

From:

Date:

B Williamson  
Development Control  
Leicester City Council  
New Walk Centre  
Welford Place  
Leicester LE1 6ZG

Dear Mr Williamson,

**Planning Application 20061661, 6 Pitch Gypsy Temporary Stopping Place**

I refer to the above planning application and wish to object on the following grounds.

1. The proposed site is in an area defined as Green Wedge, as per your own plans, and is, therefore, contrary to your Local Plan Green Environment Aims (10.2), where you state you will “protect and improve the quality of the green environment”. The proposal is also contrary to your Local Plan Green Wedge objectives, where you state that their value includes agricultural purposes and “The City Council will seek to protect and enhance Green Wedges and to improve non-vehicular access to them” (10.24). The proposal is, therefore, contrary to your own objectives and your policy GE06 (a).
2. Your Local Plan states that any development in Green Wedges must “serve the open space” (10.25). The proposal is, therefore, contrary to this objective. Given the proposed use, those utilising the site would run their businesses from the site, park vehicles and store items. The policy is, therefore, contrary to your policies GE07 d), g) and k). The proposal also includes the provision of lighting, although it lacks any detail whatsoever, and this would be most likely contrary to your policy GE07 j).
3. The proposal is not an acceptable use of Green Wedge land and is, therefore, contrary to your policy GE08.
4. Leicester City Council is yet to receive the report from the Leicestershire and Rutland Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Needs Assessment, as ordered by the City Council and due for first draft in December 2006/January 2007. The proposal also fails to meet the criteria of the Draft East Midlands Regional Plan. Thus, with a requirement not clearly defined the applicant cannot justify that the proposed site is required or even of “an appropriate size”. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to your policy H11 a). Similarly, if the size cannot be justified then neither can the management controls suggested. Simply stating “Staff – One maximum” does not provide any details of controls and this, therefore, contravenes your policy H11 a).
5. The proposed access and egress is on to the busy Ratby Lane, a road with a history of fatal accidents, on a curve and within an area of National Speed Limit, 60 mph. This is clearly not “safe and easy access on to the highway network” and is, therefore, contrary to your policy H11 d).

6. Unless the City Council intend to evict the tenants from the land in question, the proposed development contravenes your policy H11 b) as there would be insufficient separation between the proposed site and their dwellings. There is further contravention of policy H11 b) as persons reside within the immediately adjoining premises of the RSPCA.
7. The proposal indicates that the tenants of the land in question will be served notice to quit, via the termination of or refusal to renew long standing leases, partly avoiding the contravention of your policy H11 b). However, as this will deprive them of their livelihoods and their lawful homes this is in contravention of Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998.
8. The proposed site immediately adjoins Public Right of Way V85 and the development of the proposed site will affect the use of, security and enjoyment of those who utilise this Public Right of Way.
9. The proposed site immediately adjoins the recuperation area of animals within the well established RSPCA site on Scudamore Road. The introduction of lighting and unfamiliar noises will have a serious and detrimental effect on these animals as well as on the birds, rabbits and puppies that are housed within the same area. There is, therefore, a grave concern for the animals at the RSPCA who are, by definition, already in care.
10. The applicant contradicts himself in stating under question 5 there will be no new or altered pedestrian access but goes on to state "a footway would be constructed". There is clearly no existing separate pedestrian access so the proposal must be for a "new" footway. The applicant also states that no lorries will visit the site, question 21, and goes on to say "towing vehicles will probably be transit type vans". Given the word "probably" and the exclusion of lorries, what non transit type vehicles will be allowed on the site, other than the two cars specified. Simple reference to any illegal encampment will show the presence of lorries and thus the proposal cannot satisfy its objective in allowing the transfer of illegal encampments to the proposed site.
11. The applicant uses phrases such as "may be possible", "will probably", "is believed" and "could terminate" throughout the application. The application also states "which is not shown on the plans". With so many possibilities and probabilities and the lack of key information any consultee will be sorely lacking information and the consultation process itself is, therefore, in doubt.

In conclusion, I believe that the proposal is ill conceived and rides rough shod over many of Leicester City Council's own practices and policies. The proposer appears to have taken a unilateral decision to modify Leicester City Council's maps and to ignore any form of Needs Assessment. I, therefore, request that the planning application be refused.

Please advise me of the date of any meeting to discuss this planning application to which I may attend and of the final outcome of the planning application.

Yours sincerely