



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

25 June 2015

PRESENT:

J Illingworth (Chair), J Simpson (Vice Chair), P Baguley,
P Chandler, P Cumbers, P Faulkner, E Holmes, J Wyatt

Solicitor to the Council (HG),
Regulatory Services Manager (PR), Applications and Advice Manager (JW)
Planning Officer (DK), Administrative Assistant (KS)

As Substitute

Councillor Bains for Councillor Glancy
Councillor Posnett for Councillor Hurrell

D9. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Hurrell, Cllr Glancy, Cllr Botterill

D10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Posnett declared an interest in application 15/00212/FULHH as she opposed and spoke as the Ward Councillor at the previous meeting.

Cllr Faulkner also declared an interest in application 15/00212/FULHH.

Cllr Chandler declared an interest in application 15/00278/FUL.

D11. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 4th June 2015

Cllr Simpson wished for the line on page 6 “the extra bunding would be complimentary to the tarmac” to be changed to “extra bunding plus planting be in mitigation of the tarmac”

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Chandler. 7 Members voted that the Chair sign them as a true record. 3 Members abstained as they had not seen the Minutes.

D12. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 14/00148/FUL
Applicant: Mr T Abdul-Khalek
Location: Land south of The Mount, Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray
Proposal: Construction of 6 x 3 bed detached houses, 2 x 4 bed detached houses and 1 x 2 bed detached bungalows. Relocation of playground.

(a) The Planning Officer stated that: One update to report
The County Ecologist has advised that whilst insufficient information has been submitted to address mitigation of protected species they confirm that they do not consider that there is an option of satisfactory mitigation within the proposed development, as it would cause the loss of a main badger sett and the majority of the existing foraging habitat.

Therefore it is recommended that refusal reason 3 is amended to reflect the position of the ecologist:-

It is the opinion of the Council that the proposal would cause harm to protected species, destroying important habitats that cannot be successfully mitigated and would be contrary to local plan policies C15 and the NPPF part 11, particular paragraph 109.

There is nothing to further to add to the report.

The proposal is considered to have adverse impacts that are significant and demonstrable when applying the test of the NPPF para. 14 in the light that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply

The proposal seeks to redevelop a site that was part of a larger scheme to provide public open space for the development of 122 dwellings. The site is now in private ownership however the conditions attached to the original development still apply.

The condition states that details of the facilities were to be provided within the public open space were to be approved - and included an details of a level playing area and an equipped play area and stipulated that it was to be retained at all times.

The open space and equipped play area is to be retained however the development of nine dwellings would reduce the open space provision on the site. The proposal seeks to relocate the equipped play area to the front of the site which may provide some benefits in terms of drainage and better surveillance but the useable play space will be reduced.

Part of the site is currently left unmanaged to safeguard protected species and this would be removed and no mitigation however we have since been advised that its not considered that mitigation could be successfully achieved.

Immediately to the north of the site is a Schedule Monument: The Mount, insufficient information has been submitted to assess the likely impacts upon this designated heritage asset or buried artefacts and an assessment cannot be fully considered.

There are also issues relating to the proposed access and in its current position it does not have highways approval.

It is considered that the proposal does not amount to sustainable development as promoted within the context of the NPPF and should be resisted. The limited public benefits of providing nine market dwellings is not considered to outweigh the environment concerns and the proposal is accordingly recommended for refusal.

Cllr Cumbers proposed to refuse the application as per the officer's recommendation. She stated that the site should be an area of protected open space. She noted that the application was incomplete and the development would cause harm to locality and neighbours.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal to refuse the application and agreed that it should be a protected area of open space and green areas are needed in housing areas.

The Applications and Advice Manager explained that an outline application and reserved matters application had been submitted, and the development would have to provide an equipped area of play in line with Policies H10 and H11.

Cllr Chandler stated that it should be the priority of the Local Plan to put protection on the site.

Cllr Simpson stated that she was surprised there were no details regarding the Monument. She stated that the development would change the character of the area and it would become overcrowded.

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

DETERMINATION: Refused as recommendation

- (2) **Reference:** **15/00278/FUL**
 Applicant: **Axiom Housing Association Ltd**
 Location: **Car Park, Thorpe End, Melton Mowbray**
 Proposal: **Erection of 27 bedroom 'foyer' building with staff and communal facilities, associated access road, car parking and landscaping (sui generis use)**

(a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that:

Late representations had been received, mostly reiterating points which were

already reported and addressed in the committee report. The additional new point was safeguarding concerns about the proposed accommodation of vulnerable young people.

Described the proposal and the type of accommodation which was proposed and noted that the applicant who had requested to speak was better placed to answer any detailed points about a Foyer. Explained the details of the building and the location of site and relationship with neighbouring dwellings, flats, adjacent cheese factory and the town centre

Highlighted main issues – need for the accommodation; design/appearance and impact upon neighbours in flats opposite and houses in Brook Street which was illustrated with use of sectional drawing, noted that impact would be acceptable due to distances, orientation, limited windows and light render finish to walls;;referred to flood risk and mitigation; noted that site was previously public car park and was now a private car park which would be lost with some impact upon spaces in town centre and noted that ecological impact could be mitigated . Referred to need to accommodate these young people who are vulnerable and need support. Accords with saved Local Plan policies as set out in report. In conclusion, emphasised that need for the accommodation outweighs any harm.

b) Andy Walker, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Poor car parking at present
- Dangerous road as five roads join
- Overdeveloped and overbearing
- Too tall, too many occupants and too close to residential area
- Site too small
- Loss of privacy to Brook Street and St John's Court
- Overshadowing and loss of amenity
- Not in keeping with the rich history of the area
- Increase in noise and disturbance
- Flooding has occurred in 1974, 1975 and 1978
- Impact on water voles in Brook Street
- Air pollution due to increase in traffic
- Concerns for fire safety evacuation

Alan Lewin of Axiom Housing Association Ltd, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Not for profit association
- Affordable housing for vulnerable, young people
- French concept for young homeless people seeking accommodation
- Located within easy reach of education, the council, transport, retail and recreation
- Well designed and well built
- High level security and CCTV
- High quality management and well resourced

Cllr Holmes asked how long Axiom Housing Association Ltd had been building foyers and what the older buildings look like at present.

Mr Lewin stated that the first foyer was built in the 1990's and is still in use. He stated that the older buildings look as good as new.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she understood 16 year olds needing support but asked whether 23-24 year olds could look after themselves.

Mr Lewin stated that the foyer would provide independence but still offer support to young people from broken homes or care backgrounds.

The Chair asked if there was a time scale for people moving on from the foyer, and if there was a success rate.

Mr Lewin stated that the range of young people moving on is from 6 months to 2 years and it depended on their independent needs and circumstances. He stated that there is an assessment model, QUAF, which suggests an 80% positive outcome.

The Regulatory Services Manager responded to Mr Walker's concerns of water voles and stated that the ecology of the site was addressed in page 5 of the report, and Leicestershire County Council Ecology are satisfied. He stated that the air pollution was addressed on page 9 of the report, and the fire safety would be dealt with by Building Regulations.

Cllr Posnett proposed to approve the application in line with policies OS1 and BE1. She stated that the development would provide a gateway to the town centre and Sherrard Street, and is a well-designed building. There is an identified need for the development as at present young homeless people are housed in Grantham. She stated that the application is well thought out and the applicants have a good history and success rate.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal to approve as benefits are not enough and young people need guidance and support.

Cllr Bains agreed and stated that it was a positive development and there was a specific need.

Cllr Holmes agreed that the facility is needed however she was concerned for the residents in Brook Street who would be overshadowed by the development. She proposed to move the development away from the residential area.

Cllr Chandler agreed with Cllr Holmes and stated that although it would be a fantastic facility, she was concerned for the residents nearby as 14metres from the rear of properties is too close.

The Regulatory Services Manager advised that the application should be

considered as it is, as it is the result of consideration in terms of design and relation to neighbours. He stated that in terms of residential amenity, the proposal is acceptable because of the design.

Cllr Chandler stated that she supported the principle of the proposal but was concerned as neighbours have right to light and it was harmful to Brook Street.

Cllr Cumbers stated that vulnerable 16 year olds need the support and it would be a development to be proud of. She stated that the benefits of the development outweigh the possible harm.

A vote was taken. It was unanimously decided that the application should be approved.

DETERMINATION: Approved as recommendation.

- (3) Reference: 15/00858/FUL**
Applicant: Caister Castle Trust
Location: The Bowery, 2 Church Lane, Wymondham
Proposal: Construction of three detached residential properties

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks planning permission for the erection of three dwellings within the grounds of The Bowery. Plots 1 & 2 would be accessed from Chapel Lane and Plot 3 would be accessed from Church Lane. The site lies within the village envelope and Conservation Area for Wymondham.

No updates

Clarification from site visit;

No of bedrooms – 1 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed.

Trees – group TPO which covers plot 3 and the garden to the Bowery to the north of Plot 3. So the trees lost to accommodate Plot 3 are within the group TPO but are not considered to be of high amenity value except the tree to the north of the proposed access which is to be retained.

Hedge/boundary – hedge to Main Street removed. The wall retained but may need to be reduced slightly in height to meet visibility requirements of the highway authority.

The application site lies within a sustainable village and there is considered to be a principle in favour of the development. The application has been assessed and it is considered that the proposal would enhance the conservation area, provided needed housing which meets identified need and would not cause any loss to residential amenities or highway safety.

Accordingly the recommendation is for approval as set out in the report.

(b) Helen Selkin, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Fish eye lens distortion in photographs
- Plans contain multiple errors
- Adverse impact on conservation area
- Highways safety – proposed site access opposite 6 Chapel Lane, the narrowest part of the lane
- Dangerous to manoeuvre
- Affects listed building

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that in terms of the error on the plans, the Members saw the site for themselves. She addressed the concerns of the highway safety and the ground levels.

Cllr Holmes stated that the Parish Council object and that should be taken into consideration. She was concerned about the wall being taken down and with the danger imposed by lorries passing through the village to the A1. She stated that the proposal had poor design with red brick in an ironstone village, and it should be in keeping with the character of the area.

Cllr Holmes proposed to refuse the application on poor design, dangerous access and detrimental impact on the character of the area and the street scene.

Cllr Simpson seconded the proposal to refuse the application. She was disappointed with the red brick design.

A vote was taken. 9 Members voted to refuse the application. 1 Member voted against the proposal to refuse.

DETERMINATION: Refused on the grounds of adverse impact upon highway safety and adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.24pm and reconvened at 7.27pm.

-
- (4) **Reference:** 15/00194/FUL
Applicant: Mr N Yool
Location: The Old Brewery, Thorpe End, Melton Mowbray
Proposal: Change of use of existing commercial premises to residential units and conversion of existing buildings, including partial demolition of some single storey structures to create 10 self-contained dwellings plus associated car parking and landscaping.

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application proposes the change of use of commercial premises to 10 residential units. The site lies within the town envelope in close proximity to the town centre. The application proposes a mixture of 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings with car parking and landscaping proposal.

Since publication of the report LCC Ecology have advised that an emergence survey is required and mitigation measures proposed to safeguard any protected species.

There are no further updates to report.

The application to convert the existing premises to dwellings proposes an access from Thorpe End/Saxby Road junction and an exit from the site onto George Street. The site lies within the town envelope and is considered to be in a highly sustainable location. The site can provide a suitable access, parking, amenity space and has been designed to respect the form and character of the existing buildings. It is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on any adjoining properties. The proposal is recommended to be delegated to permit awaiting a satisfactory response from ecology. The response has now been received and an additional survey and mitigation measures are required. Therefore it is requested that the application be delegated to permit subject to the submission of an emergence survey and suitable mitigation proposal as well as the conditions set out in the report.

Cllr Baguley proposed to permit the application subject to the requested report and the conditions that are set out as it was a nice development.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to permit as it was a good design, would provide useful housing and was close to good transport.

Cllr Posnett, the Ward Councillor, stated the development as although it was a needed development in a good site within walking distance to the town centre; however she had concerns about the entrance onto the site as it backed out into traffic on a busy road. She stated that George Street is too narrow and already too busy.

The Chair agreed with these concerns and stated that there should be an in and out management scheme imposed.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she had concerns over where residents would park as there was little off street parking.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that there would be provisional parking of 18 spaces. The development would require 20 spaces so there

would be a shortfall of 2 spaces; however it is anticipated that the development would not lend itself to family living so and it is within walking distance of the town centre and other transport. Highways were satisfied with the level of parking on the site. She stated that although the access is not ideal, conditions would control the one way system.

The Chair was concerned with the size restriction of the archway that may prevent larger vehicles going through and would therefore have no choice but to go against the one way system.

The Applications and Advice Manager clarified that the archway was 3.2m in height and 2.7m in width.

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer the application to consider having fewer houses on the site to provide the correct amount of parking spaces, and to consider the traffic and in-and-out system.

Cllr Faulkner seconded the proposal to defer the application as he had concerns over the in-and-out traffic management system.

A vote was taken to defer the application. 4 Members voted in favour of the proposal. 6 Members voted against the proposal.

Cllr Cumbers asked if a condition to have crocodile teeth to ensure the one way system was kept to could be implemented.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that condition 4 asks for measurements and crocodile teeth could be included in that.

Cllr Faulkner stated that crocodile teeth cause noise and was concerned for the nearby residents.

The Chair suggested that the wording of the condition could be changed to include crocodile teeth or another suitable method as the noise of the crocodile teeth may be an issue.

A vote was taken to permit the application. 5 Members voted in favour of the proposal to permit. 5 Members voted against the proposal.

The Chair used his casting vote to refuse the proposal to permit.

Cllr Chandler proposed to refuse the application due to concerns of traffic and parking.

Cllr Faulkner seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

A vote was taken to refuse the application. 5 Members voted in favour of the

proposal to refuse. 5 Members voted against the proposal.
Cllrs Wyatt, Cumbers, Bains and Baguley wished for their votes against the proposal to refuse to be recorded.

The Chair used his casting vote to refuse the application.

DETERMINATION: Refused on the grounds of adverse impact upon highway safety

- (5) **Reference: 15/00125/FUL**
Applicant: Mr A Mellor
Location: Mulberry House, 53 Station Road, Bottesford
Proposal: Construction of one dwelling

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single dwelling within the garden of Mulberry House, 53 Station Road, Bottesford. The application lies within the village envelope and Conservation Area for Bottesford. The site is located on the corner of Station Road and Church Lane with the access proposed from Church Lane.

Since publication of the report a further letter of objection has been submitted stating that the previous reasons for refusal for dwellings on this site should apply to this application. The latest set of amendments proposes a building higher than the barns opposite and will not enhance the area. The hedge which was assured would be retained to screen the property may have to be partially removed to provide visibility which would have an adverse impact on the street scene. The traffic survey is not a true reflection of the traffic movement throughout the year. This is an unnecessary over development of a small site in a sensitive area which fails to take account of inevitable additional traffic and visitor parking problems. Additional on road visitor parking and traffic at the north end of the lane that will arise will add to the problem and heighten the likelihood of a serious accident occurring.

In response to this, the proposed dwelling has a ridge height of 5.5 metres and is shown on the submitted cross section as having the same ridge height as the adjoining property Beckingthorpe House. With regards to the hedge, I would advise Members that part of the hedgerow (shown on screen) from the corner of the plot to Church Lane will be removed. From the corner of the plot along Station road the hedgerow is shown to be retained. With respect to highway concerns the dwelling would have an access from Church lane and the Highway Authority have advised that the access is acceptable and the site caters for off street parking.

The application is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

Laurence Haselhurst, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Removal of hedge leaves property open for all to see
- Highways risk – leads to more traffic
- Cause of obstruction
- Over extensive use of small site
- Out of character of area
- Would not preserve conservation area

Paul Openshaw, on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Application complies with planning policies
- Modified scheme made with planner's guidance
- Highway officer happy with proposal
- Less dense than other properties
- Hedge to be retained and replanted where removed
- Property would be set lower than the road

Cllr Chandler asked if the dwelling would be a cottage or a bungalow, and asked for clarification on it being lower than the road.

Mr Openshaw stated that it would be a single storey building. He stated that the existing level of the site would be reduced sufficiently so the ridge of the building would be no higher than the property opposite.

Cllr Baguley stated that she was concerned about the character of the conservation area and the traffic issues as there is a shortcut that children use before the road.

Cllr Bains proposed to permit the application and highlighted that the Parish Council and Conservation Officer had no objections.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal to permit.

Cllr Cumbers stated that she was happy to support the application as there was a housing demand for small properties; however she had concerns of the door and windows looking too modern.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that materials would need to be submitted to be approved.

Cllr Holmes raised concerns about flooding as the ground is heavy clay and there may be a drainage problem. She was also concerned with the entrance of Church Lane as it was a tight turning circle. She asked if the driveway

would go up because the dwelling would be higher than street level.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that there were no details of the proposed driveway; however a condition of the details could be added if the proposer wished.

Cllr Bains stated that he felt it was unnecessary.

Cllr Simpson stated that there were many alterations from the previous application and objections had been taken into account, it was a nice setting and there was a need for smaller properties. She stated that she was pleased with the proposed treatment of the hedge.

Cllr Chandler stated that the application had been re-submitted better and would meet the Bottesford housing needs as there is an acute need for small residences. She asked for the wording in the conditions to be changed to gradient no more than one in four.

Cllr Bains and Cllr Wyatt were happy with this.

A vote was taken. 9 Members voted in favour of the proposal to permit. 1 Member voted against the proposal.

DETERMINATION: Approved as recommendation with minor amendment to condition 3 (gradient of access)

The meeting was adjourned at 8.20pm. Cllr Faulkner left the meeting at 8.20pm. The meeting reconvened at 8.26pm. Cllr Posnett left the meeting at 8.26pm.

-
- (6) **Reference:** **15/00212/FULHH**
 Applicant: **Mr J Klimis**
 Location: **31 Beechwood Avenue Melton Mowbray**
 Proposal: **Two storey extension to existing dwelling**

- (a) The Planning Officer stated that: The application was deferred at the last committee to allow members to visit Mr Bailey's property at number 29 Beechwood Ave following his invitation to members.

Members witnessed that there was a window serving the lounge area of Mr Bailey's property, that it faces on to the garage of the application site and that there is an additional window on the rear elevation serving the lounge and a conservatory.

The proposal would remove the garage off the boundary and be rebuilt within the site at approx. 1.5 metres off the boundary. The two storey element whilst it spans at a width of 7 metres has been stepped in 1.8 metres from the boundary

at the point of the window. Giving a 4.4 metres separation from the window reducing to 3.2 metres to the front of the site – from elevation to elevation.

It is considered that whilst the proposal would introduce a blank gable wall the two storey element would be more visible from this high-level window, in turn altering the outlook to a degree. No overlooking can be created. This is considered to be a secondary window with the main source of light and outlook being provided from the rear elevation.

It is therefore considered that in the knowledge of this window that the recommendation within the committee report of approval is not altered nor is the assessment upon the character of the area and any other neighbouring properties.

The Chair asked Members if they would suspend standing orders to allow a second objector to speak. Cllr Holmes proposed that this should be allowed and Cllr Chandler seconded.

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

- Light to his property compromised
- Overbearing
- Hedge roots would be cut into during development
- Impact on privacy
- Practical concern – no room for scaffolding
- Out of keeping with area
- Personal circumstances irrelevant
- Oversized

John Bailey, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Adverse impact
- Overbearing
- Out of keeping with area
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Natural light to his property diminished
- Noise concerns

Joe Klimis, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Unfortunate personal circumstances
- Pre planning service and guidance taken into consideration
- Extension set back from boundary
- Make effort to preserve hedge
- Garage narrowed to provide access to garden
- Provisional parking spaces for 7 cars on the drive thus no cars would be parked on the road

Cllr Bains stated that he had concerns about the application as the proposed

application would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties. He stated that it was not in keeping with the character of the area.

Cllr Holmes proposed to refuse the application as it was out of keeping with the character of the area, over intensive dwelling, detrimental to the street scene, contrary to Policies OS1 and BE1 of the Local Plan and Part 1 of the NPPF and had an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

Cllr Bains seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted in favour of refusal of the application. 2 Members voted against refusal.

Cllr Baguley wished for her vote against refusal to be recorded.

Cllrs Posnett and Faulkner returned to the meeting at 8.50pm.

DETERMINATION: Refused on the grounds of adverse impact upon amenities of neighbours and impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

(7) **Reference: 15/00244/FULHH**
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Reid
Location: 5 Albert Street, Bottesford
Proposal: New single storey extension to rear to include demolition of existing conservatory and porch; construction of first floor bedroom above existing garage.

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear, front porch and a first floor extension above the existing garage. The property lies within the Conservation Area and village envelope for Bottesford.

There are no updates to report.

The application has been the subject of amendments and the application now proposes a first floor extension above the existing garage for a bedroom. The addition of a single storey flat roof porch to the frontage and a single storey extension along the shared boundary with No. 3 Albert Street comprising of a tandem garage and spare room.

The extensions are considered to be acceptable in their design, scale and massing. It is considered that they will preserve the Conservation Area and would not have an adverse impact on the adjoining neighbouring properties.

Therefore the application is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

(b) Mrs Pat Bassett, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- 200mm gap should be honoured
- Concerns about tandem garage – not wide enough
- Intrusive – too close to boundary
- Oppressive and dominant
- Out of character of area
- Impact on privacy
- Detrimental to neighbouring amenities
- Faults with plan

Nick Bacon, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Former chapel in need of attention will be improved
- Create accommodation for family
- No visible alterations on side of neighbour
- Extension will be lower than garden

The Chair asked Members if they would suspend standing orders to continue the meeting as it had been running for three hours.

Cllr Holmes proposed that the meeting should continue and Cllr Wyatt seconded. A vote was taken and it was unanimously decided to continue.

Cllr Chandler had concerns about the application as it was in a conservation area and there could be complications with the party wall which would fall on Building Control as there is no set boundary. **Cllr Chandler proposed to refuse the application** as it was an over intensive development of the plot, would have an adverse impact on residential amenities, and would be contrary to Policies OS1 and BE1 and part 7 of the NPPF requiring good design.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal to refuse.

Cllr Simpson stated that the hedge in the garden of the neighbouring property obscures the view of the extension. She asked if there had to be an order on hedging being taken down in the conservation or could the hedge remain in the neighbouring garden. She stated that she could not support a refusal as the proposal would maintain and improve a heritage asset.

The Applications and Advice Manager clarified that there was no protection on a hedge being removed in a conservation area, therefore if it is not in the applicant's site it can remain in the boundary.

A vote was taken. 4 Members were in favour of the proposal of refusal. 6

Members were against the proposal. **Cllr Simpson proposed to permit the application** as per the officer's recommendation.

Cllr Bains seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted in favour of the proposal to permit. 4 Members voted against the proposal.

Cllrs Chandler and Holmes wished for their votes against the proposal to permit to be recorded.

DETERMINATION: Approved as recommendation

-
- (8) **Reference: 15/00345/FUL**
Applicant: Mrs E Crowther
Location: Field opposite 11 Harby Lane, Hose
Proposal: Erection of a static field shelter with attached hay store for 2 horses for domestic use

(a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that:

There have been no updated comments to report. Recommend that permission is granted as set out in the report.

Cllr Holmes proposed to permit the application.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal to permit the application.

A vote was taken. It was unanimously decided that the application should be approved.

DETERMINATION: Approved as recommendation

Development Control Performance Report 2014/51 Quarter 4 and Review of 2014/15

The Applications and Advice Manager presented the report and stated that: Report sets out DC performance for Q4 and for the year 2014/15.

Some improvements in performance and good performance in some areas. However, there are some areas which remain below service standards. We are achieving national standards as a performing authority. Not achieving some of our own local set standards.

Changes in workload and content – Major and complex developments - reflected in income and number coming to committee.

Appeal – monitored

She commended the team for their efforts.

The Chair endorsed the commending of the team.

D13. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 9.26 pm