



MEETING OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

4 April 2013

PRESENT:

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

Observer Councillor – J Illingworth

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

---

D87. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr J Simpson – Substituted by B Rhodes

D88. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013 was proposed by Cllr Baguley and seconded by Cllr Gordon. The committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the chair sign them as a true record.

D89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Rhodes declared an interest on application 13/00080/FUL as he spoke on this issue as Ward Councillor for a different application on that site. He also declared an interest on applications 13/00031/FUL, 13/00110/FUL and 13/00092/FUL as he was the Chairman for Policy Finance and Administration that promoted the development.

Cllr Wyatt declared an interest on applications 13/00031/FUL, 13/00110/FUL and

13/00092/FUL as he is a member of Policy Finance and Administration.

The Chair stated that she is a member of the CSA committee but left the meeting before any decision was made on the garage sites and is therefore free to participate in the decision making.

Cllr Freer-Jones declared an interest on application 13/00092/FUL as she sent a letter of representation as Ward councillor on behalf of local residents.

Cllr Gordon stated that she was at the CSA meeting as an observer not as a member and is therefore free to participate in the decision making.

#### D90. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1)   **Reference:**     **12/00885/FUL**  
      **Applicant:**    **Mr A Norris**  
      **Location:**    **Jalna 9 Easthorpe Road Bottesford NG13 0DS**  
      **Proposal:**     **Replacement dwelling and garage**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

- The key issue for Committee is whether NPPF requirements that new housing addresses market imbalances is to be pursued.
- There is no counter balance in this case because the NPPF is the policy lead on this matter and there are not competing or contradictory polices. However, the NPPF is itself sometimes contradictory in that at the same time as asking for houses to reflect the demography of the area, it also seeks to provide a wide choice of housing, including self build opportunities.
- It is also recognised that the application is for a single dwelling and as such will not on its own define success in terms of meeting housing needs. On the other hand, in the rural area in particular, the market is made up of numerous single and small scale proposals and the cumulative effect if these will define success.
- If we are to depart from the NPPF, reasons would need to be provided.

(b) Mr Wicks the agent for the applicant was invited to speak and stated that:

- The current bungalow is out of character and has been marketed for a year without any takers
- Complies with polices OS1, BE1, HS6, Core Strategy CS3 and the NPPF which is in favour of sustainable development and self build projects.
- The applicant has a growing family and wants to remain within Bottesford where they operate three separate businesses.

- Specific guaranteed housing need.
- Although not physically creating a new dwelling it does free up a three bedroom house within the village which our policies want.
- Applicant will be able to walk to work.
- The NPPF supports good design, effective use of land, sustainable housing and economical development. Ample reasons for this application to be supported.
- The application has received two letters of support and has overcome issues the neighbour had.
- The applicant will use local suppliers and promote local economical growth
- David Wilsons recent proposal was approximately 50/50 mix of larger small houses and that was supported this is effectively the same.

The Head of Regulatory Services replied to Mr Wicks:

- There is a danger of confusing the concepts of current market availability with planning objectives of longer term supply meeting population trends.
- The three bedroom house is not seen as a new house in calculation of the stock as it is already included.
- The David Wilson scheme was an outline application and no house types were specified.

The Chair said that she had called this application in as she is concerned about not supporting local people. The applicant employs a lot of local people and a smaller house will be released.

Cllr Baguley stated that Bottesford has a good mix of housing and the application shouldn't be turned down just because it's a bit bigger. The existing bungalow is out of character and she **proposed approval of the application** as it's an improvement.

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

Cllr Holmes stated she would have seconded the application as it will be for the betterment of the area.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he is worried about considering individual circumstances instead of policy and that it would mean losing a two bedroom bungalow which there is a need for in that area.

The Chair replied to Cllr Moncrieff saying that the bungalow had been on the market for a year at a reasonable price and still hadn't managed to sell. She also raised concerns of current legislation not stopping people from adding extensions.

Cllr Botterill stated that it's basically swapping a house for a bungalow and he can't see a lot wrong with it.

Cllr Cumbers stated that no one had mentioned there is a shortage of five bedroom

houses. If houses don't sell then the price isn't right and we aren't here to discuss the policy of extensions. Great to see someone employing local people the site could accommodate two smaller dwellings.

The Chair replied to Cllr Cumbers disagreeing with the capacity of the site.

Cllr Holmes asked a question about housing policy and that she felt that the house would fit in with the environment.

Cllr Rhodes stated that there is clearly a considerable demand for housing and it isn't suitable for living in its current run down state.

Cllr Freer-Jones asked for clarification from The Head of Regulatory Services on housing needs.

The Head of Regulatory Services replied to both Cllr Freer Jones and Cllr Holmes.

Cllr Gordon stated that the house would look congruent with the houses nearby and the current bungalow looks out of place.

A vote was taken to approve the application: 9 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention  
Cllr Cumbers wished for her vote to be recorded as an abstention and Cllr Moncrieff as against

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

**The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and appearance, parking and access arrangements and to have no significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties. As such, it is considered to be in accordance with the objectives of the above policies. 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.**

At 18:35 Cllr Rhodes left the meeting

- 
- (2) **Reference: 13/00080/FUL**  
**Applicant: Mr Harman**  
**Location: Land to the rear of the 21 Bolton Lane, Hose (Former Black Horse)**  
**Proposal: One new dwelling, temporary caravan and temporary storage**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

- 2 further objections had been received – the dwelling is still outside of the village envelope (VE) and trees have already been removed.
- These issues are covered in the report, arising from the 3 objections previously received.
- The key issue is considered to be the impact of breaching the VE. For clarity, we consider village envelopes to be current and consistent with the NPPF and as such ‘valid’ in our decision making. However, in this case we consider the harm caused by breaching it to be limited and that is the basis for the recommendation – to re-iterate, not any suggestion that they no longer carry weight.

(b) Mr Harman, the applicant was invited to speak and stated that:

- His plans were always to sell the Black horse and build a high spec retirement home
- The Wooden stables have been removed with this new application as they were a point of concern
- He feels they have taken on board the concerns from the development committee
- The difference with this application from the one previously approved is the footprint is in a slightly different position leaving some of it outside the village envelope
- The boundary wall much is a much older structure than first thought and belonged to a grade 2 listed building. This will be lost if the approved application is built causing a loss of amenities for neighbour
- The land usage to the rear unique
- The committee should make an exemption to the agreed policies

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed with Mr Harman on the position of the boundary wall

Cllr Baguley stated that the application is still outside the village envelope and this is an issue for her

Cllr Gordon stated that it being out the village envelope is acceptable in this circumstance and this application is a better position for the building. She **proposed approval of the application**

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

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he feels it's a good scheme and doesn't feel emphasis should be put on village envelopes as they are very old and would be more than happy to support this application

A vote was taken to approve the application: 8 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention

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

The proposed relocation would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the village or the countryside due to the dense screening of the site from the open countryside beyond, its former use as a beer garden and its approved use as residential curtilage. It is considered that this application represents a balance between the breaching of the village envelope and reducing the impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the converted public house. The removal of Permitted Development Rights would also give control of the site which is not present with the extant planning permission. In this instance, due to the site already being approved for residential curtilage the harm to the open countryside is not so demonstrable to warrant a refusal when weighed against the benefits to the occupiers of the converted public house. The proposal seeks to support the objectives of the NPPF in supporting housing growth in sustainable locations.

18:47 Cllr Wyatt and Cllr Rhodes left the meeting

---

- (3)   **Reference:       13/00091/FUL**  
      **Applicant:       Melton Borough Council**  
      **Location:        Car Park Adjacent To 8 Saxelby Road Asfordby**  
      **Proposal:        Three New Dwellings**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

Amended plans had been received showing the layout in conformity with that approved at outline – HA no objection subject to conditions requiring parking for plot 1 to be provided prior to occupation and adequate visibility splays being provided on Saxelby Road.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that whilst the proposal is positive, he would prefer access from Burnaby Road but highways reasons for moving it are sensible. He is concerned about the removal a thoroughfare however it's not too far to walk round. He **proposed approval of the application.**

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

The Chair stated that she is also concerned with the footpath issue.

Cllr Baguley asked if the footpath is a legal right of way.

Cllr Moncrieff replied saying he doesn't believe there is a legal right of way and that these footpaths can be a source of anti-social behaviour.

Cllr Holmes stated that she believed the road is a quiet road and that the house

position could have been changed.

Cllr Gordon asked if it was far for people to walk about without the thoroughfare.

Cllr Moncrieff replied that it was less than 100 metres.

A vote was taken to approve the application and approved unanimously.

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

**The proposal is considered to comply with the objectives of the above planning policies and supports the objectives of the NPPF in boosting housing supply in sustainable locations and contributes to preserving the character of the Conservation Area. 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.**

---

- (4) **Reference: 13/00110/FUL**  
**Applicant: Melton Borough Council**  
**Location: Garages between Greaves Avenue and Eastfield Avenue, Greaves Avenue Melton Mowbray**  
**Proposal: Four 2 bedroomed houses**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

An additional representation has been received explaining that the tree stumps at the rear of 54 Greaves Avenue, are part of no 54 If the developer requires the stumps to be removed as i am aware the roots could pose a problem with the proposed parking area then they can do so at their expense. The boundary fence can then be moved to its rightful position

Cllr Holmes states that the garages there haven't been used for years and this was a good scheme she **proposed approval of the application**

Cllr Moncrieff **seconded the proposal to approve the application** he also stated that this was a trouble spot and very much needed

Cllr Cumbers states that these garages don't work anywhere. She is against this in principle but will support it as its only answer

A vote was taken to approve the application 8 in favour and 1 abstention

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

**The proposal is considered to comply with the objectives of the above planning policies and the NPPF in significantly boosting house supply and**

**prompting sustainable development. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with these policies and no other factors are present to indicate that the decision should depart from the terms of the Development Plan.**

---

- (5)   **Reference:     13/00092/FUL**  
      **Applicant:     Melton Borough Council**  
      **Location:      Garages, Tudor Hill, Melton Mowbray**

**Proposal: Erection of 3 family dwellings on disused former domestic garage Site**

Cllr Freer-Jones stated that she was Ward Councillor and has declared an interest in this application so won't be voting. She is strongly objecting on behalf of the residents as there are too many houses in one area. She is against in principle but doesn't know what else you could do with the site.

Cllr Moncrieff stated that he disagrees with Cllr Freer-Jones and that these would have much more space than modern housing estates. He also questioned if conditions had been added to protect the hedge and the width of the path. He **proposed approval of the application.**

Cllr Baguley **seconded the proposed to permit the application** and stated that she is worried about leaving it as it is.

A vote was taken to approve the application and approved unanimously.

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

**The proposal is considered to comply with the objectives of the above planning policies and the NPPF in significantly boosting house supply and prompting sustainable development. 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**

**D91. Section 106 Obligations**

The Councillors discussed the report on the obligations and noted the content.

**D92. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. and closed at 7.20 p.m.