

Samuel Ball

From: Richard Redford
Sent: 25 March 2020 14:18
To: David Gill; Samuel Ball; DemocraticServices; Adrian Thorpe; Anne Court
Subject: FW: Planning application 19/00356/OUT

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

All,

Please see the below e-mail from Mr Charlesworth in respect of the item to be discussed and determined on Friday.

I'll reply to Mr Charlesworth to acknowledge receipt and inform him that it has been passed onto the relevant people in order to be looked at.

Thanks

Richard

Richard Redford MRTPI
Development Control Manager

The Built Environment

T: 0116 257 2654

From: R&R Mailbox
Sent: 25 March 2020 09:42
To: Richard Redford
Subject: FW: Planning application 19/00356/OUT

Hi Richard,

One for you!

Thanks,

Emily Byrne
Administrative Assistant

The Built Environment.

From: eric (mailto:ericcharlesworth@gmail.com)
Sent: 25 March 2020 09:38
To: R&R Mailbox
Cc: Jeffrey Kaufman; cllr.mohammed.darr@oadby-wigston.gov.uk
Subject: Planning application 19/00356/OUT

URGENT COMMUNICATION FAO Mr Redford

I have been grateful for the recent correspondence from Council in respect of the above application – Bloor’s Home- phase 2 Cottage Farm development. As previously a Snr. Manager with the LCC I am well aware of the procedures and constraints within which you have to work. However I am also aware 1 of the powers you have to make account. I am currently a Compliance officer for NHS work and am particularly anxious that the Governments requirements to halt the spread of Covind19 must be carried out. The strictness of me that is required to ensure correct compliance procedures are addressed and maintained , is a key requirement of the role. The actions that I can take should there be a failure in compliance without due cause or reason can be significant. In relation to this matter, this clearly may present the Council a particular added problem for yourselves as to whether this Council meeting still proceeds. Clearly there should be the opportunity for member of the public who may be affected by the decisions to be present, or taking part in a teleconference should this be considered. This has now been removed form us. I would be grateful to know the current position and whether the whole matter is to be put in abeyance. This would allow proper consideration can be undertaken with the opportunity for those who have shown concerns being able to voice these concerns prior to any final decision being taken. An added reason for this is that I have cause to believe that the latest submission appears to have had previous part of the submission changed again. If this was done after the final written submission date from the public , issues could arise.

Whilst in no way implying this may be the case, I would take exception if it emerged that only a cursory review is undertaken without challenge and explanation, and decisions then made on a tick box basis. I am aware that my Local Councillor will not be able to be present should the meeting proceed and this does concern me also.

You will be aware that I have already given a written submission. Had I been allowed to attend the meeting, I would have explained in greater detail the evidence and concerns behind the comments. Having once again reviewed the application there appear to be questionable statements and proposals which I and colleague neighbours will wished to be accounted.

1. We note on the new application, the number of proposed dwellings has increased. Was this increase in dwellings notified to all the Section 10 money organisations when making their financial considerations for additional funding. As I am working closely with the ELR CCG the significance of potential population increase for the site, as being critical to assure improved health services for the area.
2. On the aerial photo- area 6 this is now classed as “potential” Sports park or parking. On the previous plans this behind the current changing rooms on Coombe park. Why is the word potential used ? to get it through planning? I can assure you that there will be significant concerns if this area of land backing onto the Coombe Rise properties is not used as projected in phase 1 - as a sports area. We would wish Councillors to challenge or make firm what part would be a playing pitch and what would be a car park.
3. At the public meeting Bloor’s indicated they were intending to complete 50 dwellings per annum. With the new figures the site will go beyond 2031 (the current final completion) before it is totally completed. We have still NOT received the assurances made at the public meeting that they would re-site the compound to another area **prior** to work commencing on Phase 2. I cannot see (as also happened previously) any site re allocated for the compound authorised for phase 1 only. I spoke personally with Bloor's representative after the meeting and was absolutely assured the compound would be moved for phase 2.(This should include being prior to road ,access and facilities being created). The mere fact that Bloor's have not had the common resect in confirming their statements is a cause for serious concerns once outline planning permission is awarded, without confirmation.

4. As with my own property position, since phase 1 was passed, we have had to put up with lorries and cement vehicles delivering daily to the site. From early morning to late evening we have dumper trucks driving around the site, bulldozers and delivery vehicles. The thought that this could continue for another 11 + years is totally unacceptable.

Thank you once again for your continuing assurance role in this matter. I would be grateful to receive an acknowledgement of receipt of this email.

Eric Charlesworth