



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

12 January 2017

PRESENT:

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

Solicitor to the Council (SP) , Head of Regulatory Services (JW),
Regulatory Services Manager (PR),
Planning Officer (JS), Administration Assistant (LR)

PL58. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies received.

PL59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Application 16/00157/OUT - Cllr Orson unable to speak as ward cllr due to pecuniary interest. Cllr Orson unable to attend on behalf of Cllr Orson – Head of Regulatory Services to read email from Cllr Higgins.

Application 16/00797/FUL – Cllr Baines is son of applicant – will leave meeting. Cllr Greenow stated he will also leave the meeting.

PL60. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 22 December 2016 Cllr Baguley requested for the name on page 166 to be amended to Roger Smith.

Cllr Chandler commented that the minutes were not voted unanimously as per the minutes but majority.

Cllr Simpson stated with regards to the first application on pg 156 a lot of discussion had been omitted. Concerned in case application goes to appeal. Requested reasons for refusal to be included including landscape and visual impact and that the

harm outweighs the benefit of the scheme.

Cllr Simpson proposed amendments to minutes as discussed. Seconded by Cllr Glancy.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted to approve the minutes with additions. 2 Members voted against.

It was agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.

PL61. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- 1) Reference: 16/00373/REM**
Applicant: Jelson Ltd
Location: Field No 0070 Station Lane Asfordby
Proposal: Proposed residential development for 100 no. units including all matters relating to appearance, layout and scale.

Update since the agenda was published.

Asfordby PC ,which originally had concerns/objections does not object to the amended application.

Neighbours . No additional comments received since the last committee meeting .

The Regulatory Services Manager reported that the determination of the application had been deferred at the 1st December 2016 committee meeting to seek:

- relocation of play area
- more bungalows in preference to 40% affordable housing
- reconfiguration of plot 6 (relationship with South View)

The applicants had submitted amended plans which ,in summary :

- relocated the play area to a more central location ,as part of the overall public open space
- increased the number of bungalows from 8 to 12 ;with affordable housing decreasing from 40% (40 dwellings) to 30% (30 dwellings)
- reconfigured plots 5 and 6 to minimise impact upon neighbours

Propose that original recommendation is supported, subject to amendment to S106 to take account of changes to affordable housing and conditions to refer to amended plans.

Cllr de Burle, speaking as ward councillor and parish councillor, was invited to speak and stated that

- Pass on thanks of residents of Asfordby to developers and officers

A councillor expressed concerns about the play area stating it was inappropriate and not up to standard. Play area is for small children and as such should be within 60m of dwellings which it does not appear to be. Better proposal than original site but could still be improved. Cannot support. Another councillor agreed with this stating that the play area is inappropriately located however some of the other main issues have now been addressed.

Cllr Sheldon thanked officers for quick turnaround stating that young children should be with parents/ guardians at the play area anyway. Fully support the application and propose to permit amendment.

Cllr Botterill seconded the proposal to permit adding that there were now two play areas in the area now.

The Regulatory Services Manager clarified that there will be one play area on the site not two, the proposal is to move existing LAP.

A councillor expressed support of the two councillors that were not happy with the play area, adding that children do go to play areas unaccompanied.

The Chair stated that as a member, if the parish council are happy then the application should be permitted.

A vote was taken. 8 Members voted to permit the application. 3 voted against. Cllr Cumbers requested for her vote against to be recorded.

DETERMINATION: Approved as per recommendation (revised plans and s106 for open space contribution and affordable housing at 30%).

- 2) Reference: 16/00157/OUT**
Applicant: Hofton & Son Ltd
Location: Land Adjacent The Woodlands Station Road Old Dalby
Proposal: Erection of up to 25 houses with all matters reserved except access

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

Deferred from earlier meeting to ask for a more comprehensive report addressing the noise environment of the site.

Members will note from the report that the applicant has declined this request, explaining that they consider that the work carried out is all that is necessary, and that there are no further assessments possible.

The EHO has advised that whilst the assessments undertaken so far may not present a complete picture in terms of the exposure future residents will be put to, equally there is no way that that position can be reached. This is because noise exposure of residents is dependent upon a wide range of detailed design and layout considerations and until these are known, a full assessment a firm conclusions cannot be drawn. His cannot be progressed at this stage because the application is in outline with all layout and reserved matters issues reserved. It is for this reason that condition 12 is proposed, requiring the relevant assessment to be carried out when all of the relevant details are known – the more appropriate stage.

Old Dalby PC have tabled a request for contribution to a village hall project for the village. This is new and is supported by good quality background material explaining why the contribution is sought and justifying it in proportionate terms. It seeks £89,000 which is based on just under 10% of the size of the village, which the new development would represent (25 houses out of a total of 256).

Cllr Bennett, on behalf of the parish council, was invited to speak. Requested for colleague, Cllr Wade of the parish council, to join him to answer technical questions. The Chair agreed but stressed that the limit is still three minutes to speak.

- Third time speaking on this application.
- Biggest worry is accumulation not culmination as reported in previous minutes.
- Too many houses on limited resources. In last 10 days have had letter to parish council from owner of site with 15 houses permitted already proposing an additional 80 houses. Parish Council is against development that overwhelms facilities.
- Do not know whether there will be complaints regarding sound. Owners of site entitled by law. Committee is taking a gamble that no problems will arise from sound.
- Report states that site has been investigated for exploded ordinance – no mention of unexploded ordinance. Worries me and parish council that there are 13 bore holes however only 5 sent for analysis. Why?
- Should another application be received see issues with access point. Highways expect rival developers to work in harmony – won't necessarily happen.

A councillor asked for further clarification regarding the 80 houses.

Cllr Bennett confirmed that Planit-X, the original designer of 15 house scheme, sent the letter. Land goes up, around and behind current plot. Not clear if 80 houses total or existing 15 plus 80.

A councillor asked if there had been any unexploded ordinances on that side of the site.

Cllr Wade stated that the MOD acknowledge no exploded ordinance. No record of unexploded which is more dangerous. No unexploded ordinance survey.

Mark Shouler, land owner, was invited to speak and stated that

- Manging director of Houghton and Son builders. Have submitted robust application which meets all criteria for approval.
- Noise – has been taken out of context. Noise mitigation and assessment have been carried out. Detailed statement has been given to council how to mitigate noise.
- This is outline application not full design. Further information has been provided to council which is why it is now recommended for approval with condition for noise mitigation.
- Cannot build houses on an outline application. If application is approved we must meet conditions set by council. Would not invest if existing issues could not be mitigated.

Members had no questions.

The Head of Regulatory Services read out a representation from Cllr Higgins on behalf of Cllr Orson.

- Application is on top of many applications in this ward
- Represents intensive supply of housing in very small geographical area
- Old Dalby is classed as sustainable but is an isolated community which the NPPF seeks to avoid as the Local Planning Authority should be promoting healthy communities (NPPF 690)
- Application has no nearby open spaces for recreation or sport (NPPF 73) and is over 700m walking distance from facilities of Old Dalby
- Committee previously refused 50 unit application in Harby due to it creating an isolated community. This application fails in a similar area however it is exacerbated by close proximity of industrial units and high speed rail track (NPPF 123).
- Old Dalby ward has other applications in progress along with many others already permitted.
- NPPF asks for consideration of social and environmental strands, this application is unlikely to promote healthy communities, an isolated community while storing up environmental and noise harms when residents come into conflict from industrial activity on a site which can be at work 24/7.
- Application should be refused.

A Councillor for clarification would this application need a play area as it is for in excess of 10 houses.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that this is an indicative plan as with all outline. Play area can be included in reserved matters.

A Councillor queried with regards to safety and UXBs.

The Chair stated that the ordinance issue should have already been addressed. Is now inappropriate but can be discussed at debate.

The Head of Regulatory Services spoke in response to the previous three speakers' representations.

- With regards to 15/ 80 houses, a letter means that there is a prospect of a new application however this has not yet been submitted to the council.
- With regards to noise, until we have a firm design nothing can be measured, current plan is just illustrative. Appropriate for outline application. Appropriate time is at reserved matters stage.
- With regards to ordinance and bore holes – not presented to us as representations until this evening. Cannot give answers now.

A councillor stressed concerns about ordinance. There were areas in the past that you could not go into in this area due to being unsafe. Would like ordinance survey added as condition prior to development.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that this can be delegated to officers to ensure this happens.

Cllr Cumbers proposed to approve the application adding that Mr Shouler considers play areas as well as ordinance.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal to approve.

A councillor asked if officers could indicate where business premises are for noise assessment – particular concerns about extract fans. The Head of Regulatory Services highlighted this on the plan.

A councillor asked if the train was still an issue with regards to noise. The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that it is and that activity is restricted as there are houses closer to it than the proposed site.

A councillor asked if it could be specified which way the gardens would face due to noise, business is 24/7. Would like to see contribution to village hall and parish council at reserved matters stage. Not sure if can support application at this stage.

The Chair stated that the application cannot be prejudged at outline stage.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that condition 12 can influence design so it is not exposed to noise ie layout design, building materials, open space. Not impeding activities of existing business.

A councillor asked if affordables would have the same standard of insulation.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that they would need the same protection from noise as every other house.

The Chair commented that there are not enough affordables. Cllr Cumbers agreed and withdrew the proposal to permit.

Cllr Wyatt confirmed that he was happy to be the proposer including all conditions as per previous proposer.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal to approve.

A vote was taken. 6 members voted to permit the application. 4 voted to refuse. There was one abstention.

Cllrs Chandler, Holmes and Simpson requested for their votes to refuse to be recorded.

DETERMINATION: Approved as per recommendation plus a condition requiring a properly designed LAP and delegated authority to the Head of Regulatory Services to investigate the potential of risk posed by discarded ordnance.

- 3) Reference: 16/00491/OUT**
Applicant: Richborough Estates and R Machin
Location: Land off Great Lane Frisby on the Wreake
Proposal: Outline application for residential development with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian access.

Update since the committee report was published :

Frisby Parish Council

Principle – Originally objected to the application . Now support the principle of housing development in Frisby in the draft Local Plan. Great Lane site is in their emerging Neighbourhood Plan .

Highways – Have considered Highway Authority’s comments & recommendations and do not wish to pursue their previous objection .Do not support the construction of a footway on Gaddesby Lane; one-way traffic would be undesirable and support view of Highway Authority that none of the alternatives for a footway are practicable .

Neighbours

16 additional letters of objection have been received raising the following issues: Loss of privacy, density and layout, out of keeping with the area ,highway safety (including pedestrians and bus users) ,highway impact would be severe,new footpath and one way not practical, limited community benefits would be provided ,other sites in village preferable ,loss of ridge and furrow and loss of agricultural land

The Regulatory Services Manager advised that the determination of the application been deferred at the 10th November 2016 committee meeting to investigate improvements to pedestrian safety ,particularly a new footway on Gaddesby Lane, and to reconsider the density of the development.

The applicants offered to provide a footway on Gaddesby Lane and provided more detailed analysis of housing density in Frisby and on their site, which they consider indicates that the layout would be acceptable in this case.

The Regulatory Services Manager noted that the Highway Authority did not support the need for a footway and accepted that the density was acceptable. It was proposed that the original recommendation should be supported , without a footway .

Speakers

Dr Ronald Thew on behalf of Frisby parish council was invited to speak and stated that

- Parish council have previously expressed concerns about pedestrians and access to A607.
- Have considered highways response and accept their comments. Do not wish to pursue previous objection.
- Do not support footpath on Gaddesby lane/ single flow traffic.
- Ask councillors to note that the parish accepts the principle of housing in Frisby.
- Frisby neighbourhood plan has been submitted to council.
- £ 60,000 on offer to parish – can think of more appropriate uses.
- The vast majority of residents would oppose a one way system in the village.

Peter Rogers, objector, was invited to speak and stated that

- Density situation in particular plot of land has not been addressed by applicants
- Contravenes BE1 and Melton Plan policies.
- Adverse effect on amenity.
- Not adequate space around buildings.
- Not adequate open space.
- High density site in low density location.
- Application site has been split into 3 sites. 33 developments per hectare.
- Applicant has chosen to state that development fits in with village. Average DPH for village is 16. For this development average is 23./ 26.
- Direct impact on neighbouring properties, existing properties in particular.
- Separation distances between old and new housing will be reduced due to garages. Density of 48 houses.
- Application does not have adequate space around and between buildings.

A councillor asked about the open space. The Regulatory Services Manager showed this on plan. Objector questioned who would that space be benefitting due to its location.

A councillor asked Mr Rogers where he would prefer to see the open space.

Mr Rogers responded that the application is for 48 houses and is overdeveloped regardless of open space.

Justin Cove, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that

- Applicant has taken on board comments from previous committee.
- Did look at great range of options and exhausted process.
- Regarding density – we are required to adhere to number of planning policies hence the open space. Also applies to affordable housing hence smaller units and such higher density.
- Detached dwellings are at density of 20 volumes per hectare, matching volume of surrounding streets (existing).
- Reserved matters will determine details – this is just an outline application.
- Parish council have confirmed it, local plan confirms allocation, know site is deliverable and do have market interest.
- Will help maintain 5 year housing supply in Melton.

A councillor asked for clarification would small children's play areas be considered due to the small size of the proposed gardens.

Mr Cove confirmed that the applicant would be willing to have a small children's play area incorporated.

A councillor stated that six properties backing on to one garden, shown in blue on the plan, asking if the developer mitigate this as it seems heavy on one property.

Mr Cove stated that this was difficult to answer and that the developer would have to consider.

A councillor asked what the affordable mix and number of starter homes would be.

Mr Cove stated that this had not been proposed but if members wish for it to be considered it can be discussed with officers.

Cllr Hutchinson, ward councillor, was invited to speak and stated that

- Regarding traffic and footpath up to main road – this could be important aspect – is there a way to reserve funds from the application – 78 homes, this is for 48, proportionate cost.
- Will lead to extra traffic and extra people using bus service.
- Density – Mr Rogers gave a good overview, do agree with points especially regarding open space – surely this should be more central to development.

- Only outline application– when detailed hope these points are taken into account.

The Regulatory Services Manager stated that regulations must be for particular project. Regarding the contribution, when the applicants offered 60k this was capped to give future buyers and occupiers some certainty of the site. Considered acceptable with regards to open space etc.

A councillor noted that policy H11 is missing. LAP should be part of the application not an addition to it.

The Regulatory Services Manager confirmed that with regards to open space, the report only refers to H10. H10 areas are informal open space to be used for passive recreation. Threshold of more than 10 dwellings. H11 is applicable – requires laps and leaps and open space for more vigorous activity. Quantum exceeds requirement of policy.

A councillor asked if LAP is on amenity area it is not surrounded by housing. Cannot see anywhere suitable for LAP on that amenity area.

Cllr Wyatt proposed to permit the application in line with officers recommendation.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to permit. Added that need a LAP, plan should be redone, surrounded by housing. Cllr Wyatt confirmed this.

A councillor asked proposer and seconder to consider condition for starter homes within affordable mix if possible.

The Regulatory Services Manager stated that would expect section 106 to refer to housing needs survey. Critical thing is that s106 is a cascade system.

A vote was taken. Members voted unanimously to permit the application.

DETERMINATION: Approved in accordance with the recommendation.

- 4) Reference: 16/00708/FUL**
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Bains
Location: 75 Welby Lane
Proposal: Full planning application for the erection of 10 dwellings

Cllr Bains and Cllr Greenow left the meeting.

The Regulatory Services Manager advised Members that an additional reason for reporting the application to committee, which is not in the report, is because the applicants are the parents of Cllr Bains.

Explained that the details of this development in an existing residential area were acceptable. Would provide a good mix of houses with adequate parking ,gardens

and amenity areas which complemented the trees to be retained on the site, with no significant adverse impact upon neighbours.

Recommend that permission be granted .

Maurice Fairhurst, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that

- Disused untidy land with healthy trees which will be retained and protected.
- Detailed application.
- NPPF sustainable developments should be approved if it does not outweigh the benefits

A councillor asked who will maintain the trees on the site.

Mr Fairhurst responded that future residents would have a maintenance agreement, not public open space that will be used by more than the residents.

A councillor asked with regards to flooding as the site is part way up a hill.

Mr Fairhurst responded that he could not guarantee what the local flood authority will say regarding the application.

A councillor asked with regards to the permissive footpath who is permitting it.

Mr Fairhurst confirmed that Mr and Mrs Baines were permitting the footpath.

The councillor asked if that was the case could the applicants then not close the path.

Mr Fairhurst confirmed that in theory yes, the applicants could close the footpath but it would not be good for business to do so. Development would ensure it is used in a more user friendly way.

A councillor commented with regards to the site visit that there are a lot of extractor fans on the back of the shop. Would like acoustic treatment as fans can be noisy and start up at any time, would be close to proposed housing.

A councillor commented that the housing mix of two and three bed accommodation was a positive aspect of the application but expressed concerns about the footpath especially in the situation of the post office being sold – who would maintain it then.

The Solicitor to the Council confirmed that the path runs the length of the site, if and when houses are built that will become a road, therefore they cannot remove the access right.

The Regulatory Services Manager confirmed that the access would shift to the boundary. Two thirds of the permissive route is highway. Could put condition on for access to be retained and maintained in interest of sustainability. Condition can always be removed in future via an application to authority.

Cllr Chandler proposed to permit the application subject to conditions.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal to permit.

A councillor asked for the acoustics condition mentioned earlier to be included.

Proposer and seconder happy to include.

A councillor asked if the amenity area was not public.

The Regulatory Services Manager confirmed that it is privately owned and privately maintained. Enhance setting of trees and landscape, particularly at the entrance. People can still walk through if they wish.

A councillor expressed concerns about the pathway. Gated for security, narrow, will it be lit.

The Chair commented that this would be hard to condition.

A vote was taken. Members voted unanimously to permit the application.

DETERMINATION: Approved in accordance with the recommendation and additional conditions relating to retention of pedestrian access through site and soundproofing of existing air conditioning units on rear of applicant's shop.

**5) Reference: 16/00797/FUL
Applicant: Mr & Mrs S Coleman
Location: Land Adjacent The Barn Stonesby Road Sproxtan
Proposal: Construct three bedroom two storey dwelling**

Case Officer reported:

Additional comments – Parish Council – raise no objection/ no comments to make.

Application seeks permission to erect a three bed detached dwelling. It is proposed that the development is refused due to the unsustainable location, inadequate parking/ turning facilities and lack of a speed survey to demonstrate that the visibility splays are acceptable.

The agent has submitted an amended plan, which has removed part of the patio to demonstrate parking and turning. However the parking spaces (external and in the garage) are substandard to those included in the County Highways guidance. Highways have stated that this is guidance only though. Whilst the speed limit is 30mph, given the location of the village close to the national speed limit sign and outside the village, there is potential for speeds to be higher than 30mph.

Sproxtan is not considered to be a sustainable location and it is considered that the

erection of a dwelling in the unsustainable village location would be contrary to the advice contained within the NPPF.

Stuart Coleman, the applicant, plus a technical representative, Mark Benns, were invited to speak and stated that

- Have outgrown current house
- Wish to move into larger property but remain in village
- Family own land
- Help sustain amenities by someone moving into old house
- Did support application for 5 houses across the road
- Family have lived in village for many generations

Mark Benns stated that previously officers gave three reasons for refusal.

- Visibility – have looked again confident from remeasure that meet guidelines, not contrary to BE1.
- Lack of turning space within the site – suggested not in compliance, contest that
- Village unsustainable – application approved with officers support across road for 5 houses.
- 10 letters received in support from local residents.
- Maintains and enhances Sproxton area
- Not outweighed by any harm

A councillor questioned if parking arrangements were adequate.

Mr Benn stated that he believes the arrangements are adequate. Have only had one days notice of this being an issue.

A councillor asked if the garage could be made bigger to accommodate cars.

Mr Benn confirmed that yes this would be possible.

Cllr Graham, ward councillor for Sproxton, was invited to speak and stated that

- Weight of support locally
- 80 homes / 150 people – 10 representations received are significant
- 3 bed house will be available when applicant moves
- Site visit – will have little impact on area
- Will only be seen by those travelling on Stonesby Road
- Will boost numbers for local amenities etc
- Use road daily, slow road, sharp bend – believe application now complies with highways authority.
- Support the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed with regards to parking spaces that internal garage

measures 5.2m – council require 6m, therefore this is below the standards required.

The Head of Regulatory Services offered a contrast with site across the road. The same reservation regarding sustainability for that site was counterbalanced by conservation benefits. This site does not have conservation benefits.

A councillor asked for clarification – is it physically possible to reverse car if another car is there as it is an offence to back out onto a road as per LCC. Does revised plan allow for turning if more than one vehicle is on site.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that councillors need to decide that based on the site visit and the provided plans.

Cllr Chandler proposed to defer the application. Cllr Botterill seconded.

Cllr Holmes proposed to permit to keep people in village.

Chair – point of order.

Cllr Holmes proposed to permit and delegate to officers as problems not insurmountable. Seconded by Cllr Baguley.

A councillor commented that they were not against the application however expressed concern about lack of space at front of property. Response to highways – garage length 5.2m approx. – under the required 6m to class it as a parking space. If that is altered it provides parking. Easily surmountable support approval subject to officers. Another councillor supported this view.

A discussion was had about original proposal to defer being overridden by proposal to permit. Solicitor to the Council advised chair.

Chair stand by ruling. Solicitor to the Council agreed with Chair.

Propose to permit by Cllr Holmes with delegated power to officers re turning spaces being sufficient. Seconded by Cllr Baguley.

A vote was taken. 7 members voted to permit the application. 4 voted against. Cllr Cumbers asked for her vote against to be recorded adding that it should have been deferred as per original proposal.

Application permitted.

DETERMINATION: Approved as per recommendation, subject to officers being able to confirm that the site allows for the turning of vehicles.

- 6) Reference: 16/00724/FUL**
Applicant: Littlebell Ltd:- Mr C/o Richard Reynolds
Location: Land to the rear of 25 to 53 Ankle Hill, Melton Mowbray
Proposal: Erect 6 dwellings

Case Officer reported:

Additional comments – (4 received) **1.** Object to hawthorn hedge **2.** Want specific consideration of plot one and floor levels – patio to plot 1 could be the same level as top of hedge. Development would cause unacceptable overlooking privacy issues. **3.** Only provided 10 days to comment on change of application to a full application. Note that plot 6 has not been changed, concerns fallen on death ears – concerns over privacy and amenity. **4.** 10 day consultation period is not long enough, expires after meeting, confusion regarding plans to be considered.

The application seeks full planning permission to erect 6 dwellings at the site. Outline planning permission for the development had been granted in March 2013. The application had originally been submitted as a reserved matters application, however it was determined that due to the changes proposed from the original layout (as approved at outline stage) that the application could not be dealt with as a reserved matters application. The content has not changed and any comments received for the application have been taken into account in the report. The drawings received 9th Dec will be the drawings that the committee will need to consider.

A 10 day consultation period was provided, however this will expire after the committee meeting (Sunday). Any decision the committee may make will be subject to no new objections with which address issues not already considered being made arising during the remainder of the consultation period.

The agent has also submitted a section to indicate the relationship of the site in relation to Ankle Hill. This drawing shows 27 Ankle Hill and Plots 1 and 2 and the garage for plot 2.

A condition had also been included (condition 4) requesting levels details. This information has been provided on the site plan and it is therefore proposed that this condition is not included, should the committee grant permission.

A councillor questioned how the committee can consider application if is still in consultation period

The Chair confirmed that this is not unheard of – it would be a conditional decision.

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer the application. Chair stated that speakers would have to be heard prior to any proposal.

Mr Steve Limb, objector, was invited to speak and stated that

- Do not agree proposal should be decided today for reasons specified
- On behalf of objectors – do not object whole development and not trying to change it radically, just asking for certain aspects to revert to outline application.
- Bungalows – limit damage to residential amenity / designs have changed on 9th December. None to plot 6 since it was made into 2 storey building with

window facing Ankle Hill neighbours. Asking for two plots to be limited in footprint height and windows.

- Drainage – pre existing issues are not applicants fault. Opportunity to improve situation being missed. Poor drainage of soil not considered. Drainage strategy would require regular maintenance - not a realistic solution
- Boundary – safety – should be impermeable to children and pets, passing traffic. Proposal has variety of hedges not fit for purpose. Request to limit changes and opposition would diminish.

Mr Nick Cooper, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that

- The site has now been sold to developer ready to start work immediately
- Technical queries such as highways and drainage have been considered
- Layout principle as illustrated at outline stage to be retained.
- Design stops loft conversions in future.
- Reduced impact on surrounding properties.
- Floor areas not specified in previous approval.
- Ground footprint now smaller than when approved at outline.
- Plot 1 has been developed into 2 storey building – 43 m separation from Ankle Hill properties – double the guideline. Also further away than originally accepted on previous.
- Residential amenities will not be harmed.

A councillor asked with regards to drainage who would be responsible for upkeep after five years.

Mr Cooper confirmed that drainage is not to be adopted at any point

Cllr Greenow, ward councillor, was invited to speak and stated that

- Speaking on behalf of residents – seek deferral in order for residents to consider
- Full application is different from previous
- Due to changes it cannot be considered as reserved matters
- Letter dated 23rd December– received 5th January – consultation period ends 15th January – delay in informing residents – have not had sufficient time to consider.
- Have concerns regarding plots 1 and 6 and loss of residential amenity due to overbearing size and location.
- Not in keeping with other properties in area.
- Drainage will work short term but no guarantees regarding maintenance.
- Hedges currently filled with gaps could cause child safety issues.

- Grass areas should be included.
- Burton road access should be restricted and enforced.
- Need for housing – sustainable housing – site is suitable however residents will be affected.
- Seek deferral in order for residents to make case, would like to discuss with developer.

The Planning Officer confirmed with regards to layouts / reserved matters – 2015 access and layout – has come back as full application and does not match what was previously approved. LCC highways do not object.

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer application and expressed concerns about drainage.

Cllr Glancy seconded the proposal to defer. Need more dialogue with ward councillor, residents and developer.

A councillor expressed concerns regarding maintenance agreement for drainage. Other members agreed with this request as point to be considered at deferment. Proposer and seconder confirmed.

A vote was taken. Members voted unanimously to defer the application.

DETERMINATION: Deferred to seek clarification on the approach to drainage maintenance and to seek amendments to plots 1 and 6

PL62. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 9.13pm