

## UPDATE SHEET

### PLANNING COMMITTEE – 01 DECEMBER 2020

To be read in conjunction with the  
Head of Planning and Infrastructure's Report (and Agenda)

This list sets out: -

- (a) Additional information received after the publication of the main reports;
- (b) Amendments to Conditions;
- (c) Changes to Recommendations

<b>A1</b>	<b>20/00330/FULM</b>	<b>Hybrid planning application seeking outline permission (access) for up to 3000m<sup>2</sup> of B1, B2 or B8 floorspace. Full planning consent for 3 employment units (B1, B2) with associated access, structural landscaping engineering and drainage works</b> Land at Stephenson Way, Coalville
-----------	----------------------	---

#### Additional Consultee Responses

**National Forest Company** comments that the submitted landscape masterplan meets the minimum 20% National Forest woodland planting and landscape requirements, and includes sufficient space to the northern and south western planting belts. In terms of the northern belt, however, the National Forest Company recommends that this should be 15m in width, and include more mature tree planting where the buildings are elevated from current ground levels. It also recommends continuing the proposed avenue style planting within the development all the way to the site entrance, and the incorporation of energy efficiency and sustainability measures within the scheme.

**County Highway Authority** provides the following clarification in response to questions raised by Planning Committee members at the Technical Briefing:

**Q1:** *Why have RTC's been dismissed?*

**A1:** *LCC only receives details of incidents which result in personal injury. There is no requirement for non-injury collisions to be reported to the Police, and therefore there is no mechanism for non-injury accidents to be recorded accurately and fairly throughout the County.*

- Q2: *Why wasn't a left in/left out included?*  
A2: *A left-in / left-out access arrangement was not proposed by the Applicant; nor does the LHA consider that one can be justified on the basis of junction capacity or the safety record at the junction, where only one recorded personal injury collision has been recorded in the last five years, which occurred in 2018 and was recorded as 'slight' in severity.*
- Q3: *Why were queues/delays not taken into consideration with capacity assessments?*  
A3: *Capacity assessments were undertaken by the applicant and are detailed in the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the planning application.*
- Q4: *It was disappointing that the A511 improvements were not mentioned in the highway observations; the impact on speeds should have been considered*  
A4: *Details of the schemes, which the applicant will be required to contribute towards (as noted in the LHA's observations), can be found at <https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-maintenance/a511-growth-corridor-scheme> .*
- Q5: *Why was the horizontal alignment of the road/access not taken into consideration?*  
A5: *The junction is an existing junction which provides access to an existing industrial estate, as above there are no concerns with safety/capacity.*
- Q6: *HGV modelling, why were actual figures not used?*  
A6: *The Transport Assessment is based on "typical" trip generation rates (per sqm of floorspace) for B1, B2 and B8 uses from the TRICS database. A detailed survey of existing traffic levels associated with current operation would sometimes be sought by the County Council in a case like this. It is noted however that, whereas an "average" figure could reasonably be used for anticipated levels of traffic associated with the use types proposed, the applicant has in this case adopted 85th percentile trip rates (i.e. rates within the highest 85% of trip rates usually expected for premises within these uses). Having regard to this (and to the fact that any survey would in any event be likely to return lower than normal traffic data due to the current pandemic), the figures used are considered robust.*
- Q7: *LCC Property objected and HDM disagreed with their objection; what was the concern/why do we not support Property's objection?*  
A7: *The LHA have considered the application in its role as statutory consultee and it is not for the LHA to make comments on objections raised by third parties. It is for the Local Planning Authority to consider all representations made on the application.*

**NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**