate the development;
- There are existing problems turning out of Longcliffe Gardens on to Snells Nook Lane at peak times as well as noise and fumes. The development will make this worse;
- The character of the area is being changed by the amount of development and new traffic associated with it.
- The improvements to the Snells Nook Lane related to this proposal amount to an extra lane at the crossroads which will only reduce the queuing traffic by the length of 4 to 5 vehicles.
- More needs to be done to discourage use of single occupancy vehicles.
- There are some good recommendations in the report to encourage the use of public transport, to encourage cyclists and pedestrians.
- There has been no public consultation on the Hawkins Brown concept masterplan. It would be unsound for the application to be considered until there has been meaningful consultation about the concept master plan.
- Claims about the increase in jobs and economic development are unsubstantiated and optimistic.
- The loss of green space, agricultural land and Green Belt.
- Impact on town centre retail.
- Impact on surrounding countryside and landscape.
- The development would lead to an increase in the volume of water draining off the site.

#### Officer Response

The comments from the residents in relation to highways matters are noted but it is considered that these matters are covered in the published report on page 18 and in detail from pages 28 to 35.

In relation to the specific point raised about changing the traffic light sequence, the objector has misread the consultee response from the Local Highway Authority and there is no requirement to amend the committee report in this respect. The Local Highway Authority response considers the applicant's proposal in full and whilst the applicant proposed some changes to the traffic light sequence in this location they did not consider it to be a viable option and as such does not form part of their suggested conditions or obligations in their formal response.

The comments from the residents in relation to travel plans are noted but it is considered that these matters are covered in the published report from pages 28 to 35 and in particular condition 24 on page 51 relating to the need for a site wide travel plan.

The comments from the residents in relation to retail impact are noted but it is considered that these matters are covered in the published report on pages 42 to 43.

The comments from the residents in relation to wildlife, countryside and landscape matters are noted but it is considered that these matters are covered in the published report on pages 32 to 35, 36 to 38, 39 to 40 and 41 to 42.

The comments from the residents in relation to drainage matters are noted but it is considered that these matters are covered in the published report on pages 40 to 41.

The Hawkins Brown concept masterplan was finalised in 2016. There was no requirement or expectation to consult on that final plan. The masterplan provided the basis for further informed debate and options appraisal between partners and the public were engaged on proposals prior to the planning application being submitted

There are therefore no changes recommended to in response to the late items received.

Members are asked to accept minor changes to the report required to correct typos and improve the sense of planning conditions, as follows:

Recommended amendments to the report:

- i. On page 43 the first sentence of the last paragraph should be amended as follows: In conclusion the size of the retail provision is broadly in line with the policy aspiration for the LSEP as it can be controlled through a S106 obligation ~~condition~~.
- ii. Remove condition 1.
- iii. Amend condition 2: The first application for approval of reserved matters for the first Phase of the development (as detailed pursuant to the phasing programme in condition 6) shall be submitted no later than three years from the date of this permission and the development shall be begun not later than two years from the approval of the first reserved matters. All subsequent reserved matters applications shall be submitted by no later than fifteen years from the date of this permission

REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 1990.

- iv. Amend part 8 of Recommendation A to add the following to the end of the existing sentence: (including to restrict uses to knowledge-based uses within B1 and B2)
- v. Add an additional item to the heads of terms in Recommendation A: 14. A monetary contribution to be agreed for monitoring of the development uses by officers of the Borough Council.

## PLANS COMMITTEE –21ST NOVEMBER 2019

### Additional items received since the report was drafted.

<b>Page</b> 55	<b>Site Address</b> 33 Station Street
<b>Item No.</b> 02	Loughborough
<b>P.A. No.</b> P/19/1224/2	Leicestershire
	LE11 5ED

---

A consultee response has been received from the Council's Environmental Health Officer and the applicant's agent has written a letter in support of the application.

CBC Environmental Health – No objection in principle ,but notes that siting noise sensitive rooms next to areas where noise is likely to be generated should be avoided and considers that sound insulation is necessary to prevent transmission of noise.

Letter from agent - Notes that neither the applicant nor agent are able to attend the committee meeting. Ask that the following is taken into account:

- Proposal relates to two 1 bed flats and not an HiMO
- Sustainable, accessible location close to town centre makes flats attractive to non-car users and ,therefore, may not add to on-street parking
- Proposal is in accordance with policies CS2,CS3 and CS14,with no change to the street scene
- Flats would provide affordable accommodation
- Note concerns about noise disturbance. The conversion would comply with the Building Regulations, which requires new dwellings to meet soundproofing standards

### Officer Response

CBC Environmental Health - The conversion must comply with Part E of the Building Regulations, which requires new dwellings to meet soundproofing standards ( see report – page 59).

Letter from agent - noted

### Recommendation

The late presentations do not raise any new material considerations for the assessment of the proposal, and, as such there is no change to the recommendation.