



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

PERA Offices, Nottingham Road, Melton Mowbray

16 June 2016

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, Head of Regulatory Services,
Regulatory Services Manager (PR), Applications and Advice Manager (JW)
Planning Officer (LP)

PL6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr G Botterill offered his apologies to the meeting.

PL7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

PL8. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 26 May 2016

The following amendments were suggested to the minutes;

15/01013:

- Page 10: Mr Tomkinson was the applicant, not an agent.
- Pages 11 and 12: reference to Cllr Bryant (not Bryan) from Scalford PC
- Page 13: Add 'Members expressed concern regarding the issue of site levels of the proposals' prior to the Regulatory Services Manager's comments on the issue.

Approval of the Minutes, subject to these amendments, was proposed by **Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Simpson**

The Committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign

them as a true record.

PL9. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

The Regulatory Services Manager advised that application ref 16/00137/FUL – 61 Nottingham Road, Nether Broughton, had been withdrawn from the agenda to allow heritage matters to be considered in more detail. The application will be reported to a future committee meeting.

- (1) **Reference:** 16/00032/OUT
Applicant: Davidsons Developments Ltd and Mr K & Mrs R Eggleston
Location: Land off Sand Pit Lane, Long Clawson
Proposal: Residential development of up to 55 dwellings, together with new areas of public open space, access, landscaping and drainage infrastructure.

- (a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that:

Reported late material had been received:

LCC Libraries: now accept that on basis of details of specific project libraries S106 contribution now considered to be CIL compliant (see page 12 of report).

LCC Education: from the Head of Strategy – Education Sufficiency
MBC will be aware that LEA has a serious concern regarding the limited potential for the Long Clawson C of E Primary School to further expand to meet any increased demand for places, and in particular that in relation to new housing any developer contributions sought would be disproportionate to the work necessary to adapt the school. You will be aware of our related concerns regarding the replacement of the mobile classroom currently located on the site.

The LEA consider that the cost of any transport arising as a consequence of this development in the village be recovered from the developer. In the case of the Davidsons proposal for this development and the anticipated 14 primary aged pupils that will reside there, the expected transport costs would require a contribution of £138,320 while pupils pass through their primary phase of education. This would be in addition to the contribution sought for the development of primary places at the affected school(s) (£159,707) where there is scope to expand them. It is believed that both of the above sums are compliant in accordance with CIL Regulation 122/123(3).

4 responses from neighbours:

Resident (Cooper) – 11 points, 7 drainage

Neighbour (Shouler) – heritage and questions benefits
Resident (Boles) – infrastructure, highways, parking
Other (Hart) – new homes bonus; ecology; not sustainable; localism/developer led; education; housing need and scale of objection - to Members, but not submitted to LPA as formal representations

The application

This application seeks outline planning permission for up to 55 dwellings with associated public open space, landscaping and drainage. The details of the access have been submitted for approval at this stage, all other details would be subject to a separate reserved matters application.

The land falls outside of the village envelope for Long Clawson and is considered to be an edge of village location. Access to the site is proposed directly from Sand Pit Lane.

It is considered that the main issues arising from this proposal are:

- Compliance or otherwise with the Development Plan and the NPPF
- Impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon heritage assets
- Drainage/flooding issues
- Highway safety
- Impact upon residential amenities
- Sustainable development
- Education

The most significant points, in particular those which have been subject to late representations are:

Education

- The LEA do not object to this application.
- The site falls within the catchment area of Long Clawson C of E Primary School. The School has a net capacity of 105 and 133 pupils are projected on the roll should this development proceed; a deficit of 28 pupil places (of which 14 are existing and 14 are created by this development). There are currently no pupil places at this school being funded from S106 agreements for other developments in the area.

After further discussion the Education Authority has confirmed that they have a scheme designed which would replace the mobile at Long Clawson with a two classroom block and provide a net gain of 25 places. The contribution sought for this development would be put towards the cost of this scheme. However, there is concern as to how the school would accommodate children from any further housing sites in the village.

They have requested a developer contribution for £159,707 which the

applicants have agreed to pay. PLUS £138,320 transporting children which has only been requested this week and is being considered by the applicants. The LEA notes that while they do not object to the housing proposal they consider that MBC should take a more Strategic View to long term cumulative impact of housing developments in this area with regard to education provision. They state that if it is considered that the school is not capable of further expansion, for example this might include where developer contributions are insufficient for this to happen, then the Local Authority would provide education by transporting pupils to nearby schools having capacity. Should be noted that the LEA has a duty to provide school places. LPA needs to consider whether it is reasonable to expect a number of children to be educated 2 or 3 miles away in the next village. It is a difficult debate because it is imprecise. This is because school capacity changes over time and it is how it stands when the houses are actually occupied, which is hard to predict as it is in the developer's hands.

It should be noted that many children do this under parental choice anyway, and from villages with no school provision.

It is considered that the inherent uncertainties of calculating demand for spaces, coupled with the limited harm which can be identified from transporting children to the next village, means that it is very difficult to resist a planning application on this basis.

Heritage

Listed buildings – St Remigius Church (grade II*), Manor farmhouse (II*) and Old Vicarage (II)

SAM - medieval moated site NE of church – probably the site of former manorhouse

Long Clawson conservation area which was designated in 1977.

Showed plan and explained relationship with the application site.

Historic England concludes that the proposals will diminish the appreciation and understanding of the rural context of the highly graded assets, in particular the grade II* listed Church, grade II* Manor Farmhouse and the conservation area. HE state that the proposal will be harmful to the significance of designated heritage assets commensurate with less than substantial harm as identified by the NPPF

Historic England comments - special regard to desirability of preserving the setting of LBs and pay special attention to desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Less than substantial harm as identified in the NPPF (para 134) harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal

Drainage

It is accepted that drainage and flooding is an issue in Long Clawson. But must

be recorded that the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has no objection to the application subject to conditions. Where does and will the site drain to? The LLFA have reviewed the Flood risk Assessment, and understand the concerns raised from residents in relation to the existing flooding on The Sands and West End.

It is agreed that the principles behind the development of the site in particular the drainage system and SuDS design are critical to the development being carried out without increasing flood risk. The principles proposed conform to current design standards, although volume calculations for storage should be revised at the discharge of conditions stage, following the detailed site design. As such the LLFA advised a condition to ensure delivery of this including an assessment of the maintenance requirement for the life of the development.

The proposed development should not increase the flood risk on West End as the proposed outfall is to a watercourse flowing towards The Sands, hence no increase in flows at this location. It is understood that there are concerns raised regarding additional flow being sent to The Sands. This should be managed in part by the second condition advised by the LLFA. This requires an assessment of the watercourse/hydraulic model including an assessment of the inflows to the site. This should be validated to rate and quantity of water from the development entering the watercourse. The second part to ensuring this is appropriately managed is under the surface water drainage condition at the SuDS design.

Impact upon the fish pond

Concerns have been raised about the impact upon the existing fish pond to the north of the site. The pond is of ecological interest and within the curtilage of the listed Manorhouse.

This pond has no positive outfall as such would be an inappropriate outfall location for the development of the site. I also am aware there is an overflow from this pond that I believe heads towards West End a discharge to this location has the potential to increase flood risk in this area. I also understand that this pond is fed by some of the water from the proposed development site, partially through infiltration into the head deposits, although I have not validated this. If the SuDS features are constructed in the proposed location and allowed to partially infiltrate a water supply through this mechanism should be retained mimicking as close as possible the existing scenario.

Other issues – character of the area, highway safety, amenity, ecology and archaeology

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 and affordable housing in particular. The balancing issues – development of a greenfield site, impact upon landscape, heritage assets and drainage and traffic generation—is considered to be of limited harm and the nature of the land concerned (low grade agricultural), and the absence of any landscape designation. The site benefits from a range of services in the village centre which mitigate the extent to which travel is necessary and limits journey distance, and the proposal provide potential for sympathetic design and careful landscaping. The less than substantial harm to heritage assets must be balanced against the significant social and economic benefits.

Recommendation: That permission should be granted subject to a S106 and conditions as set out in the report.

Members voted to suspend standing orders to allow 2 objectors to speak. This was **moved by Cllr Sheldon and seconded by Cllr Holmes and the Committee agreed unanimously.**

- (b) Cllr Philip Tillyard, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to and stated that:
- Cumulative impact of applications – nearly 200 are proposed at present
 - Sustainability of the site: 55 houses would add to strains on schooling, health issues, landscape and heritage.
 - Education: unsatisfactory to transport children to other villages. It will split the community
 - Destruction of heritage asset. Historically a grazing area and would overshadow Old Manor House Grade II*
 - Existing traffic issues at the Sands would be exacerbated
 - Prefer to see other sites developed.
- (c) Melanie Steadman, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:
- 95% of surface water drains into fishponds. When the pond is full it will drain into Claxton Rise
 - 60% is to be diverted – this will deprive the pond and cause it to dry up
 - Ditch on Sandpit Lane flows to The Sands and this scheme will add to that. There is already problems there with flooding and sewage discharging
 - 1 million litres will be diverted towards the Sands – flooding will be exacerbated as a result
 - Dr Cooper has presented a geological report and concurs that the hydrology of the area will be affected.
 - Impact on the Fishponds which is ancient/heritage asset
- (d) Moira Hart, also on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:

- She represents 200 residents who oppose the development
 - NPPF seeks sustainable development
 - Facilities cannot accommodate any new development
 - Schools, health and road network cannot cope
 - The headteacher has advised that no more children can be accommodated in the school - a surplus of 14 from this development not being able to be accommodated
 - Transporting children to other villages will not be acceptable to parents
 - NPPF asks that issues are discussed with neighbours in advance
 - Would have a major impact on the heritage asset, not 'less than substantial' as claimed by officers
- (e) Guy Longley, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Significant benefits from housing, especially given existing shortfalls
 - Long Clawson is one of the most sustainable locations in the Borough. It has a good range of services
 - Account has been taken in the design regarding Manor Farm and the Conservation Area. The 'buffer zone' serves to protect them
 - EH advise 'less than substantial' – this therefore needs to be balance with benefits which are new housing including 37% affordables.
 - Flood risk and drainage was addressed – it is concluded it can be controlled. The engineering solution can ensure flows are maintained at existing rates. The LLFA have expressed satisfaction with this.
 - S106 – a package has been accepted, this includes a contribution to replace the mobile classroom.
 - 37% affordables and a range/mix to meet local needs. The developer is an expert builder of good repute and produces good quality design.
 - There are no issues so significant to outweigh the benefits arising from the housing.
- (f) Cllr Byron Rhodes, Ward Councillor for Long Clawson and Stathern, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Flooding: Dr Cooper's report requires further consideration
 - Manor Farmhouse and other listed buildings: development would significantly affect its setting
 - LCC 106 contribution would not relate to LC. Any 'surplus' children would be bussed elsewhere – this is unacceptable and harmful to community cohesion, especially as compelled rather than by choice.
 - Suggest deferral to consider Dr Cooper's letter further and hold further discussions with LCC education.

The Regulatory Services Manager responded to several of the points raised:

- Heritage assets: Historic England – the responsible body -have concluded less than substantial harm.
- Drainage- The LLFA have commented, but can appreciate Members may wish us to look in greater detail
- The Highway Authority consider the situation acceptable for the number of houses proposed

- Sustainability – clearly Long Clawson is one of our more sustainable locations with a range of services

Cllr Baguley proposed deferment to allow further investigation of schooling and drainage issues. This was seconded by Cllr Chandler

Members debated the suggestion to defer and agreed that further examination of flooding and the schooling situation was required. It was not welcome to send some children out of the village, education authority need to reconsider.

It was questioned the low agricultural grading of the land due to historic use for animals. Water is retained and hedges are intact. Concerns were expressed regarding the heritage aspects and the setting of Manor Farmhouse. Historic England mentioned alternative locations and this needs to be looked at.

A vote was taken:

In Favour: 9

Against: 0

Abstention: 1

DETERMINATION: DEFERRED, to allow for further investigation in respect of the schooling and drainage positions.

- (2) **Reference: 16/00142/FUL**
Applicant: Ms Kathyrn Shorrocks
Location: Land off The Lane, Barsby
Proposal: Outline application for one new dwelling with all matters reserved

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks permission for the erection of one dwelling to be used in connection with an existing farm business.

The application site is located outside of Barsby in a very open rural location, the application is in outline with all matters reserved. Barsby is not considered as a sustainable location for development due to the limited services available.

The applicant has submitted a supporting statement setting out the personal circumstances and requirements of the dwelling, however full costs for the development and predicted increase to viability from the erection of the dwelling were not submitted.

It is considered that the requirement of a workers dwelling in this location has not been fully demonstrated and any development in this rural location would have an adverse impact upon the character of the area and the setting of Barsby village, whilst also being located in a village where the future occupants would have to rely on a motor vehicle to carry out day to day tasks.

As such the application is recommended for refusal as set out in the report.

(b) Kathryn Shorrocks, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The last 3 houses sold in the village have been very expensive – out of reach of most residents
- Population of 150 means that there are limited facilities. Council decisions have restricted growth perpetuating this through their restrictive nature
- Local family who wish to see the village prosper
- Access is suitable

Cllr Chandler sought clarification on the workers element of the proposal. Ms Shorrocks explained that she offers help but it is not proposed to be a 'worker's dwelling'.

Cllr Simpson enquired as to 'green credentials' of the dwelling. Ms Shorrocks advised it would be wooden clad, solar panels and use the site's own resources

Clarification was sought regarding agricultural ties. The Applications and Advice Manager advised it would be necessary if justified by agricultural need.

Cllr Sheldon proposed approval on the basis that housing supply and affordable housing requirements outweigh the sustainability issues associated with the application.

Cllr Simpson seconded this, commenting that sustainability may not be sufficient an argument

It was requested that the 'green credentials' be added to any conditions. Cllr Sheldon and Simpson agreed to this.

It was requested that the house is limited in size as per the application, i.e. 2 bedrooomed. Cllrs Sheldon and Simpson agreed to this.

It was requested that a condition be imposed removing Permitted Development rights. Cllrs Sheldon and Simpson agreed to this.

Cllr Sheldon summarised that his reason for granting permission was in view of the housing supply position and proximity to services in Gaddesby mitigates the sustainability issues.

A vote was taken:

Favour : 10

Against: 0

Abstention: 0

DETERMINATION: PERMIT with conditions delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services and to include:

- 'green credentials'

- **Limiting the size of the house to 2 bedrooms only,**
- **Removal of permitted development rights for domestic alterations, extensions and outbuildings.**

For the following reason:

It is considered that the location is not new isolated in the countryside and as such does not required unless special circumstances. Though Barsby is limited in terms of service provision, it is close to other centres which have such provision and would contribute to the provision of housing and the current shortfall of supply, particularly of smaller house types in this part of the Borough.

(3) Reference: 16/00143/FUL
Applicant: Ms Sarah Whiting
Location: Land off The Lane, Barsby
Proposal: Outline application for one new dwelling with all matters reserved

(a) The Planning Officer stated that the issues were identical to the previous application.

(b) Sarah Whiting, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The house is not for profit, but in order to be closer to family and their business
- Has strong community ties as does the wider family
- Need to live nearby to assist with the functioning of the farm and to support them in their later life
- Agree with the need to inject new life within villages
- Will make a modest contribution to supply
- It will not be in the village envelope but is not in open countryside
- No harm will be cause d to planning policies.

Cllr Holmes sought clarification whether a 2 or 3 bedroomed house . The Applications and Advice Manager advised it is 3 bedroomed , as stated on the application form.

Cllr Simpson: proposed to permit on the same basis as 16/00142 already approved. **Cllr cumbers seconded.**

A vote was taken:
 Favour: 10
 Against: 0
 abstention: 0

DETERMINATION: PERMIT with conditions delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services and to include:

- **‘green credentials’**
- **Limiting the size of the house to 3 bedrooms only,**
- **Removal of permitted development rights for domestic alterations, extensions and outbuildings.**

For the following reason:

It is considered that the location is not new isolated in the countryside and as such does not required unless special circumstances. Though Barsby is limited in terms of service provision, it is close to other centres which have such provision and would contribute to the provision of housing and the current shortfall of supply, particularly of smaller house types in this part of the Borough.

- (4) Reference: 16/00107/FUL**
Applicant: Mr David Stirling
Location: The Wheel, 9 High Street, Waltham on the Wolds LE14 4AH
Proposal: To move a building which already has planning consent (13/00924/FUL) further north within the plot

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

Planning permission has previously been approved for a dwelling within the grounds, this proposal sets the dwelling further into the site to the northeast (slides of previous approval). The site lies within the conservation area and the curtilage of The Wheel is a designated protected open area.

There are no updates to report.

In terms of the application whilst the proposed dwelling would be located in a Protected Open Area the site has been assessed as part of the evidence base being prepared for the new Local Plan. The application site is considered to have no visibility set back behind the properties on High Street and has no public use. The site is therefore considered to be an enclosed space which does not contribute to the built form. Therefore, saved Policy BE12 is considered to be out of date in the determination of this application. The revised location of the property has been assessed and is considered to sit well within the conservation area and would not harm the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

The proposed is considered acceptable and is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

(b) Mr Malcolm Mills, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Serious impact on the light to one property
- This will turn into an additional dwelling, not a replacement
- Highways are referred to in different ways in the report
- There is a business on the site generating traffic substandard,
- Road improvements need to take place before occupation, or preferably build.

Cllr Simpson sought clarification of the highways concerns.

The Applications and Advice Manager clarified that this was a replacement dwelling on the site and measures were need to ensure it is this, rather than it becoming an additional one.

Cllr Holmes proposed refusal – on the basis of:

- danger on High St due to emerging traffic, especially when there is a high level of parking, for example from the nearby Church.
- Grounds for refusal are the overshadowing effect on the adjacent house (Tawny House).
- Concern regarding impact on an ancient wall.

She also stated that, if approved, she would wish a condition to prevent further development.

Cllr Baguley seconded the motion to refuse.

Clarification was sought on how close it would be to the boundary wall and measurements were provided, ranging from 2.5. to 3 metres. It was enquired whether the house could be relocated the dwelling to 8m from the boundary by means of condition. Advice was provided that this was not feasible within the scope of conditions

A vote was taken – in favour of refusal 2; against 5, and 3 abstentions

Cllr Sheldon moved the recommendation plus a condition to remove the former permission. **Cllr Wyatt seconded** this motion.

A vote was taken– in favour of permit 3, against 2, abstention 5

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition preventing the dwelling from being additional to that already approved.

Reasons: The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a dwelling within the Conservation Area for Waltham on the Wolds. At present the site is a designated Protected Open Area, however the site does not meet the requirements to be considered a Local Green Space in the latest policy guidelines. Policy BE12 is therefore considered to be out of date in the determination of this planning application.

The dwelling is considered to sit well within the Conservation Area in terms of its design and architectural detailing, and to not have an unacceptable impact upon the residential privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings to the extent that the application should be refused. It is also considered that issues relating to highways safety can be satisfactorily overcome by the imposition of conditions

- (5) Reference: 15/01018/FUL
Applicant: Mrs Vivienne Percival
Location: 21A King Street Scalford 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 a new single storey dwelling and new vehicle access.

The application is located in Scalford and lies next to existing dwellings and is therefore considered an appropriate location for development, with easy access to services.

The Borough is deficient in terms of housing land supply and this would be partly addressed by the application, providing a smaller unit in line with the Council's key priorities.

Since the report was published and members attended the site, additional comments have been sought from the Local Highway Authority.

The Local Highway Authority agree with members that the location of the access is not ideal, however they do not consider that it is so bad that it would cause severe harm and could be refused on highway grounds.

The applicants have relocated the access from the original location, and have demonstrated by way of speed survey, that the access can achieve visibility splays in accordance with Local Highway Authority Standards, including visibility for pedestrians crossing to and from the site.

The applicants have included within their proposals a pedestrian crossing point with a short length of footway on the application site side of King Street to provide a safe refuge for pedestrians crossing.

The Local Highway Authority are therefore 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.

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 cause harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

As such the application is recommended 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:

- Salford is a Sustainable location
- The principle has been accepted
- A 2 bedroomed dwelling meets identified needs
- The access provided good visibility and is linked by a new footpath
- Traffic speed data has shown that the visibility meets the necessary standards
- It accords with NPPF as set out in the report.

Clarification was sought regarding the size of the house : it was confirmed that it was 2 bedroomed.

Concern was expressed regarding the location of the access due to restricted visibility. An alternative exists between the High St buildings.

Cllr Holmes moved to defer the application, in order to seek an alternative route for access.

Cllr Glancy seconded this proposal

Members reported additional road safety concerns due to water flow and occasionally ice. It was suggested that a request is made to Highways that signage is provided

A vote was taken:

- **8 votes in favour of deferral,**
- **0 against**
- **2 abstentions**

DETERMINATION: Deferred, to seek an alternative means of access to the plot.

(6) **Reference: 16/00114/FUL**
Applicant: Mr Ross Whiting
Location: Eastcote, 91 Grantham Road, Bottesford
Proposal: Erection of a garage for Plot 2

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks planning permission for a garage forward of the building line at 91 Grantham Road, Bottesford. Members will recall that the application

was deferred from the last Committee to allow for a site inspection.

Since publication of the report two additional comments have been received.

One additional objection has been received stating :

- The garage is large and intrusive, 16m forward of the building line
- A refusal of a bungalow forward of the building line was upheld at appeal
- A front garage to Plot 1 was approved as the screening would ensure that the building would not be visible from the street, the developer has bulldozed nearly all of the mature tree, shrubs and hedges and therefore there is no screening from the road.

Comments have also been received from the Parish Council stating;

- The garage would be well in front of the established building line. (Plot 1 garage was permitted as it would be hidden behind an existing wall and dense shrubbery).
- Sheer size would make it overbearing and obtrusive from the street scene and the public footpath.
- Being set below the level of the dwelling, the overall height visible from the streetscene would be approaching 12m in height - overbearing and totally out of character with the area.
- Landscape plans show one set of French doors on Plot 2 and another on Plot 1 (both on south elevations) which do not have planning permission.
- Owner proposes to erect more than 36 metres of fencing along the public footpath - totally out of keeping with the rural aspect.
- Question whether Plot 2 is being built in the right place? Original plans appear to show a 1-2m separation distance from the western boundary, which is not the case now that foundations have been laid.

The Parish Council has also raised concern that previously set conditions have not been adhered to and conditions broken.

In response to this, the issues raised have all been considered within the report. With regards to the conditions being breached and not adhered to these have been dealt with through enforcement procedures and need to be considered separate from this application which relates to a garage.

Plans on the screen show the proposal in comparison to the appeal decision. This was refused for streetscene/building line issues because of the bungalow proposed in the front area. We consider that this proposal is significantly different because of its lesser scale, position further up the slope but most of all because it would be a mirror image of the adjacent plot.

The application is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

(b) Mrs Sheila Woollard, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The garage is the size of a bungalow. Appeals have been refused for this.

- All development must respect the building line
- This garage cannot be hidden, it is adjacent to the boundary and unable to be screened
- Combined effect of house and garage would be overbearing
- Fencing would be inappropriate
- Trees and shrubs are needed to retain rural character
- Land has been undermined by excavations

It was reported that many issues persisted on this site relating to tree felling, the boundary, parking and wheel washing.

Cllr Chandler moved to refuse on the grounds of the impact on the streetscene arising from the position of the garage forward of the building line.

Cllr Cumbers seconded this proposal.

Concern was expressed with the proposed reason that other garages have been permitted and this is no worse.

A vote was taken :
5 in favour of refusal
5 Against
0 abstentions

The Chair employed his casting vote was and voted for refusal

DETERMINATION: REFUSED for the following reason:

The proposed garage would occupy a prominent location on the site and street scene and would be harmful to the visual amenities of the site and surroundings through the introduction of a large structure set forward of existing dwellings. The proposed garage is considered contrary to Policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan, which require development to be sympathetic to the site and surrounding development, and contrary to NPPF paragraph 64 which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

PL10. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business but the Chair wished it recorded that the Committee's thanks and appreciation be extended to the Applications and Advice Manager ,Mrs Jennifer Wallis, at this her last meeting before leaving the Council, for her supportive and professional role over the many years that she has served the Committee.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.40pm