

PLANNING AND LICENSING – 20.10.20

PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

ITEM	PETITION, DEPUTATION OR QUESTION	NAME OF SPEAKER	REPRESENTING	ATTENDING
1.	Question	Linda Muir	Public	Not attending meeting
1.	Deputation	Stephen Lucas	Agent representing the applicant	Attending
2.	Deputation	Ross Thain	Agent representing the applicant	Attending
3.	Question	Steve Kind	Public	Not attending meeting
3.	Deputation	Kirsty Brooks	Applicant	Attending
4.	Question	John Judge	Public	Attending
4.	Deputation	John Judge	Residents of Morcott, against the application.	Attending

QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC

ITEM	NAME	QUESTION
1.	Linda Muir	<i>My residential property is directly opposite the Cricket Pavilion on Seaton Road. If the planning application is successful, will the venue be used for parties and other events and possibly hired out to third parties and if so what measures will be put in place to ensure that noise and parking do not become a nuisance to residents?</i>
3.	Steve Kind	<p>I note with interest planning condition number 12 re highways in relation to the above application which is being considered by the P&L Committee on 20th October 2020.</p> <p>I am surprised that this condition states that this is 'prior to any operational use of the development'. Is not highway safety and visibility a fundamental planning consideration which needs to be agreed PRIOR to any planning permission being granted there-by providing affected neighbours the reassurance that this has been</p>

ITEM	NAME	QUESTION
		<p>properly assessed and signed-off by relevant technical consultants rather than being left as an afterthought? Can you also please confirm the process for approval of this point.</p> <p>In addition, I note that both other locality and similar outdoor operations both at Spindleberry Woods, Belton and at Vineyard and Canvas, Preston, both only operate as seasonal venues from April to October each year. What is the rationale for allowing for this site to operate through-out the year?</p>
4.	John Judge	<p>The response from the council to a FOI request indicate that no specific risk assessment was made when deciding to reopen the North Luffenham Site and continuing the closure of the Cottessmore site. There has also been no environmental impact or a local highways impact assessment made and there is no formally documented review process in place.</p> <p>Given this, could the council explain how they have achieved a robust, quantitate assessment this application how have they would not have a detrimental impact on the highway network or highway safety, local amenity or the surrounding area.</p>