stonep@signetplanning.com
14th February 2012

The Planning Inspectorate,
3/20 Wing
Temple Quay House,
2 The Square
Bristol.
BS1 6PN

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Appeal: APP/K2424/E/11/2167607/NWF
Site At 128 Main Street Markfield, Leicestershire.

I refer to the above and in particular to the response from the Local Planning Authority. I would be grateful if you would take account of my response.

Reason for Refusal No 1
In our opinion the appeal proposal will not adversely impact on No 116/18 such that a refusal of permission is warranted. The appeal proposal has considerably less bulk than the previously approved scheme. Drawing 44 in the appeal pack shows the relative positions of the previously approved scheme and the appeal proposal. The previously approved scheme is a material consideration.

At para 7.2 the Council has indicated that if a hip roof had been introduced in lieu of the rear gable then planning permission would have been forthcoming. This is the first time the Council has been so definitive. The appellant gave very careful consideration to this request but felt that the introduction of a hip would be alien to the prevailing aesthetic of the Markfield Conservation Area. There was also concern that it would alter the internal charter of the main bedroom which had been designed with a sloping ceiling (following the roof line) with a feature window to the east gable. The hip would lose this. In response the appellant offered to reduce the pitch and lower the ridge by 0.5m.

Reason for Refusal No 2
A Unilateral Undertaking was submitted with the application. A fee of £200 was paid to the Council to cover the Council's legal costs. We have submitted a new Unilateral Undertaking with the appeal; it relates to the exact amount stated by the Council. We are frankly baffled why this is a reason for refusal. A copy of the previously signed agreement is attached.

I have carefully assessed the comments from local residents relating to the potential to create an overbearing impact, overlooking, inadequate car parking and drainage. I have also carefully reassessed the Council's report and consider that all of these matters have been addressed and were not the subject of the reasons for refusal.

With reference to the suggested planning conditions I can confirm that there is no objection from the appellant.

In conclusion we are of the opinion that the refusal is without foundation. The marginal difference between a rear gable roof and a hip roof is not of a magnitude that it is the tipping point between approval and refusal. We respectfully ask that the Inspection allows the appeals.

Yours faithfully
for Signet Planning

PAUL STONE
Regional Director