

Jane Steel

From: David Spring
Sent: 01 October 2024 09:53
To: Planning Folder New
Subject: FW: 24/00601/FUL- Grove House
Attachments: 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1100-P06-Proposed Plot 1 Floor Plans.pdf; 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1200-P05-Proposed Plot 2 Floor Plans.pdf; 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1300-P06-Proposed Plot 3 Ground - First Floor Plans.pdf; 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1400-P06-Proposed Plot 4 Floor Plans.pdf; 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1500-P04-Proposed Plot 5 Ground Floor Plan.pdf; 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1501-P05-Proposed Plot 5 First Floor Plan.pdf; 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1502-P04-Proposed Plot 5 Second Floor Plan.pdf

From: Shane Davies <
Sent: 30 September 2024 11:35
To: David Spring <David.Spring@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Cc: Tim Adams <
Subject: Re: 24/00601/FUL- Grove House

Hi David,

Apologies, I was not in the office on Friday.

We have amended all plans to match the m2 as mentioned in email on 27th September.

Plot 2 is indeed 133m2 plus the 22m2 for the garage, as indicated on revised drawing. both together is 155m2 as per email.

Plot 3 is indeed 203m2 plus the 17m2 for the garage, as indicated on revised drawing, both together is 220m2 as per email.

Please also see amenity m2 for each plot:

Plot 1 = 80.6

Plot 2 = 152.5

Plot 3 = 181.5

Plot 4 = 94.2

Plot 5 = 271.5

With this information, and that your report is nearly complete, will we be receiving the approval today please?

Look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards



From: David Spring <David.Spring@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Date: Friday, 27 September 2024 at 12:48
To: Shane Davies <
Subject: FW: 24/00601/FUL- Grove House

Hi Shane,

I'm just finishing off the report but the info below is different to the submitted plans. Please see Plot 3 for example attached which says the total proposed is 228.4m² but your email below says the total for Plot 3 is 220m².

Plot 2 attached says total is 128.9m² but your email below says plot 2 total is 155m².

Please can you go through all the proposed for each dwelling and rectify this as all these have to be identical.

Also can you list the amenity space for each dwelling please?

With thanks,

David Spring
Planning

From: Shane Davies <
Sent: 12 September 2024 11:44
To: David Spring <David.Spring@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Cc: Tim Adams <
Subject: Re: 24/00601/FUL- Grove House

Hi David,

I've tried to answer all your queries from your separate emails within this one email.

Firstly, apologies for confusion but from your first email I believe it is only Plot 5 that has the 'extension' that extrudes beyond the DPC walls that have been built to date.

Please see below the difference on SQM for the total dwellings, along with additional extensions as requested.

Plot 1:

2019 = 90m²

2024 = 108m²

Plot 1 footprint increased marginally as discussed in previous email to improve living quality.

Plot 2:

2019 = 142m² (including 18m² for Carport)

2024 = 155m² (including 20m² for Garage)

Plot 2 footprint increased marginally as discussed in previous email to improve living quality.

Plot 2 Carport amended into Garage to provide improved security to dwelling.

Plot 3:

2019 = 216m² (including 34m² for Carport)

2024 = 220m² (including 17m² for Garage)

Plot 3 2019 included accommodation in loft space, now omitted from 2024.

Plot 3 Carport amended into Garage to provide improved security to dwelling.

Exact same accommodation provided above garage in 2024 application.

Plot 4:

2019 = 104m³ (Carport beneath Study)

2024 = 107m² (Carport beneath Bedroom 3)

Plot 4 additional 3m² is only front dormers to Bedroom 3.

Plot 5:

2019 = 335m² (including Garage)

2024 = 381m² (including Garage & 14m² Rear GF Extension)

Plot 5 includes additional single storey GF extension to rear, additional accommodation (gym) within eaves of garage roof.

I thought it best highlight the following points again regarding the changes to the dwellings:

- There are no additional dwellings to the development.
- Therefore, no additional occupancy in comparison to the 2019 permission.
- The amendments are solely for the purpose of providing better living standards (larger bedrooms, gym's, study's etc), which we do not believe can be considered as over-development.
- Its also worth highlight that the change of the carports into secure garage's does not impact any light on any of the dwellings in comparison to the 2019 submission.

RE: your final email, I can confirm each plot has a minimum of 7m garden length and I can also confirm that each plot has a minimum of 80m² of amenity.

If you need any further information, please get in touch.

Look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards

From: Shane Davies <
Sent: 21 August 2024 16:33
To: David Spring <David.Spring@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Cc: Tim Adams <
Subject: Re: 24/00601/FUL- Grove House

Hi David,

Apologies for the delay in getting back to you.

Thanks again for your comprehensive email, following a conversation with the client, please see attached our comments below.

When the original application was submitted in 2019, dwellings were not used in the same manner in which they are today. Since Covid-19 and the increase of working from home, homes have become the basis for working. Open space within a property for family living is precious now, therefore within the development we have utilised space to adequately create areas for working from home, including study and gym.

We have found a demand for larger dwellings with additional bedrooms, along with spaces such as gyms and hobby rooms becoming a necessity to a family dwelling.

Subsequently, and in comparison, to the 2019 submission, an opportunity was taken to review certain aspects of each dwelling, to improve them where possible and respond to these new requirements. We have attached a breakdown of the compared footprint of each dwelling between the 2019 and 2024 applications.

	2019	2024	m ² increased by
Plot 1	42m ²	52m ²	10m ²
Plot 2	62m ²	62m ²	0m ²
Plot 3	104m ²	104m ²	0m ²
Plot 4	45m ²	45m ²	0m ²
Plot 5	144m ²	158m ²	14m ² 28m ²

Regarding these increased areas, it is worth highlighting that Plots 3, 4, and 5 are following the original footprint, as they already have foundations formed. The only additional m² to these plots are small extensions.

It is worth highlighting that none of the houses have increased bedroom numbers.

The main differences are in better use of space and layout, along with the inclusion of garages, where carports were originally shown. Please see more in-depth evaluation of changes for each dwelling below:

Plot 1:

Dwelling marginally increased to provide better internal layout.

Plot 2:

Dwelling footprint not increased since 2019 submission.

Plot 3:

Footprint of proposed dwelling is equal to the 2019 Plot 3, including the car port. Car port created a dark kitchen, which is now an open and well-lit area.

Plot 4:

Dwelling footprint not increased since 2019 submission.

Plot 5:

Dwelling footprint only increased with the addition of a new extension to the rear.

With regards to Plot 3 and the amendment from the car port to a garage, please note that the garage provides much security to the dwelling than the car port, especially with the rise in crime in the area.

In June 2024, Burbage was the worst small town in Leicestershire for drugs, with 5 crimes reported and a crime rate of 0.42 per 1,000 daytime population. February 2023 was also a bad month for Burbage residents, when it was Leicestershire's most dangerous small town for other crime, recording 8 crimes at a rate of 0.67 per 1,000 daytime population.

With this information, we believe the security for the future residents of this development is of utmost importance, which has motivated us to make this design decision. We have also considered the need to store items internally and should allow reduction of added ad hoc outbuildings to store numerous house and garden items.

We are happy to accept the following conditions
from highways RE: access, parking and turning.

from waste services RE: waste storage.

from drainage RE: incorporating Suds

Below we have outlined some views / comments on the items from the Parish Council to assist. We are happy to provide further comment if you feel that would assist you or us in the application decision.

Our views as follows in red:

The proposed amended scheme is considered to be over-development of the site as property sizes have increased from those previously approved.

Please see our comments above regarding the increased footprint. Please also note that the bedroom numbers have not increased, therefore the occupancy of the development is not increasing.

Members are extremely concerned about the increased biodiversity loss that would be caused by the amended scheme and the absence of mitigating measures, leading to a failure to demonstrate biodiversity net gain.

We appreciate the concerns RE: biodiversity loss, however, our Ecology consultant has advised us that as this application is a resubmission of an approved application submitted in 2019 (before BNG was required), they believe that it would be unjust to judge this application's BNG on the recent regulations, when the design stage of the site, dwellings and landscaping was completed in 2019. Based on the above, we would ask if the requested Biodiversity information is no longer required.

The external appearance of the proposed dwellings is felt to be out of keeping with the character of the area and incongruous in the setting.

Please note that we believe that no particular dwelling on Grove Road is similar in their architectural style. Therefore, as designers, keeping a development "in-keeping" with the surroundings is challenging. However, we believe we have improved the architectural quality in comparison to the approved 2019 submission, with the 5no. dwellings complimenting features from the Grove House dwelling to the frontage of Grove Road. Specifically, to Plot 5, which is visible to the street scene, we have taken the best features from Grove House, along with creating a bespoke blend of brick colour for Plots 1, 3 & 5, to ensure the colours compliment and match the existing, see below link and data sheet attached.

<https://bespokebrick.com/brick/rural-blend-handmade/>

There is no pedestrian footpath provision along the access road, leading to concerns about pedestrian safety.

Please note we have followed the previous scheme's approved access and road, to which no requirement was stipulated by highways. Equally, as you mentioned in your email, Highways have no objection subject to following drawing no. 198-TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1000 Proposed Site Plan P06. It is also worth noting that we do have a separate pedestrian access to the rear of the site for residents and visitors that access onto Wesley Walk allowing direct access to all local amenities.

No waste/recycling servicing area is indicated, suggesting that bins may be left on the highway on collection days, causing obstruction to pedestrians and further compromising pedestrian safety.

The waste/recycling storage, as mentioned in your email has been conditioned, so do not feel this is appropriate to address at this stage. However, the client has expressed the want to provide a bin store near the front access of the site for all dwellings.

There is insufficient parking provision for visitors.

Please note that the previously approved application contained no visitor parking. This proposed application provides an additional 3no. visitor parking spaces. It is also worth highlighting that visitors as noted above along with residents can also access the dwellings through the access via Wesley Walk.

As a result of the issues outlined above, there is concern that emergency vehicles may be impeded in accessing the site and that pedestrians may be at risk should emergency vehicle access be required.

The access is unchanged from the original approved application, with the road widened to ensure emergency service turning. There is no significant alteration to the scheme to warrant this being altered, please advise. It is also worth highlighting that pedestrians can also access the dwellings through the access via Wesley Walk.

Containers:

Regarding other matters related to this project, please see attached photographic evidence that the client, as requested, has erected screening to block all views into the neighbouring gardens.

Thanks again David, really appreciate your correspondence and I look forward to hearing from you.

If you would like any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards



From: David Spring <David.Spring@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>

Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2024 at 12:49

To: Shane Davies <

Subject: RE: 24/00601/FUL- Grove House

Hi Shane,

I hope you are well.

I was wondering if you had a breakdown of the differences in sqm for each dwelling when compared to the original 2019 permission 19/00743/FUL please?

I also wanted to give you an update in terms of the application. Most consultations are back.

Conservation Officer comments attached and no objections.

HBBC Pollution Officer no objections

LCC Highways no objections subject to a condition:

‘No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as the access arrangements, parking and turning as shown on ‘Proposed Site Plan’, drawing number 198- TAA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1000 Rev P06 have been implemented in full. Once provided, they shall be maintained and made available for use in perpetuity.

REASON: To ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site may pass each other clear of the highway, in a slow and controlled manner and to ensure that adequate off-street parking provision is made to reduce the possibility of the proposed development leading to on-street parking problems locally and to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward direction in the interests of general highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).’

HBBC Waste Services no objection subject to a condition:

‘No development shall take place until a scheme makes adequate provision for waste and recycling storage of containers and collection across the site which has been submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning authority. The details should address accessibility to storage facilities and confirm adequate space is provided at the adopted highway boundary to store and service wheeled containers’.

HBBC Drainage no objections subject to a condition:

‘Development shall not begin until surface water drainage details, incorporating sustainable drainage principles (SuDS) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Burbage Parish Council comments are:

‘Burbage Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

- The proposed amended scheme is considered to be over-development of the site as property sizes have increased from those previously approved
- Members are extremely concerned about the increased biodiversity loss that would be caused by the amended scheme and the absence of mitigating measures, leading to a failure to demonstrate biodiversity net gain.
- The external appearance of the proposed dwellings is felt to be out of keeping with the character of the area and incongruous in the setting.
- There is no pedestrian footpath provision along the access road, leading to concerns about pedestrian safety.
- No waste/recycling servicing area is indicated, suggesting that bins may be left on the highway on collection days, causing obstruction to pedestrians and further compromising pedestrian safety.
- There is insufficient parking provision for visitors.
- As a result of the issues outlined above, there is concern that emergency vehicles may be impeded in accessing the site and that pedestrians may be at risk should emergency vehicle access be required'

A local Cllr's comments echo those of the Parish Council.

Please respond to any of these points if you wish.

LCC Archaeology comments:

'In response to the previous application for the site (19/00743/FUL) both a historic building survey and trial trenching report were submitted, following which we advise that both were satisfactory.

The outstanding issue in both instances was the post-investigation programme (publication, archiving etc.), as outlined within the approved Written Schemes of Investigation (WSIs). As such we advised in response to 23/00205/CONDIT that conditions be attached to ensure that these requirements were fulfilled.

We have contacted the archaeological contractor who undertook this work to query the status of the post-investigation works. If these have been satisfactorily addressed we will be happy to advise that no archaeological conditions would be required for the current application.

I will keep you updated once we have received confirmation on the post-investigation status. Please do feel free to get in touch if you have any further queries in the meantime'.

What is the status of the post-investigation works?

We have yet to receive comments from Severn Trent Water, LCC Ecology, LCC Public Rights of way but I'll let you know as soon as I do.

With regards,

David Spring
Planning