



MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

3 April 2014

PRESENT:

PM Chandler (Chair), P Baguley,  
G Botterill, G Bush, P Cumbers,  
J Illingworth, J Simpson, J Wyatt

Solicitor to the Council (HG), The Head of Regulatory Services  
Regulatory Services Manager (PR), Applications and Advice Manager (JW)  
Planning Officer (DK), Administrative Assistants (JB, SC and KS)

---

D83. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs A Freer-Jones and Cllr E Holmes.

A request for an alteration to the order of the schedule of applications was made by the agent for application 14/00085/FUL. They requested that the application be heard first as they had a lengthy journey after the meeting and wished to set off as soon as practical. The Members noted that the agent for the scheduled first application had no objections. Cllr Baguley proposed to allow the change to the agenda and Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal; it was unanimously agreed.

D84. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

D85. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 13 February 2014

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Baguley and seconded by Cllr Bush. The Committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.

Minutes of the meeting 18 February 2014

Cllr Simpson noted an omission on p175 in the line 'A Member stated that they

pleased that a company was coming to Melton to improve a facility here.' The sentence should have read she was pleased that a company was *investing* in Melton.

Cllr Botterill noted a correction in D72 Declarations of Interest. Cllrs Chandler, Holmes and Botterill stated that their business interests were insured by NFU and not Crawford and Company as stated in the Minutes.

Subject to the changes above approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Baguley and seconded by Cllr Botterill. The Committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair signed them as a true record.

Minutes of the meeting 13 March 2014

Cllr Simpson noted two errors on p187, fourth paragraph. The second sentence should have read: Cllr Simpson stated that the turbine would be a significant feature in the area and believed it would be detrimental to the character of the landscape. The final sentence should have read: Cllr Simpson questioned why the turbine could not be better sited on the other side of the applicant's farm or be smaller in size.

Subject to the changes above approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Wyatt and seconded by Cllr Illingworth. The Committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair signed them as a true record.

#### D86. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 14/00085/FUL  
**Applicant:** Premier Inn Hotels Ltd  
**Location:** Former Working Men's Club, Norman Way, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1JE  
**Proposal:** Erection of 55 bedroom hotel, provision of car park together with new and amended means of access and ancillary works

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

Following discussions with County Highways it has been agreed to remove condition 12 relating to works on Soho Street having to be in accordance with the plans...this is covered under condition 2 and would be considering a duplication of conditions that seek to impose the same result.

The application proposes changes to the approved scheme, increasing the bedroom space from 50 to 55, inclusion of an ancillary restaurant/cafe facility for patrons, which was previously a vending area and the inclusion of the car parking to the rear – previously it was excluded as it would have been managed separately by a car parking company.

Fenestration changes are proposed which presents a more simplistic design to that approved through removing the entrance gable. However the increase in footprint ensures that the single projecting gable is centrally locating and assists with breaking up the massing on the streetscene. There are no changes to the heights or roof design and it is considered that the overall design has not been compromised to make it unacceptable in this location. The hotel will bring a significant investment into the town and accordingly the application is recommended for approval.

- (b) Helen Binns, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak but declined as there were no objections and felt it unnecessary.

Cllr Baguley welcomed the changes to the design and felt that the development was important to the town and **proposed approval of the application.**

Cllr Cumbers welcomed the proposal which was long overdue and important if Melton was to be anything more in the tourist line. The central location of the site was an advantage and moved to **second the proposal to approve the application.**

On being put to the vote the application was approved unanimously.

**DETERMINATION: APPROVE, subject to the omission of condition no. 12, for the following reasons:**

**The proposal seeks to amend an extant planning permission for a 50 bed hotel by an increase in bed provision to 55 in an edge of town centre location. The location has policy support and the proposal is considered to comply with the objectives of the Local Development Framework, regional and national planning policies in terms of generating tourist accommodation. The objectives of NPPF to promote sustainable patterns of development are achievable given that there are good public transport links in the form of bus and train services.**

---

- (2) **Reference: 13/00522/FUL**  
**Applicant: Projects 2000 Ltd**  
**Location: Former War Memorial Hospital, Ankle Hill, Melton Mowbray**  
**Proposal: Conversion of buildings to provide 20 dwellings, erection of 40 new dwelling houses, erection of retirement housing (38 dwellings, Class C3), associated accesses and parking areas, demolition of Warwick Cottage and 22-24 Ankle Hill and construction of balancing ponds.**

- a) The Planning Officer stated that:

### **Update**

Since publishing the report dialogue has continued between the Police and the applicant regards to S106 contributions requests. Whilst the viability issues relating

to the site is fully reported within the report the applicants have agreed to cover the patrol car requests to respond to community safety impacts as reported by the Police (Detailed on page 20 of the report).

The application proposes the redevelopment of a strategic site within the town with restoration and conversion of two Grade II Listed buildings and management of the treed parklands. The proposal seeks to provide 98 homes of a mix of dwellings ranging from 1 – 5 beds, including 38 later living apartments and would restore the parklands for public use. Due to the unique cost constraints that the site carries the viability of the project is requiring compromises to be considered.

There are many conflicting issues that are required to be balanced against the proposal such as the loss of protected trees, development on protected open space, no affordable housing and limited S106 contributions, namely forgoing the highways and the police requests although some leeway has been made with the Police. The application presents a balance of competing objectives and the Committee is invited to consider all of these when reaching its conclusion. The NPPF approach to the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ requires that any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or that specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted. Of particular relevance to this application, paragraph 140 advises that “Local Planning Authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies”.

It is considered that considerable weight should be assigned to the housing land supply issues that the borough has and the restoration of historic assets in particular that the proposal outweighs the harms identified. The Council is persuaded that the viability of the scheme is such that the development cannot proceed if the infrastructure requests are required to be met. Whilst important, it is considered that the refusal of permission based on the absence of s106 developer contributions would forego the very significant benefits arising from the scheme and as such the balance of the issues falls in favour of approval as outline within the report.

b) Andrew Murphey, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The future of the hospital and grounds has been a matter of concern for the Council and local residents for years.
- The site proposes challenges for the developer including theft, vandalism, existing buildings falling into disrepair and sloping ground.
- Planning permission was granted in 2008 but the proposals were found not to be viable by the developer.
- The applicant has worked with Officers for over a year to develop a viable option for the site.
- Payments were to be made for local amenity but the site remains complicated

and expensive to develop and as a result the proposal did not include social housing.

- This proposal did include:
  - fulfilment of development brief
  - reuse of brownfield land
  - development of structures that affect the setting of the listed buildings
  - repair of a listed building
  - large number of smaller houses
  - houses for the elderly
- A Tree Preservation Order protects the trees on the site but some are damaging the listed buildings, these will be felled and replaced and a long term management plan will be implemented.
- A footpath will provide access to open areas.

The Chair said how devastating it was to see the decline in the whole site.

Cllr Baguley was concerned that the materials used on the new build elements should compliment the Grade II Listed building on the site. Providing this was the case, Cllr Baguley was in favour of the application.

Applications and Advice Manager reassured Members that condition 3 required materials to be agreed by Officers and that the Hospital building itself would be restored with matching stone.

The Chair informed the meeting that Cllr Holmes had made the same point prior to the meeting.

The Applications and Advice Manager highlighted that the design pages of the report (p33, 34) refer to the materials proposed although the specific types are to be agreed. Works to listed buildings must use reclaimed materials to match the existing.

Cllr Baguley clarified that their concern was that the materials used for the new build should complement the existing buildings rather than match exactly.

Cllr Bush, a Ward Councillor for the area, had noticed the site deteriorate. Cllr Bush thought the proposal was excellent. It would open parkland to the public which can only be a benefit to the town. The proposed accommodation would be suitable to a large age group. Cllr Bush **proposed approval of the application.**

Cllr Cumbers **seconded the proposal to approve the application** stating that this is a very important site. Cllr Cumbers was also pleased with the mix of accommodation and was happy to see 1 bed. dwellings included in the development. Cllr Cumbers was disappointed to see the amount of 5 bed properties amongst the proposal but thought this was acceptable considering the needs of the site. Cllr Cumbers took the view that Highways and the Police were requesting relatively substantial amounts under Section 106 and was pleased that requirements for Section 106 were being considered critically.

The Chair was concerned that removing trees might increase the risk of flooding.

The Planning Officer replied that the northern parkland trees would remain as is and a drainage system would be installed to control flooding on the site. There was an existing flood issue with the area which the application would correct.

Cllr Botterill commented on the beauty of the site and the old house. However, this was a difficult site to develop and as a result was happy to release some of the obligations under Section 106. Cllr Botterill was glad to see the site brought back into its previous format which would create a lovely backdrop and green lung for the town. River flows could be improved. Cllr Botterill welcomed the application providing care was taken not to disturb wildlife on the site when removing the trees. Felling should be timetabled so as not to coincide with nesting time.

The Chair also welcomed the mix of housing.

The Applications and Advice Manager highlighted that a condition had been omitted from the report regarding the drainage water scheme. The Environment Agency had had stated that the drainage scheme must be approved by them. The addition of the condition was agreed by Cllr Bush and seconded by Cllr Cumbers.

Cllr Simpson felt that the loss of such a lot of woodland was a great shame and requested a condition to enforce a low carbon waste management scheme to remove the felled trees.

The Chair responded adding that wood cannot simply be burnt on site.

The Applications and Advice Manager said this was an environmental issue rather than a planning issue but a condition could be added which required the applicant to provide a Construction Method Statement detailing how the demolition and clearing of the site would be treated. The addition of the condition was agreed by Cllr Bush and seconded by Cllr Cumbers.

Cllr Baguley asked who would fund the maintenance of the public parkland on the site. The Applications and Advice Manager advised that this was covered by condition 12 which required the applicant to submit proposals to the Local Planning Authority on how they plan to maintain the site.

Cllr Wyatt asked if unsympathetic alterations to the listed building, such as plastic pipework, would be reversed. The Planning Officer pointed out the pipework on the plans.

On being put to the vote the application was approved unanimously.

**DETERMINATION: APPROVE, subject to additional conditions and completion of a s106 agreement as follows, and or the following reasons:**

**Additional conditions:**

---

- **Drainage scheme to be submitted to and agreed by the environment**

- agency
  - **A construction method statement submitted and approved prior to commencement**
- 

### **S106 obligations:**

---

- (i) Contribution for the improvement to civic amenity sites.
- (ii) Contribution for the improvement to library facilities.
- (iii) Contribution to dry side leisure facilities
- (iv) An agreed phasing approach to the development to secure the restoration of the listed buildings.

#### **As set out in the report and**

- (v) **Police requests for a patrol car contribution of £2508 to respond to community safety impacts** **Reasons**
- 

**The Borough is deficient in terms of housing land supply more generally and this would be partly addressed by the application, and is considered to comply with the local plan policies and constitutes sustainable development as promoted within the NPPF in terms of its location and access to services. The site in its present form, despite having an extant planning permission, has not moved any further forward since its closure as a hospital complex in 2005. This has led to a deterioration of the site but more importantly a rapid decay in the grade II listed buildings. The site has many financial constraints as a result of its unique character, housing important listed buildings set in 3 hectares of treed parklands and compromises have been requested in relation to the absence of affordable housing provision and limited S106 financial contributions.**

**It is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposed layout when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and safeguarding important Heritage Assets.**

**The „negative“ balancing issues – the loss of protected trees and intrusion into designated Protected Open Spaces – are considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the land-take involved and the overall design, layout and future management of the parklands. The development also has shortcomings in terms of its housing mix not responding ideally to local needs and in particular the absence of affordable housing, and is also deficient in terms of not meeting the infrastructure needs of the County Council and Police through developer contributions.**

**The development of the site would restore a prominent historical site with two important listed buildings and as such para 140 of the NPPF is applicable. The**

**shortcomings described above (affordable housing, housing mix and infrastructure provision through contribution) represent departures from NPPF policies directly associated with the enabling development, and therefore also need to be judged in balance with the securing of the heritage assets, Wyndham Lodge and the Stable Block.**

**Applying the „test“ required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would “significantly and demonstrably” outweigh the benefits; it is considered that considerable weight should be assigned to the housing land supply issues and the restoration of historic assets in particular. The Council is persuaded that the viability of the scheme is such that the development cannot proceed if the 36**

**infrastructure requests are required to be met. Whilst important, it is considered that the refusal of permission based on the absence of s106 developer contributions would forego the very significant benefits arising from the scheme and as such the balance of the issues falls in favour of approval.**

- 
- (3) Reference: 13/00844/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mr M Duffin – M Duffin Builders Limited**  
**Location: Travis Perkins Trading Co Ltd, 59 Mill Street, Melton Mowbray**  
**Proposal: New Housing Development**

a) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of 16 dwellings on a brownfield site in the town envelope for Melton Mowbray.

There are no updates to report. However, there is an error on page 6 of the report, right hand column second paragraph. The housing mix listed is incorrect and should state 5 one bedroom dwellings, 9 two bedroom dwellings and 2 x 2 bed bungalows. This is considered to represent a good mix of smaller units and bungalows which are required in Melton.

In respect of this application it is considered that the application presents a balance of competing objectives. The proposal represents the redevelopment of a derelict brownfield site within the town centre, a highly sustainable location and presents housing in a quantity and type that satisfies identified local needs. The proposal is also considered to be acceptable with regards to access/road safety, residential amenity, layout and design.

However, against this are the concerns raised with regards to the insufficient amount of affordable housing, falling short of the Councils requirement by 10%, and the lack



of open space provision within the site. There is also some concern over the presence of a protected species, bats.

On the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance of the Development Plan and in the NPPF in terms of location, sustainability and housing need in particular. The balancing issues, insufficient affordable housing and lack of open space are considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the merits of the application and as such is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

The Chair highlighted that the NPPF talks about sustainable locations and this one could not be more sustainable and has open space not too far away.

Cllr Illingworth said that it was disappointing to have considered two applications which fall short in terms of affordable housing but noted that flexibility was required for both sites and this site had a very sustainable location.

Cllr Simpson agreed that it was a shame that more affordable housing was not included but felt happy to support the application in this instance. Although it would be preferential to keep to quotas of affordable housing there was a good mix of house types included in the proposal.

Cllr Botterill commented that there appeared to be a lot of affordable housing in the streets around the development which helped to mitigate the need for affordable housing on this site. The proposals would greatly improve the area and Cllr Botterill **proposed approval of the application.**

Cllr Simpson **seconded the proposal to approve the application**

Cllr Bush, a Ward Councillor for the area, welcomed the application having received nothing but positive feedback regarding the proposal. The site was considered an eye sore and the change to residential use would reduce traffic.

Cllr Wyatt asked if the existing car park would be left in place.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed the car park would be retained.

On being put to the vote the application was approved unanimously.

**DETERMINATION: APPROVE, subject to completion of a s106 agreement as set out in the report and for the following reasons:**

**It is considered that the application presents a balance of competing objectives and the Committee is invited to reconcile these in reaching its conclusion. The proposal represents the redevelopment of a derelict brownfield site within the town centre, a highly sustainable location. This application also presents housing in a quantity and type that satisfies identified local needs. Accordingly, the application presents a vehicle for the delivery of housing of the appropriate quantity, type and location to meet identified local need. The proposal is also considered to be acceptable with**

regards to access/road safety, residential amenity, layout and design. Balanced against these are the concerns raised with regards to the insufficient amount of affordable housing, falling short of the Council's requirement by 10%, and the lack of open space provision within the site. There is also some concern over the presence of a protected species, bats. It can be judged that the application is providing some affordable housing and the shortfall is only 10%. With respect of open space the site is within the town centre and is within walking distance of existing play facilities.

On the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance of the Development Plan and in the NPPF in terms of location, sustainability and housing need in particular. The balancing issues, insufficient affordable housing and lack of open space are considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the merits of the application. Applying the 'test' required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits; it is considered that permission can be granted.

---

- (4)   **Reference:**     14/00096/VAC  
      **Applicant:**    Mr R Brome  
      **Location:**     Dinghills Farm, Oakham Road, Somerby, LE14 2QF  
      **Proposal:**     Removal of Condition 8 relating to Planning Approval  
                          12/00301/FUL for removal of 40% of agricultural use to  
                          allow 10% business

b) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks to remove a condition on the approval of a storage and agricultural building at Dinghills Farm. The removal of the condition would allow for the building to be 10% storage.

Since publication of the report comments have been received from the Parish Council. The Parish Council have commented that;

The Parish Council objected to the previous application on the grounds that it was simply creating a retail warehouse on a farm and the additional traffic generated onto a minor, weight restricted road at a point where traffic was likely to be travelling fast, would be dangerous. They also pointed out that the traffic movements being compared were not on a like for like basis. The supposed 4 x journeys per day to deliver orders to the warehouse in Langham could only be car journeys as they could only be delivering a small number of orders in paper form. They contended that such a development was not farm based diversification as it was in no way related to any form of farming operation and was, as previously stated, simply the placing of a retail warehouse with all its attendant traffic in a very unsuitable rural setting.

This revised application simply worsens the position and allows the applicant to increase considerably his current operation with the correspondent increase in traffic. All our previous objections are even more valid now that an increase in capacity is proposed.

This is a C class road with current weight restrictions; it is not the place to site a retail warehouse. They would also question the reduction in journeys due to the need to deliver orders 4 x daily from Dinghills Farm to the current operation in Langham. Surely in this day and age the simple transfer of an order will be done by electronic means? Should this be the case then the application represents a considerable increase in traffic, HGV and otherwise. Finally the application is simply to site an industrial unit on and unrelated to a farm; this is contrary to the Melton local plan. They would ask the committee to reject the application.

In response to this, the site has an extant permission for a storage and agricultural building which is restricted to 60% storage. This application is to consider the removal of this condition to allow the whole building to be used for storage, in effect, the consideration of the increase of 40%. The issue over highway safety and traffic movements have been considered by the Highway Authority who have raised no objection. The building is proposed to be used for storage of pet products and is considered to be supported in terms of the NPPF. The application is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

Cllr Simpson asked if this part of the business would be classed as ancillary to the existing farm business and if the proposal was in line with diversification outlined in the NPPF.

The Applications and Advice Manager replied that the proposed change would not be classed as ancillary as such and clarified that although the decision was close to the line, on balance the proposal would be classed as diversification of the farm as outlined in the NPPF.

The Chair agreed that the proposal was finely balanced and invited comments from Cllr Illingworth.

Cllr Illingworth agreed that the Parish Council's comments were quite valid and suggested a condition to prevent the site becoming a call and collect point for the public. This was supported by the Chair.

The Applications and Advice Manager suggested a condition stating that no retail activity could take place on the premises. Cllrs agreed with this suggestion.

Cllr Baguley **proposed approval of the application** subject to the condition above.

Cllr Illingworth **seconded the proposal to approve the application.**

On being put to the vote the application was approved unanimously.

**DETERMINATION: APPROVE, subject to and additional condition and for the following reasons:**

**Additional condition:**

No retail sales to visiting members of the public shall be carried out from the premises

**Reasons:**

The proposal lies within the open countryside, set back from the highway and satisfies the definition of farm diversification as stated by DEFRA. The storage of pet products at the site could help to ensure the long term viability of the farm. The building which has already been granted permission is significant in scale and as such is considered to exceed the provisions of the Development Plan Policy OS2 which limit such proposals to „small scale“, however this proposal does not include any alterations to the size of the building, only its use. The NPPF states that where relevant policies of the development plan are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the NPPF policies as a whole, or where specific policies in the framework indicate development should be restricted. It is considered that the proposal would continue to generate significant benefits by way of reduced vehicle movements, increasing the sustainability of both the farm and the storage businesses and could potentially offer a way for the business to grow.

It is not considered that the use of the building to 100% storage would create a harmful impact upon the open countryside, and the highways issues can be overcome by way of condition as discussed above. The NPPF actively supports the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses and enterprises in rural areas both through the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings, and actively promotes the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. It is therefore considered that the application continues to represent sustainable farm diversification which is supported by the NPPF paragraph 28 and the Melton Local Plan Policy BE1

**D87. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER – REF: 151/924/6**

This report is to seek agreement to confirm a tree preservation order on one ash tree within the grounds of Waltham on the Wolds School.

There is a correction to the report in paragraph 2.1 which should state the reference number of the order 151/924/7.

An objection to the order has been received from the neighbouring property which is detailed in the report. The Officer considers the tree to have a high amenity and biodiversity terms and recommends that the order is confirmed.

The Chair confirmed that the Ward Councillor for the area who had contacted her was opposed to a Tree Preservation Order being placed on the tree as the tree was in an unhealthy state and required immediate work to make it safe.

Cllr Simpson agreed that the tree was in a bad state and highlighted that children played near the tree and anything that put them in danger required sorting out immediately. Cllr Simpson was opposed to placing a Tree Preservation Order on the tree.

Cllr Botterill commented that the tree looked completely rotten could fall at any time. Cllr Botterill thought the tree should be taken down and a new tree planted.

Cllr Baguley pointed out that the Tree Evaluation revealed the tree to be in a satisfactory state and as children did not play under the tree every day would support the making of the Tree Preservation Order. Cllr Baguley **proposed confirmation of the provisional Order.**

Cllr Wyatt **seconded the proposal to confirm.**

Cllr Cumbers was against felling a tree of that age in principal but as it looked so dangerous asked if there was an alternative.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that the tree would not be protected from felling unless a TPO was applied.

Cllr Botterill suggested pollarding as an alternative but emphasised that the tree did look very rotten even towards the base and could fall down at any time.

Cllr Illingworth underlined statements in the report which highlighted the bad condition of the tree. A survey by an Arboriculturist on behalf of Leicestershire County Council stated that the tree was in need of drastic reduction. A further survey by Western Power advised the felling of the tree.

The Applications and Advice Manager clarified several points:

- The County Council did not appoint a tree warden but an Arboriculturist.
- The comments quoted by Cllr Illingworth were made by an objector and were not the objective comments of a statutory tree consultant.
- Should a Tree Preservation Order be applied this did not mean that the owner could not apply for works to be carried out on the tree.

The Applications and Advice Manager highlighted that the amenity value of the tree should be considered as part of the order along with nature and health.

Cllr Botterill underlined the value of a felled tree in terms of biodiversity.

The Applications and Advice Manager responded to Cllr Botterill's earlier comments regarding felling and re-planting commenting that it would not be possible to enforce replanting if there was not a Tree Preservation Order on the tree.

The Chair summarised the discussion. Members were divided realising the danger to children but not wanting to fell a healthy tree.

The Applications and Advice Manager pointed out that there was time to defer the decision to allow for an Arboriculturist to visit the site with committee Members to discuss the condition of the tree and the options available. Members were supportive of the suggestion.

Cllr Simpson asked if a condition could be applied to cordon off the tree to prevent children from being hurt should the tree fall.

The Chair commented that the safety of the children was the consideration of the School Governors.

The Applications and Advice Manager clarified that the paper before Members was to approve the Tree Preservation Order or to refuse it. It was not possible to apply conditions at this stage.

Cllr Baguley **proposed deferment** to allow time to meet and take advice with an Arboriculturist.

Cllr Wyatt **seconded the proposal to defer.**

A vote was taken: 5 in favour of deferment, 1 against and 1 abstention

**DETERMINATION:**

---

**That consideration is deferred pending to arrangements to meet and take advice with an Arboriculturist.**

---

D88. URGENT BUSINESS

- The Regulatory Services Manager requested comments on the Satisfaction Sheet previously circulated to Members.

The Chair was pleased with the document as were Cllr Botterill and Cllr Baguley. However, as some Members had not yet read the document it was decided to defer further discussion to the next meeting.

- The date of the site visits for the next Planning Committee was agreed as Thurs 17th April at 10am.
- Members wished Administration Assistant Jenny Baker well in her new post and

thanked her for her contributions to the Planning Committee over the years.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 7.26 pm