



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

19 February 2015

PRESENT:

PM Chandler (Chair), J Simpson (Vice Chair), P Baguley,
G Botterill, G Bush, P Cumbers, A Freer-Jones, E Holmes,
J Illingworth

Solicitor to the Council (HG), Head of Regulatory Services,
Planning Officer (DK), Administrative Assistant (KS)

The Chair advised the public that application 14/00712/FUL had been withdrawn and application 13/00856/FUL had been deferred.

Cllr Holmes raised concerns that two Members were absent due to a Parish Council meeting and asked for the issue of meetings clashing to be brought up some time.

D79. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Sheldon and Councillor De Burle

D80. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair and Cllr Botterill declared an interest in Application 14/00973/FUL.

D81. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 18 December 2014

Cllr Cumbers asked that the sentence on page 241, "She stated that the main benefit is the economic growth that the proposal will deliver" be removed as the words that follow contradict this.

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Freer-Jones.

Minutes of the meeting 29 January 2015

Cllr Cumbers asked for "Detford Pink" to be changed to "Deptford Pink" on page 256.

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Bush.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.

D82. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 14/00973/FUL
Applicant: Terrace Hills LLP
Location: Barn Lodge Farm, Saltby Road, Croxton Kerrial
Proposal: 400 solar PV modules to cover 62 metres by 21 metres in size totalling an array of 100kWs.

The Chair and Cllr Botterill declared an interest in the application and left the room at 6.36pm.

Cllr Simpson took over as Chair for the application.

- (a) The Planning Officer stated that the application proposes the installation of 400 solar arrays at Barn Lodge Farm. The proposal would produce up to 100kW of to be fed to the farm and will assist with reducing the carbon footprint - any surplus fed to the National Grid.

The development is considered to have no undue adverse impact upon the landscape of the area or the residential amenity of the neighbouring buildings, would not adversely affect highway safety, or have a negative impact on ecology or archaeology. The application is recommended for approval as outlined within the report.

Cllr Holmes proposed to approve the application as it is an ideal location for solar panels.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal to approve.

Cllr Cumbers agreed with Cllr Holmes and stated it would not disturb anybody to make a farm self-sufficient.

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

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

The application seeks approval for the erection of a solar farm including solar panel arrays and associated equipment. The development is considered to have no undue adverse impact upon the landscape of the area or the residential amenity of the neighbouring buildings, would not adversely affect highway safety, or have a negative impact on ecology or archaeology. The development is not considered to be supported within the Melton Local Plan policy OS2 as it is not considered to be small in scale nor essential for the purposes of agriculture. However it is considered to meet the wider objectives of the NPPF, and the guidance published within the 'Planning Practise Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy', and the updated guidance in the NPPF National Planning Practice Guidance. Following the approach set out in paragraph 215, it is considered that the latter outweighs OS2 due to its more recent date and the absence of policy addressing renewable energy in OS2.

-
- (2) **Reference:** **14/00978/OUT**
 Applicant: **Mr I E Bennett**
 Location: **Field 3465, Coston Road, Sproxtton**
 Proposal: **Single dwelling**

The Chair and Cllr Botterill returned to the Meeting at 6.42pm

- a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that there were no additions or updates to report.
- b) Cllr Graham, the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:
- The situation for isolated homes in the countryside used to be prescriptive, and the scope was limited to only the need to operate a business in terms of labour requirements.
 - The advent of the NPPF replaced this to allow wider discretion.
 - Still requires special circumstances but is less precise about what they can be. Labour requirements are no longer the only measure.
 - Likely that the site without protection in a rural setting could be broken into again.
 - The basis for the “exceptional need” approach flows from sustainable development. The proposed house would help the pursuit of sustainable development.
 - It would cut out the need for the applicant to travel to and from the site.
 - Relatively harmless in terms of the appearance of the area.
 - A well-designed house partially screened by hedges and the existing building would not look out of place.

- The concerns for ecology could be overcome by withholding permission until the necessary surveys being done.
- The application needs to be conditioned to ensure it is as intended, therefore standard outline conditions relating to design, access, landscape etc. are included.
- The occupation should be linked to the activity on the site so it cannot be sold on to someone who does not have the same justification.

Cllr Simpson asked what the Applicant's occupation is.

Cllr Graham stated that it was agricultural and contracting.

Cllr Botterill stated that the land category is 3B, which is not regarded as good quality grassland and is of the lowest practical grade. In terms of Policy BE1, there would be no adverse effects on neighbouring properties. The new building would be designed and built where lorry bodies stand by the shed and not in the open field. The dwelling would not be isolated as there is a building on the other side of the field. There have been 34 break-ins on the property and the applicant is entitled to be protected. **Cllr Botterill proposed to approve** the application.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal to approve and stated that the applicant is not able to fully use his business as so much has been stolen, and has had to rely on a separate job. The application is a necessity. She stated that she was happy for there to be a condition to build the house in a certain position on the site and agreed with Cllr Graham that there should be a condition that the property should be tied to the business.

Cllr Simpson agreed and stated that the dwelling would not be isolated as there are other properties. The proposal is in line with the NPPF in the respect that the Committee should be "proactively supporting economic development to deliver homes and businesses that local areas need", and this is in need. She stated that she was happy to support the application with the condition of the tie and noted that Cllr Graham mentioned ecology and a decision should be made subject to the necessary surveys being done. She stated that Policy BE1 should be referenced to in the next detailed part of the application.

Cllr Bush stated that the location is a target for thieves and he was happy to support the application.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she did not support the application as there was no essential need for it due to the applicant not working there as he was doing other things such as hedging.

Cllr Freer-Jones wanted clarification on the main issues relating to the proposal in terms of essential need as she could not recall that term being used.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that the term 'essential need' came from paragraph 55 in the NPPF. It traditionally meant tending to animals and rapid

response etc., however this wording is not used anymore thus the Committee had the discretion to interpret what the essential need was, in this case security. He advised that the Members could take on all conditions Cllr Graham suggested, which were approval subject to ecology studies, approval subject to the conditions that the proposal is tied to the site so that it does not become speculative, and the guiding of the design in the detailed stage of the application.

Cllr Botterill agreed with these conditions.

The Chair asked if the siting had been decided.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that the proposal had to be within the red line on the site plan.

A vote was taken. 8 Members voted in favour of approval of the application, 1 voted against.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT subject to:

- i) The undertaking of an ecological report and it giving rise to no insurmountable problems;**
- ii) Conditions addressing the following:**
 - Details of design, siting and landscaping as reserved matters;**
 - The house being restricted to occupation only by persons occupying the site;**

For the following reasons:

The NPPF requires there to be special circumstances and the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside. The applicants need is genuine, and is exceptional due to the levels of crime he has experienced. The basis for the exceptional need relates to sustainable development which is the centrepiece of the NPPF. The proposed house would constitute sustainable development by minimising the need to travel to and from to the site and, by virtue of partial screening by hedges and the existing building and with appropriate design, would not be prominent and would be relatively harmless in terms of the appearance of the area.

-
- (3) Reference: 14/00739/COU**
Applicant: Mr J Parmar
Location: Turnstyle Woodturners, Burton Road, Melton Mowbray
Proposal: Change of Use from white electrical goods storage to small woodturning workshop

a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

We have received a letter of withdrawal of objection from an original objector, advising he is now satisfied with the protective measures proposed provided:

- The noise levels indicated in the report are complied with in the future.
- Any subsequent user of the premises also has to comply with these same levels,
- The modifications to the premises and the upgrade to plant and equipment are undertaken

These measures have been incorporated into the recommendation (conditions 2, 3 and 4) and the permission would be binding on the property and therefore future occupants.

b) Mark Hoogenboom, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Whilst the noise assessment is positive, some of the figures in the new report are reasonably high.
- Challenge the comments about background noise being louder than the machinery.
- Asked for screening to be put up to minimise the visual impact.
- 8am is too early to start, it should be 9am.
- No machinery should be run on Saturdays as the area is even quieter.
- Concerned with how the noise generated would be monitored and controlled.
- Noise Assessment has highlighted that some of the machinery is very audible.

The Chair stated that the issue of screening would not be the applicant's responsibility as he is only hiring a unit and is not a planning consideration.

c) Rob Fionda was invited to speak on behalf of the applicant and stated that:

- Wicklow Lodge has always been a mix-used site.
- It has been occupied since the 1960's by many businesses including cabinet makers and car sales and repairs.
- There is currently a well-established motor repair service on site.
- Turnstyle Woodturners provides employment and business locally.
- Forced to relocate from previous location due to Westmoreland's expanding, but there had been no complaints from the previous site even though it was adjacent to housing.
- The costs involved in relocating have been in excess of £12000 and could not be afforded again.
- If the application is refused it would mean the end of a business that is an important part of the supply chain locally.
- Noise is the only issue but everything is in place to overcome this issue.
- Working hours have been restricted and 8am is a reasonable start time.

- The Noise Assessment shows that the noise levels are in acceptable guidelines.
- An original objector has withdrawn his objection as noise is no longer an issue.
- The proposal complies with all current Planning policies.

Cllr Botterill asked if sound proofing had been put in.

Mr Fionda stated that the majority of what was recommended has been installed. The report recommended that double doors should be provided rather than single doors and once that had been put in the sound proofing should be even better.

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that if the conditions were not followed, they would be enforced. If the noise was a nuisance to neighbouring residencies, it could be reported and it would be enforced via Environmental Health.

Cllr Bush stated that if the application had come in as an empty building for this type of business, it may have been refused on the grounds that it is too close to residential houses. However, it is a retrospective application and the business is already there so necessary noise checks have been carried out and some of the noises were out of range. He stated that he was not happy with this sort of industry being on a residential site. He had concerns that if this application was accepted, it could lead the way for similar applications. He stated that he could not support the application as the business is noisy and elderly people live in the area.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she did not think there would be much harm, and the business should be encouraged. **Cllr Cumbers proposed to approve** the application for the reasons stated in the report.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal and stated that businesses such as this should be supported.

Cllr Holmes asked Cllr Bush if he had visited the site, as the Ward Councillor, to see if screening could be incorporated as this may help the objector.

Cllr Bush stated that the screening had only just been removed prior to the site visit and he was aware of it. He suggested other locations for the business could have been considered.

Cllr Botterill stated that the screening may aggravate others. He stated that he supported the application as the noise factor had been dealt with.

The Chair asked if Cllr Cumbers was happy with the proposed opening times of the business.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she was happy.

Cllr Simpson stated that local industries should be supported. She asked if the car mechanics business had been operational when the noise assessment was carried out, as a lot of the noise could have been generated from that. She stated that if the application was approved, the opening times should change from 8am to 9am as this is a residential area, and if they were not changed she could not support the proposal. She stated that she would have liked to have seen a period of six months to see how the application went, whether or not the business is as quiet as the assessment suggests.

Cllr Freer-Jones had concerns about the start times and stated that the business could open at 8am, but the use of the machinery was the main concern. She asked if all noise, including background noise, had been taken into consideration on the noise assessment.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that eight noise assessments had been taken, some of which showed the noise levels of the area without the business operating. When it was operational, the machinery made no difference.

Cllr Botterill asked what the decibels were.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that it was two decibels either side of 50.

Cllr Freer-Jones asked if the noise assessment of the whole environment was causing Members to attribute the noise to the one business, which would be unfair.

Cllr Cumbers stated that most offices start at 9am, but farms and other businesses start earlier as they need the light, and an earlier start for this kind of business is okay.

A vote was taken. 7 Members voted in favour of approval of the application and 2 Member voted against.

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

The application seeks the change of use of a building from the storage of white electrical goods to a woodturning workshop within the town envelope of Melton Mowbray. As such, saved policy OS1 of the Melton Local Plan would apply, along with the relevant sections of the NPPF that seek to promote economic growth. The proposal is considered to be supported by the Melton Local Plan and the NPPF. It would not cause any additional dangers to users of the highways, and conditions restricting the times that machinery can be used are considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity and noise within a residential area. In addition, conditions relating to the mitigation of noise can be imposed to further reduce any impact upon the residents of Waverley Court.

(4) Reference: 14/00894/FUL & 14/00912/LBC
Applicant: Mr Anthony Sheward - Marstons
Location: Nags Head Inn, 20 Main Street, Harby
Proposal: Addition of an external chimney for the extractor fan.

a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that this application is an attempt to overcome the noise and odour issues arising from the installation of the extractor plan. However we are concerned that it is an inappropriate solution in architectural terms and have not been persuaded it would alleviate the problems in any event. We are seeking to open a dialogue with the brewery to find a solution to this problem.

b) Alistair Hall, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There is not enough information to make an informed decision.
- There is a negative impact on his family through noise and smell.
- Drawings presented are not appropriate or sympathetic to the beauty of the Listed Building.
- No information provided in regards of proposed materials, colour, sound proofing and smell reduction attributes of the proposal.
- Operational hours of the pub are 43.5 serving hours per week and 4hrs preparation time.
- Fan is operational approximately 10hrs a day.
- Foods served include burgers with chips and onion rings which add to the smell.
- Limited information in the application makes it impossible to say whether the proposed chimney would be in keeping with the appearance of the Grade II building.
- The lack of supporting evidence in the design and access statement does not state why the chimney is needed.
- No dimensions given on the Listed Building Consent drawings so it is not known how large the chimney will be.
- The chimney would be detrimental to the appearance of the building.
- It is in a highly visible point of the village.
- Logical solution is to have an internal chimney flue which may take away the problems of noise and odour issues.

c) Cllr Rhodes, the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The existing internal chimney with an internal flue may be a solution.
- The external chimney could be supported if there it was in the same material as the building.
- The building has other appendages around it which are not in sympathy.
- The essential thing the building is protecting is the construction of the

- building.
- The application needs to be refused but a solution needs to be found.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that if the application was refused, it is only this approach that would be refused, so others could be put forward.

Cllr Baguley proposed to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the report and hoped that Officers could agree another solution with the brewery.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to refuse the application and stated that she wished the business well but not at the expense of the neighbouring residencies.

Cllr Simpson stated that what is there at present is unacceptable and that she would prefer to see something done with the internal chimney. She had concerns that there may be problems if a chimney was built externally because it would reduce the exit and there may be problems with that when the car park is full. She stated that she was happy to support refusal.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously decided that the application should be refused.

DETERMINATION: Refused, for the following reason(s):

14/00894/FUL:

- 1. The chimney, by reason of siting, appearance, design and materials, is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the grade II* listed building. A convincing case has not been made to demonstrate that the less than substantial harm caused by the chimney would be outweighed by any public benefits and as such the proposal is considered contrary to policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan 1999 and the NPPF (paragraphs 132-134) which seek to ensure development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of buildings and the surroundings and to ensure the protection heritage assets.**
- 2. Based on the information submitted insufficient details have been provided to demonstrate that the chimney (and extraction fan within) could operate without undue harm to the residential amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties through noise and/or odour pollution. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan 1999 and the NPPF (paragraph 17) which seek to ensure development does not have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.**

14/00912/LBC:

- 1. The chimney, by reason of siting, appearance, design and size, is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the grade II* listed building. A convincing case has not been made to demonstrate that the substantial harm caused by the chimney would be outweighed by any public benefits and as such the proposal is considered contrary to the NPPF (paragraphs 132-134) which seek to ensure development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of listed buildings and to ensure the protection heritage assets.**
-

(5) Reference: 14/00986/FUL
Applicant: Scalford Hall Hotel Ltd - Mr C Warburg
Location: Scalford Hall, Melton Road, Scalford
Proposal: Erection of a marquee in the garden

- a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that at the site visit we were asked for clarification as to upgraded access arrangements and extra parking to be provided.

Precise numbers of car/coach parking spaces at present and as proposed:

- 164 cars
- 9 coaches
- 25 staff

How many guests are likely to attend an event and whether there is sufficient space on site for all of their vehicles?

- Up to 400

Widening of access drive.

- The width of the access drive is restricted by trees, between which it is proposed to provide new car parking spaces. The works we saw represent a start on the widening but not the finished article – a condition is proposed to bring this up to the necessary standard.

Noise and timing – the work undertaken to date shows that noise from the marquee itself can be controlled so that it doesn't affect neighbours, so on this basis we see no justification for hours of operation type conditions.

However this doesn't cover 'comings and goings' and the Committee may wish to consider if a condition is needed in these terms, given the proximity of residences to the access drive.

The Chair asked the Members if they would suspend standing orders to allow the applicant to speak.

Cllr Botterill proposed the applicant should be allowed to speak.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal and it was unanimously decided the speaker would be allowed.

b) The representative of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The traffic officer is satisfied with the proposals in regard to the access to the site.
- There had been an increase in the width of the driveway by 1m.
- Can cater for 250 cars as well as 9 coaches and staff.
- Good relationship with the nursing home next door which allows the applicants to use their car park if there is an overflow.
- The Hall already caters for functions and there are no traffic issues.
- The posts on the left hand side of the driveway will be removed.
- There are further plans to improve the driveway.
- Enquiries for the marquee are for between 180 and 250 people, this is expected to go up to 400 people.
- Level of parking is not anticipated to be an issue as guests share cars and take taxis.

Cllr Holmes had concerns about how a bus would get down the driveway as it is not wide enough.

The Applicant stated that it would be one-way traffic, unless there was a crossover in which case there are lay-bys which could be pulled into.

Cllr Simpson asked if it was expected that revellers at functions would carry on after midnight.

The Applicant confirmed this as the events would be held in the evening and the premises currently has a license for 2am.

Cllr Holmes stated that she hoped the business would continue to prosper, however the driveway is dangerous. She noted that as well as the 400 people in the marquee, there would also be guests at the hotel. She was concerned with the issue of using the nursing home as an overflow car park and would rather there was a specific place to put the cars. She stated that the entrance of the drive needs to be wider.

The Chair agreed with the concerns about the parking at the nursing home as windows would be open in the summer and noise travels.

Cllr Illingworth stated that he was unhappy with the proposal for widening the drive as there is a tree leaning into the entrance, which means cars still need to swing out into the middle to miss the widened part as there is a tree hanging over the drive. He had concerns with the plan of the driveway as it shows the canopy of the trees, but not the trunks and a line of vehicles would not be able to

be parked along the drive. He was concerned that the drive was not wide enough for coaches to pass each other and stated that he could not support the application.

Cllr Freer-Jones stated that the driveway and the issue of parking and passing of cars is a historical issue. Scaford Hall has always had a narrow driveway and whilst the marquee will produce an increase in guests and cars, the application will include something to make the access better. She stated that this was an opportunity to enhance the driveway before the functions begin.

Cllr Holmes stated that normally with an outline application, you cannot put something up and then advertise it because it is only outline. She suggested that the application should be deferred in order to get proper parking and use of the building. She stated that the parking must be right for the nursing home and the driveway should be wider.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that it had been proposed that 'grasscrete' or similar would be placed alongside the drive that would allow a row of vehicles to be parked upon. The temporary passing place seems to be wide enough to allow vehicles to pass, including buses. He advised that rather than deferring the application, conditions 6 and 7 could be adapted to include revised details should be submitted before a full application is approved.

Cllr Holmes proposed to approve the application.

Cllr Freer-Jones seconded the proposal.

Cllr Bush stated that 200 car parking spaces for 400 people seem more than enough as most will car share or arrive by taxi or coach. He stated he was happy to support the application.

Cllr Simpson stated that she was happy to support as a lot of the guests would be staying at the hotel.

Cllr Freer-Jones was concerned about the noise levels for the surrounding residents.

Cllr Holmes stated that she was concerned for the residents of the nursing home but the owner was not too concerned, however she remained concerned about the parking of the cars on the driveway.

Cllr Botterill suggested that temporary conditions should be put on to allow time to get the work done and get the business going.

A vote was taken. 8 Members voted in favour of approving the application, 1 Member voted against.

DETERMINATION: Approve, subject to the conditions in the report with the

exception of nos. 6 and 7 which are to be replaced as follows:

6. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved , revised details of the additional car parking, coach parking and coach turning areas shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the first event taking place at the marquee.

7. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved , revised details of the proposed widened access from Melton Road shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the first event taking place at the marquee.

For the following reasons:

The proposed marquee is considered to be contrary to policy OS2 of the Melton Local Plan as it is not considered to be small scale. It is considered to represent sustainable development, and is supported in principal by paragraph 28 of the NPPF which supports a prosperous rural economy. The marquee is reasonably well located in terms of its impact upon the countryside, and issues raised by the Highways Officer can be dealt with by way of condition. Conditions relating to a noise assessment can be attached to any permission granted to ensure that noise does not breach acceptable levels at sensitive noise receptors

(6) Reference: 14/00988/FUL
Applicant: Long Clawson Dairy Ltd
Location: Long Clawson Dairy, 28 West End, Long Clawson
Proposal: Replacement milk silos for those previously approved 08/00724/FUL reducing from 5 to 4 but with increase in height.

a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that there were no updates to provide to this report.

b) Richard Kupfer, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Objected to the height of the silos as at 17mtrs tall they would be higher than any structure in the village.
- Disagreed the proposal would have minimal impact on the visual amenity.
- Planning guidelines state plans should fit sympathetically with heritage assets but this proposal would have considerable domination of the church and the listed buildings at the west end of the village.
- There is another application to remove the screening on Hickling Lane which would open the view to the silos.
- Previous silos are only 11.6mtrs and do not have any adverse impact

visually on the street scene.

- Residents in the west end of the village are worried about multiple visits of heavy lorries and an increase in this would be detrimental.
- Objected to the height but there could be a compromise.

The Chair asked about the other planning application.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that there was an application in to remove bunding to create an access point.

c) Mr Kim Kettle, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Long Clawson Dairy operates on a global stage and supplies most of the UK retail outlets but also export products to 42 countries outside the UK.
- Milk comes from 45 local supplying farms.
- Collectively these support 135 farming jobs.
- The dairy supports over 370 jobs and over 400 local businesses.
- The application forms an investment on behalf of the farmers, making their long-term future by providing capital to invest in a manufacturing plant.
- The application will ensure food will be delivered safely and to the standards required to trade on a global stage.
- The dairy may be considered large on a local scale but it is very small on a global scale.
- Must remain competitive with other cheeses.
- Silos were moved to lower ground in order to minimise the visual impact.
- Future growth means local farmers can have a sustainable future and reinvest in their businesses for their long term security.

d) Cllr Rhodes, the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Objections centre around the issue of whether the silos will be visually intrusive.
- Convinced by the analysis in the report that the silos will not be intrusive because of the difference in ground levels.
- Although they will be slightly higher, they will not be significantly higher.
- Supported the proposal to be permitted.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated the application reinforces the importance of site inspections as the views to the church are obstructed by trees and buildings, anyway.

Cllr Baguley stated that the main concern is the visual impact. The present silos stand at 14mtrs, the new ones would stand at 17mtrs, but due to the difference in ground levels she did not think they would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. **Cllr Baguley proposed to permit** the application.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to approve as the dairy is vital to Melton Mowbray and the borough.

Cllr Simpson stated that she was happy to support as there was no harm in visual impact due to the change in ground levels.

Cllr Botterill noted that screening had already been put in and that in ten years nothing would be visible.

Cllr Illingworth was concerned that the existing silos at 14mtrs sit on a plinth of 2.5mtrs and the new ones would be built at ground level, however the plan showed that the new silos were also on a plinth.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that the plan compares the previous approval with the current application, meaning the new silos will be built at ground level.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously decided the application should be permitted.

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

The application site lies within the village envelope of Long Clawson and thus benefits from a presumption in favour of development under policies OS1 and BE1, and fulfils the objectives of EM9 and the NPPF which support economic growth within rural areas. It is also considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on either residential amenity , the streetscene, open countryside or the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building St Remigius Church and satisfactory access and parking are provided within the site.

D83. REVIEW OF SITE INSPECTION PROCEDURES

- a) The Head of Regulatory Services presented the report and stated that: Freeby PC have commented on the report and comment that:
- A representative of the Local Parish Council should be invited to attend site visits to applications within its Parish.
 - Unless members of the Planning Committee have carried out a site inspection visit either as part of the visit organised by the Planning Officer or separately they should not be allowed to vote on the application.
 - At present the site inspections are a closed process. The local community has been shut out from it. This lack of transparency is damaging to the planning process and the Borough residents faith in it. It needs to be opened up so that both applicant and others who will be affected by applications can feel that the applications have been considered in depth and with due thought. This is not the situation at

present.

- Other parish councils should be asked for their input into this review. We believe they should be asked whether they think the process is working successfully for them and their communities.

Cllr Graham agreed with the report and stated that site visits should not be made mandatory to all planning committee members.

The Chair stated that often it was not possible to keep to the published timetable due to applications often being withdrawn by applicants. Since the new arrangements where no members of the public or Parish Councillors are present, it now means that providing that access to the sites is in place Members can move from one site to another unhindered. She added that it must be remembered that not all Members of the Committee can attend site visits due to work commitments. Site visits are arranged for Members to see for themselves how the proposal in front of them will fit into the site, not for an open discussion with objectors.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that Parish Councils want to witness how site visits are conducted.

Cllr Holmes proposed that a representative of Parish Councils be invited to site visits as they know the area.

Cllr Botterill disagreed and stated that the Ward Councillor should be present, as Parish Councillors have the opportunity to come and address the Planning Committee.

Cllr Bush stated that he was happy with the way site visits are currently conducted as the purpose of them is for the Members to see the site in relation to the Committee papers.

Cllr Simpson stated that this had arisen due to there being properties on a previous site visit that had not been visited to see how the proposal would impact them. She suggested that the Parish Council could be notified that a site visit is taking place and if there are any vantage points that need to be seen, they can request for them to be visited.

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that this was already covered in the current procedure.

Cllr Illingworth stated that Parish Councils have to understand that site visits are not pre-meeting discussions but an opportunity for Members to familiarise themselves with the site. He suggested that there could be an amendment to the recommendation to informally encourage Ward Councillors to attend site visits.

Cllr Cumbers agreed that site visits were to inform Members, however the Parish Council and applicants see them as a chance to discuss the application. She

stated that a way to view all vantage points must be found, and the Committee should be more proactive with the Parish Councils to ensure they share other information and different properties that may be affected.

Cllr Baguley proposed that the existing arrangements for site visits should stay as they are as they are not a discussion, but are a fact finding mission.

Cllr Bush seconded the proposed recommendation.

Cllr Cumbers stated that on occasions the applicant needs to let Members onto the site. She suggested that there should be a two hour window to cover this.

Cllr Simpson asked for there to be an amendment to the recommendation that all vantage points on a site visit are taken into account. She stated that it would be right to go round and look from all viewpoints to see what difference a proposal would make to the landscape.

Cllr Freer-Jones noted that appendix A part 5 covered this.

Cllr Cumbers proposed that the recommendation, particularly point 5, could be worked on by Officers and brought back to Committee.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal.

DETERMINATION: A vote was taken and it was unanimously agreed that Officers will look at part 5 of the existing procedure and bring it back to Committee.

D84. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.48 pm