

# **UPDATE SHEET**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 January 2020**

**To be read in conjunction with the  
Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure to Planning  
Committee**

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

**A1      19/00141/OUTM      Residential development for up to 30 dwellings  
(outline application with details of part access)  
67 Station Road, Hugglescote.**

### **Additional Information**

#### *Call In*

The planning agent for the application (Andrew Large) is related to a serving Councillor of the District Council (Councillor Blunt). As such the application would have been brought to the Planning Committee for a decision had it not already have been 'called in' by the Ward Member (Councillor Johnson).

#### *Highway Safety*

In terms of the planning history of the site, identified in the Proposals and Background section of the Committee Report, the following additional information is provided:

- 91/0554/P (Residential development) – Was refused by the District Council for three reasons being:
  - 1) insufficient visibility splays;
  - 2) alignment of highway restricting visibility of vehicles turning right into the site to vehicles which are travelling southwards on Station Road; and
  - 3) encroachment of development onto land identified as a Sensitive Area in the draft Local Plan.

This decision was not subject to an appeal.

- 91/0784/P (Residential development) – Was refused by the District Council for two reasons which match those of 1) and 2) of 91/0554/P (see above). The Planning Inspectorate subsequently dismissed the appeal on visibility grounds but acknowledged that a total number of dwellings less than five may be acceptable on highway safety grounds but would be an insufficient use of the land.
- 93/0704/P (One dwelling) – Was refused by the District Council for one reason being:
  - 1) loss of garages would result in additional on-street parking which would disrupt the free flow of traffic on Station Road and cause detriment to highway safety.

Permission was subsequently granted at appeal as the Planning Inspectorate considered that any additional on-street parking would be minimal and that adequate visibility could be provided at the site access.

- 96/0062/P (One dwelling) – Was approved as it related to the reserved matters for one dwelling as allowed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate in relation to application reference 93/0704/P.
- 97/0584/P (Two caravans) – Was refused by the District Council for one reason being:
  - 1) encroachment onto Environmentally Sensitive Land which was contrary to Policy within the 1995 draft Local Plan.

The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal by Planning Inspectorate on visual impact grounds. There were no reasons to dismiss the appeal on highway safety grounds.

- 98/01042/MSG (Two caravans) – Was refused by the District Council for one reason being:
  - 1) contrary to Policy E1 of the 1995 Local Plan given setting adjacent to an area of informal open space which is environmentally sensitive.The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate for the same reason as the appeal dismissed under application reference 97/0584/P. It was again concluded by the Planning Inspectorate that there were no reasons to dismiss the appeal on highway safety grounds.

The County Highways Authority (CHA) have outlined that they have no objections to the application, subject to the imposition of conditions, with this assessment being based on the current Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (LHDG), Policy IF4 of the adopted Local Plan and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF. This is differing planning policy to that related with the last application which was refused on the site, and subsequently dismissed at appeal, for highway safety reasons (being application reference 91/0784/P) in 1992.

In addition, the CHA have advised that visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres in both directions at the site access are achievable and would accord with the LHDG. The planning agent has, however, provided a plan which demonstrates the maximum visibility splays which can be achieved at the site access which would be 2.4 metres by 61 metres in a northern direction and 2.4 metres by 103 metres in a southern direction. The suggested condition of the CHA would be revised to advise that the maximum visibility achievable at the site access are provided so as to assist vehicles exiting the site.

Overall, Paragraph 109 of the NPPF clearly outlines that *“development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”* It is the view of the CHA that the development is not contrary to the aims of this paragraph or other relevant planning policy.

#### *Foul Drainage*

Severn Trent Water (STW) have advised that the Grange Road Trunk Sewer comprises a 600mm (24 inch) diameter pipe which then reduces to 225mm (9 inch) for a short section before connecting to the existing 300mm (12 inch) diameter sewer in Station Road, this pipe subsequently increases to 375mm (15 inch) as it continues downstream. STW have advised that an opportunity arose to install a larger pipe as part of the Grange Road Trunk Sewer so as to accommodate future long term growth and strategic improvements to the sewer network, further improvements will enable the full capacity of this asset to be realised.

Whilst, on the basis of the above, a larger diameter pipe connects to a smaller diameter pipe, STW have reiterated that the reasons for the flooding events on Station Road were as a result of the significant storm water runoff (surface water) from the development sites on Grange Road, and surrounding fields, entering the foul drainage network and subsequently caused overloading of the foul sewer. It remains the case, therefore, that the flows into the new trunk sewer from the existing system and new development in the area can be accommodated in the downstream sewer network.

STW have also liaised with developers undertaking works on sites off Grange Road so as to ensure that surface water runoff does not enter the foul drainage network either through poor workmanship, mis-connections or via low-lying manholes adjacent to watercourses through these development sites. STW have raised their own assets (manholes) on these development sites so as to ensure they would be above the level of any surface water runoff so as to prevent ingress.

Separately to the above, and for the avoidance of doubt, STW had a meeting with a representative of Hugglescote and Donington Le Heath Parish Council rather than the Parish Council as a whole.

#### *Surface Water*

In relation to the email correspondence from Councillor Bridges to Members, it is advised that a condition would be imposed on any outline permission granted for a surface water management scheme during construction to be approved, this would be in line with the requirements of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

#### **Officer Comment**

On the basis of the above information and that there are no technical objections to the application from relevant consultees (CHA, STW and LLFA) it is concluded that the proposed development, subject to relevant planning conditions, would be compliant with relevant planning policy as outlined in the Planning Committee report.

**RECOMMENDATION – NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION.**

**A2        19/01256/FUL        Construction of new car parking areas and  
resurfacing of existing parking areas**  
Land at Ridgway Road, Ashby De La Zouch,  
Leicestershire

**Additional information received:**

The applicant has advised that fast charging points for electric vehicles aren't planned as part of this application at the current time and note that it was not raised as part of the public consultation with residents. Members are advised that the subsequent inclusion of electric charging points would not require planning permission.

The applicant has agreed that semi-mature trees would be planted in the local area to replace those being removed in the application.

The new car parking spaces would be unallocated and free for anyone to use. The applicant has advised that they propose to minimise disruption as much as possible during construction. Whilst it is likely that there would be some periods of time where there could be more cars parked on the street, it is hoped to undertake the works to each section of the site sequentially to minimise the disturbance to residents.

**NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**