

Leicester
City Council

SECOND DESPATCH

**MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2020

Further to the agenda for the above meeting which has already been circulated, please find attached the following:-


PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND CONTRAVENTIONS

The Committee is asked to consider the recommendations of the Director, Planning, Development and Transportation contained in the attached reports, within the categories identified in the index appended with the reports.

Addendum Report

Officer contacts

*Tel: 0116 454 6355 / 0116 454 5591 e-mail: elaine.baker@leicester.gov.uk /
aqil.sarang@leicester.gov.uk*



Leicester
City Council

Wards: see individual reports

20201275	115 Uppingham Road	
Proposal:	Retrospective application for use of site as a car wash and window tinting service (Sui Generis); with associated outbuildings	
Applicant:	Mr N Okeke	
Expiry Date:	5 November 2020	
ACB	TEAM: PE	WARD: North Evington

Page Number on Main Agenda:

13

Correction to the report:

Reason 2 top of page 15 should read... proposed 2.4m laminated **boards** due to

Representations

The Local Lead Flood Authority would require details of what would happen in the event of the drainage system being exceeded. They further request details of the connections to public sewers, methods to stop surface water entering the public roads and sustainable drainage.

The applicant has submitted two petitions to members of the planning committee both with 26 signatures in support of the application.

Further Considerations

If the application were to be determined and potentially recommended for approval, additional drainage details would be sought; however given the recommendation to decline to determine the application, details have not been requested.

One of the petitions appears to be a copy of that supporting the previous application. It claims to be from local residents and businesses, however it has very few full addresses and those provided are not near the site.

The other petition states "*We are the nearby residences, businesses and regular users of the business services provided at 115 Uppingham Road. We have written our details below in support of the planning application for the continued use of the site for this business and the services it is proposing. We will support the application at a planning committee if required.*" None of the signatures on this petition appear to be local residents.

20201345	1-1A Monsell Drive	
Proposal:	Variation of conditions 11 (TPO trees to be protected from damage) & 12 (Existing trees, shrubs, hedges to be protected) attached to planning permission 20191818 (Demolition of existing apartment buildings (Class C3); Construction of two and three storey Care Home (60 Bed) (Class C2) to allow for changes to the tree protection measures and felling of four trees protected by TPO N4.0177 (Amended plan received 7/10/2020)	
Applicant:	Mr Adrian Doyle	
Expiry Date:	30 October 2020	
ACB	TEAM: PE	WARD: Aylestone

Page Number on Main Agenda:

23

Representations

Councillor Porter and one of the objectors have expressed concern that a further TPO tree will be removed by the amended plan. They consider that the report should be withdrawn and the application re-publicised.

Councillor Porter has further contacted all members of the committee referring to the 2006 appeal decision against refusal of a revised scheme for 24 flats. The appeal inspector considered that the flats development then proposed would lead to pressure for further removal of trees at the front of the site.

Further Considerations

The issues are covered in the report and the reason for the additional removal is explained.

Re-publicity of applications is normally only carried out where the amendments would be likely to significantly change the comments that were made. In this case the concerns about loss of trees is understood and has been considered.

In respect of the 2005 appeal decision, this has already been considered in the main report and the conclusion is that the use of the site as a care home would result in less pressure for the trees to be felled than it would in the case of a development for individual dwellings.