



Leicester  
City Council

Wards: see individual reports

Planning & Development Control Committee

: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2026

---

## SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON APPLICATIONS AND CONTRAVENTIONS:

---

### INDEX

### APPLICATION ORDER

Page Main	Page Supp	Application Number	Address	Ward
25		20250173	20a Vulcan Road, Land Adjacent	TEI

<b>Recommendation: Conditional approval</b>	
<b>20250173</b>	<b>20a Vulcan Road, Land Adjacent</b>
Proposal:	Change of use from public open space to dwellinghouses; construction of two-storey building to contain five flats (5 x 1 bed) (Class C3) (Amended plans received 13 August 2025)
Applicant:	Mr J Sindhi
App type:	Operational development - full application
Status:	
Expiry Date:	6 March 2026
TEI	WARD: North Evington

**Page Number on Main Agenda: 25**

Two further objections have been received on behalf of the occupiers of a neighbouring property.

Concerns are raised that:

- the applicant has ignored the concerns expressed at the previous committee meeting, misaligning with the intention of the committee's original guidance,
- the proposed size, height and massing and the lack of amenity space remains unacceptable, and the design should meet modern expectations of space, comfort and environmental sustainability,
- (in relation to the yard space at 1 Sherrard Road) to positively balance the maximising of housing against the recognised significant impact on light levels in this yard is not the proper role of planning and that if an impact of a scheme is unacceptable then the development should be refused,
- that the proposal does not sufficiently address flood risk, surface water management, and pressures on local infrastructure and the feasibility of any SuDS scheme has not been properly assessed,
- the scale and intensity of the development results in a loss of outlook, an increased sense of enclosure and adverse effects on residential amenity beyond what would be appropriate for this site,
- the proposal does not strike an acceptable balance between development needs and the wellbeing of existing residents, and
- that had a better design been implemented during refurbishment, the land could have remained a much-needed green space for the community, offering benefits for residents' well-being and quality of life.

**Response**

The officer's report to committee covers many of the concerns above. However, and in addition, I note:

- Options were discussed with the agent including the removal of the smaller element to the south of the scheme, the reducing of the footprint of the

building from the east and keeping the proposal as it is. The applicant's decision was the third of these options.

- Though the officer's report considers the impact on light levels to the yard of 1 Sherrard Road as significant and resulting in a loss of amenity, it does not consider these impacts to be unacceptable.
- The addendum presented at the last committee reported that the feasibility of SuDS schemes had been discussed with the Lead Local Flooding Authority and that a SuDS scheme was considered feasible. This has been incorporated into the current report.

In relation to potential for a restored green space use, the officer's report considers the application as submitted and the proposed change of use to residential- it would not be appropriate to withhold consent on the grounds that an alternative use which has not been proposed might be preferable- the application stands to be determined on its own merits.