



MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

28 July 2016

PRESENT:

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

Solicitor to the Council (VW), Head of Regulatory Services (JWo), Regulatory  
Services Manager (PR)  
Planning Officer (LP), Administrative Assistant (LR)

---

PL16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

PL17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

PL18. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 7 July 2016

Cllr Holmes asked if page 45 had been amended. Cllr Simpson, Cllr Higgins. – pat has words.

**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.

PL19. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 15/00832/OUT  
**Applicant:** Mr And Mrs Christie/ Planit-X- Mr Colin Wilkinson  
**Location:** Field No 4862 Glebe Road Wymondham  
**Proposal:** Outline planning application for up to 15 dwellings, access included

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

Deferred from 7th July to allow for:

- Greater detail on design and layout
- Clarification of the road safety aspects and
- To request a reduction in the number of houses

Applicants have responded by providing graphics as to how the site could look when developed.

They have also provided an explanation of their view of the road safety impacts and the benefits that would be secured by providing a footpath, and in addition offering to fund a traffic calming feature for Stapleford Road.

Finally, they have not amended the application but expressed their willingness to accept a condition limiting the no. to 12. This is feasible because it is an outline application and for up to 15 houses

Our view is that this strengthens the merits of the application and the balance of the issues towards granting permission further.

- (b) Oliver Baker, on behalf of Wymondham and Edmondthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee to the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that

- Plan has been widely praised by Melton planning team. Site has been assessed along with 8 other sites.
- The site is not well harmonised with surroundings and is far from existing facilities.
- Glebe road is narrow and cannot be widened. The exit onto Melton Road is a dangerous blind spot.
- An increase in traffic would be dangerous, have a letter from the school which supports this.
- The site is suboptimal and unsafe. Emerging plan – must be well sited and safe. This is not. Please reject application.

Cllr Chandler commented with regards to the pace of the neighbourhood plan , that the 6 week consultation period is currently only in week one,

therefore plan has not been approved by the village. Oliver Baker agreed.

(c) Mark Wesson, objector, was invited to speak. Rosemary Tildsley requested to speak as a substitute in his absence. Members agreed.

- NPPF paragraph 14 states that benefits must outweigh adverse impact.
- Site is not integrated well with the village, located far from centre of the village.
- Risk to children due to blind junction.
- No traffic or parking survey carried out.
- The elevated position of the site changes the character of the village and surrounding countryside. Spoils view and encroaches on nearby playing field.
- Fails NPPF on adverse impacts. Contrary to old local plan. Contrary to Policy H7.
- Six sites were assessed by residents – three were chosen, Glebe Road was sixth and last. The local community is angry that their views may be ignored. Please refuse this application.

Cllr Holmes asked whether the objector had spoken to the majority of the village as they are speaking on behalf of the local community. Rosemary Tildsley confirmed that she had.

(d) The Agent for the applicant was invited to speak. Colin Wilkinson requested for three speakers to share one 3 minute slot. Members agreed.

Colin Wilkinson stated that

- In line with the planning committee's wishes from the last meeting, the applicant has reduced the scale of homes from 15 to 12 and has offered to fund a gate feature on Glebe Road.

David Cummins, of ADC Infrastructure with regards to highways stated that

- 1 car every 6 minutes – 2 extra cars passing school during peak time.
- Pinch point relatively new to ensure slowing down. Will act as traffic calming feature helped by gateway enhancement offered by developer.

Tom Hazleton of Hazleton Homes stated that

- Have vast amount of experience and know the importance of design in village settings.
- Housing design – intention for scale and architecture to reflect old

- village. No adverse impact to surrounding landscape.
- External walls are to be ironstone which is prevalent throughout area.

Colin Wilkinson

- Officers have recommended approval
- Scale has been reduced as requested
- No objections from highways.

Cllr Botterill enquired whether it would be the applicant's intention to put in ground source heating for these units. Colin Wilkinson responded that this had not been considered yet.

Cllr Glancy enquired with regards to the proposed mix of houses. Colin Wilkinson responded that the application is currently in outline stage however the officer's recommendation relates to a mix of housing.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that until there is a Neighbourhood Plan it doesn't affect this site. Must consider this site on its own merits. Neighbourhood plan shortly to reach its conclusion - published 5<sup>th</sup> July, in pre-submission consultation until 30<sup>th</sup> August, then has to be submitted to the council for vetting – local authority publicity period is another 6 weeks. Can also go to referendum. To clarify, there are several stages and this application is just beginning it's first. Will not reach conclusion for a considerable time.

With regards to the school opposing an increase in traffic, it must be considered whether a 2-3 car increase significant, and would it result in severe road safety conditions.

With regards to taking the neighbourhood plan into account, the first speakers gave selective quotes from the plan. Not yet in the stage of receiving objections.

With regards to the second speaker's comments reference the site being on elevated and on best quality land, the land is actually a3 land of stark quality.

The comment that this application does not meet the vision of affordable housing is wholly correct.

Cllr Illingworth commented for clarification that condition 2 relates to the provision of affordable housing.

Cllr Holmes expressed concerns over twelve houses and ten movements of cars, do others walk? Still think road is dangerous. If approved would like to see less houses.

Cllr Baguley stated that the design is nice, and a reasonable proposal for a

village. The twelve houses are nicely laid out with features relevant to the village. The development will improve Wymondham and fulfil housing needs. Do have slight concern over the road however. **Propose to permit the application.**

Cllr Botterill **seconded the proposal to permit** with the condition of ground source heating. The Head of Regulatory Services stated that conditions must be a necessity in order to be added.

Cllr Glancy expressed a dilemma over the specified 10 journeys – wouldn't 12 houses mean a potential of 24 journeys? Would also like to see a mixture of housing. Rock and hard place with Neighbourhood Plan. If we don't approve the application do not think we would win at appeal.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that a mixture of housing would be reserved matters.

Cllr Simpson asked for the Head of Regulatory Services to elaborate with regards to page 10, referring to section 38 agreement regarding footpath. The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the path is within highway land.

Cllr Simpson commented that the indicative plan is not as dense as many we do see, makes it more attractive development. Stone design fits well with village. Have not got 5 year land supply. Must support approval as not good enough reasons to refuse.

Cllr Chandler commented with regards to the neighbourhood plan that she was saddened with this situation, village has done a plan and now seems that council being disrespectful towards that. We are not following policy.

A vote was taken. **10 voted to permit the application.** Cllr Douglas abstained from the vote.

**DETERMINATION: Approved as per recommendation**

- 
- (2) **Reference: 16/00184/OUT**  
**Applicant: Mr J T Orson / Fairhurst Consultancy:**  
**Location: North Lodge Farm Longcliff Hill Old Dalby**  
**Proposal: Outline planning approval for the development of 20 dwellings**

Members were asked if they were if prepared to waive standing orders due to there being 4 objectors present. Cllr Holmes proposed to waive standing orders, seconded by Cllr Botterill. A vote was taken. Members voted 9-1.

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

The application is for outline planning permission for the erection of 20 residential dwellings, with a range of house types and sizes, including bungalows and some smaller units.

This application relates only to the approval of the access with all other matters being reserved.

The application site is located in Old Dalby and whilst within very close proximity the site is not physically attached to the existing built up part of the village and located outside of the village envelope.

It is considered that the main issues relating to the application are

Impact upon the character and appearance of the area  
Impact upon services and sustainability  
Impact upon highway safety

Whilst outside of the village, this scale of development is considered to be acceptable in a village of this size.

The application is required to be considered by the Committee due to the level of representations received.

There is no specific landscape designation and the proposal is reasonably well related to the village, screened in the main by existing vegetation, forming a natural extension to the village lying close to existing dwellings.

The local highway authority have assessed the proposal and are satisfied subject to additional information being received that the access is safe.

Since the agenda was printed 5 additional letters of representation have been submitted which make reference to

- Level of development within the village
- Impact on wildlife
- Impact on services
- Traffic and parking

These points have been raised and discussed within the committee 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 the site is of particular heritage or

landscape value and the latter because whilst the level of services available are by no means optimum, the site is considered to perform reasonably well in terms of access to facilities and transport links in the immediate vicinity and the added benefit of a modest range of additional services in Nether Broughton and Long Clawson.

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

(b) Cllr Duncan Bennett of the Parish Council was invited to speak and stated that

Procedural question before minutes started, ward/ borough council cannot speak.

- With regards to the road, the site visit was scheduled during the school holiday so would not be an accurate reflection of traffic. Road outside school gate on Longcliffe Hill is a very busy road. Members of public put cones out on the road to deter parking. Agricultural contractor works at the top of the hill, meaning that large vehicles frequently come down Longcliffe Hill. drives, Farm, vehicles have hit houses in past. Housing needs – tenants of affordable housing giving up due to expense, prepaid meters have to go to asfordby.
- Sustainability – what is it, long as piece of string. Fairhurt said that old Dalby has an optician but it does not. No shop, poor bus, small village hall.
- 58 / 39?? already permitted in Queensway, 80 in pipeline plus this 20. Total 158 houses. Scarcely sustainable before wont be now. Rural landscape will suffer. Os2 local plan -, government plan no 14 if benefits outweigh impact then it must be passed. Cumulative impact is important and is what concerns parishioners.

Cllr cumpers – prepaid meters – suggesting people have to have prepaid meters?

d.b – no, but people in sheltered housing, do not have transport, perhaps on low income, no post office in old Dalby.

Cllr Holmes asked how long since there was a shop in old Dalby. Duncan Bennett confirmed five years ago to memory.

Cllr Glancy asked if the parish council treat Queensway and old Dalby as one entity. Duncan Bennett clarified that the area is one parish of three hamlets, adding that there are no facilities in Queensway except a scout hut.

Cllr Botterill commented that a result of all these new houses it might encourage more facilities in the future, only way can see villages becoming more sustainable in future is via new housing. Duncan Bennett responded that this was a hope of the parish council but not reality.

(c) Dr S.A Taylor, objector, was invited to speak and stated that

- Have provided members with statement of opposition plus photographs.
- Houses will cause harm to Old Dalby. All frameworks say it, and a significant number of residents agree. Harm should be balanced against benefits – cannot see the benefits.
- Can see no basis for claiming that the application meets sustainability criteria.

(d) John Harper, objector, was invited to speak and stated that

- There are many residents in opposition to this application and the combined effect of numerous applications that have been approved.
- Report states that old Dalby has good transport links and employability, local residents disagree.
- 39 houses in Queensway – Cllr Orson previously emailed residents stating it would be advisable to start petition based on a lack of sustainability. Reinforced this point 12 months ago at committee.
- Transport – 2 hour bus service, does not run early am, pm or Sundays, doesn't always show up. No shops.
- Education – 12 vacancies in school but this is the same number quoted in previous applications.
- Affordable housing is a benefit of this application, however unaffordable as not in sustainable location.
- This is a greenfield site, previous applications have been on brownfield sites.

(e) Simon Proffitt, objector, was invited to speak and stated that

- Fully support the need for housing.
- Not directly affected by the Longcliffe Hill application, however feel application should be rejected because of increase of traffic on Longcliffe Hill. The area is already heavily congested with cars both moving and parked, which is compounded during school time.
- Highways report only seems to consider entrance and exit onto development.
- Rapid increase in housing not sustainable. 68 houses for next decade or so in old Dalby for next 10 years – this could set a precedent.



Cllr Botterill enquired as to what is the accident record on Longcliffe Hill for the past 5 years. Simon Proffitt asked Duncan Bennett, who confirmed that there was no record of any serious accidents.

(f) Mr D Wade, objector, was invited to speak and stated that

- Currently live on Longcliffe Hill which is most affected by the increase in traffic.
- Built house four years ago on Longcliffe Hill, road is so narrow that a tractor bounced off the kerb and took the scaffolding down.
- Applicant has previously sent police to my house for parking a transit van on side of the road as it is narrow.
- LCC Highways resurfaced road three years ago, traffic on road will increase, cost to taxpayer to maintain.
- No footpath for children/ school.
- If mindful to pass this application please add conditions for existing sewers / road condition. Developer should pay for bad effects on that road.

Cllr Holmes agreed with the point raised with regards to the condition of the road.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated for clarification with regards to school places that the education department have done it from cumulative effect point of view.

(g) Maurice Fairhurst, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The site is on low lying land around the village next to existing footpath.
- Mixture of housing including affordable.
- Previous appeal decisions prove to members that council needs to increase housing
- The social, economic and environmental benefits of the site are not outweighed by negative impacts.
- New housing is not visually obtrusive as it is set back.
- The existing hedges are to be retained and supplemented on completion.
- Excellent accessibility to amenities including the church, school, pub, cricket pitch and bus stop. Asfordby and Long Clawson are both nearby.
- Substantial employments opportunities within 1km of the site.
- Do accept that the bus services are not frequent however an increase of people in the village would increase the amount of bus services.
- New access from Longcliffe Hill and new pedestrian point to be added. \* Highways agrees with conditions, applicant is happy to comply with these conditions.
- Officers report concludes recommendation to permit.
- In relation to the Parish Council's comments – this development is self

contained, objections from residents relate to the highway network and not the site itself, particularly inadequacy of Longcliffe Hill, if highway authority felt they needed to be improved it would be said.

- With regards to having no optician in the area as stated in the report – councils survey april 2015 table in back of doc. Pub and restaurant balances lack of optician.
- Queensway – appeal decision, planning permission was originally refused, appeal inspector said acceptable , that means this site must be sustainable as so much closer to facilities than Queensway.

Cllr Cumbers asked with regards to the mixture of housing, what they would be likely to be, how many and how big. Maurice Fairhurst confirmed that they expected to provide 2 bed bungalows 3 bed and 2 bed and 4 bed houses. 8 affordable out of 20, some for rent and some for sale. However currently outline application, if permission is granted will do more work on details.

Cllr Holmes asked whether the applicant was totally happy with the proposed entrance – is it the right one, it is on a corner. Maurice Fairhurst responded yes and that visibility has been deemed adequate by the highways authority.

(h) Nick Cooper of HSSP Architects was invited to speak and stated that

- The layout principles have been specifically developed.
- Highways access provides maximum visibility both for traffic exiting and traffic travelling along the road.
- The suggested layout considers immediate neighbours, the houses are set back.
- No reason for urban design features to not be used in this side of the village.
- Buffer planting, hedgerows, ecological pathway. Site addresses all requirements to statutory consultees.
- With regards to traffic – it's a school in a village so why would there be an increase in traffic.

Cllr Chandler addressed officers that sustainability and the number of houses granted permission are the main problems for objectors – what is the running total of what has been approved? The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that the total was 58, 39 coming from the appeal decision, 15 and 4. There is also another application for 25 on books behind existing 15, this application which is for 20, plus another application for 55.

Cllr Holmes **proposed to defer** the application as twenty houses is too many coming off that corner, especially in frost. Farm at top of hill which adds to potential road safety problems. Less houses would be more acceptable. The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the quantity of houses is not the issue, it is visibility.

**No seconder.**

Cllr Simpson commented that the site does not look too dense. Think applicant should review traffic, speed and parking issues. Fear nothing concrete enough to refuse application. **Propose approval.**

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

Cllr Chandler stated that she is not happy with application but unable to find a reason to refuse that would stand up at appeal. Concerned about number of houses and places in school.

A vote was taken. 10 voted to permit. Cllr Holmes abstained from voting.

**DETERMINATION: Approved as per recommendation**

---

- (3) **Reference:** 16/00164/COU  
**Applicant:** Mr M Mcdonagh / Heine Planning Consultancy:- Mrs Alison Heine  
**Location:** Field no. 4862, Glebe Road, Wymondham -- land off sandy lane/??/  
**Proposal:** Material change of use of land to mixed use to include siting of caravans for residential occupation with associated development (utility block, bio disc treatment plant, hard standing)

(a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that:

**Updates** - Additional information from the agent:

Unable to attend to speak – report fails to explain or justify reason for temporary planning permission ( it was due to some concerns about sustainability – happy to rec permanent).

Well related to facilities , recently extended gypsy site on Dalby Road is not appreciably closer to facilities in Melton Mowbray. Policy H21 does not preclude reliance on the motor car

Costs associated with developing a new site and re-instating .Could not afford to do this .

Would appeal against such a condition .

Complies with policy and meets an identified need and ask for support.

MBC - temp was to allow Local Plan to assess alternatives – but need is now;costs to app noted and will better sites ( location and numbers be found?)

## **The application**

This application seeks planning approval for the change of use of a paddock to be occupied as a private gypsy site for one family consisting of two mobile homes, two touring caravans, a shared utility block and a bio disc treatment plant. The existing access onto Sandy Lane would be utilised.

The parcel of land is triangular in shape with the western boundary bordering Sandy Lane and is well landscaped with mature hedges along all boundaries. The site lies approximately 1 kilometre south of Melton Mowbray

### **It is considered that the main issues relating to the proposal are:**

- **Whether the proposal is in line with Development Plan Policy and National Policy, promoting sustainable development**
- **Highway Safety**
- **Impact upon the Countryside**
- **Residential Amenity.**

**Policy** MBC has an undersupply of sites ( needs 5 more by 2017) ,has a requirement for pitches. This would contribute to that provision . Accords with H21 (although dated – look to Planning for Travellers Sites 2012) and BE1 and OS2.

Relatively unsustainable location ,but must be balanced against the need ( and now 2 perm pitches – last app only for 1 pitch) . Genuine need – applicants are gypsies and on roadside encampments .

**Highway Safety** – no objection ( but LCC concerns about sustainability )

**Impact upon countryside** – well screened and contained site. Very little impact likely

**Residential Amenity** – Quite remote location ,well removed from neighbours

No public objections/comments

Great Dalby PC - question sustainability

## **Conclusion**

It is acknowledged the site is not wholly sustainable and a previous application for use as a gypsy site for one family was refused; however this needs to be balanced with the requirement of the Borough for additional pitches and the length of time before the replacement Local Plan provides these sites. The benefits arising from the development are that it would contribute to the identified need for gypsy accommodation within the District and the site, although rural, can provide access to the town to health care and education facilities with little impact on the existing established communities. The site would also meet the specific personal circumstances of the applicant and his family and would avert the impact of eviction and an unsettled future.

The critical judgements for the Committee are therefore to, firstly, conclude on the significance of the adverse effects and, secondly, weigh them against the benefits.

The relatively unsustainable location and the introduction of a domestic use and the associated visual impact of this must be balanced with the Council's requirement to provide a satisfactory level of pitches, a need which is not currently being met and is not likely to be met imminently through the emerging Local Plan.

In this case the benefits are considered to be significant in terms of meeting overall need that is currently unmet and the family's particular requirements; accordingly the **recommendation is for approval.**

No registered speakers.

Cllr Botterill stated that if this development is to be sustainable it would need more caravans on it. For a permanent application would prefer to see more caravans. **Proposed deferral.**

Cllr Cumbers **seconded the proposal to defer**, adding that the application would be better if it was not just for one family.

The Regulatory Services Manager stated that he had visited the site, agree that the application is not utilising a large part of the site however the government encourage gypsies and travellers to find their own sites. Happy that this application meets an immediate proven need for the applicant's family. The site also has permission for horses/ stables. Could defer the application however gypsies and travellers have particular needs. Certain that's the case here, probably unwilling to extend to more caravans.

Cllr Cumbers **withdrew her vote to second the deferral.**

Cllr Botterill questioned why the site is suggested as a temporary site instead of permanent if this is the case.

Cllr Chandler stated that an application for a stable had already been permitted, would like to defer on basis of establishing whether horses will still be kept on

site. Report says nothing about horses.

Cllr Holmes commented that applicant must widen gate if permitted, narrow road. **Propose approval** for permanent application.

Cllr Illingworth stated that condition 5 of recommendation needs to be approved prior to commencement anyway.

Cllr Simpson **seconded the proposal to approve**. Would like to see further information– are stables going to be built. Would like to see passing places on outside. Also cycling route. Treatment plant in place prior to occupation on the site mentioned at beginning of report.

The Regulatory Services Manager stated that the biodisk plant referred to in description is not controlled by conditions, can add condition 7 for this to be installed before occupation. With regards to access – condition 5 approved by highways authority. With regards to passing places – highways authority have not requested them, has to be necessity.

Cllr Simpson commented that if the application is approved then entrance will need to be made bigger to accommodate trailers/ horse boxes etc.

Cllr Botterill enquired with regards to provision of water to the site. The Regulatory Services Manager responded that it may be possible to sink a bore hole, or connect to main supply if it exists. Cllr Botterill asked if this was conditioned, the Regulatory Services Manager confirmed that it was not but could be added as condition 8. Cllr Holmes confirmed she was happy to add the condition.

A vote was taken. Propose to permit. Unanimous.

#### **DETERMINATION: Approved with additional conditions (PR)**

---

- (4) **Reference: 16/00390/FULHH**  
**Applicant: Mr Joe Orson**  
**Location: Parsonage House 13 Paradise Lane Old Dalby**  
**Proposal: Proposed new entrance gates and brick piers**

(a) The Planning Officer stated that:

No updates to report

This application seeks planning permission for new entrance gates and brick piers at Parsonage House, Paradise Lane ,Old Dalby. The existing single wooden gate and wooden posts would be replaced by a pair of gates supported on brick piers and short lengths of curved wall, all at a height of about 1.7m,in approximately the same position as the existing gate.

The property is located within Old Dalby conservation area.

The application is required to be considered by the Committee as the applicant is a Member of Melton Borough Council.

It is considered that the main issue relating to the proposal is:

1.Impact upon the character of the area

2.Impact on highway safety

1.The walls and piers would be built in bricks to match the existing house. The details of the double gates remain to be agreed. The development is of a scale and location which clearly marks the entrance to the dwelling ,while not being over dominant .

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and is considered to comply with Policies OS1 and BE1 of the adopted Local Plan

2. The proposal would continue to use the existing vehicular access, with the new gates set further back from the road than the current gate.

It is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on access and associated highway safety.

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

- Parish council have no objection.

Cllr Holmes **proposed to approve** the application. Cllr Botterill **seconded the proposal to approve**.

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

**DETERMINATION: Approved as per recommendation.**

Cllr holmes left the meeting at 20.15.

## **(5) Updates**

### **APPLICATION 15/00942/OUT: 15 DWELLINGS AT ALLOTMENT GARDENS, BOYERS ORCHARD, HARBY**

#### **VILLAGE HALL CONTRIBUTION OFFER**

**Updates** – representations from :Ward Member ( Cllr Rhodes)  
: Member who moved that be granted ( Cllr  
Higgins)

In summary – Cllr Rhodes - that the request for £22,625 towards the village hall is reasonable and that offer of £5,000 should be rejected.

Cllr Higgins – £22,625 is reasonable – only £1,500 per dwelling . In detail read out email ( *see separate email* )

**Purpose** – to consider whether contribution of £5,000 towards new village hall is complaint with CIL Regulations . Options are at para 2.1

**Background** – 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016 Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission for up to 15 dwellings at Boyers Orchard subject to a S106 to secure a contribution to the village hall ( and other contributions which were set out in that report)

#### **Request for contribution**

Other developments in the vicinity have agreed to make a contribution towards the village hall and playground, on the basis of a calculation used by the Harby Village Hall Committee of Management. This calculation takes into account the amount of dwellings in Harby (415), the proposed number of new dwellings (15), showing that this represents an increase of 3.62% in the number of dwellings in the village. The estimated cost of a new village hall is £625,000.00, therefore 3.62% of the estimated cost would be £22,625.00. The request is therefore for £22,625.00 to be secured by a S106 agreement.

#### **Viability /developer**

The applicant has not stated that the viability of the proposal would be impacted by the request. No details have been submitted to suggest that a request for £22,625.00 would make the proposal unviable.

The applicant does not consider that the request for village hall funding is not CIL compliant(discussed below). The applicant also does not agree that the Village Hall Committee's calculation is the only way that the contribution could be calculated. They consider that the funding should be more widely drawn, and include contributions from all of the other dwellings in the village.



## **CIL compliance**

The request for funding for a new village hall for Harby is considered to be compliant with CIL Regulations 122 and 123 as detailed above. The method of calculation of the sum requested is considered to be fair and reasonable, and has been agreed as such by previous developers.

The Committee is invited to consider if the benefits of the scheme as outlined in the committee report attached are sufficient to overcome the shortfall in the requested funding by the Committee of Management for a new Village Hall in Harby. The requested sum being £22,625.00 against an offer of £5,000.00 representing a shortfall of £17,625.00

It is considered that the request for £22,625.00 is reasonable, and the applicant has not demonstrated that this would adversely affect the viability of the scheme to the extent that a contribution of this level would make the scheme unviable. As such, it is recommended that the committee request that the applicant enters into a S106 agreement to provide £22,625.00 towards the new village hall upon occupation of the final dwelling.

## **Rec – Para 2.1**

**If necessary :**

**Options – rec c) Require the full amount requested by the Harby Village Hall Committee of Management to be paid.**

**Proposed by Cllr Baguley and seconded by Cllr Cumbers to go for 2.1 of option c recommendation. Members voted unanimously in favour (minus Cllr Holmes).**

PL20. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.30pm.