Sarah Worrall	
Planning and Development	
North West Leicestershire District Council,	
Council Offices, Coalville,	
eicestershire,	
LE67 3FJ.	Date:

Dear Ms Worrall,

## Planning Application Number14/00107/FULM: Erection of five dwellings etc.

Address:

I am writing in respect to the application to build five large houses on the historic Bath Grounds, Ashby. I object to the proposed development on the following basis.

According to the 2002 Local Plan, the proposed housing is sited on "Protected Open Space" in the Ashby Conservation Area. The plans show that it would be intrusive (3 story), ugly and out of keeping with Ashby's built vernacular. It would result in loss of public access to over 12% of the Bath Grounds which has been an essential open recreational area in the heart of Ashby for centuries.

I consider that this development, if approved, would be counter to the following planning policies:

**Local E1 (saved): Sensitive areas**. The new houses would significantly diminish the open character of the area and its contribution to the "Countryside in the Town" character of Ashby. The proposed housing area is not "small" as claimed. It would result in the loss of over 12% of the Bath Grounds for public access.

**Local L14 (not saved): Recreational space within limits of development.** According to NWLDC 's 2008 Open Space Audit, the Bath Grounds are the District's second most visited recreational space. Ashby has an under-provision of recreational space of 2.99 ha. The development would increase this under-provision by 25%. The proposal will not provide any replacement recreational space in a suitable location. There is no guarantee that any of the associated inducements will materialise. In particular the potential new sports pavilions will be **neither** built **nor** funded by the developer.

**Local E10 (not saved): Conservation areas.** The development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Ashby Conservation Area in terms of scale, proportions, massing, layout, setting, detailing and materials of construction. It would result in the loss of open space and important views within and out of the area and would be detrimental to the environmental quality.

**Local CS29 (emerging): Open Space, Sport and Recreation.** See L14 above. There is no justification to consider the proposed development an exception to this policy. The open space to be lost is **not** small, is **not** surplus to requirements and **no** enhancement to the remainder of the open space or recreational grounds will be provided by the developer.

**Local CS34 (emerging): Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.** The developer is attempting to induce the Council into allowing this intrusive housing development in return for potential improvements to the Royal Hotel. These are separate planning applications and should be considered separately. There is no guarantee that the suggested work would be undertaken at the Royal Hotel should this application be approved.

**NPPF:** The development should not be considered "sustainable" as it would reduce an accessible local community facility and violate the natural and historic environment of the town.

Yours sincerely