Simon Cheshire

From: Peter Goodchild [peter@rugbyinvest.co.uk]
Sent: 10 December 2007 13:39
To: Simon Cheshire
Cc: 'Martin Rumble'; burton.emery@btconnect.com; 'Luke Hedderwick'; Tracy Darke; Chris Merriman
Subject: RE: Derby Road, Hinckley

We feel very frustrated in that there appears to have been a change of mind set from the Council that, had this been clear from the outset, would have saved us the considerable time and expense of submitting a planning application.

We can deal with all issues arising apart from:

For negotiations to resume the scheme must combine both Martins and Colin's sites and include a co-coordinated timetable for implementation and a suitably structured and linked Section 106 agreement.

We have never been in a contractual position, despite repeated attempts at various stages, to offer Coin's site as part of an application red line or to guarantee a development timetable for Colin's site. This is why we agreed the sub master plan strategy with you and three land owners when we all met at your office.

Your current stance on this issue means that we are no longer able to proceed with our development proposals. We can only hope that the Council feels satisfied with this outcome.

Peter Goodchild FRICS
Director
For & on behalf of Rugby Investments Ltd
t: 01908 487538
e: peter@rugbyinvest.co.uk
w: www.rugbyinvestments.co.uk

From: Simon Cheshire [mailto:simon.cheshire@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2007 09:39
To: Peter Goodchild
Cc: Tracy Darke; martin@martinrumble.co.uk
Subject: RE: Derby Road, Hinckley

Peter,

we have discussed this scheme at length internally and have tried to accommodate the various constraints the site presents but the issue of comprehensiveness and employment mix are fundamental policy requirements. Schemes can have a degree of flexibility in certain circumstances, as in the case of the Richard Roberts site. The LPA successfully defended the appeal at the Hawley Road (Fludes) masterplan site where the issues were identical. At the heart of every application of this nature are the financials and we are aware of the changes in the market. However, they cannot be allowed to dictate the form the development takes to the extent you are suggesting.
We are in full support of helping Martin relocate and for the area to be redeveloped, but it appears unless the financials change then the present scheme is just not feasible and will not gain the support of the LPA.
For negotiations to resume the scheme must combine both Martins and Colin's sites and include a co-coordinated timetable for implementation and a suitably structured and linked Section 106 agreement.

Regards

Simon Cheshire
Area Planning Officer

01455 255762

CULTURE & DEVELOPMENT
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Council Offices, Argents Mead, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 1BZ

Email: Simon.Cheshire@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk
Fax: 01455 619897
Website: www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

We now receive **over 35%** of planning applications online via the Planning Portal.
To submit an online application, or to find out more about the Planning Portal, please follow the link below:
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/wps/portal?pageName=APPLY&PpAction=location_uri&select_location=K2420>

DISCLAIMER : Any opinions expressed in this message are those of the sender and do not necessarily express the views of the Borough Council. The information contained in this message, and any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom this message is sent, and should be treated as private of confidential. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (ICT Services) Tel: +44 (01455) 238141

From: Peter Goodchild [mailto:peter@rugbyinvest.co.uk]
Sent: 20 November 2007 12:39
To: Simon Cheshire
Cc: Tracy Darke; Chris Merriman; 'Luke Hedderwick'; Martin Rumble; burton.emery@btconnect.com
Subject: Derby Road, Hinckley

You are aware that we have been liaising with Martin Rumble and yourselves since 2005 in an effort to develop this site. Having withdrawn our July 2007 planning application due to unresolved car parking issues, which have since been resolved, we now find ourselves in exactly the same position as we were when we were talking to you in earnest during our January 2007 pre application discussions.

Actually, I would say that we have made progress in that we have reached agreement regarding acceptable access, massing, street scene, car parking, housing mix & environmental assessment.

BUT the two big issues that we thought we had agreed with you before we submitted our planning application are preventing us from progressing further. These are:

1. COMPREHENSIVENESS - Your requirement for the development to include surrounding land.

By the time we submitted our planning application in July this year all three land owners involved, their professional advisers, our architect and us understood that we had addressed this issue by mutual agreement of a sub master plan in the form submitted as part of our planning application. Furthermore we all believed that we had agreed with you that each land owner could validly submit

separate planning applications to you and that your support would be forthcoming if each application complied with the sub master plan. This worked for all three land owners concerned as all three have different personal circumstances and different aspirations regarding development timetable.

After we withdrew our planning application you informed us that you would refuse our re-application unless Colin Blowers site was included in a development proposal with Martins site and that this was an essential requirement on your part. Since our last meeting with you we have been in discussion with Colin and the plain fact is that he does not need to or want to move in the same immediate time scale as Martin, he is not willing to sell his site at a price which would make development viable & he is not willing to be party to any section 106 agreement. Unless we revert back to the methodology that we thought we had agreed in January, as I have outlined above, I do not see how planning permission can be obtained. We therefore ask that, having explored your desired approach but having failed to make this workable, we revert back to our original plan. This will allow the release of the Martin Rumble site for development, the removal of the traffic problems associated with car dealership use, the removal of inappropriate commercial use from this residential area, significant regeneration of the immediate area and a major stimulus for further regeneration in line with the sub master plan.

2. EMPLOYMENT – Your requirement to develop a high degree of employment use on the site.

We have undertaken further research relating to the level of employment use last discussed between us (733 sq m occupying the entire Derby Road frontage). The conclusion of this research is that the amount and type of employment use that you envisage for this site is inappropriate in that there is very low demand for small offices in this location and the value/cost equation is so poor that it is an onerous financial burden on a site that is also expected to yield affordable housing and cash contributions of various descriptions. The overall effect of these factors is to reduce the site value to a level below existing use value. Where this happens – clearly development does not take place.

We are not saying that there is no scope for adding extra employment use over & above the 4 shops that we proposed with our July planning application but we need to know that you have sufficient flexibility for us to fully review the type and overall floor area that we can provide. Clearly the employment floor area, for Martins site, needs to over 200 sq m but substantially less than 733 sq m in order to make it work.

Can you please consider these matters and advise us of a way forward.

Peter Goodchild FRICS
Director
For & on behalf of Rugby Investments Ltd
t: 01908 487538
e: peter@rugbyinvest.co.uk
w: www.rugbyinvestments.co.uk