17 JUN 2011

The Planning Inspectorate
EST 1909

3/13a Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117 372 8586
Customer Services: 0117 372 6372
Fax No: 0117 372 8181
e-mail: teamp12@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Mr Simon Wood
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Planning Officer
Council Offices
Argents Mead
Hinckley
Leicestershire
LE10 1BZ

Your Ref: 10/00799/FUL

Our Ref: APP/K2420/A/11/2150169/WF

Date: 16 June 2011

Dear Mr Wood

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr Christopher Harbot
Site at Rear Of 132 - 136 Main Street, Markfield, Coalville, LE67 9UX

I enclose for your information a copy of the appellant's final comments on the above appeal. Normally, no further comments, from any party, will now be taken into consideration.

Yours sincerely

Ceri-Marie Carr

217L(BPR)

You can use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcsportal/casesearch.asp
You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE
POSITIVE ABOUT DISABLED PEOPLE

KENNETH I PAYNE
Dip. Arch. RIBA FASI
Chartered Architect

49 CHURCH ROAD, KIRKBY MALLORY, LEICESTERSHIRE LE9 7QE 01455 850098

Ceri-Marie Carr
The Planning Inspectorate.
3/13a Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6PN

8 June 2011

Your Ref: APP/K2420/A/11/2150169/WF

Dear Ms.Carr,

Re: Appeal by Mr. Christopher Harbot
Site at Rear of 132-136 Main Street, Markfield, Coalville, LE67 9UX

I have the following comments on the Local Planning Authority statement and the third party representations.

Paragraph 7.2.3. of the L.P.A. statement contains the part sentence "The quality of the design of the proposal is considered to be poor....". Considered by whom ?. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council does not have an officer on it's staff who is an Architect, that is to say no one who is educated, qualified nor experienced in the design of buildings. Whilst it is reasonable for laypeople to hold and express opinions on an Architect's design for a building, it is quite wrong for them to make judgments, just as it would be wrong for them to make judgments on the work of medical or legal professionals say.

In response to paragraphs 7.3.1.,2 & 3 of the L.P.A. statement, I would state the following. Future occupiers of the proposed dwelling would not purchase the property if they considered that their privacy and amenities were adversely affected. The occupants of nos. 134 & 136 Main Street have not objected to the proposal, indeed the occupants of no. 136 wrote to the L.P.A. welcoming the proposal. The only window facing to the North, i.e. towards no. 1 Park Avenue is a Kitchen window on the ground floor. It is 21.5 metres from the existing house and faces a high boundary fence between the two properties.

In response to the representation by Mr. K. Bravin of no. 2 Park Avenue, I have the following comments. The proposed dwelling is sited to the west of the end of the long garden to no. 2 Park Avenue, therefore any shadow cast on the garden will be be minimal. The Tree Officer for the Council had no concerns about the surrounding trees if the proposed dwelling is to be built. The windows of the proposed dwelling will not look into any other house or garden, the building has been specifically designed to avoid this.

In response to the representation by Mr. F. Brocklehurst of No. 1 Park Avenue, I have already dealt with most of his objection points. I would add that the L.P.A. have accepted "The proposed dwelling is of single storey design but does feature rooms within the roof space, accordingly, the description of the application is considered accurate."

Finally, I can confirm that my client, Mr. Christopher Harbot, is willing to accept all the conditions suggested by the L.P.A. if the Inspector decides to allow the appeal.

Yours sincerely,



Kenneth I. Payne