

Additional items received since the report was drafted.

Pages 09 - 29

Site Address: Peashill Farm, Ratcliffe Road, Sileby

Item No. 1

P.A. No. P/20/0089/2

A resident of Ratcliffe Road writes to state that although he cannot attend the meeting his original objection still stands. He is of the view that the site is not deliverable or viable and that it should be refused on design grounds and because it strays from the terms of the consent.

Officer Response

These comments are noted and the residents original objection has been reported to members within the committee report. No change is suggested to the recommendation.

Pages 30 - 44

Site Address: 38 Charnwood Road, Shepshed

Item No. 2

P.A. No. P/20/0109/2

Issue 1

The applicant has requested that the wording of Condition 2 be amended. The condition currently states that the facing materials should match as closely those of the existing building. However, the windows to the proposed new extension will be a hybrid of aluminium and timber. It is also proposed that all the windows be replaced throughout the property although the windows in the existing building will be replaced on a like for like basis. The applicant has therefore requested that the draft materials condition (Condition 2) is amended to take the aluminium windows into account, suggested amendment below:

“The facing materials to be used in the construction of the new works hereby permitted shall match as closely as possible those of the existing building or as detailed in the Design & Access Statement.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.”

Officer Response

The revised condition is considered appropriate and would enable the replacement of the windows in the extension with the proposed aluminium windows and the existing windows with more energy efficient ones.

Issue 2

It has also been noted that there is an error in the report at 'Impact on Residential Amenity'. Paragraph 5 under this heading currently reads:

*"However, given that the proposed use will remain as a care facility and the resident numbers, it is **not** considered that the proposal would not result in any significant increase in noise and disturbance which would warrant the refusal of planning permission."*

The "not" is incorrect and the condition should read:

"However, given that the proposed use will remain as a care facility and the resident numbers, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant increase in noise and disturbance which would warrant the refusal of planning permission."

Officer Response

The error is noted.

Recommendation

That condition 2 be revised and the typographical error noted

Pages 45 - 73

Site Address: Land Adjacent to Nanapantan Sports Ground, Watermead Lane, Nanpantan

Item No. 3

PA No. P/19/2430/2

Additional correspondence has been received from the Sports Facilities Development Officer at Leicestershire & Rutland Sport asking whether consideration had been given to keeping the existing MUGA in situ and using the area next to the bowls club for parking instead.

Officer Response

The Council's main concern with the MUGA being retained in its current location is the safety of users. It is apparent that the existing facility and the entrance/egress to it puts pedestrians in direct conflict with vehicles using the site. The new location would be located away from the main vehicle movements and car parking areas and this is considered to be safer.

Recommendation

That the concerns are noted but that the recommendation remains that the application is approved.