



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

07 July 2016

PRESENT:

J Illingworth (Chair), J Simpson (Vice Chair), P Baguley,
G Botterill, P Cumbers, J Douglas,
M Glancy, E Holmes, M Sheldon, J Wyatt

AS SUBSTITUTE

Cllr L Higgins for Cllr P Chandler

Solicitor to the Council (SP), Head of Regulatory Services,
Planning Officer (LP), Administrative Assistant (AS)

PL11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

PL12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Botterill declared a personal interest in application 16/00180/FUL - Spring Farm, Spring Lane, Wymondham on the basis that he occasionally employs the applicant's services.

PL13. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 16 June 2016

Cllr Baguley requested an amendment on page 30, regarding speaker Mrs Moira Hart, on behalf of the objectors regarding application 16/00032/OUT and noted that at the end of Mrs Hart's speech she had made the remark from Historic England that if a suitable, alternative, less harmful site had been identified there is no justification for development in this location.

Cllr Simpson requested an amendment on page 33-34, to remove the word new in the determination so that it reads 'It is considered that the location is not isolated in

the countryside’.

Cllr Holmes requested an amendment on page 28, regarding the impact on the fish pond, ‘feed’ to be changed to ‘fed’.

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Sheldon.

The Committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.

PL14. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference: 15/0537/OUT**
Applicant: Mr A Burr – Springbourne Homes Limited
Location: Sandy Lane Poultry Farm, Sandy Lane, Melton Mowbray
Proposal: Demolition of existing structures and redevelopment of the site to create 30 dwellings (Use Class C3) including the refurbishment of an existing Nissen Hut to create a community space (Use Class D1) space for biomass boiler and associated open space, landscaping, drainage infrastructure and highways’ improvements

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

One further letter registering support for the application
An approach from Burton Lazars Village Hall Committee seeking a contribution for upgrading of the VH of £4500. This has been calculated on the basis of the proportion of the population that the development would make up (if granted) which is 10% - the request is for 10% of the project which is £45,000. This has received the acceptance of the applicant an if permission is granted it should be included in the list of s106 items

The application itself is in outline for 30 dwellings. It would be accessed from Sandy Lane and there are proposals to form a footpath alongside Sandy Lane all the way to the town boundary to assist its safety and attractiveness to users. This hasn’t been fully designed and as such Highways object, but it seems there is scope so if approved conditions can be applied.

As an outline we don’t have full details but we have been provided with an illustrative layout . Whilst not binding in itself, this gives us full confidence that the scheme could be accommodated in the site and make sufficient provision for roads, drainage and importantly a planting scheme which will assist the site from being separate from the adjacent Scheduled

Monument and also screened in views in the landscape.

The application presents a balance of issues as so many do. On this one, there are significant positive elements in terms of the provision of housing per se (esp. given our 5 year housing position) and affordable housing – the sum referred to have been calculated to deliver the requisite quantity and meet our target. There are also heritage benefits in terms of the reconstruction of the nissen hut and interpretation of its history and also of the adjacent SM, and finally the use of a brownfield site for a productive purpose.

Balanced against is the fundamental question of the location of the site, its lack of connectivity to communities and access to services. These are considered to be the fundamental elements of the NPPF and sustainable development and as such create a high premium to complete it. It is my view that despite the positive aspects of the scheme, they do not satisfy this test.

However, such matters are not formulaic or mathematical and the task before the Committee is to consider what weight the various components of the application should carry and to undertake the balancing exercise.

In recognition of this I have prepared suggestions at the end of the report which may assist in formulating a resolution or decision should you conclude the opposite.

(b) Wayne Hickling, on behalf of Burton and Dalby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Some form of development on this site is unavoidable.
- Delighted with rejection of poultry farm but upset by decision of the appeal.
- Springbourne Homes has worked with and listened to local people.
- Low level lighting.
- Residential traffic safer than poultry farm traffic.
- Minimise loss of habitat for wildlife.
- Social cohesion.
- Represents a low building mass and allows for generous screening.
- Local heritage is significant.
- Although classed as unsustainable Burton Lazars will have to meet the Borough housing requirements.
- Impact considerably less than poultry farm.
- Springbourne Homes have said they will withdraw the poultry farm application if the housing application is approved.

Cllr Higgins commented that there had been overwhelming support for this housing

development and asked if there would be the same support for building anywhere around Burton Lazars.

Mr Hickling responded that residents would prefer no development but that housing would be preferable to a poultry farm. He added Springbourne have gone to considerable lengths to propose an appropriate development.

(c) Tadeusz Stenzel, Chair of Trustees of The Federation of Poles in Great Britain C.I.O, on behalf of the supporters, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Supports the Polish presence in this country.
- Approached by applicant regarding including Polish heritage in the development.
- Nissen hut is of heritage interest.
- Sustaining the proposed centre.
- Heating centre to supply heat to whole estate – unusual approach.
- Camps used 1946 – 1960's.
- Look favourably on housing.

Cllr Cumbers commented that the issue of Polish heritage was mentioned and considered important and asked if Mr Stenzel was happy for the Nissen huts to be reinstated.

Mr Stenzel confirmed that he was and it could be easily done as it is a fairly simple structure.

(d) Maria Boyce and Dorian Crone, agents for the applicant, were invited to speak and stated that:

Ms Boyce:

- 2 ½ years involved in this scheme.
- As a result of events and feedback regarding the poultry farm, worked with the local community to come up with a suitable use for the site.
- Significant support.
- Unique site with unique response.
- Location cannot be changed but shouldn't be considered unsustainable.

Mr Crone:

- Heritage package with a heritage story to be told, we currently have living memory.
- Most important hospital in the country and the history of the airfield involving women.
- Polish community and contribution.
- Invaluable contribution of Nissen hut which served both world wars.

Ms Boyce:

- Significant benefits and extensive work with the local community.

Cllr Glancy asked for confirmation of the composition of housing.

Ms Boyce responded that it would be 3, 4 and 5 bed detached homes with some single storey bungalows for those looking to downsize.

Cllr Glancy asked if there would be affordable housing and 3 bed semis.

Ms Boyce responded that there was nothing to preclude that in reserved matters. She added that plots could be retained for those wanting to build their own homes.

Cllr Higgins noted that as the poultry farm application was approved at appeal, the Inspector must have felt it was of some benefit. He asked for clarification of the economic investment into the poultry farm and how many jobs it could create.

The Chair reminded members that they were to discuss the housing application on its own merits not the poultry farm application.

Cllr Higgins asked if the applicant had been working with the community, why did they appeal.

Ms Boyce responded that it would have created around 10 part time jobs. During the appeal it was given weight but not the main reason for approval. It is a difficult site but this is appropriate countryside use. Agricultural would have been better use but the applicant saw that it wasn't wanted. Had to pursue the application and appeal in tandem due to time constraints of appeals.

Cllr Holmes commended the applicant for trying to preserve history.

Cllr Cumbers asked for clarification of the percentage of affordable housing.

The Chair responded that it would be 11 or 12 houses out of 30.

The Head of Regulatory Services noted that the sum is low due to the fact that it doesn't include land. It is a compromise and a way of delivering housing that would not otherwise occur.

Cllr Simpson proposed to approve the application and commented that whilst the location is unsustainable, the following points outweighed that:

- The development would reuse a brown field site.
- Innovative energy solution.
- Management trust – social cohesion within the development.
- Contribution to affordable housing is a lot for our council to receive and without the contribution it wouldn't be acceptable.
- Goes towards our housing supply.
- Improved safety on Sandy Lane as long as there are passing places.

- Effective screening around the site.
- Protect character of the land scape and many views.
- Prevent fly tipping.
- Appropriate use of site without jeopardising health of local residents.
- Unsustainable villages will have to accept some degree of housing.
- Bridle paths, cycle route and footpaths help improve health.
- Outweighs harm.
- Bullets points on page 26 – provision of housing including affordable housing. Reuse of brown fields site. Environmental benefit. Enhancing the ecology. Heritage benefits. Preserve history. Innovative energy. Long term sustainability.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal and added that developers need to be more imaginative with their layouts as many of them are quite urban.

The Head of Regulatory Services asked if Cllr Simpson would consider a package of section 106 headings and conditions with her motion.

Cllr Simpson confirmed that she would and believed they were listed on page 27 of the report. She also added that on page 12 of the report the applicant would relinquish the consent for the poultry farm. Section 106 contribution to the village hall of £4500.

Cllr Baguley confirmed agreement with additions to the motion.

There was discussion regarding the highways recommendation and the danger of going against it. Heritage element is very positive.

Concern was expressed that the Council wouldn't have approved or recommended this application if it had come in before the poultry farm and would only be doing so to prevent the farm.

The Head of Regulatory Services noted that the footpath could be conditioned. Highways are not convinced it can be accommodated so would need to pass that test to be able to proceed with development.

Several Councillors offered their support and commented that a lot of thought had gone in to the development.

A Cllr noted that on page 28 of the report the bridle way goes through site but it should go round the outside. There was concern about narrow path next to hedgerow. They must have passing places.

The Head of Regulatory Services noted that these concerns were covered in Cllr Simpson's list of conditions.

Cllrs commended the Polish community and their contribution to the town and asked

if there were time limits for the Nissen hut completion.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that this had been captured by Cllr Simpson and on page 27 of the report number VI. However time limits can be built in if that is required.

Cllr Simpson added that the Nissen hut will be heating system for the development so it has to be up and running to provide heat to the houses.

A vote was taken. 9 Members voted in favour of the proposal and 2 Members voted against.

Cllr Higgins and Cllr Botterill asked for their votes against the proposal to be recorded.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT subject to the completions of a section 106 agreement and conditions as follows, for the following reasons:

Section 106:

- (i) Contribution for the improvement to civic amenity sites.**
- (ii) Contribution to libraries**
- (iii) Contribution to education provision**
- (v) Contribution for the provision of off site affordable housing (£880,000)**
- (vi) Arrangements for the provision and subsequent maintenance of the Nissen Hut interpretation centre**
- (V) Contribution to upgrading of Burton Lazars village hall (£4500)**

Conditions addressing the following:

- **Submission of reserved matters**
- **Time limits (s 91)**
- **Landscaping**
- **Landscaping and open space maintenance**
- **Contamination works**
- **Archaeology**
- **Drainage and use of SUDS**
- **Provision of highways works to Sandy Lane, and their timing**
- **Maintenance of sightlines free from obstruction**
- **Specification of bridleway through the site**

Reasons:

The Borough is deficient in terms of housing land supply more generally and this would be partly addressed by the application, including affordable housing via a financial contribution facilitating the provision of the appropriate quantity (37%). The provision of housing should attract significant weight as set out by NPPF para 47. Affordable housing provision remains one of the Council's key priorities.

Heritage concerns related to the Scheduled Monument, specifically the western approach route, but following amendment Heritage England no longer conclude that it would result in ‘less than substantial harm’ and as such this concerned is ‘neutralised’. The scheme would bring benefits relating to interpretation and the use of the site in connection with WWII and the local Polish community.

Balanced against the positive elements are the site specific concerns particularly the detachment from any settlement, the impact on the rural character and appearance and highway safety, and a less than ideal provision and mix of house types/sizes.

In conclusion it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply, affordable housing and heritage in particular, which are considered sufficient to outweigh the balancing issue – development of a site in an unsustainable location.

-
- (2) Reference: 16/00180/FUL
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Dungworth
Location: Spring Farm, Spring Lane, Wymondham
Proposal: Change of use of land from grazing to all weather horse exercise arena**

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks change of use of land from grazing to a domestic all weather horse exercise arena.

The site is located within the curtilage of the residential dwelling known as spring farm, which benefits from being surrounded by open fields.

The proposal whilst visible from a public footpath will be a fairly low level flat development with only the proposed 1.5 metre post and rail fencing being readily visible from outside the application site.

There are no updates to the report

It is considered that the design, size and location of the arena is acceptable and would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the area or create an unduly detrimental impact upon any existing or future residents, with existing parking and access to the site already available.

As such the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

(b) David Manning, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The arena for private use only.

- No wish to run an equestrian business so there is no commercial interest.
- The arena is needed to train for competitions.
- Reduce traffic on spring lane as no need to take horses to train in larger arenas.
- It is a low area. Highest part 1.5 metres above ground levels. Proposed hedge.
- Will not obstruct views as too low to do so.
- Passers-by can enjoy the trees and shrubs.

Cllr Holmes proposed approval of the application and added that the applicant had gone to great lengths to make very little impact.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal and added that there should be a condition regarding the installation of flood lighting.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was already covered by condition 4.

A vote was taken. 10 Members voted for the proposal. Cllr Botterill abstained from the vote due to declaring an interest.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT subject to the conditions set out in the report.

It is considered that the design, size and location of the arena is acceptable and would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the area or create an unduly detrimental impact upon any existing or future residents.

The details have been considered by the Local Highway Authority whom have confirmed that there would not be a detrimental impact from this proposal.

As such, the proposal is considered to meet the objectives of policies OS2 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan, and the relevant sections of the NPPF.

(3) Reference: 15/00832/OUT
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Christie
Location: Field no. 4862, Glebe Road, Wymondham
Proposal: Outline application for up to 15 dwellings including access

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that: 3 further letters of objection:

- Rehearsing the position of the neighbourhood plan and how this application is unwelcome and unfair
- Concern that the view from the bedroom of no 1 West Well Gate (the nearest house) will be spoilt
- Concern that covenants on the land should be taken into account.

The application is in Outline and it is clear scale can be accommodated within the site.

Details of the access have been submitted and there is no highways objection

Wymondham is a Sustainable location that we and Neighbourhood Plan are looking to accommodate housing there.

The site is close to facilities and adjacent to existing settlement but separate from heritage assets.

Neighbourhood Plan – this site is contrary to the wishes of the NP team. However guidance is very clear on this (page 5 of the report)- only when a NP is at a “well advanced” position can it be deemed premature or prejudicial. The PPG explains what ‘well advanced’ means and unfortunately the NP in Wymondham is some way short and as such falls foul of this guidance. There is sympathy because the same guidance addresses our LP (incidentally more advanced than the NP) and similarly can afford it no weight.

(b) Christian Semmonds on behalf of the objectors was invited to speak and stated that:

- Rated lowest of 6 potential plots on a popularity basis
- High level of objections
- Policy BE1 and H8 – not exceptional circumstances.
- H11- no designated playing space.
- OS1 – the form, character and appearance is adversely affected.
- OS2 and C1 parts A and B
- Significantly outweighs the benefits.
- In the wrong place.
- Remote from remaining amenities with the exception of the school and nursery.
- Increase traffic on narrow road at a complex junction outside the school and the preschool.
- Elevated position effects character of the village.
- Enclose school playing field cutting off views.

(c) John Edmond, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- It is a modest development.
- Served reasonably well by public transport.
- Site located outside of settlement boundary but is well related to the settlement.
- Small but important contribution to housing need.

- Design and layout benefited from input of Hazleton Homes who would deliver the site.
- Highest quality design reflecting local character and particularly the village core. Set within a sympathetic landscape frame work.
- Without significant harm.
- Reserved matters in consultation with the parish council.
- No objections from key stake holders.
- No covenants on the site.
- It is a sustainable development.

Cllr Higgins asked for clarification regarding affordable housing and the housing mix.

Mr Edmond confirmed that the affordable contribution will be policy compliant which is secured by a planning condition. Mix will be dealt with by reserved matters. Indicatively shown on the layout as two storey with some single storey dwellings.

Cllr Higgins noted that 37% of a development should be affordable housing.

Cllr Simpson noted that policy H11 states if there are 15 or more dwellings there should be a provision for playing/open space.

Mr Edmond confirmed that is being dealt with through developer contributions.

Cllr Holmes asked if the houses would be stone.

Mr Edmond commented that he had provided slides with a selection of homes that Hazleton Homes have built within this Borough. They will be built to reflect the character of the core of the village.

(d) Cllr Malise Graham, Ward Councillor for Wymondham, was invited to speak and stated that:

- It is a controversial development.
- 73 objections.
- It is a bad site for development
- Policy BE1. Not harmonious.
- Doesn't recognise character.
- Highway grounds – not considered suitable.
- Road cannot be widened at crucial point by the school.
- Will affect the new day nursery which is a much needed facility.
- Visual impact.
- Drainage and flood risk.

The Head of Regulatory Services showed a slide of a portrayal of the house designs the applicant is proposing. He advised that many of our policies are deemed out of

date by NPPF and case law has reinforced this regarding OS2.. OS1 and BE1 remain applicable. Because it is an outline application there is no detailed layout to check under the policies regarding design, layout and open space. This would come from reserved matters. Highways recommend no objection. The test would have to render the situation 'severe' and which it is not considered will occur owing to the scale of the development and the level of traffic it will generate.

A Councillor understood that open space would be decided later however would there be a footpath in to the village.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that they had seen an existing footpath on site visit and that the proposed footpath would connect to other footpaths.

It was enquired how the land rated in relation to other sites under the SHLAA assessment process.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that it is a SHLAA site and will be included in the Local Plan approach to site selection, but that exercise is not yet complete.

Cllr Higgins noted that they need to rely on technical evidence with regards to transport and highways if they were going to depart from officer advice.

Cllr Sheldon proposed to approve the application as there is no evidence to refuse it.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal to approve.

Councillors commended the residents efforts with their neighbourhood plan.

A vote was taken. 4 Members voted in favour of approval and 5 Members voted against. There were 2 abstentions.

Cllr Douglas proposed to refuse the application on the grounds of BE1. Out of keeping with the surroundings and there were concerns regarding increased traffic around the school and the busy junction. Not in harmony with the surroundings. Traffic concerns – she believed it would cause severe impact.

The Chair noted that there was no seconder to Cllr Douglas' proposal.

Cllr Douglas amended her proposal to one reason only : not in keeping with the surroundings.

The Chair noted that there was no seconder to Cllr Douglas' second proposal.

The Chair advised Members that voting against a permit is not the same as giving reasons to refuse.

Meeting adjourned at 7.45pm. Meeting reconvened at 7.50pm

The Chair advised Members that we do have to have a proposal to refuse with a seconder.

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer the application due to wishing to seek further clarification from highways and address safety concerns and seek fewer houses.

Cllr Higgins seconded the proposal and asked if BE1 could be added to the reasons.

Cllr Holmes agreed to the addition to her proposal.

A vote was taken. 9 Members for deferral and 2 Members voted against deferral.

Cllr Orson left the council chamber at 7.56pm and asked for this to be noted.

DETERMINATION: DEFERRED to invite:

- **greater detail on design and layout,**
- **clarification of the road safety aspects and**
- **to request a reduction in the number of houses**

(4)	Reference:	16/00137/FUL
	Applicant:	Mr Martin Ellis
	Location:	Land adjacent to 61 Nottingham Road, Nether Broughton
	Proposal:	Full planning consent for development of two single storey bungalow residences, with associated car-parking and hard landscaping; formation of domestic gardens to same

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks permission for the erection of two single storey dwellings. The application site is located next to Mill House which is a grade II listed building, and is isolated from the core of the village of Nether Broughton by the A606.

It is acknowledged that the Borough is deficient in terms of housing land supply and being of a suitable design and scale the proposal would help to meet identified local needs of the Borough.

Nether Broughton is considered to be a sustainable location for housing and the proposal would be of a design not to adversely impact upon the Grade II Mill House, however the detachment of the proposed dwellings to the centre of the village would lead to significant harm.

On balance of the issues, the proposal is considered to offer public benefit when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply however the balancing issue is considered to be development within an unsustainable location, segregated from the core of the village by the A606. As such the application is recommended for refusal as set out in the report.

(b) Cllr George Schmidt, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The site is not isolated from the village but adjacent.
- It has access to the village facilities and is as sustainable as the part of the village across the A 606.
- OS 2 and BE1 cited as a reason for refusal.
- It is in the nature of the village that some parts are separated from the core of the village.
- A606 wasn't considered a barrier for a previous application further south.
- Much closer than other parts of the village. The village is sustainable and has a pub, village hall and bus stops with a good service – the site is closer to these than 75% of rest of the village.
- Sustainability is assisted by the Broad band box near this site.
- Only concerns were highways but highways have put that to rest.
- Housing survey 2014 – highlighted that we would benefit from houses.

Cllr Holmes commented that is a notorious road and asked if there had been any recent accidents.

Mr Schmidt commented that there had been very few accidents but more near misses. Speed limit has been brought down from 40 to 30.

(c) Piers Flavin, on behalf of the supporters, was invited to speak and stated that:

- He lives directly opposite the proposal.
- Great place to live and good community. A good example of sustainability.
- Applicants are an essential part of village life – good friends and neighbours.
- They are fully integrated with the village.
- Supplements the life of the village.
- Different and interesting.
- Housing need for our village. Provide opportunity to downsize.
- Long term vitality.
- Aware of road safety limits. Development could help maintain awareness.
- Family cross the road regularly and it is not a barrier.
- Retain wonderful character.
- Not uniformly built up. Will complement and be a continuation of the village.

(d) James Botterill, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- No relation to Cllr Botterill.
- No objections with regards to ecology or highways.
- Location is sustainable.
- Much needed property type.
- Proximity of amenities (Pub and bus stops). 2 bus stops on western side of A606.
- Will have to cross the road to get to the homes.
- Speed limit reduced.
- Avid members of the local community.
- A606 is not a reason to feel segregated from the village.
- Golden Fleece in Upper Broughton segregated from 90% of its village and it survived.

The Planning Officer noted the compliance with the NPPF.

Cllr Higgins proposed to approve the application with conditions delegated to officers. Understood officers point of view, however listening to speakers has helped his decision. Great to see people supporting. Will help get families in to villages.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal and added that Nether Broughton is sustainable and suitable for residential development..

Members discussed the possibility of extending the area of the 30 mile per hour speed limit.

A vote was taken and the members voted unanimously for the proposal.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with those specified in the application unless alternative materials are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details
3. The proposed development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with plan drawing numbers:
 - o 6861-03-01
 - o 6861-03-10
 - o 6861-00received by the Authority on 2 March 2016
4. Landscaping shall be provided as detailed in drawing 68661-03-10, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings or in the first planting

season following first occupation.

5. Before first use of the development hereby permitted, visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 60 metres shall be provided in each direction out of the proposed site access on to Main Road. These shall be in accordance with the standards contained in the current County Council design guide and shall thereafter be permanently so maintained. Nothing shall be allowed to grow above a height of 0.6 metres above ground level within the visibility splays.

6. Notwithstanding the details submitted, the shared private drive shown serving the site shall have a minimum width of 4.25 metres with minimum 0.5 metre wide clear margins on each side for at least the first 5 metres behind the highway boundary and have a drop crossing of a minimum size as shown in Figure DG20 of the 6CsDG at its junction with the adopted road carriageway. The access drive shall be provided before any dwelling hereby permitted is first occupied and shall thereafter be permanently so maintained.

7. Before first occupation of either dwelling, the proposed shared private access drive and turning space shall have been surfaced with tarmacadam, concrete or similar hard bound material (not loose aggregate) for a distance of at least 5 metres behind the highway boundary and shall be so maintained at all times.

8. If any vehicular access gates, barriers, bollards, chains or other such obstructions are to be erected they shall be set back a minimum distance of 5 metres behind the highway boundary and shall be hung so as not to open outwards.

9. Before first use of the development hereby permitted, drainage shall be provided within the site such that surface water does not drain into the Public Highway including private access drives, and thereafter shall be so maintained.

10. The car parking and any turning facilities shown within the curtilage of each dwelling shall be provided, hard surfaced and made available for use before the dwelling is occupied and shall thereafter be permanently so maintained and available for this purpose.

11. Before first occupation of either dwelling hereby permitted, the proposed shared turning facility shown serving the dwellings shall have been provided, hard surfaced and made available for use within the site in order to allow vehicles to enter and leave in a forward direction. The turning area so provided shall not be obstructed and shall thereafter be permanently so maintained.

Reasons: The proposal would result in the dwelling occupying a sustainable location and whose design, size and massing is such that it is considered to result in a proposal that is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and does not significantly harm the residential amenities of existing neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposal would not be harmful to the heritage assets in the locality.

As such the proposal complies with the above policies and guidance and the core principles identified in the NPPF.

-
- (5) **Reference:** 15/01018/FUL
Applicant: Mrs Vivienne Percival
Location: 21A King Street Scaford Melton Mowbray
Proposal: Construction of new single storey dwelling and new vehicle access

- (a) The Planning Officer stated that: This application seeks outline permission for the erection of one single storey dwelling and new vehicular access.

The application was deferred by members at committee on 16 June to seek an alternative means of access to the plot. The existing entrance to Clayfield Farm has been assessed and the forward visibility from this entrance is worse than the current proposal by approximately 15 metres.

The entrance width and kerb radius of Clayfield Farm access can be improved, however the access distance between existing buildings would fall below the LCC design standard of 5.25 metres clear when passing between 2 walls close to the entrance from a highway.

The proposed access originally included within the application is supported by traffic speed data which demonstrates the available visibility splays for both vehicles and pedestrians and has raised no objection from the Local Highway Authority.

The applicant has offered to provide a series of speed countdown markers on the approach to the 30mph limit, should members feel this approach is acceptable an additional condition has been added to the recommendation of approval for the applicant to provide details of proposed village gateway entry treatments.

The Local Highway Authority remain of the opinion that the applicants have done as much as they could to ensure a safe access, and that a highway reason for refusal could not be substantiated in this instance.

As such the application remains with a recommendation for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

- (b) Richard Cooper, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- They had reviewed alternative access options but were unable to improve upon the original proposal.
- Understand importance of highways. 7 day survey of speed of traffic. Speeds are lower than actual speed limit signs. Factual evidence and has led to support from LCC Highways.
- Countdown markers. Village entry feature and Mrs Percival is prepared to undertake traffic calming improvements as part of this scheme.

Cllr Holmes proposed to approve the application and sympathised with the Parish Council's concerns as it is a known dangerous bend. She felt the applicant would do her best to accommodate traffic calming and is a very good member of the community. Cllr Holmes enquired regarding the situation with too many markers along the road.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal.

Concerns were raised regarding sign clutter and noted that he would be abstaining for that reason.

Members support due to the proposed house being further down the road.

Cllr Higgins asked if they would be 3 2 1 repeaters.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that it would be a gateway feature a noted in condition 14.

The Chair noted that the applicant offered 3 2 1 repeaters but they were not deemed appropriate by highways and a gate way is offered.

Cllr Holmes asked for an adjustment to condition 14 to exclude gates.

A vote was taken and the members voted unanimously to permit.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT subject to the conditions set out in the report except condition 14 which is amended to read:

The dwelling shall not be occupied until a village gateway entry treatment, or other speed reduction measures that have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, have been provided on King Street on the approach to the 30 mph speed limit, in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons:

The proposal would result in the dwelling occupying a sustainable location and whose design, size and massing is such that it is considered to result in a proposal that is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and does not significantly harm the residential amenities of existing neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposal would not be harmful to the heritage assets in the locality.

Upon the submission of additional information the access via Clayfield Farm is not as good a solution as the proposed entrance option.

The proposed access included within the application is supported by traffic speed data which shows that the available visibility splays for both vehicles and pedestrians are achievable within the requirements of the Local Highway Authority and as such there is no objection to the proposal from the Local

Highway Authority.

The applicant has offered in addition a series of speed countdown markers on the approach to the 30 mph limit to serve as a visual indicator, these were not included originally as the submitted traffic speed data showed that approach speeds were less than 30 mph. The Local Highway Authority are not supportive of countdown markers on King Street as they are not prescribed signs, however have suggested some form of gateway entrance treatment would be acceptable to try and help reduce the speed of traffic.

As such the proposal complies with the above policies and guidance and the core principles identified in the NPPF.

PL15. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.30pm