



MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

PERA Offices, Nottingham Road, Melton Mowbray

21 April 2016

PRESENT:

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

Solicitor to the Council (SP), Head of Regulatory Services,  
Regulatory Services Manager (PR),  
Planning Officer (LP), Administrative Assistants (AS and RA)

---

D88. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

D89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Baguley declared a prejudicial interest in application 15/01016/OUT.

D90. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 31 March 2016

Cllr Chandler asked that the minutes be amended to reflect that she had asked for her vote against application 15/00931/FUL Dock between river and The Glory Hole, Wilton Road, Melton Mowbray be recorded.

Cllr Holmes also asked for the same amendment regarding her own vote against application 15/00931/FUL to be recorded as well.

Cllr Glancy asked for the determination to be more precise regarding the condition about the wire fence and would like the condition to state that the wire fence be erected before commencement of work on the dock to ensure safety.

Cllr Simpson added that she had seconded the proposal to withdraw the proposed

deferral of application 15/00931/OUT. She also added that she had concerns about the fence obstructing building works.

Cllr Illingworth noted the practicalities of building works but felt this should be left to the construction company to organise.

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

#### D91. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference: 15/00910/OUT**  
**Applicant: Mr Gladman Developments Ltd**  
**Location: Field OS 002, Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray**  
**Proposal: Development of up to 520 No. dwellings and associated convenient shop, public open space and landscaping, with all matters reserved, except for access**

- (a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that: Late items update – Reported that two objections received from neighbours since the agenda had closed. These relate to impact from about a possible link between Teasel Drive and the development site and concerns about highways and transportation. Both of these neighbours have registered to speak and any outstanding issues will be addressed at that point in the meeting. The application – Pointed to Executive Summary which sets out the key issues. Would summarise the report by describing the development; explaining how highways and transportation objections have been overcome and finally highlighting other key issues. Outline application with only vehicular access submitted for determination at this stage. Proposes up to 520 dwellings, a small food store and associated landscaping. While this is a stand-alone application it could form part of a strategic urban extension to the south of the town. Although emphasised that this is only a proposal in an early stage of the emerging Local Plan, which can be given no weight at present. Application submitted to try to overcome highways and transportation objections to an identical previous application (15/00082/OUT), which is the subject of an appeal against non-determination. This is scheduled to be heard at a Public Inquiry 22-24 June 2016. Emphasised that there are no other grounds for opposing the application. Referred to Executive Summary and explained how the applicant had overcome the objections to impact upon highway network; inadequate sustainability measures and failure to demonstrate provision of safe access. This is by contributions of £4.5m to strategic road improvements, £0.5m to sustainable transport measures and submission of detailed design drawings of accesses from A607 Leicester Road and Kirby Lane.

The contributions are considered to be a proportionate share of the strategic highways works required to provide a solution to the town's congestion issues based on a current evidence and understanding. Noted that while there would be mitigation both this Council and the County Council have accepted that traffic conditions will probably worsen in the short term.

It is accepted that no more than 15% affordable housing can be provided if the highways and transportation contributions are considered to be the priority. All other requests for developer contributions would be paid in full. Site is in the countryside, outside defined boundary of the town, but policy OS2 is out of date and having regard to a lack of 5 year housing land supply there are no planning policy reasons to oppose the development. Landscape impact had been an initial concern. Further evaluation of the applicant's landscape appraisal by Influence Environmental indicates that development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the landscape.

Note that there are significant archaeological remains on the site which would be addressed by conditions.

No outstanding technical objections.

There will be some impact upon neighbours and note undulating terrain of parts of the site. Sufficient space on site to satisfactorily accommodate development with minimal impact upon occupiers of existing neighbouring dwellings. This can be dealt with at reserved matters stage. May need to include mitigation to limit impact of adjacent industrial estate.

In conclusion, on the balance of issues there are significant benefits accruing from this proposal and it is recommended that permission should be granted subject to the details of the section 106 and conditions set out in the report.

The Chair noted that two individuals wanted to speak in opposition and asked Members if they would suspend standing orders to allow this. Cllr Simpson proposed to permit and Cllr Botterill seconded the proposal. A vote was taken and the members voted unanimously to allow.

(b) Sarah Cox, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that: she was speaking on behalf of the residents of Teasel Drive and a neighbour on Heather Crescent.

- Not concerned with the location of the piece of land as they accept that town needs to expand.
- Concerns regarding access through Teasel Drive – it would create a rat run.
- Seen 2 plans – 1 indicates access through Teasel Drive and the other one indicates no access through Teasel Drive.
- Traffic backs up on Leicester Road which is a recognised issue.
- 14,000 vehicles through town on daily basis so increase traffic volume.
- Teasel Drive would be used to circumvent queues and Kirby lane is already used for this purpose.

- Teasel Drive does not have the width compared to other surrounding roads such as Heather Crescent.
- Blind driveway on the corner of Teasel Drive which is dangerous when pulling out.
- Concerns regarding congestion.
- Concerns regarding construction traffic using Teasel Drive for up to 10 years whilst development is taking place. The road is not wide enough for this.

(c) Wendy Posnett, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that: she was speaking on behalf of herself, her husband and local residents. Main concerns regarding:

- Road safety
- Highway impact
- Primary school places
- Visual impact
- Access on to Kirby lane – it is a lane not a road. It is narrow with poor visibility. 4 accidents in the last 5 years near proposed junction.
- LCC highway impact considered severe and they are only accepting due to the contribution to the bypass.
- Severe impact due to greater traffic.
- Losing pleasant visual approach and walkway.
- There should be conditions to ensure no significant impact on current residents with buffer zones or low height buildings near existing residents.
- Should be built on an area with less chance of flooding.
- There are other more suitable sites.

A Member asked if the children who already live towards that end of town currently attend Frisby School.

Mrs Wendy Posnett responded that didn't currently but that they would and it would be around 109 children.

A Member commented that they thought a school was being provided.

The Regulatory Services Manager clarified that there would be a contribution towards education. It would fall in to the catchment area of Frisby School as it exists now. The view is the contribution will go towards a new education facility should it be required. However if no other development is built on the south end of town the contribution would go to Frisby school. The formula the education authority applies is to what schools currently exist.

A Member noted that they need to take a long term view.

A Member asked Mrs Wendy Posnett where she lives.

Mrs Wendy Posnett confirmed that she lives on Honeysuckle Way.

(d) Mr Lane, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Gladman endorses the officers recommendation and are grateful for it.
- 3 key considerations –
  1. Officers revised opinions on visual impact and landscaping
  2. Teasel Drive - vehicle access to their street forms no part of this application
  3. Contribution towards bypass.
- Affordable housing to meet local needs.
- No other technical concerns.
- Solution to road problems go hand in hand with sustainable sites.
- Addresses the difficulties in providing the overall housing need.
- Transport advisor on hand if there are any questions regarding highways.

A Member asked how long it would take to complete the development.

Mr Lane responded that the properties would be built over an 8 to 9 year period with 2 house developers building in tandem with 70-80 units per year.

Cllr Posnett noted that she represents both the North of Melton as a ward councillor and LCC Highways. She had previously declared an interest at a meeting with LCC when this application was being discussed and had left that meeting. She also noted that she was no relation to the speaker, Mrs Wendy Posnett.

The Regulatory Services Manager clarified that there is no proposal for access via Teasel Drive. There will be pedestrian and cycle links between existing developments and new scheme. Access on to Kirby Lane is going to meet highway standards. There may be impact on traffic in the town in the short term. Mitigation and benefits will outweigh any shorter term harm. It is a sloping site but there is sufficient space to minimise impact on neighbours. This includes buffers where necessary. The Northern end of the site, towards Leicester Road, is within a flood area. The indicative layout shows that they will provide landscaping and balancing lagoons to allow the scheme to go ahead. Areas susceptible to flooding won't be developed and are being dealt with as amenity areas.

A Member asked where the bypass would be located.

The Regulatory Services Manager commented that there is an ambition in the emerging local plan that the relief road would be south of town and to the south of this site. Work with the highways teams to establish the route is underway.

The Head of Regulatory Services highlighted the scale of the benefits of the development with £4.5 million towards the design of the bypass as well as partially towards the build of the road.

A Member asked if the Section 106 will allow the money to be released in a lump sum or release on a gradual basis. The only way Melton will get a bypass is with a large developer contribution.

The Regulatory Services Manager responded that we don't know the details at this stage. It will be part of the legal agreement. It is likely to be paid in phases, however the Highways Authority could borrow money against that.

**Cllr Chandler proposed approval of the application** and commented that she would prefer a bond in place and would like to see the legal agreement with more explanation.

**Cllr Simpson seconded the proposal.**

Several Members expressed their support and commented Gladmans have worked hard with the Council. They have listened to requirements and changed the position with regard to highways. The houses are needed. It would create short term pain but deliver longer term gain, to the benefit of many people.

A Member asked how can we ensure we receive the money and felt a bond should be in place.

The Regulatory Services Manager responded that he appreciated Members concerns. It is a significant application with substantial mitigation. It is legally binding if they wish to proceed in development that they have to provide the money agreed.

A Member asked if the developer could buy a bond or insurance so the money will be available whatever may happen.

The Regulatory Services Manager commented that the section 106 is sufficient security for highways on the basis that it will be delivered. If any party wishes to change a section 106 it would have to come back to Committee. It would ensure the deliverability of the highway infrastructure.

A Member asked what would happen if the developer went out of business.

The Regulatory Services Manager responded that the Section 106 is legally binding on Gladmans and the landowners. Should another developer or landowner come forward they would take on the section 106 and all conditions would transfer to them.

A Member noted that if the application should be approved they wanted to see it developed to a very high standard as the site is very visible on the way in to Melton Mowbray.

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

**DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to:  
Completions of an agreement under s106 securing the following, as set out in the report:**

- **Strategic road contribution - £4,500,000**
- **Sustainable transport/bus contribution - £500,000**
- **Travel Packs and Bus Passes**
- **A Framework Travel Plan monitoring fee - £11,337**
- **Education - £531,035**
- **Police - £176,834**
- **Civic amenity site - £42,983**
- **Libraries - £15,690**
- **Employment Opportunities**

**Conditions as set out in the report, the precise wording delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services**

**For the following reasons:**

**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 scheme also makes a substantial contribution to transport infrastructure and associated mitigating measures. The balancing issues of highways impact, development of a greenfield site in the countryside and some impact upon residential amenity, are considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the surrounding built form, layout and opportunity for landscaping.**

---

- 
- (2) **Reference: 15/00866/FULHH**  
**Applicant: Mr T Pruce**  
**Location: The Shires, 26 Church Lane, Long Clawson, Melton Mowbray LE14 4ND**  
**Proposal: Proposed internal and external alterations to existing bungalow with associated detached garage.**

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that: Application may appear routine at face value but there is the added complication of the s52 agreement relating to the site, dating back to when the exiting bungalow was first built. The conventional aspect of this development requires a judgement on the merits of the proposal in the normal way – the impact on the adjacent neighbour and passers by, bearing in mind a public footpath passes the site.

We consider the design entirely appropriate in that it is in keeping with the dwelling etc. the residential amenity issues are a little more difficult because the garage would occupy for all intents and purposes the full width of the garden it

abuts (no 28)

However no 28 has a long garden, is elevated higher than the site and has a panoramic outlook which extends far beyond (eastwards) the direction that the garage would interfere with, and through a combination of these factors it is considered that refusal could not be sustained.

The s52 restricts “the use of the driveway to use as a public footpath and for private vehicular access to the development and for no other purpose” (page 9). We have taken legal advice on this matter and advised that this does not preclude the proposed extensions and garage - the access would continue to be used for access to the development, and no other use of it is proposed.

Finally a note on recent correspondence that may cause confusion: The application is for residential development and does not include a change of use. This does not justify the development as such and it still needs to be judged for its size, shape and appearance in the usual way.

The comparison with permission Planning application 11/00752/REM has been incorrectly conveyed to you in that this application remains in abeyance, it is not granted as claimed and does not create a ‘fall back’ as stated

(b) Melanie Steadman, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that: she was speaking on behalf of residents of Church Lane.

- It is essentially a 17ft high concrete block which will block neighbours views.
- Its height is to achieve a car lift.
- Unreasonably long.
- Industrial in size.
- Out of keeping with surroundings and out of place in a residential setting.
- Visually intrusive.
- Dominate public footpath and visible from other public aspects.
- Potential for noise pollution.
- Overbearing and disproportionate.
- Major harm to neighbouring properties.

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

- It is an enhancement of an existing dwelling.
- Application amended to include hipped roof.
- Not out of proportion.
- It's for pursuing hobby.
- Revised drawing differs from one presented at the site visit.
- Not out of proportion with residential curtilage.
- Close to boundary - does not overlook or overshadow neighbours.
- 900m off boundary



- Residential amenity is not compromised.
- Significant change in floor levels.
- Separation distance of 34 metres which is well in excess of the minimum.
- Continuing line of built form.
- Loss of view not a material consideration.

A Member asked about the 3 metre height distance between the existing garage.

The Head of Regulatory Services explained the difference between the site levels and height levels.

The Head of Regulatory Services reminded Members that the onus to determine applications lies with the Council – it is not on applicants to justify their proposals. Site visits are informative and valuable when looking at the impact on surroundings. Officers consider the application acceptable due to the distances involved. The separation distances are larger than the minimum requirements and the plays would be unaffected by this.

A Member noted that the purpose of the application is to carry out a hobby but asked if it could become a business.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that it would become a change of use application if they did use it for business. That would be dependent upon the exact nature and frequency of activity carried out.

A Member commented that it is un-neighbourly and asked if the garage could be converted into a house and be heightened if so.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that it would be a change of use application which would require planning permission.

**Cllr Chandler proposed approval of the application** with a condition added that there will be no business use. She noted that it is an un-neighbourly application but that there are no planning grounds to refuse the application.

The Chair advised that it is already part of condition 5.

Cllr Chandler noted she would like it emphasised.

**Cllr Simpson seconded** the proposal and noted that when people have hobbies items are often bought and sold. Depending on the volume of this would depend on whether it could be considered a business.

The Chair confirmed it will be checked if concerns are raised.

A Member mentioned that the access road should always be available and the applicant should make sure vehicles coming and going are not restricting its use.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that there is a footpath and a road to house.

A vote was taken. 7 Members voted for approval and 3 Members voted against

**DETERMINATION: Approve in accordance with the report, subject to the amendment of condition no 5 as follows:**

*The garage hereby permitted shall be used solely by members of the household of the host dwelling or their dependants for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and it shall not be sold, leased or disposed of separately from the main dwelling, nor be used for any business purposes.*

**For the following reasons:**

The proposed development lies within the village envelope of Long Clawson and thus benefits from a presumption in favour of development under policies OS1 and BE1. It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on either residential amenity or the streetscene and satisfactory access and parking can be provided within the site, and as such meets the objectives of policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan. The continued residential use of this area would not encroach upon the undeveloped countryside and a refusal on this basis could not be justified. Counsel advice has shown that the proposed development is not within the scope of the Section 52 Agreement, and therefore the proposed development is considered to comply with the development plan and the NPPF

- 
- (3) **Reference: 16/00120/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mrs Burnham & Mrs Benzie**  
**Location: 34 Main Street, Thorpe Satchville**  
**Proposal: Removal of existing garage and driveway, construction of two bedroom dwelling with new driveway and garage.**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

A further representation had been received stating: "I live in the village next to Thorpe Satchville and would support this application as there is a shortage of smaller affordable houses in the area".

The application is located in Thorpe Satchville which is not considered to be a sustainable location for development. Any future occupant would need to rely heavily on the use of a car for the everyday needs and services.

We are concerned about the design in terms of its compatibility with the

surrounding street scene.

The access, is not ideal but we consider it justified because it is better than that exiting for the garage, so whilst poor is considered to be no worse than at present.

The main issue however is considered to be the tension between sustainable development and the attractiveness of a smaller house type. This creates a balance between two competing objectives and the reason we consider the former should prevail – therefore refusal is recommended – is that it forms the key objective of the NPPF that is intended for all planning decisions to follow. The benefits of a smaller house type are limited.

(b) Mrs Sandy Johnson, on behalf of Twyford and Thorpe Satchville Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Fully supportive of the application.
- It is in a sustainable location
- Will be in character.
- Improved turning area.
- No increase in on street parking.
- In addition to road safety aspect, a horse box which is regularly parked slows the traffic.
- Opposite a bus stop.
- Good schools nearby.
- Twyford is close by with amenities.
- If the village doesn't grow it can't remain sustainable.

A Member expressed concerns regarding the access and egress of vehicles due to restricted visibility.

Mrs Johnson responded that there is a slight rise in the road but it is straight.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that the Parish Council had recently objected to another house in the village due to unsustainability.

Mrs Johnson commented that she couldn't recall the previous application or advocate an objection towards it.

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

- There is significant local support.
- In accordance with the development plan.
- Thorpe Satchville is set within a cluster of villages.
- NPPF- consideration to the environment.
- Shortfall of smaller homes and it will provide an opportunity for a new family to come in to the village or an existing one to down size.
- Communities should flourish.
- Highways not supportive of intensification between houses but agreed

with the reduction of on street parking.

Members raised concerns regarding manoeuvring in to the parking space on the property and also asked if the bricks would blend in to the surrounding buildings.

Mr Cooper admitted the parking would be tight but hoped that the residents would reverse on to the drive. There will be two parking spaces. One in the garage and the other in front. The bricks will be similar to existing buildings.

(d) Joe Orson, Ward Councillor for Old Dalby, on behalf of the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Welcome and encourage housing in to the ward.
- Lowest rates of households with children of age 0-4.
- Widespread support from local residents.
- Immediate neighbours welcome the development.
- Highways have commented that the application represents an improvement compared to previous access.
- Reinstate original access which doesn't need approval.
- Increase in visibility splays.
- Thorpe well served by own amenities as well as surrounding villages.
- One house. Limited harm. 2 bed house is much needed.
- Benefit to wider community.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented in response to Mr Coopers comments that officers haven't recommended refusal just due to location. Officers have recognised that more than one factor is present and the application was considered in the balance of the issues.

**Cllr Cumbers proposed approval** and added that it fits in with area and the overall the gain outweighs the harm. The village is sustainable enough.

**Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal.**

**Cllr Holmes proposed deferral** of the application due to the road safety.

**Cllr Botterill seconded** the proposal to defer for the same reason as Cllr Holmes and commented that he would support it if a parking facility behind the building was added.

The Head of Regulatory Services referred to page 5 of the report and commented that it would be superior to what is there at present.

A Member commented that they shouldn't go against Highways advice but has concerns regarding relying on parked vehicles to slow traffic down. On a return visit there were no parked vehicles and the traffic was going too fast. Concerns regarding being ability to reverse in to the parking space.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that there is probably just enough space to adjust the design to make a turning space and that could be added to the condition.

A Member commented that there is already an existing garage and they hadn't heard of any accidents there.

A Member asked for clarification of the proposals adverse impact.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the design doesn't fit with the street scene.

A Member offered their support for the application and commented that Thorpe Satchville needs houses of this size. There are amenities nearby. A turning point on the front would alleviate the problem.

The Chair informed Members that they would be voting on the proposed amendment to the recommendation due to the need for better access.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted for the amendment and 4 Members voted against.

7.48pm Meeting adjourned. 7.52pm Meeting Reconvened.

The Chair informed the Members that they would now vote on the motion regarding the proposed deferral.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted for the deferral and 4 Members voted against.

**DETERMINATION: Defer, to invite consideration of the inclusion of turning facilities within the proposal.**

- 
- (4) **Reference: 16/00025/FULL**  
**Applicant: Mr and Mrs Howard**  
**Location: White House Farm, 33 Main Street, Holwell**  
**Proposal: Full planning consent for the demolition of existing storage barn, construction of new 2 bedroomed house with home office involving conversion of existing out-buildings and enclosure of existing swimming pool.**

- (a) The Planning Officer stated that: This application seeks permission for the demolition of existing storage barn, construction of a 2 bedroomed 2 storey dwelling involving the conversion of existing out-buildings and the enclosure of existing swimming pool.

The application is located in Holwell which is not considered a sustainable location for development. Any future occupant would need to rely heavily on the use of a car for the everyday needs and services.

The site is set back from the road and well screened. The site neighbours the Manor House which is a listed building.

The agent has made reference to the demolition of the existing agricultural building and swimming pool enclosure being positive to the setting of the listed building.

It is acknowledged that the buildings are both large scale and discordant features which are damaging to the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building, however the positive change could be achieved just by the removal of these features without the additional dwelling.

There are no updates to the report

It is considered that the impact on the nearby listed building and conservation area is insufficient reason to depart from the guidance given in the NPPF on sustainable development in this location and would be contrary to the core planning principles contained within paragraph 17 of the NPPF .

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

(b) Miles Howard, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- He and his family have lived in Holwell for 15 years and wish to downsize due to grown up sons leaving home.
- Low carbon and energy efficient.
- Active role in the community.
- Existing house is 5 bedrooms so it will attract another family to the village.
- Supported by the Parish Council.
- Solar slates in a conservation setting.
- Wants to work from home. High speed broadband cuts down the need to travel for work.
- Removal of asbestos barn which is damaging to conservation area and setting.
- Designed to match the form.
- Reflects and respects surrounding area.
- Within the village envelope.
- Replacement of detrimental feature.
- This enhances a listed building and enhances the setting of the manor house.
- No objections from neighbours.

A Member asked if there is a bus service.

Mr Howard responded it is ½ mile walk to the cross roads where the bus stop is. There is also a bus stop in Ab Kettleby.

(c) Cllr Joe Orson, Ward Cllr for Old Dalby, was invited to speak and stated that:

- No objections. It has actually received support.
- High speed broadband in hamlets is encouraging people to work from home.
- Near doctors in long Clawson.

**Cllr Holmes proposed moved approval** of the application and added the applicant is integrated in to the village and should be admired for wanting to stay there. It is vitally important that there are more smaller houses. A new family coming in to the village is a benefit.

**Cllr Botterill seconded .**

Several Members expressed their support and commented that the benefits of the application outweigh the harm and it is an enhancement of a listed building.

The Head of Regulatory Services asked if Members wanted to delegate the conditions to officers or prescribe themselves.

Cllr Holmes, the proposer, agreed to delegate to officers and added that the home proposed is going to be green and harmonise with the village.

A vote was taken. The Members voted to unanimously to approve the application.

**DETERMINATION: Approve, subject to conditions, the details of which were delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services for the following reasons:**

**On balance, the harm of the unsustainable location is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of establishing a dwelling and the enhancement of heritage assets. Para 132 of the NPPF states that “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation” and adds weight to the balance of the issues towards Conservation.**

**The proposed conversion and extension would be sympathetic to the visual appearance of the building and surroundings and would be satisfactory in terms of residential amenity, highway safety and ecology.**

8.08pm Cllr Baguley left the meeting due to declaring an interest in application 15/01016/OUT.

---

(5) Reference: 15/01016/OUT

---

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Mr Stephen Lee</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Easthorpe Lodge, Manor Road, Easthorpe</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Demolition of domestic outbuildings and the erection of 9 dwellings, garage block and associated infrastructure. All matters reserved except for access from Manor Road and green Lane.</b>

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks outline permission for the demolition of domestic outbuildings and the erection of 9 dwellings, garage block and associated infrastructure. All matters are reserved except for access from Manor Road and Green Lane.

The application is located in Easthorpe, the site itself is within close proximity to Bottesford and therefore considered an appropriate location for development, with easy access to services.

This relationship was demonstrated in a previous appeal decision at Manor Farm Easthorpe where the inspector concluded that in this particular case it was his view that the development need not lead to undue reliance on the use of the private car when a range of facilities and public transport links are conveniently placed. As such he considered the proposal to be in a reasonably sustainable location and that in this regard it would not offend against the thrust of national planning policy on this issue.

The site is currently a residential garden with no presumption in favour of development, however the proposal does include 4 affordable dwellings which equates to a 44% mix.

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

There are no updates to the report

It is considered that, on balance of the issues, there are significant benefits from this proposal when assessed under the NPPF in terms of housing supply and affordable housing in particular.

The balancing issues are considered to be development of a greenfield site and the shortcomings in the sustainability of the location.

The former is considered to be of limited harm, bearing in mind its location and the absence of any identification that it is of particular heritage or landscape value and the latter because of the proximity to Bottesford.

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



**Cllr Chandler proposed approval** of the application and added that it would be a great addition to the housing stock of Bottesford. The homes in the stable block will be affordable. There have been concerns about traffic but no problems have been noted.

**Cllr Botterill seconded** the proposal and added that it is a beautiful site with well developed with gardens. Smaller dwellings are needed.

A Member expressed their support and commented they are looking forward to seeing reserved matters.

A vote was taken. The Members present for this application voted unanimously to approve the application.

**DETERMINATION: Permit, in accordance with the recommendations in the report, for the following reasons:**

**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 are considered to be development of a greenfield site and the shortcomings in the sustainability of the location. The former is considered to be of limited harm, bearing in mind its location and the absence of any identification that it is of particular heritage or landscape value and the latter because of the proximity to facilities in Bottesford.**

8:14pm Cllr Baguley returned to the meeting.

- 
- (6) **Reference: 16/00113/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mr And Mrs LMA Griffiths**  
**Location: Church Farm, 22 Back Lane, Stonesby LE14 4PT**  
**Proposal: Alterations and conversion of existing outbuildings to create a new dwelling house.**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

The application is similar to the previous applications on the agenda but differs because the heritage benefits are greater : restoration of a listed building and removal of a structure that is a major blight on the setting of a key listed building in the village. On the balance of the issues this is considered to justify the proposals.

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

- Reusing a disused building and will enhance the setting.

- Significant enhancement to the area.
- Removal of a large Dutch barn, will allow sweeping views of the Grade II listed church.
- Unsustainability issues can be outweighed by the benefits.
- The one objection received has now been withdrawn.
- There is evidence of bats and as long as there is no adverse impact on the bats or it can be mitigated then there is no issue.

**Cllr Wyatt proposed approval** of the application and added that it will be good for the village, the church and the existing house.

**Cllr Botterill, Ward Councillor for Croxton Kerrial, seconded** the proposal and commented that it will enhance the village.

Members expressed their support and commented that farming is no longer sustainable and barns are being taking down.

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

**DETERMINATION: Approve, subject to:**

- (a) The receipt of an ecological survey that does not give rise to issues requiring further consideration and ;
- (b) conditions as set out in the report

**For the following reasons:**

**The harm of the unsustainable location is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of establishing a dwelling and the enhancement of heritage assets. Para 132 of the NPPF states that “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation” and adds weight to the balance of the issues towards Conservation.**

**The proposed conversion and extension would be sympathetic to the visual appearance of the building and surroundings and would be satisfactory in terms of residential amenity, highway safety and ecology. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.**

D92. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.21pm