Simon Cheshire

From: Simon Cheshire
Sent: 31 August 2007 13:45
To: 'Peter Goodchild'
Cc: 'martin@martinrumble.co.uk'; Tracy Darke; Chris Merriman
Subject: RE: Derby Road Hinckley
Importance: High

Peter,

on those figures the scheme would require 96 parking spaces (1.5 per flat , 2 per house & 4 for the commercial/retail units) and this morning I have received confirmation that Highways have recommended refusal on the lack of adequate on-site parking provision.

I ve just spoken to policy regarding the employment classification and should hear back this afternoon.
There are other design issues that will have an impact on the parking provision and I have delayed my response until I d received the Highway comments. We have continually referred to the Richard Roberts site which incorporates a larger mix of housing. We feel the if the site is to be determined in isolation then the dominance of flatted development is inappropriate in this location / density. The Druid Quarter Master Plan and PPS3 call for mixed communities to include both market and affordable/RSL dwellings, particularly in terms of tenure and price. I am aware the housing section may offer advice on the shortfall of one and two bedroom flats within the Borough but they appear to be unaware of the planning implications of such advice especially on sites of this size . I had a pre application meeting with Gary Turner of Notts Community Housing Association over a year ago and he was made aware of the planning implications for such a scheme of this density.

I have now got the details of your solicitors and I am awaiting the revised figures from County but I will send the draft off and amend the figures when they arrive.

The site is problematic given the ownership issues and I have discussed the scheme with both Tracy Darke and Chris Merriman. If we are to consider the application on this site only then the proposal will have to be revisited. In its current form it will be placed on the agenda for planning committee on Tuesday 25th September 2007 with a recommendation of refusal.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Goodchild [mailto:peter@rugbyinvest.co.uk]
Sent: 31 August 2007 11:38
To: 'Simon Cheshire'
Cc: 'Martin Rumble'; 'Luke Hedderwick'; 'Michael Hales'; jdp@tungsten.uk.com
Subject: Derby Road Hinckley
Importance: High

Further to our telephone conversation this morning I confirm:

Number of units - the mix shown on our plans comprises:

60 apartments
2 houses
4 employment units

Car parking - I agree that the parking arrangements shown on planR74/01A are not fully clear. There are 55 car parking spaces shown, 2 of which occupy the intended link through to the Colin Blower site. The intention is that these 2 spaces will be re-provided within the Blower site in exchange for the access when the development of that site occurs. Is this sufficient, just right or too much? At the time of our pre application discussion there was some difference in highways and planning preference.

Employment units - associated with car parking is the nature of the employment units. In the past we have discussed with you users ranging from traditional offices to more retail based uses such as travel agents going through a range of other uses including dentists, vets e.t.c. We would prefer to see more retail based users that do not require additional on site car parking and that made a contribution to the street frontage and he vibrancy of the area. Is this acceptable to you? Which use classes would you accept & which would you specifically exclude? We could cover allowances and restrictions such a this by planning condition.

Design issues - you advise that despite advice to the contrary from Nottingham Community Housing Association (who in turn have been consulting your housing section) you require more housing on the site. Please be more specific. You mention no other design issues - can you therefore please confirm that there is nothing else or us to address under this heading.

Section 106 issues - I have sent a proposal but not received a response from you. If you would be good enough to respond immediately on those issues where you are able and confirm which issues, if any, are outstanding pending receipt of consultation responses.

Your early response to the above would be greatly appreciated. Can you please confirm that in the event that we address the above issues quickly (and forward any amended plans to you by the end of next week), you will be able to take this application to committee with a recommendation for approval.

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