



MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

07 January 2016

PRESENT:

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

Solicitor to the Council (VW), Head of Regulatory Services,  
Applications and Advice Manager (JW), Administrative Assistant (AS)

---

D61. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Holmes

D62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Simpson declared a personal interest in application 15/00873/OUT, Field OS 1712, Coston Road, Sproxton.

The Solicitor to the Council advised that Cllr Simpson could stay in the meeting and take part if she wished, as long as she didn't have a pecuniary interest in the application.

D63. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 9 December 2015

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Baguley and seconded by Cllr Simpson.

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

#### D64. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 15/00547/OUT  
**Applicant:** Mr And Mrs R Lee And Miss S Donnelly  
**Location:** Field No 7858, Melton Road, Long Clawson  
**Proposal:** Development of 10 private dwellings and public open space

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services presented again with more detail on drainage proposals associated with the site. He referred to the previously circulated applicant's clarification of drainage proposals on 23rd December.

He advised that there are no further updates to provide but Members have received a document outlining objections and concerns and he offered to answer any questions on that.

Cllr Cumbers asked if the culvert could be made bigger.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the danger with larger culverts is that water will rush more quickly and in greater quantities to the pinch points. The developers are proposing to put mechanisms in place to withhold water back rather than letting it flow as it does at the moment.

Cllr Chandler asked if the attenuation pond can hold the amount of water and noted that there are already problems in the area with surface water flooding.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that it is 450 square metres and it has been calculated rather than estimated. It has been examined by the Local Lead Flood Authority and they are satisfied with the content. It is an outline application and we would see the complete picture at reserved matters.

- (b) Melanie Steadman, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Not allowed to channel water on to your neighbours land according to an environmental law website.
  - It is clay land which makes the ground boggy and water retentive.
  - Existing unsolved problems with the drainage ditch which is undersized and culverted under the road.
  - SUDS proposal will not keep water on site for any significant length of time and they are relying on an inadequate pipe under the road.
  - Too many variable unknown quantities for this site and too many risk factors.
  - SUDS will need maintenance forever which will be a financial and resource burden.
  - No plans to do remedial works on current systems.

- (c) Mike Etchells, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:
- The government has conveyed the benefits of natural flood management.
  - Limited impact on the form and density of Long Clawson.
  - Not affecting the unique character of the village.
  - Community benefits – public open space, traffic calming, provides housing types required and makes contributions to local services, in particular additional school places.
  - Respects the existing ecological features.
  - Application by local land owner with a sensitive approach to the Borough's housing needs.
- (d) Cllr Byron Rhodes, Ward Councillor for Long Clawson and Stathern, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Difficult to consider as there is widespread concern regarding possible increased flooding.
  - New buildings don't increase the amount of water, they decrease the site area through which it can drain.
  - Impressed with applicants proposal for a flood attenuation scheme and this can only be beneficial as there is no additional water to dispose of.
  - We need additional housing.
  - Located on a good site.
  - The flooding issue will need to be approved by the lead flood authorities as part of the conditions for consent.
  - For these reasons not in opposition to the application.

Cllr Chandler commented that the report states that £29,000 will go towards education. However if the school reaches capacity, the County Council will pay to transport children to other schools within the vicinity. Parents expect their children to go to the village school.

Cllr Rhodes responded that due to the size of the development the numbers of primary school age children generated would be very small. He added that the primary school needs to have its capacity increased and his view is that a new primary school should be built.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that we are encouraged SUDS on some developments. There is a drainage hierarchy within national policy which promotes their use. Long Clawson school is projected to be over capacity anyway and this scheme would add to it. The £29,000 is its fair share of this breach of capacity. That would help solve the issues of the existing capacity and what this scheme would add to it.

A Cllr agreed with Cllr Rhodes regarding the much needed smaller houses within the Borough, however she did still have concerns regarding drainage and would like to see the full application at committee.

**Cllr Wyatt proposed to permit** on the grounds of the basic outline application.

**Cllr Faulkner seconded** the proposal based on the officer's recommendation.

A Cllr asked for clarification that it would come back to Committee with the full application and it was confirmed an arrangement would be made for this to happen.

Several Cllrs voiced their on going concerns regarding flooding however they felt more comfortable with supporting the proposal.

A Cllr added that the proposed traffic calming would be beneficial.

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

**DETERMINATION:**

---

- (i) **PERMIT, subject to the s106 agreement and conditions set out in the report, for the following reasons:**

**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, and the Highways Authority have identified the traffic calming as having benefit beyond that of the application itself. The balancing issues – development of a greenfield site and traffic generation—is considered to be of limited harm due to the small scale of the proposal 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, careful landscaping and bio diversity opportunities.**

- (ii) **That the resultant full or 'reserved matters' application is presented to the Committee for determination.**
- 

- (2) **Reference: 15/00902/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mr R Truswell**  
**Location: Field OS 3076, Goadby Road, Waltham On The Wolds**  
**Proposal: Change of use of land to use as a residential gypsy caravan site (maximum 6 caravans) with grazing for horses**

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that: It was a new application, similar to that is 2014, main difference is no. of caravans, reduced from 7 to 6.

A further consultation reply, from the Parish Council was received today: Waltham on the Wolds and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council to formally object to

this planning application. Their full grounds for objection were submitted on the previous application for this site ( ref 14/00065.)

In short due to there being minimal changes from the old application to the new one, logic would follow that the same objections stand. There seemed little point using public money again to complete such a comprehensive report as was previously submitted.

2 further letters of objection have been received :

One from a local resident reiterating the point that there is little change to this application, so previous reasons have not been overcome, and questioning why the application was submitted.

The other from rom Severn Trent, in their capacity of adjacent land owner rather than as utility provider – STW's previous objections remain. The proposal is also contrary to the new Travellers Policy because it is in an unsustainable and countryside location and these are not made good by other aspects of policy. It is also contrary to Local plan Policy H25

The applicants had submitted a Doctor's Letter along with a letter giving permission to make its content public. The Head of regulatory Services read the letter out in full, in which the applicant's health issues and care provision were explained.

He also read out a Statement from the applicant who could not attend tonight due to health reasons:

*My family and I are well known in the area and have travelled the lanes of Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire for over 30 years as part of our gypsy lifestyle. During this period we have become well known by the Local Authorities and been helped by them on occasion.*

*Recently my wife and I have started to suffer ill health, necessitating us to look at a more permanent location to base our caravans and live out our lives. We do this with regret having lived nomadically for many years. A report has been provided by the Local Authority to show our connection to the area. We therefore wanted to find a site within the area that we know and where we have an existing support network.*

*Our son and daughter and their families provide support for us with our health needs meaning that we live together as part of a larger family group. It is this fact that has informed the maximum number of caravans being included within the application as this provides the wider community with certainty that the site is for our sole use.*

*We are well known to Melton Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council through their Multi Agency Travellers Unit who have supported us with this application. Our health needs have also been assessed by the Specialist Nurse and Health Visitor for Travelling Families. A report is submitted with this application together with a letter from our Doctors in Waltham. Our health needs are therefore well known by agencies in the area providing us with continuity of care rather than needing to start afresh elsewhere.*

*It is for these reasons – our ties with the area from our travelling, and the support network we have already in place in the area – that we wish to site ourselves in this location for our remaining years. We have requested an application that is restricted to one generation to facilitate this and to give comfort to local people that the site is intended solely for us.*

Planning Policy has changed since 2014 in that new National Guidance was issued in August 2015. This is summarised on pages 4 and 5. It is similar in content to the previous policy guidance and an item by item assessment against this policy is made at pages 10 and 11.

The Main issues remain as previously – the benefits in terms of the supply of sites and to the applicant's personal circumstances, versus its limited sustainability credentials due to its location and impact on the appearance of the countryside. We consider, as we did in 2014, that the impact is limited (please note the application is proposing a relocation of the caravans to an area where they can be well screened), and the benefits to supply and to the personal circumstances of the applicant are significant. This is partly because the Policy tells us that "significant weight" should be given to land supply issues where there is a deficiency.

The Chair advised that Mr Mills could speak in two capacities as it was not outside of the Constitution. Mr Mills decided to address the Committee in one speech.

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

- This application doesn't address the original reasons for refusal.
- Only reduced the number of caravans and nothing else has changed.
- Should restrict and limit new traveller sites in open country side that are away from existing settlements.
- Should attach weight to brownfield, untidy, derelict land.
- Not well located to services.
- The proposed location is unsustainable with reliance on a car.
- Road is 60mph with no street lighting and no footpath.
- Kilometre from amenities.
- Site is not safe or sustainable for long term living.
- The existing trees are deciduous and there would be no screening from these for 5 months of the year.
- Circa 200 objections.
- Severn Trent have objected.

The Solicitor to the Council advised Members that there is on going enforcement action against the site. She re-emphasised that this is a separate issue and does not prevent determination of the application at this meeting.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that there is strict control regarding

travellers' sites as the Council have only ever allowed one site. It gains no credit for brownfield land as it is greenfield land. He reminded Members that they are required to balance positive aspects against negative aspects.

A Cllr raised concerns regarding the ability for emergency vehicles to access the site due to it being waterlogged.

A Cllr commented that it is not a suitable site. She actively supports the plight of travellers but it is a miserable site. The Doctors report didn't sound like a letter of support. Wheelchairs aren't going to be able to manoeuvre on such a muddy site.

**The Chair proposed refusal** of the application for the same reasons as when it was previously refused. There is not enough change to the proposal to overrule the previous decision. Concerns regarding the ability to negotiate the site in wheelchairs. The Chair also wished to add a rider regarding animal welfare on the site.

**Cllr Cumbers seconded** the proposal and added that the Council takes more responsibility to find suitable land for travellers.

The Chair agreed to the proposal and that the Council should be more proactive.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that it is a component of the local plan and is well in hand.

A Cllr commented that the advert regarding sites didn't include gypsies.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the adverts invited uses of all descriptions. We have also been approaching land owners and reviewing our own land holdings. We are proposing that new site revision is integral to the sustainable neighbourhoods in the area.

A Cllr commented that they didn't feel able to support refusal. It is temporary permission so the family can live their life out in the place they call home and it meets the personal circumstance of the applicant. It does benefit the identified need to provide gypsy areas.

A Cllr commented that it is a totally unsustainable site and it gets worse upon every visit. 2 acres would not be enough to sustain 6 horses especially with part of the land being used for living accommodation and getting rid of waste water and sewerage. Animal husbandry is a separate issue but should be of concern. There was no sign of straw for the horses. There is no footpath. Concerns regarding emergency vehicles access. There were difficulties for Members walking on the site visit.

A Cllr commented that it would be even wetter today due to the recent rainfall. It is not a suitable site for people with arthritis as it is damp. They should be on a better site with a hard surface, with the ability for emergency vehicles to access.

The Council have only ever arranged one travellers site. The horse numbers are greater than they should be. The grass is destroyed and there are potholes that fill with water.

A Cllr commented that there is no hard standing as they haven't got any planning permission to be there. Perhaps if the application was permitted there could be condition for them to put hard standing in place. The application has hardly changed since the previous one. The amount of horses allowed on the land should have been conditioned. A refusal is the correct option.

A Cllr commented that this would not fall under the traveller provision that the Council requires as this is only an application for a temporary site.

The Chair reiterated the reasons for refusal with an emphasis on the Parish Councils comments regarding the 60 mph speed limit, unlit roads and no footpath.

The Head of Regulatory Services noted the road safety points and commented that they had been included in the previous refusal but were implicit rather than explicit.

Cllr Cumbers confirmed she agreed to add the road safety points to the proposal for refusal and also recommended that more suitable sites are found.

A vote was taken. 8 Members voted in favour of refusal and 2 Members voted against.

**DETERMINATION: Refused, for the following reasons:**

**1. The site is considered to be in an unsustainable location. Though nearby, visits to Waltham are difficult and hazardous and likely to be taken by car and as such the location is not considered to be sustainable as a location for residential use of the nature proposed. The access is on a stretch of road which has fast moving traffic and its use would increase hazards to vehicles accessing the site and passing it on Goadby Road. The caravans are only partially screened by hedgerows and are readily visible and unsightly in the countryside and it is unlikely to reduce tensions between the settled and traveller communities. As such the proposal is contrary to policies OS2 and H21 of the Adopted Melton Local Plan, and the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites 2012 when read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework. The benefits in terms of meeting overall need that is currently unmet and the family's particular health considerations are not considered to be of such significance as to outweigh the significant and demonstrable adverse impacts identified above.**

**2. The proposed site is not suitable for the grazing of horses by virtue of its size and inability to accommodate horses with a satisfactory standard of**



grazing.

- 
- (3) **Reference:** 15/00585/FUL  
**Applicant:** Ashby Folville Land Trust  
**Location:** Land between 15 and 21 Folville Street, Ashby Folville  
**Proposal:** Demolition of derelict mushroom sheds and construction of four dwellings, gardens and parking

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of derelict mushroom sheds and the construction of four dwellings. The current building is to be replaced on a similar footprint to provide three 2 bed properties and one 3 bed property. The site adjoins the village envelope and sits within the designated Conservation Area. Since publication of the report comments have been received from County Archaeology who have advised that the application area occupies part of the projected medieval and post-medieval historic settlement core of the village and the site has the potential to have been occupied by structures prior to the construction of the present building. On that basis it is anticipated that the development area possesses a significant potential to contain significant buried archaeological remains. Whilst the application site has been previously developed to house the current mushroom sheds, it is unlikely that their construction will have removed all traces of previous settlement. On that basis, groundworks for the proposed residential development, including foundations, services and landscaping, will in all probability truncate or destroy any surviving archaeological remains. In addition to the buried archaeological remains the standing timber agricultural buildings are of some interest. Dating from the late 19th or early 20th century, the Mushroom Sheds are an unusual example of a building type not commonly found in Leicestershire, and owing to its construction methodology, liable to loss through a process of decay and demolition. The Archaeologist is not objecting to the proposal but has recommended that conditions requiring archaeological investigation and recording are imposed on any approval.

The main issue with regards to this application is that the proposal is located in an unsustainable village. However, the application would have benefits which include enhancements to the Conservation Area by demolition of the derelict sheds with the creation of well designed residential units. The proposal would also provide much needed small scale residential units and an enhancement to the vehicular access. The application requires a balance of issues and it is considered that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm of the unsustainable location in this instance. The application is recommended for approval as set out in the report with the addition of the requested archaeology conditions requested by the County Council.

(b) Alex Stroud, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- His family lived in the village for over 400 years.
- Support from the village, planning officers and highways.
- Flooding has been resolved.
- Village is category 3 status.
- 4 small units within the estate for renting purposes only.
- Sits within the conservation area and would be an asset.
- Would not create a precedent.
- Social cohesion.
- Attract young families.
- Help village prosper.
- Tidy up a scruffy part of the village.
- Demand for the properties already.
- Proposal is popular.

The Chair asked if there would be any restrictions regarding the occupants of the rental properties.

Mr Stroud responded that the properties would be open market but they would ideally like young people and families as occupants.

The Applications And Advice Manager confirmed that there is no section 106, so the dwellings may not forever remain as rental, as there are no restrictions and they are open market.

**Cllr Posnett proposed approval** of the application and commented that it is a wonderful, imaginative, well worth project.

**Cllr Simpson seconded the proposal** and commented that although it is classed as an unsustainable village, the project will enhance the village. The new houses are of a great benefit. She also asked for a condition to be added regarding the archaeological investigation as recommended by the Leicestershire County Council.

Cllr Posnett agreed to the condition being added to the proposal.

A Cllr commented that they support the application in an unsustainable location as it has small houses which are much needed and it is sympathetic to the conservation area.

A Cllr commented that it may lead to some sustainability for the village.

A Cllr commented that it is wonderful as it is not 5 bedroom detached homes. Villages need this type of housing and she hopes other villages follow suit.

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

**DETERMINATION: Approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the following reasons:**

**The proposal relates to the demolition of the current building and the erection of four dwellings. Although Ashby Folville is not a sustainable village the proposed scheme would have benefits including the enhancement of the Conservation Area, the creation of small scale residential units and the enhancement of the vehicular access. Furthermore, support from residents has been received for the proposal. The recommendation is very much 'on balance' with significant weight given to the issue of sustainable development through the NPPF. However, in this case the benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the sustainability issue. The proposal is also acceptable in terms of residential amenity, flood risk and highway safety and would safeguard the heritage assets.**

---

- (4) Reference: 15/00873/OUT**  
**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Britten**  
**Location: Field OSS1721, Coston Road, Sproxton**  
**Proposal: Outline application for one dwelling**

Cllr Simpson asked for confirmation if she could take part.

The Solicitor to the Council advised that Cllr Simpson's interest did not appear to be a pecuniary interest from the information she had provided and that it was her decision if she wished to take part.

Cllr Simpson remained in the meeting but confirmed she would not be taking part.

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks outline consent for the erection of a dwelling to provide security and help with the day to day running of an established tree service and ground maintenance business. The application is in outline with all matters reserved apart from the access. The site lies some distance from the nearest settlement of Sproxton in the open countryside.

Since publication of the report a further 5 letters of support have been received. The support letters do not raise any new issues which haven't been included within the report.

Comments have been received from the Parish Council who have stated that they are in support of the application

Parish Council - support the application: Whilst animal welfare is not a consideration at this site, the parish has seen a huge increase in isolated rural crime with farm and

rural machinery being a prime target for theft, leading to increases in insurance premiums and other anti-theft measures. Securing the premises by living on site is an understandable measure on the part of the Brittens.

The property would support an integrated and existing rural business which could offer employment to local people benefiting the Parish. The Parish would regret the loss of the business should they choose to move elsewhere to be able to live on site.

There would be little added pressure to infrastructure as the family already work within the area.

The property would not be detrimental to the landscape

Accessibility would not affect any other properties

A further letter has been received from the neighbouring Farmer stating that they farm the land below the wood yard and have a right of way through the wood yard to their field. The right of way has been in continuous use for the last 60+ years.

Paragraph 5.4 of the D&A statement refers to the frequent and irregular access for the neighbouring land owner, leading Mr Britten to have to open the gates onto Coston Road on demand. Special trips to the site have to be made if they are not on site. This is incorrect and should not form part of the 'functional test' for the requirement for a dwelling. The right of access should be unfettered and for use at all times. Recently Mr Britten has started parking a forklift across the entrance which is an illegal obstruction to the right of access to the field. The land owner holds a key to the gate, and prior to the forklift being parked across the entrance were able to unlock / lock the gates themselves without any assistance. The forklift causes distress gaining rightful access and is a poor and inadequate means of security for the wood yard. It attracts unwanted attention of would be intruders and suggests a lack of security on site. Proper security gates, security lighting, CCTV and trackers on machinery would be a far more effective means to deter theft.

In response to these additional comments it is considered that these matters have been addressed in the report. With regards to the right of access this is a private legal matter and the planning application would not remove any existing rights of access.

The proposal would represent the creation of a residential dwelling in an isolated location which is not considered to be sustainable. The applicants have applied for a dwelling for security and access purposes for the current business which operate on the site. It is not considered that security of tools and machinery is sufficient justification for a dwelling in the open countryside. The application has been assessed and it is not considered that proposal meets the functional and financial tests required to justify a dwelling in the open countryside. The dwelling would be some distance from Sproxton and is considered to be in an unsustainable location. Whilst it is noted that the application has received a good level of support it fails to demonstrate the essential need for a rural worker to live

at or near their place of work in the countryside and is recommended for refusal as set out in the report.

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

- The applicant has owned the field for more than 20 years.
- Field has been developed for business use with permission.
- The business provides 4 full time jobs and 2 part times jobs.
- There is currently a lack of presence and security on the site.
- On site accommodation will enable enhancements to the business.
- It will enable a young family to return to Sproxton.
- Received letters of support.
- Won't harm the views or amenity.
- Reduce traffic to and from the site.
- Secure sustainable economic growth.
- Rural worker to live at their place of work.
- Financial viability – less than current rental payments and would reduce travel costs therefore giving more confidence to invest in new equipment.

Cllr Cumbers asked if the family live locally.

Mr Fairhurst responded that the parents live in Sproxton. However their son and his family live quite a long way from the site and he has to travel every day. The son will be taking over the business eventually.

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

- He wished to express the importance to the community.
- Letters of support.
- Importance of businesses and jobs to our community.
- Bringing young families in will enhance village life.
- Loyal base of customers.
- Rural crime is a major issue. The site is vulnerable and has been broken in to several times.
- The business needs investment and would like to expand.
- No objection.

**Cllr Chandler proposed to permit** the application. She commented that the financial statement had caused concern, however on hearing the proposal she felt the application should be permitted but with a condition that the property was tied to the family business.

The Applications and Advice Manager said that it could be conditioned with similar wording to an agricultural tie if Members were happy to delegate the wording to officers.

Cllr Chandler commented that she would like the condition to withstand even if business was sold.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that this would be part of the condition.

**Cllr Botterill seconded** the proposal and commented that it is a good family business in the village. They will probably create more employment if the application goes ahead. The business will have more security to prevent crime.

A Cllr commented that rural businesses should be encouraged. Rural crime is an issue. The application has received a lot of support. It is a family business and a young family returning to the village will increase sustainability.

A Cllr commented that they couldn't support the application and they weren't sure how useful the condition would be, as the Council wouldn't make them tear it down if it wasn't used in this way.

The Applications and Advice Manager asked Cllr Chandler if she wanted any other conditions or reserved matters.

Cllr Chandler asked for it to come back to committee.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that they would normally impose reserved matters agreements at the outline application stage and asked if they wanted standard conditions delegating to officers.

Cllr Chandler confirmed that she did.

Cllr Botterill also confirmed agreement as seconder.

A Cllr asked how big the property will be.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that it is a reserved matter and would come in at that stage. She added that it is denoted on the application form as 4+ bedrooms, so it could be 4 or more. That is the only information we have received regarding the size and scale at present.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted for the proposal to permit and 3 voted against. There was 1 abstention. Cllrs Wyatt and Cumbers asked for their votes against the proposal to be recorded.

**DETERMINATION: Approved, subject to conditions requiring submission of details, landscaping, materials, access arrangements and limiting occupancy by persons connected with the business on the site only.  
For the following reason:**

**The dwelling would allow for supervision of the adjacent business and for its expansion, providing rural employment.**

---

**(5) Reference: 15/00823/FUL  
Applicant: Mr Ross Whiting  
Location: Eastcote, 91 Grantham Road, Bottesford  
Proposal: New vehicular entrance**

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks planning permission for a new vehicular access onto Grantham Road to serve one of two recently approved dwellings.

There are no updates to report.

The proposal relates to the provision of an additional vehicular access. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway safety and is considered to be visually acceptable. It is not considered to impact on residential amenities and is compliant with policy. Accordingly the proposal is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

(b) George Machin, Agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Members approved 2 detached dwellings on this site last year.
- Seeking approval for a new access point so each dwelling can have its own access rather than shared access.
- The Parish Council does not object and there are no neighbour objections.
- Highways support the application.
- The new boundary wall will allow the wall and access points to be screened.
- There will be new long lasting planting.
- Follows characteristics of the area, as the houses are set back with long driveways.

Cllr Wyatt asked for confirmation of the location of the wall.

Mr Machin responded that it is a frontage wall.

Cllr Wyatt asked for more information regarding if there will be a fence or hedge as depicted on the slides.

Mr Machin confirmed that it will be a fence no more than 1.8 metres tall.

Cllr Simpson asked why there weren't two entrances on the original application.

Mr Machin responded that the applicant bought the land with outline planning permission in place and that only had the permission for the shared driveway.

Cllr Chandler asked for clarification regarding the location of the fence.

Mr Machin confirmed that a fence will be down the middle splitting the two plots.

The Chair asked if the drives would be separate as one looked wider than the other on the proposed plans.

Mr Machin confirmed that they would be entirely independent. One is narrower but each property will have their own driveway which they will go in and out of.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that Condition 3 regarding the boundary treatment requires that within 2 months from the date of the permission, the applicant provides a detailed soft and hard landscaping scheme. This would need to come to officers for approval.

A Cllr commented that page 4 of the report refers to a hedge but there is already a wall there and the hedge has gone.

The Applications and Advice Manager responded that the planting would go in front of the wall.

**Cllr Chandler proposed approval** of the application as she had no issue with having 2 access points. She also commented that most of the trees have gone except a willow and raised concerns regarding levels. Now it has been levelled out there is yellow clay, so this raises concerns regarding drainage now the vegetation has gone. Understands it is permitted development rights but there should have been consultation with the Council. Too much has been done without building regulations or planning officers input.

A Cllr commented that 2 separate drives are better as shared drives can cause problems. They also asked how much room is in front of the wall for planting.

A Cllr commented that there is very little due to the footway. There is a verge on the roadside but there is very little on the inside other than a dyke and it is culverted.

The Applications and Advice Manager commented that there is the understanding that there is a strip of land in front of the wall that can accommodate planting. It is conditioned. This is a separate matter to this application. The removal of the hedge and construction of the wall could have been done without permission at any time.

A Cllr raised concerns regarding the 1.8 metre high fence as they felt that together with the wall it would obstruct visibility for vehicles.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that the 1.8 fence was to do with separating the 2 properties. Officers would need to consider if that is suitable for the area and the impact it would have on the street scene and character.

A Cllr asked if the views would be obstructed.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that acceptable visibility splays



needed to be provided. The application for the fence still needs to come in and be considered if it is acceptable.

**Cllr Wyatt seconded** the proposal.

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

**DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the following reasons:**

**The proposal relates to the provision of an additional vehicular access to serve the approved dwelling. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and would be visually acceptable, subject to a landscaping condition. The access would not have an undue adverse impact on the residential amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties and complies with the above policies and NPPF.**

D65. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 7.58pm