

## Appendix B: Summary of Representations received

-It is premature to seek to discharge conditions 3, 4 and 12 as they are concerned with matters associated with the as yet undetermined reserved matters application 21/00289/REM: landscaping, landscape maintenance and footpath management.

-As pointed out in an objection to 21/00289/REM the applicant's proposals for areas of amenity grass and hard surfacing and the planting schedule would not be characteristic of the conservation area. It is also important that arrangements for the long term management and maintenance of the area of public open space should be secured but the applicant's Landscape Management Plan limits this to just 12 months post practical completion.

-No management plan has been submitted in respect of the footpaths and the issue of ownership is not addressed.

-In respect of condition 11 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) we have examined the documents associated with 21/00825/VAC but can find no information about this.

-It is noted that, apparently to address highways concerns, the applicant is seeking changes to the agreed site layout.

-Comparing the approved site masterplan drawing 3353/02K with the new proposed site layout plan dated 11/12/20 the applicant is seeking to further encroach on the natural landscape but not all the changes proposed relate to highways. For example:

- The turning area adjacent to plots 8 and 12 has been increased such that the extent of reserved green space behind no.1 Main Street is reduced;
- The boundary area adjacent to the turning space opposite plot 19 shows a reduction in the tree planting screening of the site which would also impact on the important views from the Grade II\* Church of St Swithun. (Historic England raised concerns about the visibility of plots 18 and 19 and their impact on the setting of the church);
- The tree screening of 17 Burdetts Close from plot 11 has been removed completely and replaced by a close boarded timber fence (which is surely not necessitated by highways);
- The off-street parking bays have been widened and in the case of those at the south east corner would intrude further into the retained natural landscape;
- The increase in width of the shared road surface adjacent to plots 25-29 means that the green space associated with the attenuation pond is reduced; and
- The widening of roads and shared surfaces has resulted in reductions to front garden areas (see for example plots 12, 15 and 24). It is important to bear in mind that one of the defining characteristics of Great Dalby is that "buildings are often set back from the road with front gardens frequently defined by hedgerows" [Burton & Dalby Landscape Appraisal May 2018]

-In their letter of objection to 21/00289/REM we drew your attention to the identical, parallel outline planning application (19/01376/OUT) that was submitted for this

scheme when permission for 18/00721/OUT was subject to judicial review. At the planning committee meeting on 9 April 2020 when 19/01376/OUT was considered, members, on reflection, shared a concern that the layout that they had previously agreed “did not meet the character, historical and conservation aspirations of the village for future generations and considered there was opportunity for better design and an improved scheme”. It was considered that a layout, more characteristic of the village, could be achieved on the site and address the harm to the setting of the church.

-Given that the committee clearly had second thoughts about the scheme it would surely not be acceptable to agree to the applicant's request to vary conditions 5, 8 and 23 to the detriment of the site.

-It appears a brazen attempt of the developer via the backdoor to change the original applications to one that is more profitable and not necessarily one that benefits the proposed residents or the existing inhabitants of the village.

-Making boundaries between proposed dwellings can only be a precursor to the attempt to get more development on the site.

-Added to this is the fact the developer has no regard for keeping the plans with sympathy for the historic village and the view from the church, which it is meant to compliment rather than to run contrary to.

-In addition to developer is looking to get permission without having due consideration of the landscaping requirements, and as such I would propose they are looking for a cheap and ineffective landscaping commitment, which will ensure that this development is not in keeping with a historic & characterful village.

-It is appreciated that we have lost the fight to have this development here, but we do not wish to see large numbers of characterless houses crammed together with DIY-style fences between the developments.

-Furthermore they want a discharge of the traffic management requirements, when getting up and down Burdetts close is already a nightmare for residents. and this development cannot proceed if the current residents continue to park their vehicles as they have done as would be too narrow for construction vehicles to access.

-They also wish to waive the requirement to ensure that safe passage possible via the existing footpaths is maintained. As the individual who for the past 2 years has cut the footpaths on this site, to ensure village inhabitants and others can enjoy a safe and untroubled right of way, I feel that I have some investment in this attempt to discharge their responsibilities.

-Furthermore they wish to discharge the requirement for planning permission to pass the rules about what style of buildings can be built. This is madness, and will quite conceivably result in loads of cheap and ugly houses, totally out of keeping with the village.

-Whilst I do not know what the variance is to 5, 8 and 23 are, 5 and 8 refer to traffic issues which are a legitimate concern for the village. Burdetts close is often very restricted with parked cars owned by the existing residents and traffic to and from the proposed site is almost certain to cause issues during and after the construction phase.

-The application to vary plans surely also alters the terms of the original application and so should be denied.

-The application to discharge conditions on footpaths and rights of way, archaeology and future planting, landscaping and maintenance of the site and existing trees are also very important to the village residents.

-This site has been quite contentious falling as it does within the Great Dalby conservation area.

-The footpaths running across it and the contribution the space makes to the character of the village in the conservation area statement should not be underestimated.

-To commence work without having dealt with these concerns would, I believe, lead to them not be dealt with adequately and potentially lead to a development that irrevocably damages the nature of the village.

-Drainage on the site is also an important factor that needs to be considered. The site is often waterlogged and a properly considered drainage plan is essential. To allow a development to begin without such a plan is to potentially miss opportunities to adequately deal with the surface water on site leading to a poor outcome for the village.

-I have consistently objected to this development as I believe it is inappropriate for the village and against the conservation statement. I feel that this application to vary and discharge conditions without proper consideration can only lead to an even less satisfactory development and even greater damage.

-Is against any variation of discharge until such point as a suitable access has been secured as the access off Burdetts Close is not and cannot accommodate the 50 plus vehicles the development will attract.

- Access should not be through Burdetts Close but through the car park of The Royal Oak;

- No doubt the conditions 5, 8 and 23 will be discharged in due course. I await the proposals with interest.

- In respect of conditions 3 and 4 is it agreed that theses have been discharged if so when? In respect of the site maintenance and management as described in the Additional - drainage statement 10/5374 12.11.2021 the company described in the document, TH Great Dalby Management Co. Ltd, does not exist. How then is it possible that they are capable to carry out this vital work? In addition who will

supervise these works. Also who pays for the works to be carried out? Will there be some kind of charge imposed on the residents? If so is this reasonable on residents of the Affordable housing, some 40% of the properties. I note that Llfa, on 1/12/2021, require further information in respect of the site drainage and subsequent maintenance.

- With the site drainage now being discharged into new underground services and additional inspection chambers in Burdetts Close, this will create further disruption to the existing residents.

- When was it agreed and by whom that conditions 3, 4, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 had been discharged. Or is it being assumed by the Developer?

- I note that the Construction Management Plan has many flaws in it. i.e. Clauses 2.1 and 4.2.5 etc. No doubt these will be corrected before any approval is given. I would comment however that if this is an example of the quality of the works proposed by this developer / builder then it must bring suitability into question.

- I support the comments made by the B&DPC.

- Page 26 of 27 shows the Site Logistics Plan. Site security fencing and public footpath is marked by a red line. The red line is shown to pass through the end of my private garden, and possibly through the end of my garden shed! It also passes through the private gardens of several neighbours, and straight through the middle of a very substantial Leylandii hedge! Has anyone actually visited the proposed footpath site, or is it simply guesswork?

- Concern that there are to be variations in disposal of surface water from the site. The property the objector occupies backs onto the lowest point in the field, so if there is any likelihood of surplus water run-off they are likely to be on the receiving end!

-In previous plans there was mention of some sort of pump to be housed in the bottom corner of the field to aid water drainage. If that is still the case, can it be confirmed that such pump will be completely silent in operation? My partner and I are pensioners, and often sleep with the bedroom window open, and would object strongly to any obtrusive noise during the night.

-I am most concerned with road safety, both with Burdetts Close and where it joins with the B6047 main road.

-On the subject of motor vehicles, future law will require the use of electric powered vehicles only, and these will need charging points. Is it within the plans for individual houses to have such charging points provided at the time of build, or are there to be 'communal' charging points, if so, where will these be sited?

-I understand that there is to be a fence erected around the whole site, does that mean that there will also be a gate for vehicular entry to the development? I see no mention of this.

-I understand that covid has/and still is causing communication problems between the developers and local residents. However, once the pandemic has eased a little further, may I respectfully suggest a scale model of the development be available

for public viewing either in Melton Council offices, or somewhere equally convenient. Then, laypeople like myself will be able to get a clearer understanding of what is planned for our quiet country village within the conservation area.

-The application to vary plans surely also alters the terms of the original application and so should be denied.

- Lack of discussions with residents from developers;

-The site access is unsuitable due to car levels parking on Burdetts Close;

- Local residents have been treated with contempt and requests the original planning permission be brought back to Committee;

-Highway and pedestrian safety concerns;

-Opposed to the variation until such time as a meaningful access is provided as the proposed access cannot accommodate the traffic associated with the development;

- The access is not wide enough;

- Increased car levels in the area leading to increased noise and air pollution;

- Under the granting of the original planning certain conditions were imposed. It now seems that the developer is trying to override those conditions.

- The protection of the environment including trees, hedgerows and the removal of an ancient pasture.

- The site drainage and subsequent maintenance.

- Traffic management.

- Footpaths

- General disturbance to this ancient village and the subsequent effect on the residents.

- It is noted that on the Drainage statement produced by Ward Cole for TH Great Dalby Limited dated December 2020, that the maintenance of the site will be carried out by TH Great Dalby Management Co. Ltd. I can find no trace of this company in company records. However there is TH Great Dalby Limited (Reg. No. 12925061) whose shares are held by Battersea Group Ltd. ( Reg. No. NI 666695). The document contains a planned maintenance schedule. How is this to be implemented and is the Council going to ensure that this work is done and supervised? The implications of default in this respect could be horrific for the residents of Burdetts Close and those properties and highway at the bottom of the hill; Main Street and Nether End.

-Whilst I appreciate that the proposal includes for a storage tank and detention basin I note that these discharge, via a flow control valve, into an existing ditch. Who will be maintaining this ditch to ensure it is clear and of sufficient capacity to take the outflow? Is the existing brook in Nether End of sufficient capacity to take the additional run-off to prevent flooding of the highway and houses? This has happened in the past.

-I would also question who is going to pay for the maintenance of the estate? I presume that this will be passed on by TH Great Dalby Ltd. to the residents. I would then question is it reasonable that the occupants of the 'Affordable housing', both

purchased and rented, should have this additional burden. I hope that they will be advised of this additional liability.

- Surface Water proposals as per drawing no 10-5374-500A. The basic scheme for Road and Property water looks OK but I would have grave concerns about the discharge from the Attenuation Basin and Geo cellular Tank via Flow Control chamber in the NE corner of the site at 5.8 litres/second. This appears to discharge into a minimal ditch running northwards behinds the existing houses on Burdetts Close and then into the Brook. This does not seem adequate and could cause flooding problems to properties on the south side of Nether End adjacent to this discharge.

- To the South of the development site are several fields which slope and drain onto the site. No provision appears to have been made to prevent flooding of the properties on the new development from run-off from these.

- Foul Water in the village goes to a Pumping Station near the corner of Main Street / Nether End. Is this adequate to take the additional flows from the proposed site, as I understand that Severn Trent are having to tanker away sewage from here at present as there are problems with the existing pumps, and have told nearby residents that even if the pumps were up-sized they would still not handle the current flow rate. This is before the additional load from the new development.

- Is there a need for this developed and how they are going to be crammed into the site;

- Flooding concerns and maintenance of elements shown on the submitted plans;

- Concerns regarding the accuracy of the submitted documents.