

For Plans Committee – 17th June 2021

Additional items received since the report was drafted.

Item No. 1

P.A. No. P/21/0579/2

Site Address: 28/30 High Street, Quorn

Pages: 8 - 42

Issue 1

It has been noticed that recommended condition 8 has been duplicated as condition 14.

Officers Response:

It is recommended the resolution contained within the report is amended to remove condition 14.

Issue 2

A comment from a local resident raised concerns that the report inaccurately refers to The Banks opposite the site as a “newly landscaped” area. This is disputed because the area in question was re-landscaped at least 13 years ago and is referred to as “newly landscaped” within the 2008 Quorn Conservation Area Character appraisal.

Officer Response:

The resident’s point be noted, however in the historic context of the wider conservation area, the re-landscaping that has taken place is relatively new and therefore the report provides an accurate description in this regard.

Recommendation:

Condition 14 be deleted, and the remaining conditions renumbered accordingly.

Item No. 2

P.A. No. P/20/2140/2

Site Address: Land South of Farmers, Way/Brookfield Road, Rothley

Pages: 43 - 77

Two additional letters of representation has been received from local residents since the report was published raising the following additional concerns:

- Concerns that access via Warren Way and Brookfield Road for construction vehicles during the build phase will be dangerous for local people and school children due to the residential nature of the streets where cars are often parked on the road.
- Requests confirmation that a risk assessment has been undertaken and requests that any such risk assessment be published.
- Confirms that the Highway Authority do not consider safety of access for construction vehicles as part of their consideration of the application.
- Concerns that despite there being only a reduction in 10 units from the previously refused application, the recommendation of the officer is so fundamentally different.
- Concerns that a previous appeal decision which required re-establishment of the parkland setting and enhancement of the public footpaths around the site is being ignored.
- Loss of views towards the Church Tower
- Requests confirmation that the proposed housing development is not required in order to facilitate a school extension and that a school extension would take place irrespective of the current application.
- Concerns that the traffic surveys are not valid due to the time that they were undertaken (outside of school hours) and that traffic volumes generally will increase adding pressure to key junctions.

Officer Response:

- Access for vehicles during the construction phase is a matter for the developer to consider and risk assess prior to construction work commencing. A Construction Phase Health and Safety Plan would need to be prepared prior to construction and this is in addition to the Construction Management Plan required by the Local Highway Authority. The Construction Phase Health and Safety Plan would be covered by the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations and would be in place prior to construction and would consider issues relating to the school and on-street parking. Notwithstanding this, there is no evidence that the development cannot be delivered because of the existing access arrangements through the

residential development or that any risks associated with this cannot be mitigated with traffic management. The proposed site access route via Warren Way and Brookfield Road has been assessed to be suitable in its design and width to accommodate the additional 70 dwellings and School building proposed. On this basis it can be concluded that the proposed access routes will also be suitable for construction traffic. The local Highway Authority in its formal consultation response has recommended a condition that requires details of a construction traffic management plan to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development. This will include details of traffic routing, wheel washing facilities, parking areas and a timetable for their provision. It is not considered that any risk associated with construction vehicles would result in severe harm having regard for paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

- Conflict with policies of the Core Strategy, the saved policies of the Local Plan and the newly made Neighbourhood Plan have been considered and any harm in this regard has been given negative weight in the planning balance as set out in the report.
- Reasons as to why the recommendation is fundamentally different to the previously refused application is on account of the revisions that have been made to the scheme, thus reducing the level of harm arising from the development together with the significant shift in policy position now that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply.
- Impact on heritage assets such as Lord Macaulay's Walk and the immediate landscape setting have been considered in the report and harm identified has been given negative weight in the planning balance as set out in the planning balance.
- Views of the church have been considered in the design and positioning of the development preserves key and direct views of the church tower.
- The County Council has confirmed that funding is in place to expand the school on its existing site, albeit this will result in a less positive expansion than the extensions proposed as part of the current application. The County Council has also confirmed that the school's status as an academy gives it the right to refuse to expand without the additional land being provided by the adjacent landowner.
- The validity of the submitted transport evidence and impact on wider highway network capacity has been considered by the Highway Authority and considered to be acceptable having regard for paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Recommendation:

No change to recommendation.

Item No. 3**P.A. No.** P/21/0487/2**Site Address:** Land adjacent to Nanpantan Sports Ground, Watermead Lane, Nanpantan, Loughborough**Page:** 79 -108

Since the publication of the report correspondence has been received from Jane Hunt MP who writes to express support for the application. The new location proposed for the MUGA is in her view more appropriate and will reduce the impact on neighbouring residents significantly.

It is however requested that the condition attached to the previous planning permission (ref P/19/2340/2) which required the details of the fencing and surfacing of the MUGA to be submitted for approval, is re-imposed. This would be to ensure the MUGA is constructed using noise reducing materials to preserve neighbouring amenity.

Officer Response:

The location now proposed for the MUGA is adjacent to the existing MUGA facility on the site and away from existing residential properties. The condition to secure noise reducing materials attached to the previous scheme for the use was to mitigate the impact of the new MUGA as it was set closer to existing residential dwellings. Given the location of the replacement MUGA is now proposed to be adjacent to the existing facility and away from existing dwellings it is not considered that such a condition is necessary or would meet the required tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation

No change to recommendation.