

Samuel Ball

From: Richard Redford
Sent: 25 March 2020 08:43
To: Samuel Ball; David Gill
Subject: 19/00356/OUT - FW: Cottage farm Phase 2 application.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Both,

Please see the below from Cllr Charlesworth to Cllr Bentley in respect of the application on the DC committee for records.

I'll make verbal reference to the points made.

Richard

Richard Redford MRTPI
Development Control Manager

The Built Environment

T: 0116 257 2654

From: John Boyce (<mailto:johnwilliamboyce@icloud.com>)
Sent: 18 March 2020 15:31
To: Richard Redford
Subject: Fwd: Cottage farm Phase 2 application.

Richard

We need to take the below into account.

Regards

John Boyce

Begin forwarded message:

From: eric
Date: 18 March 2020 at 15:22:33 GMT
To: johnwilliamboyce@icloud.com
Cc: philip_oshaghnessy@sky.com, jeffrey.kaufman@leics.gov.uk
Subject: Cottage farm Phase 2 application.

Hi John,
My apologies for sending this communicating to your personal account rather than the Council contact. I put your name in, and clearly our previous correspondence and contact detail came up.

I have been checking when the Phase 2 application for the Cottage Farm development will be listed to come before Committee . I know understand this will be 26 March at 7:00 m

1. In view of the current Corin19 position, I am aware that in the NHS world all meetings have been cancelled or know take on teleconference status. I presume the same will apply to Council business, unless such meeting still require statutory status.
2. Whatever the case may be,I cannot emphasize to strongly how the views of the public are addressed in relation to any discussion /decision being taken in the above application, I would ask that this correspondence and others you may receive are taken very seriously and transparency and accountability is able to seen as thorough,and robust considerations have ,and will be taken.
3. As I and colleagues fall into the category of being aged / and within the high risk , I will not be able to attend as would have been my wish. I think Jeffrey as my local Councillor is in the same position.
4. I would therefore request a response of how the Council intend to deal with this matter, and how as residents we can ensure our views are fully and openly discussed?
5. Had I been able t attend, I would have wished to make representation on the following issues
 - Following the public meeting and the statements made by the Bloor representatives about the assurances they were giving regarding the siting of the Compound, nothing has been received. I spoke personally with one of the representatives who said this assurance was given that the compound would be re sited BEFORE phase 2 is commenced (assuming it will be approved). Such assurance appear to have been hollow. *I would require the Councils officers and representatives to obtain these assurance. As it currently stands the compound could be in situ till 2031. This would be totally unacceptable.*
 - You will be aware that a formal complaint was lodged by me with the Ombudsman, part of which clearly showed there had been ill advised statements made by Council officers which if they had been handled appropriately a different outcome may have been achieved.
 - We note no site seems to have been designated for the phase 2 . We have a strong concern that Bloor’ still intend to keep the compound position for a significant period during the remaining **11 years** of this site on Bloors statement of building 50 units per year.
 - I am aware that some concerns have been expressed that the notification of the phase 2 development has received a minimal number of responses. T he reason for this I suggest is that there are only 6 houses currently that will be affected significantly if the compound remains.
 - In regard to finances under section 10 monies, can we make sure account is taken of some equity in the distribution which on phase one seemed highly questionable (I recognise decisions are made on the submissions received.)
 - Having examined the phase 2 plans very carefully I note there is a change of possible land behind the existing Council Changing rooms. As in phase 1, changes made subsequently to the approval given, would have been challenged if there had been a greater degrees of transparency and honesty.
 - Neighbours and myself *seek assurance* that the land behind properties 68-82 Coombe Rise will be retained as phase 1 as a sports field and will NOT be made into a car parking area.

I am sure there a number of other issues which hopefully Councillors themselves will challenge and ensure satisfaction prior to sign off. This must NOT be a tick box activity without challenging the Council and BLoors officers, which form other investigation made by mysef previously appears not to have been the case.

I am sure I and colleagues would be able to assist officers or Council members should this be required.

Wishing you well and with respect.

Eric Charlesworth