

Tim Hartley

From: Tim Hartley
Sent: 11 March 2024 11:35
To: Joshua Bird
Subject: RE: Barwell - 23/01175/FUL, 23/01177/FUL, 23/01184/FUL, 23/01186/FUL

Hi Josh

Further to our conversation on Friday I said I would confirm a number of matters. Most importantly we still await a formal response from the Highway Authority. This has been chased

In terms of public consultation responses we have the following:

- Environment Agency – no objections
- HBBC Environmental Health – all applications need land contamination investigation and appropriate reports submitted – incorrect reports have been submitted for 23/01175/FUL and 23/01184/FUL
- HBBC Waste Services – No objections subject to condition
- LCC Archaeology – No objections subject to condition
- Leicestershire Police – No objections but provide advice and request a S106 Contribution
- LCC Tree Officer – No objections
- LCC Ecology – The full metric calculation for biodiversity is missing and needs to be provided for review
- LCC Lead Local Flood Authority – Further info required

As agent you should be checking the public file and responding where issues are raised

In terms of other consultee responses that are not publicly viewable there are the following:

- HBBC Affordable Housing – attached, please see different mix and additional affordable home needed
- LCC S106 Contributions – attached (we are missing a response for 23/01186/FUL and this has been chased)
- NHS S106 Contributions – attached
- Barwell Parish Council – attached

I raised seven key issues:

1. Highways – having spoken to the LHA officer dealing with these applications they stated that their draft response was with their managers but that a key point was that in the interests of highway safety it was likely that a single access was better than two. This would necessitate some redesign and this will offer opportunities for layout improvements and to provide better open space. The Equipped Play Space area should be 453.6sq.m (126 x 3.6m per dwelling). The casual informal open space should be more centred around the equipped play space to create a more central open area. This is more important given that the biodiversity net gain is not being provided on site. It's also not acceptable for the accessible natural green space to be made up of so many tiny strips of left over land on the edges of the site – this doesn't meet the definitions of accessible space. Care should be taken that the interface distances between dwellings meets the requirements of the Council's Good Design Guide which sets out on page 34 that back-to-back distances are at least 21m, minimum back to side distances of 8m where the relationship is single storey and 14m where it is 2 storey. This same page also sets out that gardens should have a minimum length of 7m and that a three-bed house should have a minimum garden area of 80sq.m and a two-bed house needs at least 60sq.m. All existing houses on the Hinckley Road frontage feature chimneys and so it will be important that at least some on the main road frontage and at focal points within the site have chimneys

2. Red line boundaries – there were at least two plots, 56 and 57, that lie within all four application boundaries – Emily had said in her email of 31 January that the red lines are separate from each other. I understand though that those plots are blacked out under three of the applications
3. Open space – dealt with above
4. Tree Protection Plan – we discussed what appeals to be incorrect labelling and work to T24 on the main road boundary
5. The Biodiversity Net Gain S106 – we needed to see the signed version of the S106 that deals with the off-site biodiversity. An unsigned version was submitted with the application to discharge the condition that was attached to the appeal decision. Without the signed version there is no evidence that biodiversity is being addressed. As we will hopefully be issuing new permissions for 126 dwellings a new legal agreement will be required
6. Can you confirm if development of either permission has commenced please?
7. Consultation responses – dealt with above

Please let me know if you needed further information

Kind regards

Tim

Tim Hartley
Team Leader (Development Management)

T: 01455 255656

From: Tim Hartley
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 3:21 PM
To: 'Joshua Bird' <Josh.bird@geoffperryassoc.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Barwell - 23/01175/FUL, 23/01177/FUL, 23/01184/FUL, 23/01186/FUL

Hi Josh

Many thanks for the conversation

I'll confirm the points raised in a longer email that will be with you by 12 Monday lunchtime (11 March)

Many thanks for confirming an extension of time to 3 May. Under our scheme of delegation applications have to go to Committee if we receive objections from five or more separate addresses (so that all five people in one house objecting doesn't mean an application goes to Committee. So far we have 13 objections to 23/01175/FUL, 11 objections to 23/01177/FUL, 10 to 23/01184/FUL and 10 to 23/01186/FUL. Therefore the applications will have to go to Committee. The only Committee meeting scheduled before 3 May is 9 April and the deadline for that is 26 March which is just over two weeks away. The next Committee after that though is on 7 May so realistically I think we should aim for that. Even if we did get to that Committee though the decision notices can only be issued once the S106 Agreement has been signed

I see that previous approval 22/01053/FUL for the 45 dwellings was dealt with via a Unilateral Undertaking rather than a full S106 Agreement – this covered the following:

- Affordable Housing
- Civic Amenity Contributions (waste recycling)
- Education Contribution

- Libraries Contributions
- Open Space
- Outdoor Sports Contribution
- Local Employment Strategy
- Health Contributions

The Heads of Terms will be the same for the current applications so if your client wanted to deal with this via a Unilateral Undertaking I can check if that will suffice – please let me know how your client wishes to proceed on this point

I will deal with the other S106 matter regarding Biodiversity in my subsequent email

Many thanks

Tim

Tim Hartley
Team Leader (Development Management)

T: 01455 255656

From: Joshua Bird <Josh.bird@geoffperryassoc.co.uk>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:52 PM
To: Tim Hartley <Tim.Hartley@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Barwell

Email from client below with points raised as discussed.

Kind Regards,

Josh Bird BSc (Hons)
Architectural Technician

Geoff Perry Associates Limited



The Shrubbery, 28 Erdington Road, Aldridge, West Midlands, WS9 8UH

01922 744900

josh.bird@geoffperryassoc.co.uk

This email message and any attachment file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only. The contents are not to be disclosed to anyone other than the addressee. Unauthorised recipients are requested to preserve this confidentiality and to advise the sender immediately of any error in transmission. If you experience difficulty with opening any attachments to this message, or with sending a reply by email, please contact, tel no: 01922 744900 or fax no: 01922 744901. Any advice contained in this email or any accompanying file attached hereto is for information purposes only. Geoff Perry Associates Limited do not take any responsibility for differences between the original and the transmission copy or any amendments made thereafter. If the addressee requires Geoff Perry

Associates Limited to be responsible for the contents of this email, Geoff Perry Associates Limited will be pleased to issue a signed hard copy of the document upon request.

From: David Thonton-Baker <davidbaker@redboxsecurities.com>

Sent: 07 March 2024 13:31

To: Joshua Bird <Josh.bird@geoffperryassoc.co.uk>

Subject: Barwell

Hi josh

Ref Hinckley Road Barwell

Point to cover with Tim

- 1/ clarify four redlines in master plan do not overlap -discuss
- 2/ Pedestrian access from Crabtree Road and Landscaping at the end of Powers Road agree revision
- 3/ No chimneys - (none on the full consents on both field).
- 4/ Send PDF copy of photo on application 23/01186/Full

A/ we will have the reply for the LLFA after we have the photos (our report replies to expected next week)

B/ BNG - we have the full metrics calculation. Will send in

B/ BNG the off-site BNG will be dealt with by way of credits.

Will the applications be dealt with by delegated powers? (should be if only a few objections)

Extension of time 3rd May