



MEETING OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

5 April 2012

PRESENT:

P.M. Chandler (Chair), P. Baguley, G.E. Botterill  
P. Cumbers J. Douglas, M. Gordon, E Holmes  
J Illingworth, T. Moncrieff.

Head of Regulatory Services, Applications and Advice Manager (JW)  
Solicitor to the Council (VW), Planning Policy Officer (PG)  
Administrative Assistant (JB)

---

D81. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs J Moulding and J Simpson.

D82. MINUTES

a) D78 : SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

Cllr Holmes noted that on page 4, third paragraph, she stated that there was sufficient "other 2 bedroomed accommodation" not "other 2 bedroomed bungalows" and in the fifth paragraph, it should read: "the previously refused application had been refused on appeal".

Cllr Gordon noted that on page 6 her comments went on to state a concern about an upstairs window on the nearby side of the house being damaged by branches due to the close proximity of the tree.

Cllr Moncrieff noted a grammatical error on page 7, third paragraph of the officer's report, and suggested that it should read "the tree does want removing and the size of the trees are a concern in gale conditions"

(b) subject to (a) above, the Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 March 2012 were proposed by Cllr Moncrieff and seconded by Cllr Douglas. The committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair signed them as a true record.

D83. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

**RESOLVED** that the undermentioned applications be determined as follows and unless stated otherwise hereunder in the case of permissions subject to the conditions and for the reasons stated in the reports.

---

D84. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference: 11/00925/FUL**  
**Applicant: Hamptonline**  
**Location: Old Dalby Trading Estate, Station Road, Old Dalby**  
**Proposal: Proposed flexible workspace units with associated parking, cycle shelter and bat roost and landscaping with drainage bowl.**

(a) Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

- The development proposed comprises of an industrial unit capable of operating as a single unit or being sub divided into as many as 8
- The floorspace is only a little larger than the existing buildings on the site and the applications presents the opportunity to introduce controls over use and noise emissions which are currently not present
- The planning policy specifically for the site was not saved in 2007 and new policy in the NPPF encourages development for economic growth
- The applicant has made comments about the draft conditions on noise emissions and asked if it is reasonable or indeed effective to place over limits on this development. Officers have consulted environmental Health and agree that it should reflect the other uses on the site and recommend the condition is amended accordingly.

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

- 13 years ago Colin Wilkinson addressed a public meeting stating that the site would introduce no significant increase in vehicle movements, that there would no new buildings and there would be no effect on local trade
- Local policies at the time directed the type and restrictions upon development in the site

- However later developments had changed the site dramatically, especially the brewery; which is also a pub and restaurant and has subsequently affected local businesses
- Traffic increases are an acknowledged problem in the area and the impact on road surfaces is costly
- These changes have had a cumulative adverse impact which is not in keeping with the original permissions and
- The Parish Council ask that the application be refused or at least deferred due to the speculative nature of the development especially of concern when other developments lay empty on the site.

(c) Paul Hutchinson, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- He is a resident of Station Lane, directly next to Old Dalby business park
- The new development will adversely impact on the privacy of local residents
- The increase in vehicle movements will also have an adverse impact on what is already an inadequate and damaged minor access road especially as lorries try to turn around in the confined space
- There are concerns regarding the working hours and noise generated by the proposals
- Alarms and other invasive noise are already a problem for locals
- No screening has been put in place even though this was a condition of previous permissions and question if this application's conditions will be enforced or not
- Currently empty sites on the business park so question is if there is a need for more development especially outside the current perimeter
- Concerns regarding the possibility that new areas around the site could be opened up to development should this proposal go ahead, effectively encircling the local domestic residents and
- The quality of life will be further reduced if this application is permitted.

(d) Ben Hooton, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There is a need for small flexible spaces for small businesses, this will provide employment opportunities as well as commercial space
- This is a good use for an existing derelict and unsightly site and will improve the visual aspect from inside the business park and out
- There will be no increase in noise and traffic over the existing agreed amount
- There is understanding that local residents may be concerned about possible noise and therefore a suggestion that a noise attenuation system be designed and agreed as part of a landscaping condition and

- The applicants are prepared to remove the B2 usage on the site from the proposal if that would alleviate concerns of the residents and Members.

(e) Cllr Orson, Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- This is a speculative development that is being proposed despite other units laying empty and others approved and as yet unbuilt , signalling that there may be no call for this development either
- The County Councils Highways department has grave concerns over traffic in the area as stated in other reports concerning a different site on Station Lane and
- If permission is granted then a noise attenuation system and landscaping must be implemented on the site as well as traffic calming measures to reduce the speed of vehicles.

Head of Regulatory Services replied to the Parish Council: the policy quoted (EM11) was in effect when the original development was approved however this policy was not 'saved' in the subsequent 2007 and therefore cannot be given weight in consideration of this application. Replying to Mr Hutchinson: enforcement of conditions, including landscaping, will be undertaken if they are found to be lacking. Replying to Cllr Orson: the Highways report quoted was regarding a new development rather than a replacement development as in this case and cannot be compared; also, the size of the parking spaces are smaller and the type of development proposed will be less likely to attract HGVs. Traffic calming measures cannot not be imposed upon the applicant as they would be outside of the applicants site. Finally in reply to general concerns regarding traffic increase; the Highways department cannot demonstrate that there will be an increase in traffic due to this proposal and do not support this as a reason for refusal.

On a procedural matter; the suggestion that the applicant withdraw their intention for B2 usage needs to be formalised in conditions should approval be agreed. The noise barrier also suggested could easily be incorporated into a landscaping condition and therefore easily enforced.

The Chair noted that speakers mentioned that the application was speculative and asked for confirmation that this cannot be taken into to account when considering the application.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that 'speculation' cannot a planning consideration.

Cllr Holmes agreed with the PC that the area has a traffic problem and the site is off a fast road. She asked how long a permission of this type would stay 'live'.

The Head of Regulatory Services replied that permissions last for 3 years from approval. Some applications from pre 2008 are still valid due to a temporary change

in procedure to give permissions a 5 year 'life' however the procedure has reverted to 3 years as previously.

Cllr Holmes enquired about the status of the house on the site.

The Head of Regulatory Services replied that it is restricted to B8 use.

Cllr Holmes **proposed to defer the application** till a traffic survey could be undertaken and its results looked at more carefully.

No seconder came forward.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she thought it would not be a problem if the application was speculative because as the economy recovered these types of units would be useful. She asked about the suitability of a noise barrier.

The Head of Regulatory Services agreed that it would be a positive measure to mitigate noise from the site. He went on to reply to Cllr Holmes that a survey of existing traffic would not give information on any possible increase in traffic due to the proposal, and possible increases had already been assessed by the County Councils Highways department.

Cllr Baguley asked for confirmation regarding the traffic figures and stated concerns about traffic on rural roads.

The Head of Regulatory Services referred to the report and confirmed the findings of the Highways department as well as confirming the type of traffic expected would be mainly smaller vehicles.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that the site visit was helpful and believed that the officers report and the Head of Regulatory Services replies to be useful. He asked that the landscaping conditions be enforced and if there could be measures to stop traffic from using Station Lane in error. He **proposed to approve the application** with the removal of the B2 use and noise attenuation improvement as part of a landscaping condition.

Cllr Cumbers **seconded the proposal**.

Cllr Illingworth asked if the applicant could improve the signage to reduce the amount of traffic using the Lane in error.

The Head of Regulatory Services replied that the entrance to the business park was outside of the applicants control and cannot be conditioned.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that this development offered employment opportunities which would be a positive step.

The Chair agreed that the size of the proposed units offered a valuable foothold for small businesses and supported business development.

A vote was taken: 8 in favour and 1 abstention.

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

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and appearance, access arrangements and to have no significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties. Conditions 3, 4 and 5 are imposed to ensure a satisfactory appearance, conditions 2, 6, 8 and 10 are imposed in the interests of residential amenity, condition 7 is to ensure satisfactory flood mitigation, whilst condition 9 is imposed in the interests of highway safety. The specific reasons for each condition are set out above. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the above stated policies and no other factors are present to indicate that the decision should depart from the terms of the Development Plan.

Subject to additional conditions to:

---

- (a) Incorporate a noise barrier into the landscaping scheme
  - (b) Limiting the use of the building to B1 and B8 (excluding B2)
  - (c) Amending the noise condition to reflect those on adjacent sites i.e. 47dB expressed as a 1 hour LAeq between 07.00 and 19.00 hours Monday to Saturday, 42 dB LAeq (15 minutes) between the hours of 19.00 and 22.00 hours Monday to Saturday and 34 dB(A) expressed as a 5 minute LAeq at any other time,
- 

- (2)   **Reference:**     **11/00930/FUL**  
      **Applicant:**    **Belvoir Ridge Holdings**  
      **Location:**    **Lodge Farm, Stathern Road, Eastwell LE14**  
                      **4EN**  
      **Proposal:**    **Installation of one wind turbine 25 metres to**  
                      **hub and 9 metre blades (radius) plus**  
                      **ancillary development.**

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager (JW) stated that:

This application seeks approval for the erection of a wind turbine, 25 metres to hub and 9 metre blade, a total height of approximately 34.2 metres. The site lies in a field close to Lodge Farm outside of the village of Eastwell.

There are no updates to report on this application.

The proposal is considered to be supported in terms of principle by national policy in

the NPPF as contributing to the wider aims of encouraging renewable energy and de carbonising the economy. It is also considered that the proposal will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area to an extent that it is regarded as unacceptable within national guidance. It is considered that whilst there is the need for a balance between the interests of renewable forms of energy and landscape issues, in this instance the impact would be limited in extent on the landscape, although the landscape is unspoilt it is not one that attracts protection through its designation, in the manner explained in the NPPF. Accordingly, the balance of these issues is considered to favour the installation.

The proposal is considered by Environmental Health to have a negative impact upon one property located 350m from the application site with regards to the potential noise at low wind speeds. On balance it is considered that this risk could be mitigated by condition in line with ETSU-R-97. The site is considered to have adequate access arrangements and the amended site location has overcome many objections. Having considered all the issues, in this instance, the proposal is considered acceptable and is therefore recommended for approval as set out in the report.

(b) John Forinton, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The Stathern Action Plan from the Melton Core Strategy (LDF document) quotes that the proposed site is in a “dramatic landscape”. The residents believe that this landscape should be protected and the application be rejected.

(c) David Holmes, agent for the applicant and the applicant, were invited to speak and stated that:

- They were happy with the recommendation in the officer’s report
- The NPPF does encourage this type of development
- The siting has been altered to minimise the adverse impact as noted in the report and in response to concerns, the current site is ideal due to the windy conditions at the ridge and
- The applicant pointed out that they are a working mixed farm who want to reduce their CO2 emissions and energy costs while increasing their sustainability

The Applications and Advice Manager replied that she acknowledged that the turbine will be visible but asked Members to balance these concerns and evaluate if there will be harm caused.

Cllr Botterill, Ward Councillor for the area noted that the applicant asked for advice and responded to concerns and suggestions. He stated that it is the council’s policy to encourage a reduction in CO2 emissions and that he could see no harm from the siting of the application therefore he **proposed approval**.

Cllr Baguley **seconded the proposal** agreeing that although there will be an impact

she believed that this would not cause harm.

Cllr Moncrieff agreed with other members and stated that the site visit was useful to understand the proposal. He went on to say that developments like this have to be encouraged to reduce CO2 emissions.

Cllr Holmes noted concerns about the siting on the ridge.

On being put to the vote the application was approved unanimously.

**DETERMINATION: PERMIT, for the following reasons and with the conditions detailed in the report:**

The proposal is considered to be supported in terms of principle by national policy as contributing to the wider aims of encouraging renewable energy. It is also considered that the proposal will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area to an extent that it is regarded as unacceptable within national guidance nor have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings. In terms of the landscape, guidance in NPPF puts the emphasis on protecting international and nationally designated sites such as SSSIs and AONB. It is considered that whilst there is the need for a balance between the interests of renewable forms of energy and landscape issues, in this instance the impact would be limited in extent on the landscape, although the landscape is unspoilt it is not one that attracts protection through its designation, in the manner explained in the NPPF. Accordingly, the balance of these issues is considered to favour the installation. The proposal is not considered to impact unacceptably on the amenities of residential dwellings and there are adequate access arrangements.

- 
- (3) Reference: 11/00986/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mrs A Cowley**  
**Location: Hunters Lodge 12 Church Lane, Old Dalby**  
**Proposal: Extension and alterations to existing care home to improve facilities.**

The Chair requested that standing orders be suspended to allow further speakers due to the nature of the application. Cllr Holmes moved to suspend standing orders. Cllr Gordon seconded this proposal.

On being put to the vote, the motion to suspend standing orders was carried unanimously.



(a) The Applications and Advice Manager (JW) stated that:

This application seeks planning permission for the extension of an existing care home within the village envelope and Conservation Area of Old Dalby. The proposed extensions are to provide single rooms as there are currently 7 shared rooms and to allow the care home to comply with requirements for care facilities.

There is an error in the report on page 9 in the conclusion which incorrectly states an increase to 37 when in fact it should read 38 giving a total increase in the number of residents by two, from the current approved numbers. It is not considered that this error alters the recommendation in the report.

Since publication of the report there have been 3 further objections to the amended plans as outlined below:

- With regards to the guttering/eaves and the foundations these still encroaching onto No 8 Church Lane: the amended plans still do not remove the overhanging of the guttering of the garage (north), or encroachment of foundations.
- No information has been submitted to show how they would maintain the extensions once built. The site plans still do not show the extension to No.8 or the garage as the applicants have used an out of date OS map.
- The resubmitted plans still create an *inaccurate* representation of how close the proposed extension would be to No. 8 and the potential impact it could have. The separation distance is 11 metres not 14 as quoted in the committee report. The application form states no trees will be affected but it is clear that they will be removed and there is objection to their removal. There would be no opportunity to replace such screening as it would be replaced with a huge, tall, ugly and continuous brick wall.
- It has also been raised that that there is dramatically different measurements quoted in the proposals. On the original application form, the Site Area is quoted as 1,923 sq metres and on the original Design and Access Statement, it is quoted as 2,863 sq metres. These two measurements are vastly different and despite the fact that new boundary site plans have been submitted, there has been no clarification as to what the actual site area is. The exact size of the site area needs to be clarified before any informed decision can be made. The Site boundary is incorrect showing a garden and house not in applicants ownership. The application incorrectly states that the access serves three dwellings however in icy conditions it is also an alternative access to a fourth dwelling.

- The application represents overdevelopment of the site; the site is already running at capacity and would be over developed if this application is approved.
- Overhead power lines would need to be removed and neighbours are not going to give permission for any underground power cables.

Finally all other objections to the proposal still stand. In summary:

- The proposed extension would be too near and overbearing in what has been designated an Important Open Area.
- The proposed extension still encroaches upon neighbouring boundary, both in the airspace above and in the ground below and they will take legal action to prevent this.
- The current tree screening would be removed, with no opportunity to replace it.
- The proposed extension would take up most of the Hunters Lodge's own green space and represents a 50% increase of the building space.
- The proposed extension still contravenes policies BE1, BE2 AND OS1.
- The proposed construction would have a negative environmental impact on a conservation village with three Grade One listed buildings near it and several other building projects already underway in the vicinity.
- There are far too many misleading inaccuracies in the applicant's proposals which need clarification and revision before any informed decision can be reached.

It is considered that all these points are covered within the officer's report. With regards to the overhanging guttering and foundations these are considered to be civil matters. With regards to the distance separation these are guidelines and have no policy weight. Site visits allows for an informed judgement to be made with regards to topography and orientation of buildings. With regards to the inaccuracy of the plans the application site boundary has been amended several times due to being incorrectly drawn. The site area is as written on the application form not the design and access statement and this is what has been assessed within the report. With regards to the site boundary this was addressed with a revised site boundary plan submitted on the 13.02.12, the objector to which it affected has confirmed that it is now correctly drawn. With regards to the proposed access; Highways are not objecting to the proposal as the access is served from a private driveway. With regards to overdevelopment of the site if approved the proposal would only increase the number of residents by 2 from that allowed by appeal.

Further comments have been received from the Parish Council in respect of the amended plans stating that they do not overcome their previous objection.

The proposal seeks planning permission to extend existing facilities to meet the demand for residential care but with a marginal increase to numbers. The design is considered acceptable and not to have a detrimental impact upon any neighbouring

properties. The access and parking facilities are considered acceptable due to there not being a material increase in traffic generation. The proposal seeks to increase the existing numbers from 36 to 38 but to have an option of providing twin accommodation for married couples if requested, with a maximum of 5 twin rooms being made available. Due to the constraints of the accommodation it is not considered that there could be a high number of residents on site at any one time, as the applicants are governed by separate legislation as care providers. For this reason it is considered not necessary to restrict the number of residents by condition. The previous reasons for doing so was in the interest of highway safety and the impact an increase in traffic movements would have on neighbours. There has been a substantial shift in highway guidance since the previous approval, the driveway is private and not in the control of the Highways Authority and its use cannot be restricted by condition. Accordingly the application is recommended for approval as set out in the report

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

- There has been 15 objections, which shows the strength of feeling against this application
- The objectors and the Parish Council are not “anti Hunters Lodge” but rather the application itself
- The issues relating to the boundary may be civil matters but they are caused by planning matters and should be considered
- The site is already full and further development will impact the conservation area
- Parking spills over to neighbouring areas and this proposal will make this worse
- It will be difficult to build the proposed extension without causing damage to neighbouring property
- Maintaining the proposed extensions once built will be difficult on such a restricted site and
- The Parish Council believe this is not a sustainable proposal.

(c) Tony Bunn, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- He is particularly objecting to the North East extension
- He lives at No. 8 Church Lane
- He is concerned with the proximity and the height of the proposed development at its closest point being too big and overbearing
- The extension will make his garden feel like a prison
- The eaves will be overhanging his property
- A very large cherry tree will be removed, which the application form does not state, which will be a loss to the screening between properties

- Policies BE1 and OS1 will be impacted
- There are inaccuracies in the application especially regarding the number of residents on the site and
- There will be an increase in problems with traffic at an already problematic corner junction

(d) Hilary Wrenn, agent for an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There are concerns with the number of vehicles using the site and there is no information in the application about transportation or vehicle movements
- There are concerns with the proximity to the neighbouring properties and the loss of privacy due to overlooking
- There are inaccuracies in the application especially regarding the possible number of residents and
- Case Law is clear about when to depart from appeal decisions

(e) Mrs Cowley, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The care home is a family run business
- They live in the village and therefore understand the local issues
- The proposal is necessary as residents want their own rooms
- The business would not be viable if these developments don't go ahead
- The building does not look institutional and it is popular partly because it looks pleasant
- They will be placing planting and screening where possible to minimise impact
- The car park will be marked out to maximise parking on site
- There have been no complaints from neighbours regarding parking and
- They have always tried to be a good neighbour

(f) Cllr Orson, Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- His mother did live in the care home and therefore he does have an 'interest' to declare however, it is not prejudicial
- Hunters Lodge has always received good reports from inspectors and has a good environment
- It employs local people and retains their staff
- He notes that the increase in beds will maintain the viability of the business
- There being 2 extensions does complicate the application and there is acknowledgement that there are concerns with overlooking and overbearing impacts on the neighbours on both sides and

- Perhaps there could be amendments to the design to draw the elevations away from these neighbours to reduce impact.

The Applications and Advice Manager replied: to the Parish Council that civil matters are outside of Members consideration. To Mr Bunn; there is acknowledgement that the separation distance is closer but the distance he refers to is only guidance, used more especially when considering windows and overlooking, the site visit gives a better understanding than the plans for Members to make a decision. Also the loss of the tree would not need a separate planning application; the report does note the loss of the screening offered by the tree. To Mrs Wrenn; the Applications and Advice Manager clarified which elevations were of concern and pointed to the location of windows using the screen. Regarding appeal decisions; they should not be departed from but policy has changed and therefore conditions on parking can no longer be added. The Applications and Advice Manager quoted from the relevant planning policy and referred to the report before the Members.

Cllr Gordon asked if windows could be moved to reduce the impact of overlooking.

The Applications and Advice Manager replied that the Members had to consider the application before them at that time.

Cllr Holmes acknowledged that the care home is needed and considered however, the extensions to be too overbearing on neighbouring properties. She **proposed refusal of the application.**

Cllr Baguley **seconded the refusal**, agreeing with Cllr Holmes and adding that the design is not ideal in the conservation area pointing out the Conservation Officer's comments in the report.

Cllr Holmes agreed the inappropriate design and its impact on the conservation area should be added to the reasons of refusal.

Members discussed the design, with differing opinions as to its appropriateness. They also discussed the setting of the home and the proposed extensions' proximity to neighbours. It was agreed that care homes are needed.

Cllr Douglas noted that the proposal would also have an impact on the streetscene, stating that it would have less impact if it was single storey.

The Applications and Advice Manager summarised the reasons tabled for refusal to establish that they were correctly understood and referred Members to policies OS1 and BE1, and quoted the relevant parts. These were:

1. The proposal would be contrary to policies OS1 and BE1 of the adopted Melton Local Plan as a result of the unacceptable impact on residential amenity arising from:

- The overbearing and over dominant impact of the extension at the north east corner of the building upon no 8 Church Lane
- The overbearing, over dominant and loss of privacy upon no.10 Church Lane arising from the extension to the south east corner of the building

2. The proposed extensions would result in a harmful effect on the built form and architectural character of the building and as a consequence upon the appearance of the area and the character and appearance of the Old Dalby Conservation Area in which it stands.

The Chair stated that she had sympathy with the applicants but that a balance needed to be found to reduce adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

A vote was taken. 7 voted to refuse, 2 voted against refusal.

**DETERMINATION: REFUSE for the following reasons;**

1. The proposal would be contrary to policies OS1 and BE1 of the adopted Melton Local Plan as a result of the unacceptable impact on residential amenity arising from:

- The overbearing and over dominant impact of the extension at the north east corner of the building upon no 8 Church Lane
- The overbearing, over dominant and loss of privacy upon no.10 Church Lane arising from the extension to the south east corner of the building

2. The proposed extensions would result in a harmful effect on the built form and architectural character of the building and as a consequence upon the appearance of the area and the character and appearance of the Old Dalby Conservation Area in which it stands.

**(4) Reference: 12/00074/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mrs Sue Duffin**  
**Location: Church Farm, 10 Melton Road, Waltham On The Wolds, LE14 4AJ**  
**Proposal: Alteration to Cow Shed**

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager (JW) stated that:

This application seeks regularisation to a Cow Shed which has previously been granted approval to be converted into a bungalow. The site is located on the edge of Waltham on the Wolds.

There are no updates to report on this application.

The main issue with this application is whether the amendments to the extant planning permission are acceptable. Planning permission has been granted for the principle of the development and this is not a consideration of this application. The main issue is the further encroachment of the building by 2 metres into the open countryside. As assessed within the report, whilst it does encroach two metres further into the open countryside it still lies within the former farm yard complex and the residential garden as previously approved and would not represent an encroachment into undeveloped countryside. It is not considered that the proposal would adversely impact on the open countryside and accordingly the application is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

(b) Sue Duffin, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- This was a genuine mistake made by the builders who should have placed the footing on the existing layout.

Cllr Holmes, the Ward Councillor for the area stated that she understood that this development had encroached outside the village envelope but that this had been a genuine mistake. The site visit had shown that it was not unsightly and had no adverse impact therefore she **proposed approval of the application**.

Cllr Botterill **seconded the proposal for approval** stating that the development has enhanced the streetscene.

Members agreed that although village envelopes were an important guideline they should not restrict Members decisions, especially in cases like this where there had been a genuine mistake that had no detrimental impact.

On being put to the vote the application was approved unanimously.

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

The proposed extensions are considered to be acceptable in terms of scale, design and materials and would have no adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbours. The proposal satisfies the above policies and safeguards the character and appearance of the area and accordingly, it is considered to accord with the objectives of the relevant development plan policies.

---

D85. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair stated that she would take up with the corporate director current problems relating to the lack of microphones and the problems currently existing with the screen. Members also felt that a change in layout of the room may resolve some of the issues currently being experienced.

It was also planned to hold a briefing/training session for Members on the new National Planning Policy Framework before the next scheduled meeting.

The meeting commenced at 6:00 p.m. and closed at 8:15 p.m.

Chair