

PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th JUNE 2018

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

COMMITTEE UPDATE: 17/01325/REM

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this update report is to convey the response of the applicants to the request made by the Committee at its meeting of 26th April 2018, to defer to determine the application to:

- **Reduce Revisit the parking for plots 9, 10 and 11;**
- **Revisit the house types, including single storey dwellings, across the front of Great Lane;**
- **Relocation of the play area**
- **the number of houses to 48;**
- **Increase the number of bungalows;**

The original report is attached as Appendix A.

2.0 Additional Information

2.1 The applicants have submitted the following:

2.1.1 Parking on plots 9, 10 and 11

2.1.2 Bellway have reviewed the parking in this area in particular the proximity to the western boundary and the number of tandem parking spaces between plots 9-10 and are presenting a revised layout (Drawing Reference LE5036/5/PL02 Rev H).

2.1.3 Below are extracts of plans which show the changes that have occurred to the parking arrangement in this area throughout the planning process, Bellway have stated that these amendments have occurred through consultation with the local community and the planning officer. The final extract shows the revised proposal to the parking between plots 9-10.

2.1.4 The initial proposed parking arrangement below shows 5 no dwellings being served off one rear parking court:



2.1.5 The AMENDED parking arrangement below, which was presented to Planning Committee on 26 April 2018, showed 3no.dwellings being served off one private drive between plots 9-10.



2.1.6 The amended parking arrangement shown below now shows 2 no. dwelling being served off a private drive between plots 9-10.



2.1.7 The amended parking arrangement which is now being presented has been re-arranged to

reduce the number of parking spaces for five dwellings to just two properties in a conventional arrangement and has been moved further from the boundary of the existing properties on Great Lane (a distance of 9.5m from the boundary to the back edge of the parking spaces, as opposed to 4.3m). Bellway have stated that this re-plan will enable planting to be implemented along this boundary between the properties in order to reduce any noise from moving vehicles, acoustic fencing can also be implemented along this boundary.

2.2.1 Public Open Space

2.2.2 Bellway have prepared a series of plans to demonstrate that the proposed public open space is fit for purpose and will not suffer from drainage issues.

2.2.3 Drawing Reference Number PC/0327/100/01 has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed public open space is fit for purpose. The drawing shows cross sections through the proposed houses and public open space in order to demonstrate that the existing ground will be regarded to provide a 1 in 30 gradient for the Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) with gently sloping areas from the residents parking onto the Public Open Space area and then it gently slopes down again to the area which to be buffer planting for ecology purposes. The public open space layout and gradients must adhere to guidelines set out by ROSPA and the DDA.

2.2.4 In order to address the Committee's concerns about the flooding of this area Bellway will provide land drains to the bottom of the site which will mitigate any flooding issues.

2.2.5 The current surface water run-off will change once the site is developed; it will now be 'positively drained' and not follow the natural properties of the site. The extract below of shows the area of the development site which will be drained to the balancing lagoon approved in 2017 (ref 17/00832/FUL).



2.2.6 A further more detailed plan has been submitted for the detailed drainage strategy for the site, this shows that the invert levels of the lowest manhole on the site (adjacent to plots 13 and 14) is 84.725 and the invert level of the pipe into the approved lagoon where the surface water will drain to is 83.425. Consequently the only surface water which will affect the public open space is that which falls directly onto this land, which is a different scenario to what is currently happening to the surface water on the site at present as surface water flows and collects in this area. Therefore, despite the proposed public open space area currently being wet the re-development of this site and the proposed drainage strategy will enable the public open space area to be fit for purpose.

2.2.7 The public open space is overlooked by a number of residential properties so natural surveillance is provided. A LEAP has been provided which has a walking distance of 5 minutes/400 metres which encapsulates the entire development site. So it is not considered necessary to relocate the POS from its current proposed location.

2.3.1 Housing Mix and relationship with the existing properties on Great Lane

2.3.2 The housing mix proposed is considered to be a good balance when reviewing the housing market in the area and following discussions with Local Estate Agents. The mix was agreed with the Council’s Housing Officer early on in the pre-application process with the Council, this agreed mix is outlined in the table below;

	Market	Affordable Rented	Shared Ownership / Equity	Starter Homes	Total
1 Bed					
2 Bed	5	6	2	3	16
3 Bed	10	4	2	2	18
4 Bed	11	2			13
5 Bed	6				6
Total	32	16	4	5	53

2.3.3 The mix agreed with the Housing Officer did not define a need for bungalows.

2.3.4 Following discussions with the local community and the Planning Officer a number of changes were made to the scheme and the housing mix see table below;

	Market	Affordable Rented	Shared Ownership / Equity	Starter Homes	Total
1 Bed					
2 Bed	7 (includes 4 bungalows)	6	2	3	16
3 Bed	8	4	2	2	18
4 Bed	11	2			13
5 Bed	6				6
Total	32	16	4	5	53

2.3.5 The affordable housing provision has been provided in accordance with the request from the Housing Officer so it is only the market housing mix which has been amended to more family homes which Bellway, a major housing developer in the Country, understand to be where the demand of the market lies.

2.3.6 The Neighbourhood Plan Policy H5 states that; Priority should be given to dwellings of 3 bedrooms or fewer. This policy requirement is being met by the scheme as a whole as

64% of the dwellings proposed are 3 bedrooms or less. Policy H5 does not require a proportion of the housing mix to be bungalows, despite this a proportion of bungalows for private sale have been provided.

2.3.7 It is worth noting that in order to meet the housing mix defined in the Local Plan and the Frisby Neighbourhood Plan then the site capacity is approximately 60 dwellings. This is based on the following;

- The outline Planning Permission does not define a maximum number of properties for the site within the description of development or within a planning condition attached to the planning permission. Therefore the number which can be developed on this site is not restricted, but because the site is on the edge of a village the scheme has been designed to respect the context of the site.
- Emerging Government Policy NPPF paragraph 122 states; planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land. By being strictly in accordance with the Council's housing mix policy on the market houses and reducing the number of dwellings to 48 as per the indicative masterplan which was not approved as part of the outline planning permission, the Government's policy of optimising available land is not being met.
- In addition to the NPPF the emerging Melton Local Plan at paragraph 9.4.9(g) states that; *Density of new development should be sympathetic to its context but should also seek to maximise the use of land as a scarce resource;*

This Policy is in-line with the Governments emerging policy.

2.3.8 Bellway believe that they have achieved a balance between delivering an appropriate housing mix at a density which reflects the sites context on the edge of Frisby on the Wreake adjacent to the countryside whilst optimising the use of the land. The scheme has been designed to incorporate and utilise the existing features of the site such as the mature hedgerows to soften the development edge and provide a built development edge which is not a solid built form abutting the open countryside which would be inappropriate in this context.

2.3.9 The properties which front onto Great Lane are set back significantly from the road. It should be noted that the properties which front Great Lane are in excess of normal 'front to front' separation distances of 21 metres. The shortest distance between the proposed and existing dwellings is 34.5 metres, increasing to 45.7 metres. Bellway have therefore requested that the scheme is reconsidered at the next Committee meeting considering the above information and additional drawings

- Proposed Site Plan –LE5036/5/PL02 Revision H
- POS Site Section – PC/0327/100/01
- Preliminary Storm Outfall sewers and balancing pond – EL16-01/04/B
- Storm Drainage Catchment Areas – EL16-01-SW01
- Proposed Separation Distances – LE5036/5/PL30.

3.0 Comment

3.1 The layout density has not altered , but the additional information and drawings which have been submitted now make it clear that the proposed density is acceptable in this instance in this location. The outline permission contained no description or condition to limit the development to 48 dwellings.. The proposal is broadly in line with the optimum housing mix and is considered acceptable.

- 3.2 The dwellings on the boundaries of the site are well set back to help assimilate the development into the landscape, with the revised parking showing that the parking would not constitute a nuisance to existing residents.
- 3.3 The further details submitted with regards to drainage and the additional drainage proposed ensures that the proposal will drain adequately once developed, with the LEAP being positioned within the requisite guidelines.

4. Consultation

- 4.1 7 Letters of objection have been received in response to the amended plans which state the following:

4.1.1 Parking

- Whilst the layout changes to the parking is much welcomed, the tandem style of parking has been retained. Surely this will still lead to unnecessary shunting of vehicles, underutilisation and parking on the adjacent roadway. The comments made by Councillors at the last meeting were that this tandem arrangements were not desired. Given the layout at plots 16-20 could be utilised on the open space opposite plots 9-14. This would give individual single parking spaces for all those plots, encouraging safe use and keeping vehicle movements to a minimum.

4.1.2 Open space, play area and drainage

- Given that the site is of medieval ridge and furrow the run off and drainage of the site as it stands is not maybe as you might be lead to believe. The current system with a 400 year proven effective history, slows water flow and ensures a manageable drainage off from the site. The upper areas of the field therefore have little impact on the drainage in its lower area at present. So whilst the development will drain this way to the attenuation pond this area has never really had much affect on the lower area. The proposal to drain to the bottom of the incline would be ok if sufficient drains/ditches were in place to cope with this “channelled drainage/water flow”. There is not presently sufficient supporting drainage along the boundary and will only lead to potential drainage and possible flood issues further down the village. We are concerned for our new neighbours/village residents that they should not have to find an unusable play area for the wettest parts of the year.

4.1.3 Housing Mix

- The comments of the village representatives at the last Committee meeting, echoed by a Member, were that a more balanced property arrangement was needed around the boundary of the site. These comments would seem to of been ignored. A simple re-statement of the figures and a veiled threat in mention that the site could take up to 60 dwellings is not welcomed.

4.1.4 Other matters.

- It is extremely disappointing as a village resident to think that our inputs, efforts, time and energy during the consultation process with the agent, Parish and Borough council seem to have been largely ignored by the developer.

- To my knowledge there has been little or no real engagement by Bellway directly with residents other than one informal meeting last winter. Hardly the consultation and engagement with village residents that they claim.
- The developer has not amended their plans to address the reasons for deferral despite these being clearly identified in the minutes of the meeting. It would appear that Bellway has total contempt for the Committee and the local resident representatives as it considers it acceptable to totally ignore the majority of the requested plan amendments. It is hoped that the Committee will maintain its resolve to have the outstanding items adequately addressed with appropriately amended plans.
- Whilst it is good to see a positive response over the issue of parking on Plots 9, 10 & 11, it is worrying that they have failed to tackle the remaining issues. The failure to accept the well established need for bungalows along the western edge of Great Lane and denial of the need to re-position the Public Open Space to a more central location to afford parental supervision is very worrying.

5.0 Development Plan

- 5.1 Since the application was first reported to the Committee the Frisby Neighbourhood Plan has passed referendum and is now the Development Plan for consideration of this application. Decisions therefore must follow the terms of the Plan unless there are material considerations to indicate otherwise. Policy H2: 'housing allocations' states that land is allocated for housing development at 3 locations as set down below and as shown on the Limits of Development Map including Great Lane – "for approximately 48 dwellings";

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 **In conclusion it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, the issues raised are not sufficient to indicate a departure from the development plan (the Frisby Neighbourhood Plan) or the emerging Melton local plan is justified.**

7.0 Recommendation

- 7.1 It is recommended that Planning Permission is granted, as originally recommended on 26th April 2018, with the addition of land drains to be provided and the revised plans accordingly.


Reference: 17/01325/REM

Date submitted: 17.10.17

Applicant: Bellway Homes

Location: Land off Great Lane Frisby on the Wreake

Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters – 16/00491/OUT – Outline application for residential development with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian access



Proposal:-

In March 2017 outline planning permission was granted for residential development with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian access. **This application seeks permission for the details of that development. These include the design, appearance and scale of 53 dwellings along with associated Layout and Landscape.**

The site is currently two agricultural fields which are adjacent to Frisby on the Wreake, Access has been secured through the outline consent and is taken from the western boundary of the site onto Great Lane.

It is considered that the main issues arising from this proposal are:

- **Compliance or otherwise with the Development Plan and the NPPF**
- **The layout and design of the development**
- **Impact upon residential amenities**
- **Provision of suitable housing mix**
- **The role of the emerging Local and Neighbourhood Plans**

The application is required to be presented to the Committee due to the level of public interest and the planning history of the site.

History:-

16/00491/OUT – Outline application for residential development with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian access – Permitted with Section 106 March 2017.

17/00382/FUL – Engineering operation to construct a drainage pond – Permitted October 2017.

18/00222/DIS – Discharge Condition 9 –Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation – 16/00497/OUT – Pending Consideration.

Planning Policies:-

Melton Local Plan (saved policies):

Policy OS2 - This policy restricts development including housing outside of town/village envelopes. In the context of this proposal, this policy could be seen to be restricting the supply of housing. Therefore and based upon the advice contained in the NPPF, **Policy OS2 should be considered out of date when considering the supply of new housing.**

Policy OS3: The Council will impose conditions on planning permissions or seek to enter into a legal agreement with an applicant under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the provision of infrastructure which is necessary to serve the proposed development.

Policy BE1 - allows for new buildings subject to criteria including buildings designed to harmonise with surroundings, no adverse impact on amenities of neighbouring properties, adequate space around and between buildings, adequate open space provided and satisfactory access and parking provision.

Policy H10: planning permission will not be granted for residential development unless adequate amenity space is provided within the site in accordance with standards contained in Appendix 5 (requires developments of 10 or more dwellings to incorporate public amenity space for passive recreation with 5% of the gross development site area set aside for this purpose).

Policy C1: states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, (Grades 1, 2 and 3a), unless the following criteria are met: there is an overriding need for the development; there are no suitable sites for the development within existing developed areas; the proposal is on land of the lowest practicable grade.

Policy C13: states that planning permission will not be granted if the development adversely affects a designated SSSI or NNR, local Nature Reserve or site of ecological interest, site of geological interest unless there is an overriding need for the development.

Policy C15: states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the habitat of wildlife species protected by law unless no other site is suitable for the development
Policy C16.

The National Planning Policy Framework introduces a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ meaning:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out -of- date, granting permission unless:
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
 - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The NPPF offers direction on the relative weight of the content in comparison to existing Local Plan policy and advises that whilst the NPPF does not automatically render older policies obsolete, where they are in conflict, the NPPF should prevail.

It also establishes 12 planning principles against which proposals should be judged. Relevant to this application are those to:

- proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs.
- always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside
- promote mixed use developments, and encourage multi benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation)
- actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.
- Take account of the different roles and characters of different areas, promoting the vitality of urban areas, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities.

On Specific issues it advises:

Promoting sustainable transport

- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people
- Development should be located and designed (where practical) to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities.
- Create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians
- Consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

Delivering a Wide choice of High Quality Homes

- Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand

Require Good Design

- Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- Planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

- Recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.
- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, and;
- Opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

- Encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value
- Aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by taking opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments

This National Planning Policy Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. (NPPF para. 12)

Consultations:

Consultation reply	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services
<p>Highways Authority: No objection, subject to conditions and developer contributions</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority does not consider that the application as submitted adequately assesses the highway impact of development and further information is required as set out in this response.</p> <p>Without this information the Local Highway Authority is unable to provide final highway advice and is unable to advise whether this application is acceptable and any conditions and/or contributions which would be required to make it acceptable in highways terms.</p> <p>Background Following the previous observations submitted be the Local Highway Authority (LHA) to the Local Planning Authority on 4th January 2018, the Applicant has submitted be1 Architects drawing number PL02 Rev A</p> <p>Internal Layout Based on the submitted drawing the proposed roads do not conform to an acceptable standard for adoption in their current format and therefore they will NOT be considered for adoption and future maintenance by the LHA. Given the scale of the development, the Applicant is strongly encouraged to submit revised drawings showing a highway layout that will be suitable for adoption. The LHA would therefore advise the Applicant to undertake the following amendments in order for the LHA to consider the roads for adoption:</p> <p>S38 layout plan- The current S38 plans require amending so as they are coloured correctly to comply with part 5 6C's design guide.</p> <p>Road gradients- The LHA recently received the full S38 submission for this site. The long section reveals that there is a section of proposed adoptable highway on road two with a gradient of 1 in 15.</p> <p>The LHA's maximum gradient requirement is 1 in 20, the Applicant will need to amend the development layout to ensure the road gradients to comply with design requirements.</p> <p>Should the Applicant consider that due to the topography of the site, the road layout cannot be amended or fill material be imported to achieve the LHA's design maximum gradient required, they we will need to supply a written explanation as to why the design requirements cannot be achieved. Alternatively road two will need to remain in private</p>	<p>The access on to Great Lane was agreed at outline stage.</p> <p>A Section 38 agreement is an agreement between the applicant and the County Highway Authority, this is a separate decision to that of this Reserved Matters Planning Application.</p> <p>The 6C's Design Guide allows for a relaxation of the standards to allow steeper gradients where topography is particularly difficult. The applicant has stated that the existing ground levels are steeper than this 1 in 15 and they are already requiring fill to achieve this gradient. Stepping this up to 1: 20 would not be feasible as over the 60m in length they would be an additional 1m out of the ground which would have a knock on effect to the plot levels and would require a substantial amount of imported material, these details are covered within the Section 38 agreement.</p> <p>Pedestrian Desire Line – The footway on the opposite side of the carriageway was chose as this links to the P.O.S area, and therefore will be utilised by children, and is the shortest route. The side in question would loop around a turning head the applicant has stated that whereby this would be unlikely to be used and would mean pedestrians cross at the point across the turning head where this enters to the private drive which servers 5 plots. The decision was then taken that the footway should be placed on this side to provide the safest route and one which is less prone to conflicts.</p> <p>The applicants are obliged under Condition 13 of the outline permission to seek approval of the detailing of the highways prior to development commencement through the Planning Authority who will consult with County Highways.</p> <p>The details are considered acceptable to ensure that the layout and parking meets the required standards.</p> <p>The County Highway Authority have been contacted and asked to re-consider their comments in consideration to the planning application and not the Section 38 agreement, comments will be reported verbally.</p>

<p>ownership.</p> <p>Pedestrian desire line- The design plan shows that road two will have a one metre service margin installed on the side of the road which will be the desire line for pedestrians walking through the development. The layout will need to be amended to detail a two metre footway fronting plots 4 to 15 and a one metre service margin installed on the opposite side of the road, currently detailed as a two metre footway.</p> <p>Tactile paving- The plan details that tactile paving will be installed within the development. The Applicant is advised to remove the tactile paving within the development as this is not in keeping with the current footway environment within Frisby.</p> <p>Road markings- The longitudinal lines at the give way marking, need to be amended to detail 2 longitudinal lines not 5.</p> <p>Drainage It has not been possible to comment on highway drainage proposals as no level or gully positions have been included. All drainage infrastructure should be in accordance with 6Cs, Part 3, Section DG12. Private access drives should also not drain in to the highway.</p> <p>Parking provision, pedestrian visibility splays and bin storage areas are now considered to be acceptable by the LHA.</p>	
<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>The Agency has reviewed their planning consultation workload to ensure that their time and expertise is focussed on those locations and development what present the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high risk to the environment • Those that are able to offer significant environmental benefit <p>The application as present does not fall under either of the above categories and therefore we do not wish to comment further on these proposals.</p>	<p>These comments are noted, the proposal does not fall within any flood zones, the application has been considered by the LLFA who is now the statutory consultee, and their comments can be found below.</p>
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - Acceptable subject to condition</p> <p>From review of the granted outline permission and the layout submitted as part of this reserved matters application, together with the separate application of 17/00832/FUL, which is the consented approval for the attenuation basin – it appears the scale of the attenuation basin proposed within the submitted layout is consistent with the details approved at outline planning.</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council as LLFA advises the Local Planning Authority that</p>	<p>The application site is not within a known Flood Risk area and is not at risk from flooding.</p> <p>Planning application 17/00832/FUL permitted engineering operation to construct a drainage pond on 20 October 2017, the application provided a drainage proposal to limit run off into a nearby watercourse to green field rates, by means of flow attenuation.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed reserved matters are considered acceptable to Leicestershire Council as the LLFA. 	<p>Details have been submitted to discharge elements of the proposal that was reserved for later consideration and will, with the consultation responses of the LLFA, be considered and determined upon their merit.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk assessment incorporating a Drainage Strategy.</p>
<p>LCC Archaeology: No objections.</p> <p>The outline application has been subject to archaeological evaluation including trial trenching and earthwork survey. These works have been completed and therefore have no objection to this application.</p>	<p>The outline permission contained details to be submitted with regards to archaeology, Planning application 18/00222/DIS has been submitted to the LPA for consideration – Discharge condition 9 – Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation – 16/00491/OUT</p> <p>This application is being considered upon its own merit, further comments from LCC Archaeology on revised plans confirm that the archaeological works at the site are now completed and they have no further comments to make.</p>
<p>LCC Ecology – No objection, subject to conditions securing mitigation.</p> <p>Initial concern raised on 22 December 2017</p> <p>Concern is raised with the layout of this proposal. We welcome the substantial buffer of open space to the northern end of the application and we consider that this will provide a satisfactory buffer to the pond to the north, should great crested newts (GCN) be present. However, the remaining hedgerows are no longer buffered from the development in the way shown in the proposed layout at the outline stage. Of particular concern is the lack of buffer between the garden of plot 39 and the hedgerow. It is unacceptable to provide visitor parking spaces within the existing hedgerow on the eastern boundary and we would recommend that the plans are revised to provide a buffer of semi-natural vegetation (a verge) between the existing hedgerow and the development. This will help to retain the hedgerow long-term for its landscape and biodiversity value and will prevent the hedgerow being severely cut-back or removed to prevent cars being scratched or for access</p> <p>We note that the outline application contains a number of ecological conditions and it appears that these have mainly been addressed. The required management plan should be submitted prior to the commencement of the development.</p> <p>We would welcome being able to comment on the landscaping plans when they are submitted to ensure that suitable habitat for GCN is included.</p> <p>Further concern raised on 23 February 2018</p> <p>It is noted that there is now a buffer between plot 39 and the existing hedgerow which is welcomed,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed hedge was not included in the original submission and has only been included at the request of LCC Ecology, with regards to the management of the hedged this falls outside of the remit of planning permission and would be a discussion for future occupants and management companies as part of their management and maintenance scheme.</p>

<p>however the plans still show a number of parking spaces with the existing eastern boundary hedgerow. This is unacceptable and it is recommended that the plans are revised to provide a buffer of semi-natural vegetation (a verge) between the existing hedgerow and the development. This will help to retain the hedgerow long-term for its landscape and biodiversity value and will prevent the hedgerow being severely cut-back or removed to prevent cars being scratched or for access.</p> <p>6th April 2018</p> <p>We welcome and accept the proposed native species hedgerow on the eastern boundary of the site. I still have concerns with the proximity of the parking bays to this hedgerow and would still recommend that the layout is amended. If this is not possible, adequate cutting of the hedgerow should be included within the management plans to prevent long-term piecemeal removal.</p>	
<p>Parish Council – Object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Revised comments received 19 February 2018</p> <p>Frisby Parish Council have examined the amended documents submitted by Bellway on 9th February 2018, LCC Highways report and held a residents meeting. Comments from Bellway to MBC in response to the FPC previous comments have also been shared by the planning officer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst the removal of 2.5 storey dwellings is noted, there are still 6 x 2.5 storey properties on the site plan, 2 of these in full sight of the present Great Lane resident's dwellings. 2. The Highways report states there are insufficient parking facilities for some dwellings. These have been added to the 2 areas adjacent to the boundary of the present dwellings on Great Lane. The relocation from the boundary to allow landscaping buffer will do little to reduce the intrusion on privacy and reduction in noise. <p>We note there are still tandem parking bays which will increase the level of vehicular movements. The highways report states that the designated parking areas for several plots are located a considerable distance from the front doors of the properties and could lead to on-street parking out of convenience.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Too many properties. The amended plan is in excess of the approved 48 and density was a concern to Melton Borough Council officers at the original planning committee meeting. A 10% increase is untenable to the residents. The rationale for increase of dwellings from 48 at outline to 53 at reserve given 	<p>The 6 x 2.5 Storey dwellings have been distributed evenly within the site and whilst these will be visible from existing dwellings, the location of the dwellings, their windows and orientation assures that these will not have an unduly detrimental impact upon existing occupants.</p> <p>The County Highway have requested the submission of further details within a Section 38 agreement that will be submitted directly to LCC, they have confirmed that the parking provision is acceptable.</p> <p>The outline planning permission did not limit the number of dwellings to 48. The proposal does contain 5 additional properties to those shown on indicative plans at outline stage, it is considered that the addition of 5 dwellings to those already considered appropriate is not a significant quantity to recommend refusal of the</p>

<p>in the housing numbers statement 2018 presented by Bellway was that 'The housing Policy Officer has requested predominantly smaller 2 and 3 bedroom units which lead to higher numbers being accommodated on site'.</p> <p>The PC appreciates that the site plan submitted at outline application was indicative only. However the actual number of 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings has reduced from 35 (outline) to 34 (reserved) and the number of 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings has increased from 13 to 19. The extra dwellings are all 4 and 5 bedroom properties and therefore the rationale for the increase is unacceptable.</p> <p>In the indicative plan there were 6 x 1 storey buildings and 2 x 1.5 storey. This has been reduced to just 2 x 1.5 storey properties despite the shortage of single storey dwellings in the villages being identified as an issue by the councillors of the planning committee at previous determinations.</p> <p>4. The play area position is situated too far away from the rest of the development and is not central to the site. The MBC playing space standard for residential development requires that developments of 15 houses or more must be within one minute walk of a play area. The houses at the far end of the development will be more than one minute walk of the play area. This area was noted by the Neighbourhood plan examiner during his site walk during the public hearing to be 'unsuitable for a game of football' due to topography and boggy.</p> <p>5. The repositioning of the Wet Well (for foul sewage) to 10 metres from the boundary is not sufficient movement to be acceptable by the village residents. It should be situated much further away, over towards the corner north of the site.</p> <p>6. The Highways report states that the site in the November submitted plans did not fit the criteria for adoption by the LCC. Some of these issues we are unable to comment on due to the technicalities involved.</p> <p>The added parking bays, still situated a distance from the designated dwellings, and the traffic calming measures of 'sleeping policemen' are, in the PC and resident's opinions, not appropriate amendments to address the concerns of this report.</p> <p>With all the implications which could result on the non-adoption of this site, it is in the best interests of the future residents of the development that this site conforms to the criteria for adoption by the County Highways Authority.</p>	<p>application in principle (however the resultant impact requires consideration).</p> <p>The Housing mix is considered appropriate and will make a large contribution to those smaller 2 and 3 bedroom properties that are needed with the addition of bungalows.</p> <p>The play area has been located in this position due to the topography of the site that in order to locate dwellings in the northern area of the site then significant ground works and retaining walls would be required. There is also a condition on the outline approval (condition 17) which requires a 5m buffer between the development and the northern boundary which is greater achieved with the play equipment adjacent to the boundary.</p> <p>The pumping station location is again due to the topography. This dictates the general area for the pumping station at the lower end of the site and then pumped back up towards Great Lane, where it joins the existing foul sewer.</p> <p>The parking has been amended and appropriate measures taken to ensure that they are utilised by future occupants of the development. As stated earlier, there are still details that need to be submitted to both the LPA and the LHA.</p> <p>Please note that some of these issues are addressed in greater detail further within the report.</p>
---	---

Environmental Health

A phase 1 desktop study was undertaken by ASL in May 2016. This was followed by a phase 2 intrusive investigation in March 2017. A further phase 2 investigation was undertaken by GRM in August 2017. This was justified on the grounds of further refining the conceptual model; however it is not clear as to why. Indeed the report does not contain a refined/conceptual model and makes little reference to the conceptual model in the previous ASL reports. The GRM report stands largely in isolation.

The ASL phase 1 study identifies potential sources of contamination; in particular, make ground associated with road boundaries and infilled ponds. As I understand, 3 ponds were historically identified: 1 in the north corner, one in the centre area and one in the south east corner. The latter being marked as 'issues' and associated with a small building – now removed. In terms of the conceptual model, I agree that the risk to human health from these potential sources of contamination is low.

Despite identifying potential sources of contamination, the rationale for the sampling regime in the ASL phase 2 is undefined. I do not understand why sampling did not target former ponds and buildings. As such these sources of contamination remain an unquantified uncertainty. This could have been picked up by GRM in the subsequent phase 2. Otherwise the results from the soil sampling and gas monitoring are acceptable and within generic screening criteria. No remediation or gas protection is required. I would note that all soil samples were taken from topsoil. It would have been advantageous to sample the natural soil / subsoils for evidence of unusual natural metal enrichment.

Given the remaining uncertainty associated with made ground, I would advise the applicant ascertain the approximate location of the ponds/building from ASL and to make an account of the materials found during ground works. A visual/olfactory assessment would be appropriate. Should the applicant find anything indicative of gross contamination - ashy inclusions or petrol type odours etc, the materials must be isolated and reported to the geo-technical consultants and to the LPA for further assessment.

These comments are noted, two conditions have been proposed to overcome the concerns raised opposite.

1 If during the development any contamination is identified that has not been considered previously, then other than to make the area safe or prevent environmental harm, no further work shall be carried out in the contaminated area until additional remediation proposals for this material have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval - this would normally involve an investigation and an appropriate level of risk assessment. Any approved proposals shall thereafter form part of the Remediation Method Statement.'

2 In the event that it is proposed to import soil onto site in connection with the development the proposed soil shall be sampled at source such that a representative sample is obtained and analysed in a laboratory that is accredited under the MCERTS Chemical testing of Soil Scheme or another approved scheme. The results shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for consideration. Only the soil approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be used on site.

Should permission be granted the inclusion of these two planning conditions would allow the submission of further detailed information to be carried out and submitted to the LPA for consideration, should there be circumstances arise when this is required.

Representations:

A site notice was posted and neighbouring properties consulted. As a result **39 letters of objection** have been received from **25** households, a **petition** has also been received registering objection to this application and contains the signatures of **20** residents.

Representations	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services
<p>Matters accepted at outline stage</p> <p>The planning permission granted was for a maximum of 48 houses. The detail plans show 53 houses. This is clearly in breach of the original planning permission and should be rejected outright.</p> <p>Appalled to see that the submitted plans bear no resemblance to the original plans submitted.</p> <p>There were 8 bungalows shown in the indicative plan, something the village needs, the current plan shows only 2.</p> <p>These plans are totally different in terms of both housing numbers, type and layout with little regard being given to the existing residents of Great Lane.</p> <p>Increased density is too great and makes a mockery of careful consideration given to this site.</p> <p>There has been a tremendous amount of time spent by Richborough to involve the Local Community to ensure that their development meets with the Village needs and is also a commercially viable development, this plan seems to disregard all previous agreements or proposals.</p> <p>There remain, in this amended application, more houses than the 48 which were in the outline planning permission. This adds to the density of housing which is out of keeping with the existing nearby properties. Other sites are available in the village which means that there is ample provision for more housing and, therefore, no reason to exceed the original number.</p> <p>Increased density is too great and makes a mockery of careful consideration given to this site.</p>	<p>The outline planning permission 16/00491/OUT was for the erection of residential development with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian access, there was no confirmation of numbers within the description, similarly a condition was not added to this permission that limited the number of houses that could be applied for within the Reserved Matters submission.</p> <p>The application site remains the same as the outline, and therefore whilst it is acknowledged that the numbers have increased from earlier indicative plans the application is a valid submission for the consideration of Reserved Matters.</p>
<p>Residential Amenity</p> <p>Concern regarding the lack of privacy and being overlooked by the 3 properties surrounding my home which the application proposes.</p> <p>Bellway have proposed 1 dormer bungalow but am worried that the other 2 proposed properties back onto my bungalow are 2 storey and will look directly in to my home and garden</p> <p>I would like to propose that the 2 storey house behind me is replaced by another dormer bungalow as they do not have upstairs windows which look directly into my home and garden.</p>	<p>Amended details have been submitted as part of the application, as a result of discussions with the applicant.</p> <p>The number of bungalows has been increased and the submission of boundary treatment details has been submitted therefore, the impact of the proposal from the built form has been reduced.</p> <p>The LPA does not have any adopted space standards, the distances provided are considered to be in line with those typically found in residential areas and satisfy the requirements of normally accepted standards.</p>

Both Bufton and Whitwick are 3 bedroom homes

I cannot see the proposal for the type and style of fence between my property and the 3 new properties.

In order for me to have any pricey, I would propose that the dividing fence/wall between my property and the 3 new properties would need to be a 1.8m (6 foot) fence/wall all the way around to provide a consistent barrier which is the same as otherwise with 3 different homes bordering me I could potential have 3 different fences around my garden.

The type of developments that back onto 31 Great lane will grossly take away any privacy that this house currently endures. The proposal has three plots (6,7 & 8) backing onto 31 Great lane, a detached Bufton style dwelling and a semi-detached Somerby style dwelling.

The Bufton style give far greater benefits as the rear of the building has Velux style roof windows that would not overlook into our very large patio doors / windows and our downstairs bedroom, therefore not affect our privacy.

The Somerby dwellings on Plot 7 & 8 will affect our privacy greatly. The Somerby dwellings have upstairs windows to their rear that can and will overlook straight through our rear windows.

This is not acceptable. We would like to propose a solution that would be acceptable to us. We would like to see Bellway remove the Somerby dwellings on Plot 7 & 8 and replace with another Bufton style detached dwelling therefore maintaining our privacy.

This would bring the new Bufton's Garage nearer to us and grossly reduce the separation distance, however providing this is a single garage it provides a better option to us.

When My wife and I built this property in the early eighties the MBC would NOT allow us to build a house, it had to look like a bungalow to be in-keeping with the surrounding properties. Therefore we should be offered the same courtesy.

The current houses on Great Lane have differing separation distances i.e. some with greater rear gardens. Why is it that number 31 & 33 Great lane who have the smallest rear gardens are surrounded by the grossly reduced separation distance to the proposed properties. We would like a rethink with this in mind.

The proposal has over the course of the submission period been amended to consider the relationship between the proposed dwellings and those on Great Lane, the proposal now presents, 4 x 1.5 storey dwellings that have roof light windows to the rear, these windows allows light to proposed en-suite, bathroom and dressing area, the purpose of roof lights is to prevent a line of sight being available due to their height above floor level being above 'eye level'.

To the rear of 27 Great Lane, the application proposes 2 storey dwellings in the house types of Somerby and Tilton, these are both 2 storey and propose 2 and 3 bedrooms, at this point, the separation distance between the proposal and the built form increases and the proposal of 2 storey dwellings in this location is not considered to significantly adversely impact those of existing dwellings through overlooking or loss of light.

There are several 3 storey buildings planned which back directly onto existing neighbours in Great Lane with much lower houses and bungalows. There are also car parking areas directly adjacent to Great lane properties. This again is just not acceptable because of the noise issue. This is a village-not a city suburb.

What provision is being made for a secure boundary between this development and the existing properties backing on to it from Great Lane? The plans offered do not clearly demonstrate the perimeter boundary. Will it only be 1800mm high as I believe it might? If so this is insufficient to assure some level of privacy and security to the existing adjoining properties.

No adequate separation distance from the adjoining proprieties (due to Density), lack of suitable screening from the Parking areas leading to noise problems at all times from vehicular movements.

There remains a 2.5 storey property directly adjacent to our house and is in actual fact now the only such 2.5 storey property on Access Road

The eaves height from plot 14 to our house (indicative Site Sections – 69.39 v 95.13) Site section C-C. In actual fact plot 14 is a two storey property and not in line of sight from our house (additionally obscured by a mature tree). In actual fact plots 12 &13 (2.5 storey) are directly in line with our house and these should be measured.

One would naturally assume being 2.5 storey they will be considerably higher than the stated eaves height comparison and offer no privacy whatsoever.

Despite the changes made to some of the house designs the two houses which have driveways directly on to Great Lane remain as double storey, the original proposal was to have these boundary properties as bungalows however in the developers wish to increase the density of buildings on the site this has been changed.

Please not that these double storey houses which are positioned close to the road are overlooking the bungalows across the road which are on lower ground.

The visual impact for these bungalows is the same as having a 2.5 to 3 storey building directly across the road.

Housing Mix and Density

Please ensure that bungalows and smaller cottage type homes are built next to Great Lane which are more in keeping with the existing lane.

Why are all the Affordable Rents, Shared ownership, Starter homes sited in the same location.

Directly behind the current Great Lane residents. This site is clearly divided and split between dwelling types.

They have provided an “Us and Them” community and not mixed them accordingly.

It is Not in-keeping with the current existing properties. It appears that Bellway have tucked all similar low- cost dwellings behind our properties to hide them from view. This does not sit well with us.

The semi- detached properties and the Children’s Play area are housed on the area of the site where the ground will be extremely wet. Do Bellway think that the children will all come from the affordable area of the site. This needs a rethink.

Outline Planning was given for UPTO 48 dwellings not 53. At the Planning committee meeting held for this application on 10th November 2016 this site was deferred due to the density being far greater than any other parts of the village.

The site is adjacent to the Great lane properties that have a density of 10 houses per Hectare where this proposal is greater than 28 dwellings per hectare now that an increase of number is being proposed.

This is not in-keeping with the surrounding area and needs to be adjusted back to the original consent given on the 12th January 2017.

The village needs bungalows, of which the indicative plan had eight. There are only two in the plan and these are dormers.

Too many properties, the numbers have been increased by around 10% (48-53) over the outline planning. The planning committee already expressed their concern at the density with 48. 53 is untenable.

The indicative housing mix in Richborough outline application (Statement of Community Involvement) indicated 8 bungalows and there are now only 2 within this application. The NP

As set out the application has been amended to include more 1.5 storey dwellings, making a total of 4. This is considered to be a reasonable contribution towards a scheme of 53 dwellings.

It is not ideal that the affordable, shared and starter homes are together within the site, however these are not completely isolated from the proposal and the layout does allow for integration between the differing types of ownership and tenure.

The affordable housing proposed is in line with details submitted and secured by the Section 106 obligation agreed as part of the outline permission and cannot be changed at this stage.

The proposal will provide 53 dwellings in total with 32 market units and 21 affordable units, which are required to be a combination of both rented and available for purchase at discounted rates.

The proposed mix for the overall scheme is

- 6 x 5 bed
- 13 x 4 bed
- 16 x 3 bed
- 18 x 2 bed

The Housing mix requirement for Frisby on a scheme of 53 dwellings is as follows

- 8x 4+ bed
- 25 x 3 bed
- 16 x 2 bed
- 4 x 1 bed

This mix is considered to be sufficiently close to the ‘ideal’ in terms of meeting need, focussing predominantly on the 3 bed dwellings, there is also the provision of 1.5 storey dwellings on the site which is an identified need and is promoted in the Neighbourhood Plan. In the current circumstances (i.e. without an adopted Policy requiring a specific mix of house types/sizes) it is considered that the proposed mix is adequate and acceptable.

The proposal does contain 2.5 storey dwellings, however these have been reduced in number from 6 to 4 and spread more evenly through the site, to avoid conflict with the existing single storey dwellings on Great Lane.

<p>clearly states that the villagers have requested the need for more bungalows to allow aging residents to remain within the community.</p> <p>There has been no change in the number of 4 and 5 bedroom homes, 3 bedroom properties have increased by 5 and 2 bedroom properties remain as 6 less than in the outline plan. In other words there is an emphasis on larger properties on this site which is out of keeping with the area.</p> <p>Too many 5 bed roomed houses, there should be more single storey or 2/3 bed roomed homes to encourage first time buyers and “down sizers”.</p> <p>This development amended plan submitted by Bellway strikes as a very divisional arrangement of housing, by property size and affordability. All rental and shared ownership properties are located at the Northern end of the development whilst the larger, more expensive 4 & 5 bedroom property is located at the Southern end. Should there not be a greater mix of property type across the development? This would assist with ensuring a sense of community cross the development.</p> <p>No alteration has been made on this plan to the housing mix. We understand that it is policy to integrate different housing types but the amended plan continues to have all the social and affordable homes at one end of the development. No alteration has occurred on this plan to meet the indicative housing mix outlined in the Statement of Community Involvement, para 4.4 – providing 8 bungalows.</p> <p>Having no bungalows in this area is a huge mistake. For flow to take place in any village bungalows need to be an option to release larger properties when people choose to downsize. Bungalows sited to the rear of and adjacent to existing properties would fit in with the area and be far less intrusive.</p> <p>There are too many 5 bedroom (5 cars) houses and insufficient 2 bedroom houses. The provision of more 2 bedroom single storey houses and less 5 bedroom mansions would create an opportunity for elderly village residents to downsize and remain within the village.</p>	
<p>Sewerage Pump</p> <p>The newly submitted plans shows a structure that looks remarkably like a sewerage pump to the rear of our property, this being so close will affect my young family would have detrimental effect to the cluster of 5 houses backing onto it.</p>	<p>The sewage pump has been amended during the application period to be located further away from the existing houses, additional landscaping and a buffer has also been included to the proposal.</p> <p>The pumping station location is due to the topography. This dictates the general area for the pumping station at the lower end of the site and then pumped back up</p>

<p>There are many questions that need asking and much further investigation, I do not believe this is the best positioning for sewerage/pumping stations.</p> <p>The pumping station should be re-sited away from properties.</p> <p>The Wet Well outlined in the plan is a major concern to those living in the vicinity. Again this has been moved from the original plans and is now located directly behind existing properties.</p> <p>I would like to understand more about the exact structure of this Wet Well and how this sewage pumping will operate, whether the noise, venting to air etc. will be a nuisance to Great Lane residents. I would strongly request that MBC consider if this Wet Well should be re-sited in a less intrusive location.</p> <p>The Wet Well has been moved only slightly and still could present problems to existing properties.</p> <p>The sewerage station should be relocated to a suitable distance (a further 20 metres) to prevent pumping noise and possible smell from storage tank vents.</p> <p>The minimal alteration in the siting of the wet well (now termed a pump station) remains a major concern. On the original outline permission for a development on this site, Richborough Estate placed the wet well halfway down the northern boundary of the site, well away from properties.</p> <p>This is a sizeable and unattractive structure but we note some screening has been attempted on the new plan. A wet well is presumably vented to atmosphere, and will also need maintenance, both a potential cause of odour.</p> <p>Concern that because the power supplies to the village are on overhead cables power cuts are prevalent, (the longest being for 3 days), and the pumping of sewage would be effected by any electrical outage.</p> <p>Concern about over-flow or leakage.</p> <p>It would seem prudent to site this facility downhill and further from gardens.</p> <p>Most other villages that have this kind of facility have been sited away from properties.</p> <p>Concerned about any power failure that could lead to an overflow and flooding situation as has been well documented in many of these pumping</p>	<p>towards Great Lane, where it joins the existing foul sewer.</p>
---	--

<p>stations.</p> <p>One of the significant issues affecting such a pumping stations performance is high levels of rain and surface water. Both these situations present themselves on the site leading me to believe that such a flooding/overcapacity issue could arise here on this development given inadequate account for the excessive groundwater already present.</p> <p>Given its current proposed location those directly affect by an overflow and lack of capacity will be the Great Lane residents. Ironically putting at risk our properties from the frisk of flooding with raw untreated sewage.</p> <p>It is beyond a joke that anyone should have a pumping station on this site at all.</p>	
<p>Character of the area</p> <p>Any large houses should be further into the site and 3 storey homes are completely out of keeping with the area.</p> <p>Please do not allow the huge houses planned for the edge of this site.</p> <p>In their outline application 16/00491/OUT, Pegasus Group set out a design and access statement on behalf of Richborough Estates. Specifically this included a character study (see P30 onwards) of the village built environment. It was my expectation that this study would influence the type of housing to be built. Appendix A of the examined Frisby Neighbourhood Plan also provides guidelines to help ensure that developments within the parish are attractive and well integrated to maintain the character of the village.</p> <p>Bellway propose standard house designs for this development, in contrast to what was suggested in the outline application and desired by the community. I urge Bellway to consider the character of the village in the details of their house designs, as well as considering the concerns of those most affected.</p> <p>I also ask MBC planning to review the promises of the design and access statement in the permitted outline application against the proposal of this detailed plan.</p> <p>The planned proximity of large 5 bedroom houses very close to the road will make for an unpleasing</p>	<p>The layout plan makes provision for adequate parking and public open space in accordance with the Council's standards to achieve a well-designed development meeting the needs of future occupiers.</p> <p>Frisby as a whole displays housing of varying character including single and two storey dwellings. This site is some distance and separated from the historic core and Conservation Area and the scale of the development would not be readily apparent to users of Great Lane and visitors to other parts of Frisby, and it is not considered that it would overwhelm the village or affect those parts of it that display strong and valuable character.</p> <p>Due to the medium scale landscape that is contained by rising topography to the south, up to the A607, Leicester Road. Consequently, the settlement edge is relatively well integrated by vegetation across this sloping landscape.</p> <p>The housing design has been amended during the application process to further ensure that the dwelling assimilate well amongst their surroundings.</p> <p>The proposed materials will further ensure that the dwellings will sit well amongst existing development.</p>

<p>approach to the village.</p> <p>The developments at Kirby Bellars and Hoby have blended in well with the villages by sympathetically building homes which reflect the existing homes</p> <p>Last week in Theresa May’s speech she said we should build the right homes in the right place.</p>	
<p>Highway Safety and Parking</p> <p>There is no easy-to-use pedestrian access down into the village. Residents of the new houses will create the vehicle traffic into the village which at peak times is already difficult.</p> <p>Concerned of the cumulative affect of the increased number of homes and therefore vehicles into and out of Frisby on all the local roads.</p> <p>All of the concerns raised previously regarding vehicular and pedestrian access to the site and the A607 appears to have been ignored.</p> <p>A parking area is proposed adjacent to our garden. Such is the lateral design of the two spaces per property, it would require vehicles to be continually shunted to be able to utilise the spaces as proposed.</p> <p>Highways report – this is extremely damning of the amended plan. There is a lack of footway on Road 2.</p> <p>Traffic calming measures need to be included.</p> <p>Double garage dimensions are non-compliant and there is insufficient parking for several plots with other parking too far away from plots to prevent on street parking.</p> <p>Roads are unlikely to be adopted causing problems with refuse collections, upkeep would be residents’ responsibility.</p> <p>Car parking provision is not sufficient; cars will be parked next to houses rather than in communal areas and block road access.</p> <p>Road 2 Access Road appears narrow and needs a pavement on BOTH sides, as the location of garages means cars will be parked on the roadside and restrict access.</p>	<p>As per the comments above, the County Highway Authority do not object to the parking arrangements of the scheme. Further provision is made in the requirement to submit details and formally discharge conditions of the outline approval whilst also submitting a Section 38 agreement and having this formally agreed by the County Highway Authority.</p>

Tandem parking will create problems and encourage car owners to park on the road side.

Tandem parking is not forward thinking and not suitable now or in the future.

Car parking area at present near Pump Station/Wet Well seems unnecessary if houses are given their own sensible parking spaces. A car park area can become untidy and unkempt.

If planners look to development taking place on Leicester Road Melton, they will notice that two parking spaces means that visitors are already parking on pavements in order not to block slip road. Another hazard for children going to play area.

Communal parking at the rear of existing properties is undesirable and unnecessary if the number of properties originally planned is maintained.

The proposal disregard LCC recommendations that there is insufficient parking facilities for some dwellings, in the report it also states that the designated parking areas for several plots are located a considerable distance from the front doors of the properties and could lead to on-street parking out of convenience.

Tandem parking bays as raised previously and highlighted cause issues with shunting of vehicles thanks to their design. Early morning work departures or late night-arrivals, will result in little sleep for us existing adjoining residents of Great Lane. Added to this their distance from the main entrance to many of the properties (as pointed out by LCC Highways) will lead to on street parking and said bays used as "storage areas" for all manner of items/trailers/caravans etc.

Access Road 2 appears unduly narrow and concerns for the safe and easy access for service vehicles (waste collection, fire engines, emergency vehicles) must be a concern.

Concerned by the excessive use of joint access areas to properties than direct on to a road. This may suit the developer but leaves these driveways as un-adopted access ways and a possible cause of friction between neighbours in the new properties.

<p>In addition they become a potential liability to high maintenance costs in the years to come.</p> <p>There is also a potential problem for the access of emergency or service vehicles.</p>	
<p>Drainage/Flooding</p> <p>The pond which was originally part of the drainage system has disappeared and replaced by the play area</p> <p>There must now be issues about the water table and the suitability of the land in this corner</p> <p>I understand that a drainage pumping system (wet well) is now to be installed directly adjacent to some of the existing houses on Great Lane. This was not in the original plan and seems to directly antagonise existing neighbours.</p> <p>Water courses. I understand that there are major concerns that the alterations to the indicative plan will lead to potential flooding issues.</p> <p>Alterations made to the indicative plan will result in potential flooding.</p> <p>The storm water balancing ponds has been relocated to the adjacent field. As water does not flow uphill, this will no doubt put it in a more favourable position for the previously muted “phase 2” of this development.</p> <p>Earlier this year it would appear a Hydro geological survey was commissioned in field directly adjoining the properties along Great Lane. This saw the installation of a number of test boreholes to establish the position of the water table across this land. Despite being some 300 feet above sea level, the water table it would appear sits less than 24” below the surface (much closer in other areas). This highlights an underlying issue of poor surface water drainage and sub surface water flow in this area.</p> <p>The re-positioning of the “Wet well/pumping station” now at the top of the hill directly adjacent to some properties in Great Lane point to the fact the agents/developers have discovered a major drainage issue? Is this an attempt to cover up this issue by re-locating the play area to the “wet hole” in the bottom Northern corner of the field, where building would not be advisable?</p> <p>The presence of medieval ridge and furrow highlight the longstanding presence of surface water drainage issues in this field and our ancestor’s efforts to address it more than 400 years ago!</p>	<p>There is an existing condition (Condition 7) attached the Outline Approval (16/00491/OUT) which requires the surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the development.</p> <p>Drainage is not a reserved matter. The trigger for submitting drainage details is required prior to commencement and not as a reserved matter because the final approved layout needs to be established before a drainage strategy can be developed based on that layout.</p>

<p>I know request have been made by Great Lane residents to see the result of this Hydrogeological survey, but as yet there has been no response.</p> <p>I am concerned about the land drainage and the amendments made from the original Richborough application to this new application from Bellway. The drainage pond originally at the north of the site has been moved to a higher area on the site and given the topography of the site I am concerned this will cause drainage/flooding issues.</p> <p>The development increases the risk of flooding</p> <p>Since I experience poor drainage of my land I have asked both Richborough and Bellway Homes for information concerning the location of underground water sources. Neither organisation has divulged information.</p> <p>At an informal meeting with representatives of Bellway Homes yesterday evening I was informed that the information was not available. I think that the matter of realistic drainage is an item that should be investigated further.</p> <p>The site still in its existing mature grassland state is currently waterlogged after extensive, although not exceptional rainfall in the last few weeks.</p> <p>The proposed drainage scheme (fall to a storm water balancing pond) for surface water fails to offer a sufficient remedy to the future surface water drainage of this site, once large areas of this medieval ridge and furrow permanent grassland site are covered over.</p> <p>This proposed system relies upon the surrounding field ditches to disperse said water.</p> <p>Given the poorly maintained state of the said ditches and impeded dispersal, it's likely that this will result in the raising of ground water levels. Add to this the very evident natural spring in the field and the lack of disclosure of the findings from the hydrological survey, how can we as Great Lane residents have any confidence in not seeing drainage of or gardens and grounds impacted in the future.</p>	
<p>Play Equipment</p> <p>There are serious safety issues about the play are being so far away from supervision and distance from the rest of this site, let alone the village.</p> <p>This is in a far corner of the site, quite a distance from some of the housing and there are serious concerns about children's safety so far away from supervision.</p>	<p>The play equipment proposed on site has been upgraded from a Lap to a LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play).</p> <p>Matters with relation to the Play area and its land condition were relayed to the applicant who re-walked the site and made the following response</p> <p><i>"We have visited the site at Frisby on the Wreake to</i></p>

<p>Location of play area remains unchanged. This should be central to the development if it is to be of any use and in its suggested location presents a risk to children using it.</p> <p>Public Open Space – if this is a Play Area it is too far from most of the houses on the estate. It should be centrally placed to enable parental supervision and play equipment erected and maintained by Bellway. If this is just an open site who will maintain it?</p>	<p><i>investigate the reported spring and boggy ground that could potentially pose a health and safety hazard. The visit was conducted on Monday 19th February and was after a period of recent wet weather, with standing water evident in places around the site, which would not be unexpected given a sloping site which is predominantly clay. Our inspector did see a “structure” and adjacent, yet topographically higher boggy patch on the northern boundary which are considered likely to correspond to the reported spring and boggy area. From our observations it is considered likely that the boggy area is due to combination of a sand lens, which can hold water, being present at the base of a slope. The spring is considered likely to be a hole excavated to enable water to flow from the sand lens to provide water to livestock. It should be noted that at the time of the visit, despite standing water on parts of the site, the spring was not flowing.</i></p> <p><i>Given the recent precipitation and lack of flowing water from the spring, it is considered that normal measures for site traffic ability and drainage will be sufficient to mitigate the risk posed to health and safety from the spring and boggy area.”</i></p> <p>These comments are considered acceptable and it should be reiterated that further drainage works are being considered through a discharge of condition to planning permission 17/00832 which will re-direct storm water to a balancing pond and away from the hill towards the POS site and boundary.</p>
<p>Ecology</p> <p>One of the conditions on the original planning permit was to adopt the mitigation measures in the ecological report. I do not think that plots 40, 46 and 47 are far enough away from the hedgerow to conform to LCC Ecology requirements.</p>	<p>The application has been assessed by the County Council and amendments made as per their recommendations above.</p>
<p>Policy</p> <p>The detailed layout has several major flaws and is not consistent with the housing needs of the village and may not conform to requirements of the LCC Ecology conditions and NPPG best practice for play areas</p> <p>The proposal is not sympathetic to the site, nor is it in keeping with its immediate environment. We are the ones that have to live with decision made by others, therefore through the Localism Act please allow us the power to influence the future direction of the development of this site.</p> <p>It is time that MBC stated the exact, total number of houses that they would be prepared to agree to being built in this village.</p> <p>Community values are very clearly outlined in our</p>	<p>In the current circumstances (i.e. without an adopted Policy requiring a specific mix of house types/sizes) it is considered that the proposed mix is adequate and acceptable. The proposal has been assessed by LCC Ecology who now raise no objection to the proposal, the play area is discussed at length later in the report.</p> <p>The site is allocated within the Local and Neighbourhood Plan and has been assessed as per the policies within these documents, the Neighbourhood Plan has been compiled by residents of Frisby and as reported further in this report has been given significant weight.</p> <p>Each application is assessed upon its own merit, this site is an allocated site which has been accepted for approximately 48 dwellings, the additional 5 is not considered unduly excessive on this site.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has been given significant</p>

<p>NP. Please respect these.</p> <p>Nothing should proceed until the Melton Plan is settled and then only should the planning for the various building sites be considered along with the amended Frisby Local Plan. This should also include Great Lane.</p>	<p>weight during the assessment of this proposal.</p> <p>Planning legislation does not allow for the Local Planning Authority to delay making a decision until this time, for full details on how the proposal accords to the Local Plan, please see the comments below.</p>
<p>Other Matters</p> <p>In the design and access statement (page 10) the developer talks of opportunities to quote “take advantage of the distant and expansive views”, I assume therefore this can be done at the cost of the existing residents views</p> <p>When the time comes to repair the surfaces of parking areas who will be responsible?</p> <p>Since there is a communal car parking area site close to my garden and I want to be sure that this area is used only for parking cars and not for example commercial vehicles, boats or caravans. I also want to be sure that these areas are not used as dumping sites for rubbish.</p> <p>It would seem that the sewage pump is in close proximity to some Great Lane Gardens. Could this pump be moved further away since its presence could very well affect future house sales</p> <p>There is no apparent bin storage</p> <p>All through consultation Richborough have always used their documents they have produced and at a public meeting I asked a representative from MBC and Richborough if the documents would have to be adopted by the new developer to which I was given a reply of yes from both parties.</p> <p>The situation has been brought about by House building purely for profit and requirements of the government (this building was no way required for the benefit of the village. The site should not have gone ahead before completion of the Melton Plan.</p> <p>In view of the new sites now available, this site should be reappraised and reduced in size, to accommodate only houses that can be served by gravity sewers.</p> <p>I would be interested to know what the opinion of Severn Trent is in this principle and look forward to hearing from you on this point. Having contacted them it would appear that they have not been informed of final matters.</p>	<p>Whilst this comment is noted, the planning legislation does not allow for the protection of a view, the design and layout of the proposal has been considered to ensure that the proposed dwellings do not dominate the existing dwellings.</p> <p>This is a civil matter for consideration of the owners and maintenance company and not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>The application states car parking, however there is no control within the planning legislation to remove the ancillary use of these spaces for alternative vehicles.</p> <p>Housing Sales and values are not material planning considerations.</p> <p>The proposal does make adequate provision for bin storage.</p> <p>There is no requirement through the outline planning consent for these details to be legally binding, unless specifically conditioned accordingly, no such condition was added to the outline planning consent.</p> <p>Planning legislation does not allow for the Local Planning Authority to delay making a decision until this time, for full details on how the proposal accords to the Local Plan, please see the comments below.</p> <p>Severn Trent have been consulted on this application but have not as yet made formal comments, the outline proposal and the separate permission for the drainage pond will allow for further discussions to take place with Severn Trent.</p>

<p>The proposed residential development is neighbouring a boarding kennels licensed to board 80 dogs and in the height of summer the kennels is full to capacity. A lot of dogs means a lot of barking-noise!</p> <p>The kennels is open all year round and whilst not always full it is a busy kennels. I can't imagine why anyone would wish to invest in a property so close to a boarding kennels of this size and if they do so unknowingly and in good faith, I can imagine Melton Council receiving a lot of complaints about noise pollution.</p> <p>In all this there is an elephant in the room: the Great Lane site is less suitable for Frisby than that of the Cooks offer.</p>	<p>The principle of development in this location has already been agreed at the outline stage, whilst this nearby use is acknowledged, measures would be taken as per existing dwellings to ensure that the adequate glazing etc. is afforded to the proposed dwellings.</p> <p>Noise nuisance is governed by the Environmental Health Department who would advise on this matter, should it arise, there is no evidence to suggest this is the case at present.</p> <p>The application is considered on its own merit.</p>
<p>A petition was received and signed from 20 residents which raised the following points.</p> <p>In accordance with the guiding principles enshrined in the Localism Act 2011, we the undersigned residents of Great lane, who are most directly affected by this development, wish to bring to your attention our concerns for the building scheme proposed by Bellway Homes (East Midlands).</p> <p>It is our collective view that this proposal is not sympathetic to the site, nor is it in keeping with its immediate environment. It is likely to diminish the character and charm of the village and fails to fulfil or expectations. We are acutely aware that we have to live with the consequences of decisions made by others. The Localism Act empowers us to be engaged in the decision making process and our voice needs to be heard. We have identified several issues we are unhappy with as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Outline planning permission was granted for 48 dwellings and not 53 proposed. These if permitted, would provide an even greater density than anywhere else in our village. With other alternative development sites available we do not see the need to exceed the allocation of 48. 2) The indicative housing mix outlined in the statement of Community Involvement (SCI) para 4.4, provides for 8 bungalows but only 2 appear on the plan. The need for bungalows has been recognised and would allow for possible downsizing, enabling elderly residents the chance to remain in the village. 3) The plan shows that vehicular access and egress will be via an Access Road located on the western edge of Great Lane. We would prefer to 	<p>These comments are noted, the response can be found within the sections above which have assessed these points.</p>

have vehicles entering and exiting the site via the Access Road on to the Southern side of Great Lane (near the "Dogs Home") to avoid issues with existing residents and for closer access to the A607.

4) Access and egress into Plots 1 and 2 should not be directly onto Great Lane but via the Access Road. This will allow the integrity of the bordering hedge to be maintained and continue to be a habitat for a flock of Hedge Sparrows who have used it for decades. The hedges bordering the site needed to be retained as they will soften the impact of the development.

5) Existing residents of homes 23 to 33 Great Lane are worried that their privacy will be unduly violated by the proposed erection of 2 storey homes immediately behind them. These will be visually intrusive and dominate their garden views.

6) Concerns for the adequacy of the site drainage have been expressed. The fields behind Great Lane are historically prone to hold surface water. The development of this site will only exacerbate the problem.

7) The proposed positioning of the Wet Well (Sewage Pump) immediately outside the bottom of the garden at 19 Great Lane is unacceptable and should be repositioned well away from all homes if noise and smells which it will inevitably create are to be avoided.

8) The area designed as a Play Area is located in the wettest and most isolated part of the site. It needs to be centrally located to enable parents to supervise their children at play. The other village children will be reluctant to use it because of its inaccessibility.

9) Residents whose homes will overlook the car parking areas have concerns about personal and house security.

10) When erected the fencing type proposed will stop the free movement of wildlife. It is not ecologically friendly.

11) The type of house proposed for Plot 1 will dominate the existing dwelling at 33 Great Lane on its south side and be visually intrusive, as will be the 2 houses to be erected behind it on its western boundary.

Other Material Considerations,

Consideration	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services
<p>Application of Planning Policy</p> <p>The NPPF advises that proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>The NPPF recognises that housing should meet the needs of present and future generations (para 10). It continues to recognise the importance for local planning authorities to understand the housing requirements of their area (para 28) by ensuring that the scale and mix of housing meets the needs of the local population. This is further expanded in para 110-113, in seeking to ensure that housing mix meets local housing need.</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to boost the economy and house supply to meet local housing needs. The NPPF advises that local housing policies will be considered out of date where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply and where proposals promote sustainable development objectives it should be supported.</p>	<p>Frisby on the Wreake has a Neighbourhood plan that has gained significant weight, of which the application is in compliance with. The application is required to be considered against the Development Plan and other material considerations. The NPPF is a material consideration of some significance because of its commitment to boost housing growth.</p> <p>Frisby on the Wreake is considered to perform well in sustainability terms owing to its community facilities and access links.</p> <p>5 year land supply issues: The Council’s most recent analysis shows that there is the provision of a 5 year land supply and as such the relevant housing policies are applicable. Therefore this consideration does not weigh against the Development Plan, whose policies retain full weight.</p>
<p>The (new) Melton Local Plan – Submission version.</p> <p>The new local plan has now completed Examination and the Inspector has recently suggested proposed Modifications. None of these specifically address Frisby or this site.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that: From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); ● the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and ● the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given). <p>The Submission version of the Local Plan identifies Frisby on the Wreake as a Rural Hub in respect of which under policy SS1 and SS2 the proposal as an allocated site with an outline permission is considered acceptable</p>	<p>The Local Plan has progressed rapidly since the determination of the outline proposal. The relatively minimal amount of work required to complete the local plan modifications that do not impact upon the main policies of the plan means the plan can be afforded significant weight.</p> <p>We therefore need to consider the application in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF which states due weight should be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).</p> <p>The site is identified for housing purposes in the Emerging Local Plan and referenced as FRIS 1 and ranked first of the three allocated sites, the summary of assessment describes that the site is attached to existing residential development and is close to village facilities. The site boundary has been altered to align with the planning permission, and the capacity also increased to reflect this. The site is considered suitable for similar development in the surrounding area. No mitigation measures identified on the site.</p> <p>The site is identified for housing purposes in the</p>

<p>Policy SS1 –Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development: when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solution which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Where there are no policies relevant to the application, or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account whether:</p> <p>Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the national planning policy framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>Specific policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted.</p> <p>Policy SS2 –Development Strategy: Provision will be made for the development of at least 6,125 homes and some 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough.</p> <p>Development will be distributed across the Borough</p> <p>Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations: New housing will be delivered within the Local Plan on a number of sites to which this site forms one of those, the policy continues that Housing proposals will be supported where they provide;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 A mix of dwellings in accordance with Policy C2; 2 Affordable housing in accordance with Policy C4; 3 The necessary infrastructure required to support development in accordance with Policy IN1 and IN2; and 4 High quality design in accordance with Policy D1. 5 The requirements as set out in Appendix D1 	<p>Emerging Local Plan for an estimated number of 48, which is predominantly gained from the indication of dwellings at outline stage with an appropriate mix presented and affordable housing secured at outline stage.</p> <p>The proposal accords with the requirements of Policies IN1 and IN2 which strongly emphasises the need to provide housing in a location that can take advantage of sustainable travel and make appropriate provision for parking and ensure that there is not a significant impact caused to the Highway network.</p> <p>Policy D1 of the Emerging Local Plan sets out that:</p> <p>Active Design can be used as a tool to inform the design and layout of development and assist in pre-application discussions. The Council will use its design guidelines in the determination of planning applications. Policy D1 – Raising the Standard of Design All new developments should be of high quality design. All development proposals will be assessed against all the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Siting and layout must be sympathetic to the character of the area; b) New development should meet basic urban design principles outlined in this plan and any accompanying Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD); c) Buildings and development should be designed to reflect the wider context of the local area and respect the local vernacular without stifling innovative design; d) Amenity of neighbours and neighbouring properties should not be compromised; e) Appropriate provision should be made for the sustainable management of waste, including collection and storage facilities for recyclable and other waste; f) Sustainable means of communication and transportation should be used where appropriate; g) Development should be designed to reduce crime and the perception of crime. h) Existing trees and hedges should be utilised, together with new landscaping, to negate the effects of development; i) Proposals include appropriate, safe connection to the existing highway network; j) Performs well against Building for Life 12 and seeks to develop the principles of 'Active Design' for housing developments; k) Makes adequate provision for car parking; and l) Development should be managed so as to control disruption caused by construction for reasons of safeguarding and improving health well-being for all. <p>As discussed within the report, the proposal has been designed to ensure that it will assimilate well amongst its surroundings with significant amendments having been made to ensure a development that harmonises well amongst the existing built form and does not significantly impact upon the occupants of existing</p>
---	--

	<p> dwellings.</p> <p>Materials have been chosen to ensure that they reflect the local vernacular, with the addition of chimneys added to the proposed dwellings which front Great Lane, replicating the existing street scene.</p>
<p>Frisby on the Wreake Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Examination has now concluded, with the Examiner confirming that, subject to modifications, the plan passes the basic conditions and can be advanced to Referendum. The Referendum will take place on the 10th May 2018.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan states that through the process of Examination, it became clear that the three residential sites identified in the Melton Local Plan would receive allocations through that process. The recommendation of the Examiner was to agree the Local Plan allocations, and this is accepted in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy H2: Housing Allocations Land is allocated for housing development at 3 locations to which Great Lane is identified as being acceptable for approximately 48 dwellings.</p> <p>Policy H3 Limits to Development: Residential development proposals within the Limits to Development as identified in Figure 5 where it complies with the policies of the development plan.</p> <p>Policy H4 Building Design Principles: all new development proposals of one or more houses, replacement dwellings and extensions will need to have regard to the guidance as set out in Appx A Guidelines for Building Design and satisfy the following building design principles:</p> <p>Sympathetic designs with varied house types, building widths, styles, details, facing and roofing materials reflecting a varied street scene will be supported. Heritage assets and their setting will need to be preserved and enhanced through the layout, design and detailing of schemes.</p> <p>The character, scale, mass, density and layout of the development must have regard to the</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is well advanced, objections have been resolved through the Examination process and it has been found to comply with the NPPF (subject to Modifications). Under the guidance of para 216 it should therefore carry substantial weight.</p> <p>The proposal is allocated for development in Policy H2 of the Neighbourhood Plan which has allocated the site for “approximately 48 houses”, it is acknowledged that the proposal is for 53, however there is no limit to the housing number and the additional 5 dwellings are on balance not considered to overly intensify the development.</p> <p>The proposal falls within the revised Limits to Development and indeed the red line identified within the Neighbourhood Plan borders the allocation site.</p> <p>Policies H4, H5 and ENV9 are very similar to those of the Emerging Local plan which aim to ensure that new development sits well amongst that of existing, as explained above the design of the proposal would ensure that the development sits well and reflects that of existing. The Housing Mix has been amended to ensure there is an appropriate quantity of those smaller 2 and 3 bed dwellings with infrastructure and drainage considered through alternative applications.</p>

<p>characteristics of the surrounding area, including external roof and wall materials, and there must be no disruption to the visual amenity of the street scene or wider landscape views, provision must be made for storage of domestic items and paraphernalia.</p> <p>Appropriate off-road parking will be required;</p> <p>Schemes, where appropriate, should contain a fully worked up landscape proposal. Hedges and native trees must be retained. Plot enclosures should, where possible, be native hedging, wooden fencing or stone/brick wall of local design and allow for clearly defined areas in front of dwellings where they are in good condition and contribute to the amenity of the area;</p> <p>Proposals will be encouraged to have regard to the criteria of “Building for Life 12”, to include green spaces to accommodate play areas/benches and promote buffer effects on existing housing where appropriate.</p> <p>Sustainable drainage schemes with clearly funded maintenance regimes will be required. The use of sustainable drainage schemes and permeable surfaces should be used in preference to hard surfaces to reduce run off.</p> <p>Policy H5 Housing Mix: In order to meet the future needs of the residents of the Plan area, new housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet local needs in Frisby on the Wreake. Priority should be given to dwellings of 3 bedrooms or fewer.</p> <p>Policy ENV9 Sustainable Development: Development proposals that are compliant with the aims of a low carbon economy and contribute to mitigating and adapting to climate3 change including sustainable design, energy generation, drainage and construction techniques and practices will be viewed positively.</p>	
---	--

Conclusion

Outline planning permission was granted on the basis that the advantages were judged to outweigh the disadvantages, including the contribution that the development would make to housing supply, both in the market and affordable sectors in a location which performs reasonably well in sustainability terms.

This development brings forward a reasonable mixture of housing which would contribute to identified needs and provides 21 affordable homes. It accords with the outline permission and s106 provisions in this respect.

The detailed layout shows a well designed development laid out with separate groups of dwellings, many of which take advantage of views over landscaped or public spaces. The landscaped areas incorporate SUDs schemes and areas of buffer planting. There is space around the site to sustain wildlife habitats and provide good levels of privacy and amenity for neighbours and the occupiers of the new dwellings.

The proposal is one that is allocated for housing in both the Local and Neighbourhood Plans, both of which are well advanced, and this adds significant weight to the proposal.

There are matters of concern that have been raised through representations received, however these predominantly relate to matters of drainage and highways, both of which are to be further considered through the submission of further details to both the Local Planning Authority and the County Highway Authority for formal consideration.

Recommendation: RESERVED MATTERS APPROVAL subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following drawings:
 - i. PL01, 31, 33 received 17 October 2017
 - ii. PL13 Rev A, PL14 27, PL28, 29, 30, 32 Rev A, received 2 November 2017
 - iii. PL09 Rev B, PL08 Rev A, PL22 Rev B, PL05 Rev A, PL34, 35, 36 received 6 February 2018
 - iv. PL02, 03, 04 received 6 March 2018
 - v. PL11, 12, 39, 40 received 8 March 2018
 - vi. GL081901D and GL081902E received 4 April 2018.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 or any subsequent amendment to that order, no development within Class A, B, C and E shall be carried out unless planning permission has first been granted for that development by the Local Planning Authority.
3. If during the development any contamination is identified that has not been considered previously, then other than to make the area safe or prevent environmental harm, no further work shall be carried out in the contaminated area until additional remediation proposals for this material have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval - this would normally involve an investigation and an appropriate level of risk assessment. Any approved proposals shall thereafter form part of the Remediation Method Statement.'
4. In the event that it is proposed to import soil onto site in connection with the development the proposed soil shall be sampled at source such that a representative sample is obtained and analysed in a laboratory that is accredited under the MCERTS Chemical testing of Soil Scheme or another approved scheme. The results shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for consideration. Only the soil approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be used on site.

There may be additional conditons added following discussions with the CHA.

Officer to contact: Ms Louise Parker

Date: 20 April 2018