



Leicester  
City Council

## MINUTES EXTRACT

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
STRATEGIC PLANNING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Held: WEDNESDAY 20 FEBRUARY 2002 at 5.30pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Hunt - Chair

Councillor Bodell-Stagg - Labour Spokesperson

Councillor Mrs. Chambers - Conservative Spokesperson

Councillor Henry

Councillor Soulsby

Councillor Hunter

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

|                        |   |                     |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Councillor Chohan      | - | Ward Councillor     |
| Councillor Kavia       | - | Cabinet Lead Member |
| Councillor Mugglestone | - | Ward Councillor     |
| Councillor Platts      | - | Ward Councillor     |
| Councillor Sood        | - | Ward Councillor     |
| Councillor Thompson    | - | Ward Councillor     |

\* \* \* \* \*

### 53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare any interests they may have in the business to be discussed and/or indicate that Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applied to them.

Councillor Hunt declared a personal prejudicial interest in the item entitled "Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for Abbey Park Road", on the basis of his employment offices being based within the site on which guidance is based. He left the meeting for consideration of this item.

Councillors Platts and Thompson, attending as Ward Councillors, both declared personal interests in the item entitled "Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Former Mundella Community College" as both are members of the Greater Humberstone Management Board.

Councillor Platts also declared a personal interest in the item entitled "The Towers – Site Development Guidance" as he lived near to the site.

## 57. MANOR FARM HOUSING SITE - SITE DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE

The Director of Environment, Development and Commercial Services submitted a report outlining the draft Manor Farm Housing Site – Site Development Guidance.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Mugglestone, Humberstone Ward Councillor and gave him the opportunity to comment on the guidance. His comments were as follows:-

- Concern that development in Hamilton in general was piecemeal
- A divide should be formed for Humberstone Village to retain its character
- Support was given for retention of the fishponds and a high quality development
- Three storey buildings were inappropriate in this area of the City.
- The proposed density was too high, it was felt people needed space to have a good quality of life.
- There was a significant need for youth provision in the area and it was queried what was happening to the money provided as part of any section 106 agreement.
- A pedestrian walkway should be build across Hamilton Way and a pedestrian crossing across Keyham Lane before any new houses are built.
- Local schools were overburdened and the problem could get worse from more development, benefits should be obtained from developers for this purpose.

In response Officers told the meeting they shared the concerns of the Ward Councillor with regard to the pace of development in Hamilton and work had been undertaken to secure better quality development. They felt it was not developing in a piecemeal manner and that the local plan and replacement local plan referred to maintaining a separate identity for Humberstone Village and to ensure that green open space was retained and protected. With regard to 3 storey houses Officers felt there were other examples of three storey houses in Leicester villages and in Humberstone village that fitted suitably with the surroundings. On the issue of density they stated that government guidelines were clear – to achieve 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Refusal of planning applications would be likely if the planning guidance did not reflect government guidelines. They felt it was necessary to work within the guidelines using good urban design principles to ensure a high quality living environment. In respect of leisure facilities for the area the officers stated that Keyham Community College were submitting a lottery bid supported by £180,000 of Section 106 funds for a sports facility that the local community could use. The Quakesick development had brought in funds for community facilities that were ringfenced for the Hamilton area. Negotiations were underway with Tesco for expansion which would mean a library and health care centre built also. Negotiations were also underway with the Hamilton Trustees for the positioning of the footbridge over Hamilton Way.

Members of the Committee raised concern at the comments made by the

Council's property section during the consultation process regarding the farmhouse that was to be retained. Members requested to know what precautions were to be undertaken to ensure the building was not vandalised or left to dilapidate. Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed level community benefits and Transport Assessments for future development being undertaken as a matter of course.

Officers in response stated that the Property Section were taking a typical landowner perspective on the proposals. They agreed that it was important to seek ways to protect the farmhouse and agreed to strengthen the guidance. With regard community benefits the Officers stated that legislation expected that money from this development should be spent in the area, it was also hoped that other council policies such as energy efficiency could be utilised cost effectively on any proposed development.

**RESOLVED:**

that the above comments be passed on to Cabinet for consideration.