

East Leake Parish Council Response - 19/00323/FUL

Increase no of homes from 36 to 83 on part of Phase 3, Land off Kirk Ley Road

OBJECT

East Leake Parish Council **objects** to this application in its current form.

1. Our objections to further new homes in East Leake in general can be found in our responses to 18/02692/OUT (Field End Close) and 19/00288/OUT (Stonebridge Drive). In brief East Leake can no longer be considered a sustainable location for further housing due to infrastructure capacity being exceeded with the huge amount of housing experienced. Policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires that infrastructure improvements would have to be made in time to serve the needs of the development and this would not be possible for these additional homes.
2. The principle of developing the site has been established by the outline planning permission, but increasing the density of homes on this site by more than doubling the number of homes is not acceptable. The original application for the complete site (12/01840/OUT) was for up to 175 homes. The public consultation promoted a scheme with woodland and open space:

"The proposal is for about 175 new dwellings together with significant areas of new woodland and publicly accessible open spaces. ... The proposals include extensive open areas and significant new planting which could make a positive contribution to this area of the village. The site is currently primarily used agriculturally. Woodlands were planted on the site some 20 years or so ago, particularly on the southern and eastern boundaries and these are now maturing to provide visual enclosure. The concept plan links and extends these woodlands to complete a clear definition between village and countryside."

Since then the number of houses has increased to 300. Much of the woodland and green space has been removed. The soft edge proposed to link the village to the countryside has largely been lost. If permitted this latest increase would bring the number of homes on the whole site to 347, double that originally planned and consulted on.

3. No more trees should be removed.
4. We note that the scheme would provide some smaller homes, and that the proposed mix is in line with that required by policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan, which gives the proposal some merit in our view. However the hugely increased density proposed is unacceptable. With the right housing mix, conforming to policy H3, we might support a scheme with a smaller increase, say to 50 homes, rather than 83. We would be pleased to see bungalows and some 1-bedroom homes – perhaps maisonette style rather than an apartment block.
5. Policy E1 of the Neighbourhood Plan protects the ridgelines around East Leake. The revised plan would have much more of an impact on the ridgeline (Ridge A in Fig 5.1/1 of the NP) than the currently approved plan, giving a much more built-up appearance from within the village and when looking into it from outside. In particular we are very unhappy about the

proposed 3 storey homes in this area which is the top of the overall site. Homes here should be limited to 2 storey, with no 2.5 or 3 storey homes. Some bungalows instead of 2-storey homes along the very top would help. (There are bus stops quite close by.)

5. We note that there is no public open space on-site and that a S106 contribution for off-site public open space is suggested in the draft S106 Heads of Terms (see Planning Statement). We can see an opportunity to provide foot and cycle path linkage with the neighbouring Rempstone Road site to maximise the benefit of the open space existing on both developments. This would tie in with policies T1 and T2 of the NP, and improve access to the surrounding public footpath network for residents of both sites.
6. We have concerns about the widths of the roads and on-road parking. This would be made worse by the increased number of homes. On other new developments we have noticed that where tandem parking for 2 cars is provided residents are more likely to park one car on the road (and often over the pavement). Side by side parking spaces are preferable. We note tandem parking on plots 13-24, 37, 73-77, 82, 83. Some semis and terraces appear to have fewer than 2 spaces per home, e.g. 3-6, 7-10, 27-29, 30-31, 40-43, 50-53, 58-60, 64-65, 69-71, 79-81. Shared spaces could be problematic.
7. Does the SuDS provided for the site have capacity for the additional run-off generated by the proposed development?