



MEETING OF THE
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

10 January 2013

PRESENT:

P.M. Chandler (Chair), P. Baguley,
P. Cumbers J. Douglas, A Freer-Jones
M. Gordon, E. Holmes, J Simpson, J Wyatt, T Moncrieff, G Botterill,

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

D64. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

D65. MINUTES

29th November 2012

Cllr Gordon corrected page 138. Previous minutes 26th July 2012 page number correction from 30 to 20 was raised by Cllr Simpson not Cllr Gordon, Cllr Simpson agreed this.

Cllr Holmes concerned that the general public believe that minutes are not recorded in full with regard to what is actually said at the meeting. Cllr Chandler referred to the Solicitor to the Council who quoted from Paragraph 16 of Constitution:

“The Chairman will move that the minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record. The only part of the minutes that can be discussed is their accuracy. Minutes will contain all motions and amendments in the exact form and order the Mayor put them.”

It was concluded that content other than motions and amendments cannot be corrected.

A discussion ensued regarding the amount of detail required which should be recorded in the minutes.

Cllr Chandler stated that she is satisfied that any changes to the minutes are as per the Constitution and that the wording of the determinations are recorded accurately in the minutes.

Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 29th November 2012 was proposed by Cllr Baguley and seconded by Cllr Gordon. Vote on approval of changes to the minutes: 7 in favour 3 abstained. It was agreed that the Chair should sign them as a true record.

20th December 2012

Cllr Gordon requested that the wording of her comment on pg. 60 was amended to add the words "in regard to the stable block" following the comment "concerns about the neighbour having to look out at a brick wall"

A discussion followed about the relevance of the alteration.

A Vote on approval of changes to the minutes of the meeting held on 20th December 2012: 6 in favour 5 abstained. It was agreed that the Chair signed them as a true record.

D66. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Chandler and Cllr Botterill declared a prejudicial interest in application no. 12/00769/FUL

D67. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) Reference: 12/00722/FUL**
Applicant: Mr J Hinton
Location: Former Working Mens Club, Norman Way, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1JE
Proposal: Proposed demolition of existing Working Mens club including detached house and construction of 50 bedroom hotel on land off Norman way Melton Mowbray

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

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a 50 bedroom hotel

within the town envelope for Melton Mowbray.

There is an error on the report on page 6 which should state that the railway station is located to the south of the site and not to the north.

Since publication of the report a revised travel plan has been submitted by the applicant. The County Council have been consulted and are satisfied with the document subject to a condition in respect of a Green Travel Plan.

The application relates to the erection of a hotel on the site of the former working men club. The site sits within commercial uses on the edge of the town centre. The application has been assessed to be in line with national policy by encouraging economic growth, tourism and sustainable development. The application has been assessed to be acceptable in terms of highways, design and the character of the area. Therefore it is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval as set out in the report with the addition of highway conditions in relation to the Green Travel Plan.

There were no speakers

Cllr Holmes commented that the development would be beneficial to the tourism market of the town and **proposed approval of the application**

Cllr Cumbers **seconded the proposal to approve the application** saying that the town is in need of this sort of accommodation, and that although not strictly in keeping with the surrounding area that the design was acceptable.

Members agreed that the case officer was to be commended for seeking amendments to the design, lamented the loss of the Working Mens Club, but concluded that the site was in need of development and that approval would result in improvement to the economy of the town through tourism.

Vote on the approval of the application: It was unanimously agreed to approve the application.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions listed in the Committee report, the following additional condition and for the following reasons:

1. The development shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plan drawing nos. 146.09 Rev A, 146.05 Rev G, 146.04 Rev E, 146.03 Rev D and 146.11 Rev B submitted on the 30th November 2012.
3. No development shall start on site until representative samples of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. The gradients of the vehicular accesses serving the site shall not exceed 1:12

- for the first 5 metres behind the highway boundary.
5. Before first use of the development hereby permitted, drainage shall be provided within the site such that surface water does not drain into the Public Highway and thereafter shall be so maintained.
 6. For the period of the construction, the applicant shall take measures to ensure that the highway is kept free of mud, water, stones etc, in accordance with details that shall have first been approved in writing by the LPA in consultation with the Highway Authority.
 7. For the period of the construction of the development, vehicle parking facilities shall be provided within the site and all vehicles associated with the development shall be parked within the site.
 8. The car parking and turning facilities shown within the curtilage of the site shall be provided, hard surfaced, marked out and made available for use before the development is first brought into use and shall thereafter be permanently so maintained.
 9. Before the development is first brought into use, Soho Street shall have been widened as shown on the submitted plan, in accordance with Highway Authority standards.
 10. Notwithstanding the details submitted, minimum visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 7 metres to the right and 20 metres to the left shall be provided out of the proposed access on to Soho Street. These splays shall be cleared of any obstruction that exceeds a height of 600mm above the level of the adjacent carriageway before the access is first brought into use and shall thereafter be permanently so maintained.
 11. Before the development hereby permitted is first used, the proposed cycle parking provision shall be made to the satisfaction of the LPA and once provided shall be maintained and kept available for use in perpetuity.
 12. Before first use of the development hereby permitted the proposed access to the car park to the rear of the site shall have been provided and have been surfaced with tarmacadam, concrete or similar hard bound material (not loose aggregate) for a distance of at least 10 metres behind the highway boundary and shall be so maintained at all times.
 13. Notwithstanding the details submitted, no planting shall overhang the public highway, but shall at all times be kept trimmed so that it has a minimum clearance of 500mm from the edge of the highway boundary.

The reasons are:-

The proposal seeks to apply for full planning permission for a 50 bedroom hotel development on the edge of town centre. The location has policy support and the proposal is considered to comply with the objectives of the Local Development Framework, regional and national planning policies in terms of generating tourist accommodation. The objectives of NPPF to promote sustainable patterns of development are achievable given that there are good public transport links in the form of bus and train services.

- (2) Reference: 12/00621/FUL**
Applicant: Mr Martin Lomas
Location: Field OS 0043, The Driveway, Eye Kettleby
Proposal: Erection of 1 no. 50kw wind turbine measuring 24.8m to the hub (34.5m to tip).

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

The turbine will have a hub height of 24.8 metres with a blade length of 9.6 metres giving a total height from ground to blade tip of approximately 34.5 metres. It will be located in a field dedicated to touring caravans but some distance from the collection of buildings that form Eye Kettleby.

This application is presented to the Committee in view of the extent of public interest in wind turbines. It presents the same issues as previous applications but has not attracted the same levels of public comment.

UPDATE: Since publishing the report a letter of objection has been received opposing the proposals on the grounds that its size, colour and moving parts will be different to any existing features. It is contrary to policies OS2 and C2, and will have a substantial and very significantly detrimental impact on landscape character and visual amenity. It fails entirely to protect the countryside. It will be an entirely discordant and incongruous industrial feature in the unspoilt rural landscape that is entirely incapable of mitigation.

There is an error on top of page 9 describing the route to the site for components – it is of course left off the A607 not right.

We have also been asked about issues of cumulative effect and inter-visibility, particularly with reference to the two applications refused last autumn near Thorpe Satchville. My advice on this is that such effects are very definitely a material consideration, but because the Thorpe Satchville cases are in the appeal system, there can be no expectation whether they will come forward. Accordingly, this aspect should be considered in this context and minimal weight applied. The effect of the appeal is to affect the running order of the applications and this issue will be more significant for the Thorpe Satchville appeals than this.

This application is considered to meet all of the technical requirements of such applications in terms of noise, residential amenity etc. In terms of the landscape it is advantaged by its location and the rolling nature of the landscape and pages 5 and 6 explain our conclusions on this issue.

(b) Mr Tom Armfield, the agent was invited to speak and stated that:

- The proposal is for a wind turbine which is 24.8 metres high to the hub with a blade span of 9.6 metres to be located within the Eye Kettleby Lakes site.
- The purpose is to allow the business to be self sufficient with regards to

electricity supply.

- The proposed turbine will supply power to the existing campsite and excess production will be passed on to the National Grid.
- The site is not affected by any local designations.
- The proposed location of the turbine is well distanced from any residential property, natural feature of the landscape / scheduled ancient monument in the vicinity of the site.
- The agent appreciates the concerns raised by the Parish Council however stated that local policy and the NPPF are in support of small scale development for renewable energy.
- The application is supported by landscape photo montages which demonstrate that the proposal will not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of local residents and is not unduly dominant.
- There have been negotiations with consultees throughout the process of the application and any issues raised have been resolved accordingly.
- No objections were received at the time of the committee report being written.
- The agent requests that the application is approved in accordance with local and national policy.

Cllr Cumbers - Ward Councillor for the area commented that she had watched this tourist site develop over the years and that it has not been a problem to local residents i.e. not aware of any complaints regarding the type of activity that takes place. Cllr Cumbers was in favour of wind turbines generally and would welcome the development in her ward. Cllr Cumbers had received one telephone call opposing the proposal. Cllr Cumbers **proposed approval of the application.**

Cllr Gordon -Ward Councillor for the area commented that the location of the turbine seems rather close to the campsite area and asked for the opinion of the Head of Regulatory Services

The Head of Regulatory Services replied that the distances mentioned in the Committee report are the facts of the application proposal. The consideration of the effect of the proposal is made in regard to the effect on neighbouring properties and those not in control of the development of the site: however not the occupants of the site itself as this is in the control of the applicant.

Cllr Gordon queried the issue of shadow flicker.

The Head of Regulatory Services answered that this relates to within the site only and it not an issue for any properties outside of the application site.

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

Cllr Botterill commented that he is in support of the application and that its need was justified.

Cllr Simpson agreed that the need is justified, but has a problem with the height of the

turbine in conjunction with its elevated position and inter-visibility with other turbines which have been proposed. Would prefer to see one or two smaller turbines, also feels that it should be located nearer to the establishment it is to serve. Cllr Simpson also has some concern over view from nearby Great Dalby. **Request to defer decision.**

Cllr Chandler stated that it is not desirable to defer due to right of appeal on non-determination.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that the inter-visibility issue is not significant as the other proposed turbines are not approved at this time.

Cllr Holmes reiterated points made by Cllr Simpson relating to distance of the turbine from the farm establishment and camping area, and the height of the turbine stating that two smaller turbines would be preferable. She asked whether an approval of permission would limit the development to one turbine?

The Head of Regulatory Services answered that the proposal is for one turbine only and that if it were to be approved the description would specify that it was for one turbine only.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he believed that to erect two turbines would be at greater financial cost to the applicant and that having smaller blades may create less output. He agrees with other councillors that there is a justified need for the proposal. He believes that the NPPF would override the concerns that have been raised over the height of the proposed turbine. He is in support of approval of the application.

Vote: 10 in favour of approval of the application 1 abstention.

DETERMINATION: Approve, subject to the conditions set out in the report and for the following reason:

It is 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. In terms of the landscape, guidance in the NPPF puts the emphasis on protecting international and nationally designated sites such as SSSIs and AONBs. 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 NPPF. Accordingly, the balance of these issues is considered to favour the installation. The proposal is not considered to impact on the amenities of residential dwellings and there are adequate access arrangements.

-
- (2) **Reference:** 12/00756/FUL
Applicant: Mr Ian Hardwick – Ian Hardwick Limited
Location: Land adjacent 23 Middle Lane, Nether Broughton, LE14 3HD

Proposal: Single storey dwelling and ancillary works.

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that:

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey dwelling on Middle Lane, Nether Broughton. The site is situated within the village envelope.

There is an error in the report on page 7 under other matters and in the response from the Head of Service should read “could not remove it without seeking consent from the land owner”

Since publication of the report there have been three further letters received objecting to the development on the following grounds:

- Not in keeping
- Close to No. 1 King Street
- Scale is too large and out of scale with the rest of the streetscene
- The outline planning permission specified a footprint of only 77 sq metres and a minimum spacing of 1.5metres from the retained boundary wall in King Street. The eaves of the building are shown on the plan as projecting past the ‘site boundary line’ and overhanging the neighbouring land of the King Street public amenity space.

Additional comments have also been submitted in relation to the amended plans from 3 objectors who have previously commented stating;

- The building is too big for the plot, and too close to the boundary of no 1 King Street, and the garage wall is too close to the boundary with No 23 Middle Lane.
- Concern regarding the garage wall, the boundary and whether the fencing is to be removed. As a registered Childminder they would object to scaffolding on the drive and access on to the adjoining land due to the health and safety of the children in their care.
- The height of the property is higher than No, 23 and would be overbearing to No. 23 and No. 1 King Street.
- On the plans the line of the current wall adjacent to the green in Kings Street is not marked and it is not clear if there is any encroachment onto the green. This includes encroachment by the roof overhanging the green.
- The demolition of the wall is to be regretted and can see no reason why the piece of wall between the house and number 1 King Street should be demolished. If it is to be removed it should be replaced by a similar brick wall. King Street is primarily wall and hedging and the fencing proposed would look out of keeping with the surrounding area.
- In the application it states that there are no trees on adjacent land that might affect the build, there is a willow tree on the green that should be protected. The majority of large trees in the village are ash and we are facing a potential loss of trees from the village.
- It is understood that the movement of the lamp post on the green has been withdrawn although this has not been heard formally and would be a concern.

- Still loss of privacy to No. 23 Middle Lane and No. 1 King Street due to the dwelling being overbearing for the size of the plot. With regards to housing need a smaller 2 bed property would be more suited to the plot and the housing needs.

In response to these issues it is considered that these are addressed within the report.

Comments have also been submitted in relation to the Committee report and that the report states that a site notice has been posted and there has not been one. As the development impacts on the community area on the corner of King Street and is used by many residents, if a notice had been placed there more residents would have had the opportunity to comment on the development. Only neighbouring properties were informed and there were 9 households objecting not 6 as stated in the notes. There had been a problem with the MBC website and some residents sent their comments direct to Denise Knipe. 118 residents supported the application for Village Green status for this area on King Street. A Planning Notice has been placed on the site for the development on Chapel Lane, if as the notes state a notice was placed on the site on Middle Lane why was this not carried out to give residents using this community area the opportunity to comment?

In response to this the Applications and Advice Manager advised that the reference in the report that a site notice has been posted is an error. The application is not one which requires a site notice and the correct notification procedure has been undertaken. With regards to the number of objections received the total is 9, the 6 reported in the Committee report and the 3 received after the drafting of the report which have been verbally updated this evening in line with common practice. Comments sent direct to the case officer have been received and have been verbally updated this evening.

Finally, a request has been received in relation to the proposed conditions on the report requesting a condition that the timber fence between the proposed bungalow and No. 1 King Street is constructed in brick as per the officer's assessment in the report. It is considered that this is a reasonable request.

The application site lies within the village envelope and thus benefits from a presumption in favour of development. The proposed development has been designed to have a limited impact on adjoining properties, and is considered capable of reflecting the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and complies with highway requirements. The house type proposed meets the requirements of the Borough's housing needs in providing single storey accommodation of which there is a shortfall in the area. The NPPF seeks to boost significantly housing growth in sustainable location of which Nether Broughton is considered as a sustainable village within the Local Development Framework. Accordingly, the proposal is recommended for approval.

(b) Richard Cooper of HSSP Architects, the agent was invited to speak and stated that:

- The application was for one single storey dwelling, a previous application for two semi detached dwellings was withdrawn as residents were concerned over the effect on the green and the mass of the development.
- Concerns have now been addressed and a smaller development was proposed.
- The orientation of the dwelling had been amended and the mass of the proposal reduced, now being lower than adjacent property at 1 King Street.
- Adequate amenity space is proposed for the plot which is in a prominent corner location.
- Housing need has been met.
- Design reflected the character of the surrounding area.
- Applicant is aware of concern over possible future loft conversion, and would not be averse to removal of Permitted Development rights.

Cllr Orson - Ward Councillor for the area was invited to speak and stated that:

- He wished to express the view of the Parish Council on their behalf, and that he is not a member of the Parish Council but is the Ward Councillor for the area.
- It had been established through a number of previous site visits that the site is very compact and therefore difficult to deal with.
- There are neighbours at all four points of the compass and therefore occupiers of the new development would experience “goldfish bowl syndrome”
- The proposal is too large and would be overbearing for the site.
- The committee report states that the outline permission is in place but that there have been no further submissions relating to it.
- The eaves part of the proposal appears to overhang the boundary of the site onto the public amenity space.
- Separation distance was an issue.
- Although surrounding properties have no distinct style to relate to, they do all have front gardens and this should be borne in mind.
- Should the application be approved a condition for the retention of the brick wall

is requested.

Cllr Chandler asked for advice from a Planning Officer regarding the lack of site notice, and invited comments in response to the speakers comments.

The Head of Regulatory Services explained that a site notice was not required due to the site being surrounded by neighbouring properties which were notified by letter. The site is neither within a conservation area nor major development.

Applications and Advice Manager responded to the issue of overhanging of the boundary, stating that the eaves of the bungalow are within the red outlined area of the site according to the plans submitted.

Cllr Freer questioned the history of refusal of an application for a large three bedroomed dwelling in relation to housing need how is the current proposal different as the bedroom number is the same.

The Planning Policy Officer answered that there is a requirement for single storey dwellings in particular regardless of the number of bedrooms and that there are already sufficient 2 storey 3 bedroom dwellings within the borough.

Cllr Freer agreed that there was a need for single storey dwellings.

Cllr Baguley expressed concern that the proposal is too big for the plot and felt it had been shoehorned in, that it seems very high considering that it is a bungalow, and that it is out of keeping with the character of the area.

Cllr Chandler stated that the issue of shoehorning has been raised during previous applications on the same site and that the NPPF is not supportive to this.

Cllr Holmes **proposed refusal of the application on** the grounds that the proposed building is too large for the plot.

Cllr Simpson **seconded the proposal to refuse the application** and agreed that the proposed building is too big and that it would be detrimental to the streetscene if the wall were demolished. It was stated that the proposal was contrary to policies OS1 and BE1. Cllr Simpson believes that it would be a cramped development.

Cllr Gordon agreed with the comments made by Cllr Simpson.

Cllr Moncrieff also agrees with some of the comments and that the grounds of refusal could possibly withstand scrutiny at appeal, but also mentioned that the lack of garden could be seen as a benefit to some and remains open minded to the proposal.

Cllr Chandler sympathises with the views raised regarding demolition of the wall and does not believe that it should be demolished.

Cllr Wyatt stated that the building work would take place very close to the wall and would probably damage it anyway. He believes that provided that the wall is replaced

with a fence or similar that the proposal is acceptable He stated that caution should be exercised when considering refusal on grounds of scale and mass.

Cllr Botterill stated that the wall should be retained in order to control livestock.

Cllr Freer requested clarification regarding number of bedrooms and housing need.

The Planning Policy Officer responded that the housing need guidance does not specify a requirement for any particular number of bedrooms in relation to single storey dwellings.

Cllr Freer feels that a two bedroom dwelling would be more appropriate for the site.

Cllr Chandler stated that Members need to consider the current proposal as it stands.

Cllr Wyatt believes that policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan are contravened. He would prefer to see a smaller dwelling.

Cllr Chandler stated that the application would need to be refused in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to submit an application for a smaller scale proposal.

Cllr Cumbers stated that the building is too big and would look squashed and incongruous. She believes that members would be questioned for allowing the development.

Cllr Simpson asked if overbearing could form part of the grounds for refusal

The Applications and Advice Manager responded with confirmation of the wording for the reason for refusal.

Some clarification was offered on the issue of demolition of the wall. The site is not within a conservation area therefore the wall could be demolished without the requirement for planning permission. A condition to replace the wall could be imposed but refusal on grounds of the demolition of the wall being unacceptable is not a valid reason.

Cllr Baguley queried the inclusion of Para. 58 of the NPPF in the reason for refusal.

Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that this is captured in the wording of the refusal.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that the wording of the refusal was acceptable and accepts that the issue of demolition of the wall can only be dealt with by conditioning its replacement.

The Applications and Advice Manager re-read the wording of the refusal reason to confirm to Members.

Vote: 10 in favour of refusal of the application and 1 against refusal.

DETERMINATION: Refuse for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed bungalow, by virtue of its form, size, scale and mass would appear cramped within the plot and would not reflect the character of the area. The siting of the proposed dwelling would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties and the "village green". The surrounding properties have a spacious feel with separation between properties and boundaries. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan and the NPPF.

-
- (3) **Reference:** 12/00769/FUL
Applicant: Belvoir Estate
Location: Croxton Park Nursery School, Croxton Park, Croxton Kerrial, NG32 1QY
Proposal: Change of use of former nursery school to a dwelling.

Cllr Chandler and Botterill left the room due to prejudicial interest.

Cllr Cumbers took the chair.

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that:

This application relates to the change of use of a former nursery school to a dwelling within Croxton Park.

Since publication of the report the applicant has submitted an ecology report. Leicestershire County Council have considered the report and are satisfied that no protected species or ecological features of note have been identified and no further action is required. They have advised that Natural England should be consulted as the buildings are immediately adjacent to a SSSI.

In response to this as the proposal is immediately adjacent to a SSSI then Natural England should be consulted.

This application seeks planning permission for the change of use of the former children's nursery to a two bedroom dwelling outside of the village envelope for Croxton Kerrial within the Croxton Park complex. The proposal is not considered to comply with policies OS2 and C6 of the Melton Local Plan or the Local Development Framework Core Strategy in relation to new dwellings in the countryside. However, in this instance it is considered that the building is of significance in relation to the surrounding listed buildings and the quality of the building itself as a heritage asset. It is also considered that the proposed dwelling will help to reduce the shortfall of smaller dwellings in the rural North, and would not add to the oversupply of larger executive

homes. Therefore on balance it is considered that the retention of a heritage asset outweighs the unsustainable location of the building. It is therefore recommended to delegate to permit the application subject to consultation with Natural England and no adverse comments or additional works in relation to this correspondence.

There were no speakers for the application.

Cllr Moncrieff queried the results of the bat survey which was carried out as part of the application.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that no objection was received from Leicestershire County Council Ecology department however it was recommended that Natural England be consulted.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he was previously unaware of the site and that although the proposal is a departure from local policy and contrary to guidance on housing need and sustainability Cllr Moncrieff **proposed approval of the application** as he feels that it is preferable to maintain the use building in some form.

Cllr Cumbers queried the issue of consultation with Natural England.

The Applications and Advice Manager responded that if members vote to approve the application, this can only be carried out provided there is no objection from Natural England.

Cllr Baguley **seconded approval of the application** and requested that a materials condition be imposed to avoid the use of UPVC windows.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that the standard wording of Condition 2 does not specify windows and that a specific condition could be used for this purpose.

Cllr Baguley believed that this should be done if the application is approved.

Cllr Wyatt queried the use of conditions to control the alteration of the ancillary buildings.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that the outbuildings are located within the red lined area of the site, therefore would be classed as ancillary buildings to the dwelling. Condition 4 (removal of Permitted Development rights) was referred to.

Cllr Cumbers questioned whether the use of UPVC windows would be permitted for the existing outbuildings.

The Applications and Advice Manager responded that the condition does not restrict maintenance of the existing outbuildings.

Cllr Cumbers questioned whether a condition could be formulated to protect the outbuildings.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he felt it would be difficult to put a condition on the maintenance of the outbuildings. He imagines that the developer would be unlikely to wish to harm the character of the site.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that a separate debate on conditioning of any work to the outbuildings would be required.

Cllr Cumbers suggested adding an informative / note to the applicant to the decision notice.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that this is an option.

Cllr Simpson stated that she felt that renovation of the outbuildings would not be a problem and questioned whether Condition 4 covered the outbuildings as well as the dwelling.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that Condition 4 relates partly to the dwelling and that the part relating to outbuildings is Class E but that this related only to proposed new outbuildings and not those already in existence, as they are within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling and can therefore be used as ancillary to the dwelling.

Cllr Cumbers asked if UPVC windows could be used on the outbuildings.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that there is no control over the maintenance of the existing outbuildings.

Cllr Holmes **proposed to refuse the application** because the proposal only applies to part of the building, would prefer to see an application which comprises a proposal for the entire site including the outbuildings.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that Members need to consider the current proposal for change of use as it stands with no proposal for the outbuildings which are within the curtilage of the site. A condition can be imposed to restrict work to the outbuildings.

Cllr Holmes **requested to defer the decision**

The Solicitor to the Council stated that no seconder yet for the approval.

Members agreed that Cllr Baguley had seconded the approval

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he would be happy for the application to be approved with the addition of a condition to restrict work to the outbuildings.

The Applications and Advice Manager clarified that Condition 2 (materials) could be extended to include the outbuildings.

Cllr Cumbers queried whether work to the existing flat was restricted by conditions.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that the existing flat was not part of the application being discussed.

Cllr Holmes **withdrew the proposal to refuse the application.**

Cllr Douglas commented that there is a concern that the outbuildings may fall into disrepair.

Cllr Cumbers commented on the attractive nature of the site.

Vote: 9 in favour of approval of the application, none against

DETERMINATION: Approve subject to:

- (a) Consultation with Natural England being undertaken and not giving rise to any objections
- (b) The conditions as set out in the report, amended to ensure window and door materials are agreed.
- (c) An additional condition: No works shall be undertaken to the outbuildings without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Cllr Chandler and Botterill returned to the room.

D68. URGENT BUSINESS

Cllr Baguley raised an issue regarding the length of time taken over the discussion of the minutes of previous meetings. A suggestion was made to discuss the previous minutes prior to the Development Committee meeting.

A discussion ensued over the level of detail required to be included in the minutes, and the possibility of using a recording device

Cllr Chandler stated that consultation with the Chief Executive is required in order to resolve the issue.

Further discussion took place over the relevance of correction of the exact wording of members comments.

Cllr Chandler commended the efforts of the Committee clerk, and expressed disappointment that the minutes were being scrutinised. Cllr Chandler stated that the exact wording of the comments of the members is not important, provided that the final decision is recorded correctly. The only amendments she made to the draft minutes are either grammatical or factual. She promised to report Members concerns to the Chief Executive.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that the purpose of minutes is to give a

flavour of the meeting only and not to be a verbatim record thereof.

The meeting commenced at 5:30 p.m. and closed at 8 p.m