



MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

16 July 2015

PRESENT

J Illingworth (Chair), J Simpson (Vice Chair), P Baguley,  
P Chandler, P Cumbers, P Faulkner, E Holmes, J Wyatt, M Glancy, G Botterill  
Solicitor to the Council (HG),  
Head of Regulatory Services (JW), Applications and Advice Manager (JW)  
Administrative Assistant (DW)

---

**D14. Apologies for absence**

No apologies were offered.

**D15. Declarations of interest**

No Members declared an interest in any of the items on the agenda.

**D16. Previous Minutes, 25<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

Cllr Chandler stated that the Minutes recorded that she had an interest in application no. 15/00278/FUL but she did not, and the minutes should be amended to read no interest.

With that amendment **Cllr Holmes** proposed to accept the minutes as a true and accurate record. **This was seconded by Cllr Chandler.** A vote was taken with 8 in favour, 0 against and 2 abstentions (both stating there were not present at previous committee).

## **D17 Schedule of Applications**

1) Ref: 14/00980/OUT

**Applicant:** Jelson Ltd

**Location:** Field No 0070, Station Lane, Asfordby, LE14 3SL

**Proposal:** Outline application for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure (all matters except access reserved for subsequent approval)

The Head of Regulatory Services introduced the application and stated:

- It was an outline application with only access provided at this stage, all other matters (site layout, design etc) are reserved.
- The proposal also includes works to the junction of Station lane near Kirby Bellars to assist with queuing at that junction.
- The application is also supported by a indicative layout
- We have now received a consultation reply from National Grid regarding the power lines that cross the site, and who have no objection to the proposal.
- The application is considered to be in a sustainable location, Asfordby being a larger village with a wide range of facilities. All of the expert bodies have been engaged to look into ecological, flooding, drainage, highways and other technical issues and each of them has concluded the application to satisfactory.
- The application would bring up to 100 houses and a 40% proportion of affordable houses, which are of great importance to the area.
- However, there are negative aspects too and the loss of a greenfield is one. However, on the balanced of the issues we believe – informed by numerous appeal decisions – that this on its own is insufficient reason to refuse permission.
- Indicative Plan – has prompted a number of comments which we cannot address due to its outline status. However it's clear from the size of the site that it can easily accommodate up to 100 dwellings with sufficient space to maintain acceptable privacy levels, provide for open space, footpaths and drainage, so none of these are considered to be reasons for refusal.
- Finally, the application has presented some detailed legal issues , firstly around s106 requests for LCC, the police and parish Councils and the application of the new Regulations (pages 13 -20)and secondly the question of the relationship with the Asfordby NP which us in progress 15/16

**Cllr De Burle (Asfordby PC) addressed the Committee and stated:**

- Does not meet local needs
- It would add to traffic volume, and rat running
- Access to Leicester Rd is almost impossible
- Will worsen parking issues
- Ageing population – need suitable homes and unlikely to move from the area. This site does not provide the solution

**Mr Webster, an objector, addressed the Committee and stated:**

- Power Lines carry warnings and were built to avoid houses
- Existing Houses are arguably too near, proposed ones even closer

- this site is outside the Village envelope, why was this being ignored?
- The site is Prime agricultural land

**Cllr Simpson** sought clarification from Mr Webster whether any existing residents had made any complaints about the buzzing from the power lines. Mr Webster did not know the answer to the Councillor's question

**Mr Thorley (applicant)**

- The site had limited visual impact
- There was general support of development from parish council and locals
- It is a logical and unobtrusive location
- The draft Neighbourhood Plan suggests site will be allocated for development, therefore not prejudicial

**Cllr Holmes** sought clarification as to why the entrance is regarded as adequate. Mr Thorley explained that it had been discussed with LCC Highways and it is in accordance with their standards

The Head of Regulatory Services responded to the points raised as follows:

- The TIA calculates an am peak hour 57 added to existing of 430; pm 49 into 450 existing.
- Highways believe the proposed solution at Leicester Rd including development is better than current situation
- Village envelope considered out of date, and cannot be relied up, as conveyed in several appeal decisions.
- The land is considered low grade agricultural land
- The application does not specify the size of the houses; that is the next stage of application if successful.

**Cllr Wyatt observed that** the application does not mention the 13<sup>th</sup> Century Bridge, which will need work;

**Cllr Chandler commented that**

- The application may be seen to undermine Neighbourhood Plan
- Accepts Asfordby have nominated the site
- Site does satisfy many criteria regarding sustainability
- Neighbourhood Plan can ask for specific density and design

**Cllr Simpson asked whether** the site was identical to the site in the neighbourhood plan. **It was established that it was**, apart from a small strip on the western edge. **She asked if we can ensure the** developers talk to the Parish Council about, types of housing required and was referred to the content of Condition 3 of the recommendation.

**Cllr Holmes expressed concern regarding** flooding and was advised that

- Flooding does occur but not within the proposed area
- Local Flood Authority has not identified why sufficient drainage cannot be carried out to alleviate standing water.

She was also concerned about the bridge and traffic lights, and was advised that the application contained no proposals and that the Highway Authority consider the proposals safe.

**Cllr Cumbers** noted that the developers didn't want to provide a LEAP and asked if there had been a housing survey to identify local needs. She was advised that a LEAP was required on a site of this size and that housing demand had been undertaken for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan. She expressed the view that the application is a good development and hoped nothing happens to the bridge due to its historic nature.

**Cllr Glancy** asked whether the Neighbourhood Plan allocation avoided the power lines and was advised that it broadly coincides with the power line

**Cllr Chandler moved that the application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Faulkner**

A Vote was taken with 10 votes in favour (Unanimous)

**DETERMINATION: Approved in accordance with the recommendation, for the following reasons;**

**It is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and affordable housing in particular. The balancing issues – development of a greenfield site outside of the village envelope – is considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the site characteristics and the limited importance assigned by policy in the NPPF.**

---

**Reference:** 14/00777/FUL

**Applicant:** Mr Jamie Gibbins - Barwood Homes Ltd

**Location:** Land behind 38-48 High Street, Waltham on the Wolds, LE14 4AH

**Proposal:** Residential development to 28 dwellings

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that the Applicants have requested deferral of the application in order to allow them time to address the matters raised in the conclusion of the report.

**Cllr Holmes** stated that she was reluctant to defer, and proposed to refuse, the application. There was no seconder to Cllr Holmes' motion.

**Cllr Wyatt proposed to defer the application and this was seconded by Cllr Cumbers. A Vote was taken with 8 votes in favour and 2 against.**

**DETERMINATION: The application was deferred to allow the opportunity for the submission of further amended plans.**

---

**Reference:** 15/00017/OUT

**Applicant:** Family Housing

**Location:** Land West Of Marquis Road And North Of Station Road, Queensway, Old Dalby

**Proposal:** Residential development of up to 39 dwellings and associated works.

The Head of Regulatory Services introduced the application and stated:

- It was an outline application for up to 39 dwellings
- Application includes access details, which are directly on to Station Rd – an amendment from an earlier version which showed the site linking into Marquis Drive to the east.
- It is supported by indicative plan but this comes with the usual health warnings.
- Update – petition received containing 44 signatures against the development. This is unusual because it doesn't provide reasons everyone has subscribed to, rather each signatory has specified their reasons separately. The reasons provided are:
  - Impact on wildlife
  - Housing is not needed in the area
  - Insufficient infrastructure and services
  - School not big enough for more children
  - Danger from busy road and narrow pavements

These are all issues raised earlier in the process and are addressed in the report.

Page 6 of the report lists facilities both immediate and in neighbouring Old Dalby. It is clear that this list is far from a perfect situation, e.g. there are no shops, secondary schools, leisure etc, but it performs quite well in sustainability terms compared to many locations. Members will be aware, for example, that appeal decisions have adjudged Asfordby Hill and Twyford as sufficiently sustainable locations, and in previous assessments Queensway has been assessed in this way too.

It is bearing this in mind, and the 'credit' the application can be given due to its contribution to housing supply and affordable housing, we have concluded in favour of this application. It is clear that the location has shortcomings but considered that these are limited and are compensated for by the positive aspects of the proposal.

Turning to more detailed matters, the app comes with a fully worked up management plan for the land to the rear of the site, in compensation for the impact on ecology. It has raised similar s106 issues as the previous case but in this instance fall foul of the new 'pooling' limitations (pages 9/10).

**Cllr George Schmidt (Parish Council) addressed the Committee and stated:**

- It is an unsuitable site
- 39 new dwelling increases village by 20%; far too big an increase
- Housing needs survey only identified 14 house of which 6 affordable
- The NPPF states local interests should be taken into account
- Supporters of the application have questionable interest in local community

**Cllr Chandler** sought clarification whether buses run through the village. Mr Schmidt confirmed that they do and commented on their route and frequency.

**Mr Wilbraham**, representing the applicant, was invited to address the Committee and stated:

- It is a sustainable location
- The scheme will make a contribution to overall supply and affordable housing
- It will incorporate energy efficient design
- It will consolidate development and fit in with adjacent housing
- Additional choice of housing
- Services will be supported
- The land makes no positive contribution; the site will improve ecology in the area
- Jobs and training will be provided through apprenticeships
- It is technically competent
- The NPPF requires housing unless harm outweighs benefits
- There were no objections from consultees.

**Cllr Simpson** sought clarification whether the village was classed as sustainable in 2011. Mr Wilbraham advised that Old Dalby/Queensway classed as more sustainable than other villages of similar sizes

**Cllr Orson, the Ward Cllr, addressed the Committee and stated:**

- The land was farmed in the 1970's and has become derelict since
- There are no shops, church etc, only a brewery and scout hut
- There are smaller villages have better access
- The bus service is unsustainable
- It is a mile from the school. Parents drive to the school from Queensway.
- Local employment – small demand for housing from employees in the nearby employment sites.

**Cllr Chandler** commented that the site is poor agricultural land and is close to business park, Local facilities are not close, that a 20% increase in size of settlement is large but that the proposal would building homes for families

**Cllr Simpson** observed that Highways don't object to access but that the site was unsustainable in terms of public transport

**Cllr Cumbers** commented that the development is in the wrong place but we do need the houses

**Proposed Cllr Chandler proposed refusal of the application and this was seconded by Cllr Simpson.**

A vote was taken with 5 votes in favour and 5 against. The Chair cast his casting vote in favour of the motion to refuse.

**DETERMINATION: The application was refused for the following reasons:**

**In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would, if approved, result in the erection of residential dwellings in an unsustainable location. The development in an unsustainable location where there are limited local amenities, facilities and bus services and where future residents are likely to depend on the use of the car, contrary to the advice contained in NPPF in promoting sustainable development. It is considered that there is insufficient benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh the guidance given in the NPPF on sustainable development in this location and would therefore be contrary to the "core planning principles" contained within Para 17 of the NPPF.**

---

**Reference:** 15/00201/FUL

**Applicant:** Talavera Estates - Mr J Chastney

**Location:** Land Adjacent To 23 And 24 Glebe Road, Asfordby Hill

**Proposal:** Construction of 15 dwellings and associated road

The Applications and Advice Manager introduced the Application and stated:

- This application seeks permission for the erection of 15 dwellings on the edge of Asfordby Hill on a greenfield site outside the village. The proposal is for 100% affordable housing and has been applied for as an exception site.
- The 15 dwellings would be accessed from Glebe Road with a single point of access and turning head. The application proposes a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings including bungalows, 2 storey dwellings and a maisonette.
- The main concerns with regards to the proposal have been in relation to the access and concerns over Glebe Road, the relationship and impact on the adjoining properties particularly Houghton Close and the loss of/encroachment into the open countryside
- This application presents a balance of competing objectives and Members need to consider these in reaching a conclusion on the proposal. The loss of green field and impact on the rural village needs to be balanced against the positives of the provision of affordable housing and dwellings which meet an identified local need. Asfordby Hill is considered to perform reasonable well in sustainability terms and the development has been assessed to provide adequate access and parking provision. In this instance it is considered that there are significant benefits of the proposal and the balancing issues of loss of open countryside and lack of open space provision is of limited harm and therefore the application is recommended for approval as set out in the report.
- Condition 7 requirement that the hammerheads are suitable for turning
- There are no parking issues, off street parking adequate

- Highways see this as a betterment on the existing situation due to the turning hammerheads
- Condition 7 requires turning heads to be “available at all times”. The developers could line the road, or we could require details of how they will ensure they are available at all times.

**Cllr Sheldon, representing the Parish Council, addressed the Committee and stated:**

- Access is very poor; larger vehicles have to reverse along Glebe Rd.
- The relationship with 27 Houghton Close is of concern.

**Cllr Illingworth** sought clarification of whether highways will take steps to stop parking on the hammerhead. Cllr Sheldon Enforcement is just not possible at all times.

**Cllr Simpson** sought clarification as to what the Parish Council envisage the solution to stop parking on the hammerhead. Cllr Sheldon was unable to give one

**Mr Silcocks, representing the applicant, addressed the Committee and stated:**

- Grant funding will ensure that it is delivered
- High Court decisions have affirmed the advice in the PPG on prematurity in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan (NP)
- In any event it complies with the NP – it is not in area of separation and complies with AH policies
- Introduces a parking head for the street which is current absent and a problem.
- Only limited harm identified which does not outweigh the benefits

**Cllr Baguley** sought clarification on the adequacy of the turning space. Mr Silcocks explained that large lorries are able to turn in them

**Cllr Holmes sought clarification on the configuration of** affordable housing and it was clarified as 2/3 social rented 1/3 shared ownership.

**Cllr Baguley** stated that whilst she was in favour of affordable housing she could not support this proposal due to parking issues.

**Cllr Botterill** disagreed and highlighted the need the housing

**Cllr Chandler** commented that the density is high but agreed the Houses are needed

**Cllr Illingworth** reiterated concerns about turning and whether it could be secured by the condition (7).

**Cllr Cumbers** questioned whether an additional condition will be effective



**Cllr Wyatt observed that the hammerhead is as big as the one on the adjoining street (Houghton Close) so should be acceptable**

**Cllr Botterill proposed approval of the application with an additional condition requiring details of how the hammerhead will remain free from obstruction. This was seconded by Cllr Wyatt.**

A vote was taken with 8 in favour and 1 against. Cllr Baguley asked for her vote against to be recorded. There was 1 abstention.

**DETERMINATION: Approved in accordance with the recommendation, with the additional condition, for the following reasons:**

**it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and affordable housing in particular. The balancing issues – development of a greenfield site outside of the village envelope and lack of open space provision – are considered to be of limited harm in due to the location and surroundings of the site, its proximity to existing open space and potential for careful landscaping.**

---

**Reference:**15/00150/COU

**Applicant:** John O Gaunt Brewing Co Ltd - Mrs C Frew

**Location:** The Fox Inn, 13 Main Street, Thorpe Satchville, LE14 2DQ

**Proposal:** Change of use from Drinking Establishment to Residential use

**The Head of Regulatory Services introduced the application and stated:**

- We have received a request from the applicant that the application is deferred. This is because there was a problem with the notification of the site inspection and as a result the applicant could not show you the internal condition of the building.
- The primary issue for this application is the policy requirements not to lose community facilities (and pubs are specifically cited in the NPPF) where it is unnecessary. We have reservations that the marketing carried out to establish whether this is the case was insufficient in terms of both its length and nature.
- May I also draw attention to reason no.2 because it is potentially an even bigger hurdle. There is a significant track record that TS is an unsustainable location for new residential uses, so even if marketing had been adequate, would the proposed new use be acceptable anyway.

**The Committee first addressed the request to defer the application. Cllr Simpson proposed to proceed with consideration and was seconded by Cllr Chandler. A vote was taken with 9 votes in favour and 0 against. There was 1 abstention.**

Mr Jones, representing the Parish Council, was invited to address the Committee and stated:

- The Village is unsustainable
- Uncertainty over the pub is affecting village life
- It is concerned that an older population will become isolated without the pub as the hub of the community
- Impasse is causing village problems due to the uncertainty

**Cllr Baguley, sought clarification regarding** how many people live in the village. Mr Jones replied that there are about 100 houses.

**Cllr Botterill** sought clarification whether the Parish Council have any plans for working with the owners. Mr Jones advised that there was currently an impasse with the owners

Mr Mitchell-Borts, an objector, addressed the Committee and stated:

- The community has committed to invest £73,000 in the pub
- Demand could be enhanced by making a wider attraction
- Residents can demonstrate a local demand for the pub

Mrs Frew, the applicant, addressed the Committee and stated:

- Business developed over 20 years
- Interior is important to understand the level of investment needed – postpone to visit
- Previously leased to respected restaurateurs, both were unsuccessful despite flexibility with cost and flexibility with the lease.
- Community right to bid failed. Group has been offered a lease on reduced terms
- A party said to want to buy the pub is actually not interested
- A local pub chain has not taken up the opportunity of dialogue

Cllr Higgins, the Ward Cllr, addressed the Committee and stated:

- Pubs are important, care is needed.
- With the right business plan they can flourish
- Government policy has changed for pubs and MBC allows business rates relief
- 2 pubs have been sold locally for under £200,000 and are successful
- Officers have worked hard to seek a solution
- The case for change of use is not yet made

**Cllr Baguley expressed a view that a** Public House needs 1500 people to be viable and questioned how a village with 100 houses can provide that viability

**Cllr Simpson agreed that** Public Houses in villages are important. Small village pubs are thriving elsewhere.

**Cllr Cumbers stated that** pubs can adapt and attract different clientele. She was disappointed that the CSA Committee declined it as being a community asset. The viability of this pub needs to be driven by the local community

**Cllr Chandler noted that the** right to buy bid was refused. The group failed to attend or present a business plan. If it is not used it will deteriorate. If we refuse what will happen to then building, how will it be viable in the long run.

**Cllr Holmes** questioned where the pub was marketed. She believes if it was done properly it would do well

**Cllr Glancy** noted that the pub has been successful in the past. Its condition is not a matter for planning that's a commercial consideration.

**Cllr Botterill** expressed the view that it needs to be let to the public. It can come back to committee but we can't be held at ransom. It is a Good amenity for the village.

**Cllr Faulkner** was concerned it been taken off the market.

**Cllr Simpson proposed that the application was refused for the reasons provided in the report. This was seconded by Cllr Cumbers. A vote was taken with 7 in favour and 2 against.**

Cllr Baguley and Cllr Chandler asked for their votes against to be recorded vote. There was 1 abstention.

**DETERMINATION: The application was refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. In the Council's opinion the proposal would result in the loss of a valued community facility for residents of Thorpe Satchville to the detriment of the life of the community and the ability to meet its day to day needs. This would be, contrary to policy CF4 of the adopted Melton Local Plan and the NPPF paragraph 70, insufficient information has been submitted to support the change of use from public house to residential.**
- 2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would, if approved, result in residential development in an unsustainable location. The development in an unsustainable village location where there are limited local amenities, facilities and jobs and where future residents are likely to depend on the use of the car, contrary to the advice contained in NPPF in promoting sustainable development. It is considered that there is insufficient reason to depart from the guidance given in the NPPF on sustainable development in this location and would therefore be contrary to the "core planning principles contained" within Para 17 of the NPPF.**

---

**Reference:** 14/00136/OUT

**Applicant:** Mr Duffin Builders Limited

**Location:** Land to the rear of Hall Farm, Mere Road, Waltham on the Wolds

**Proposal:** Housing development comprising of 8 units providing suitable accommodation for retirement or small work / live units

The Applications and Advice Manager introduced the Application and stated:

- The application has previously been presented to Planning Committee where it was determined that planning permission should be approved subject to a legal agreement for a commuted sum for the provision of off site affordable housing.
- The application has been brought back to committee due to a change in National Planning Policy requirements. The NPPG now states that developer contributions should not be sought on development of 10 units or less. As the scheme relates to 8 units the authority can no longer require affordable housing provisions on or off site. The application remains the same as previously considered. Therefore members are required to make a decision balancing the merits of the scheme with the provision of off site affordable housing removed.
- The application is considered to be in a sustainable location, is not considered to harm the adjoining listed building and would conserve the Conservation Area. The eight single storey units are considered to meet an identified housing need as it is providing 2 and 3 bed bungalows. This needs to be balanced against the location within the open countryside and a development on a greenfield site.
- Having assessed the proposal and on balance of the issues it is felt that even without the provision of affordable housing there would be significant benefits accruing from the proposal and the loss of a greenfield site in the open countryside is considered to be of limited harm due to the location of the site, screening and the proposal layout. It is therefore considered that the benefits of this application outweigh the harm and the application is recommended for approval.

**Cllr Holmes** commented that the development is of a high standard of design and met current Need and designs for bungalows.

**Cllr Cumbers** would like to tie the development down to bungalows.

**Cllr Holmes** moved for approval of the application in accordance with the recommendation. This was seconded by **Cllr Cumbers**.

**A vote was taken with 10 votes in favour (Unanimous)**

**DETERMINATION:** Approved in accordance with the recommendation, for the following reasons:

**On the balance of the issues, even without the provision of affordable housing there is a significant community benefit accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of meeting identified local housing need. The balancing issues – development of a**

**greenfield site and protrusion into the open countryside, development of the Conservation Area – are considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the high levels of screening, the proposed layout, indicative designs and materials.**

---

**Reference:**15/00349

**Applicant:** Mrs Taylor

**Location:** 4 Dairy Lane, Nether Broughton, Leics, LE14 2EW

**Proposal:** Retention of kennel and enclosed dog run.

The Applications and Advice Manager introduced the Application and stated:

- This application seeks retrospective planning permission for a kennel and dog run.
- The kennels are situated in the residential curtilage of 4 Dairy Lane but lie outside the village envelope in the open countryside. The kennels have been designed for their purpose and are of a size, scale and materials which could be easily dismantled and moved. It is not considered that in this location the kennels would have a detrimental impact on the open countryside nor any adjoining residential property. The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies and is therefore recommended for approval as set out in the report.
- Regards to Environmental Health the owners would have to be diligent
- Nuisance is not something that is dealt with by planning as it is covered by other legislation.
- The planning application is about their current location only

Mrs Osbourne, an objector, was invited to address the Committee and stated:

- The plans do not show whole situation
- Dogs affect other residents and have reacted to noise of construction
- Support has come from the applicant's tenant and people who have done work for the applicant. The latter is not sufficiently familiar with the area.
- Kennels should be closer to the applicants house

**Cllr Holmes** enquired how long the dogs are kept in the kennels. Mrs Osbourne advised that three are kept there overnight and can be heard barking

Cllr Orson, the Ward Cllr, was invited to address the Committee and stated:

- The kennel impacts on the visual amenity, relocation further back would resolve this.

**Cllr Holmes** enquired whether we have a standard design criteria for kennels and was advised that we do not. She believes the design is cruel. She would understand if the kennels were located closer to the house. The structures are an eyesore.

**Cllr Chandler** agreed that were not pleasing to the eye, a better design is feasible. They would be better closer to the house and asked where the dogs were on their visit

**Cllr Wyatt** noted that if the moved the kennels to a different location would it be permitted development, which was confirmed by officers.

**Cllr Glancy** considered that the current Layout encourages dog barking

**Cllr Simpson was** minded to permit for a limited time only

**Cllr Holmes moved to refuse the application on the grounds of its appearance. This was seconded by Cllr Chandler**

A vote was taken with 8 in favour of the refusal and 2 against.

**DETERMINATION: The application was refused for the following reason:**

**The proposed kennels and dog run in this location and design would be an eyesore and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved Policies OS1, BE1 and C11 of the adopted Melton Local Plan and the NPPF.**

---

**Reference:** 15/00322/FUL

**Applicant:** Mr K Taylor

**Location:** 12 Pasture Lane, Gaddesby

**Proposal:** Alterations and extension to existing bungalow

The Applications and Advice Manager introduced the Application and stated:

- This application proposes alterations and extensions to a semi-detached bungalow within the village of Gaddesby. The application proposes a rear extension and alterations to the roof and front projecting dormers.
- Since publication of the report a further letter of support has been received, the support letter does not state any reasons.
- The dwelling is an attached bungalow and there is concern over the front dormers proposed. The dormers are considered to be large and would be dominant within the street scene altering the character of the pair of bungalows. There is also a concern over the proposed materials which are cedar cladding and render which is not considered to be in keeping with the host dwelling or the locality.
- The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies OS1 and BE1 and accordingly is recommended for refusal as set out in the report.

Mr Taylor, the applicant, was invited to address the Committee and stated:

- The site was in a bad state of repair when bought
- He took out garage from application due to complaints
- Other properties on the street have dormers and gable ends facing the street,.

**Cllr Simpson** considered the dormers will have an impact due to ridge height of dormers. It would be a semi-detached to a bungalow and the size just a bit too big. She would like the applicant to come back with a modified proposal.

**Cllr Chandler** considered the dormer looks bad when on one semi-detached but not the other. It will have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

**Cllr Holmes** was concerned that it was over bearing. If we refuse it may come back with something better.

**Cllr Baguley** questioned why, if others have dormers, this so different. The Officers replied that it was small and on a detached property, it impacts more on a pair of dwellings.

**Cllr Simpson proposed refusal of the application for the reasons stated in the report. This was seconded by Cllr Chandler.**

**A vote was taken with 8 votes in favour and 1 against.** There was 1 abstention.

**DETERMINATION: The application was refused for the following reason:**

**The proposed extensions, by reason of their scale, size and massing, would be to the detriment of the streetscene and the neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved Policies OS1 and BE1 of the adopted Melton Local Plan and to the National Planning Policy Framework regarding 'Requiring Good Design'**

---

**Reference:** 15/00401/FUL

**Applicant:** Melton Borough Council – Mr R Selvon

**Location:** Play Close, Park Lane, Melton Mowbray

**Proposal:** Replacement new skate park with removal of existing damaged equipment

The Applications and Advice Manager introduced the Application and stated:

- This application seeks planning permission for a replacement skate park within the park to the west of the Council Offices. The application includes the removal of the existing equipment in the park and is part of a wider programme to improve facilities.
- The proposed facilities are considered to provide a benefit to the community and are supported in principle under the NPPF. The proposed skate park is considered to be well designed and would have a minimal impact on the overall character and appearance of the park. The proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact on any residential properties and accordingly is recommended for approval as set out in the report.

**Cllr Holmes** expressed delight that the application has come forward

**Cllr Baguley** had a desire for lighting

**Cllr Chandler** was delighted its concrete not wood, being familiar with problems caused by a wooden skate park in her Ward.

**Cllr Holmes** proposed approval of the application in accordance with the report. This was seconded by **Cllr Baguley**.

**A vote was taken with 10 votes in favour (Unanimous)**

**DETERMINATION:** Approved in accordance with the recommendation, for the following reasons:

The proposal is considered to be of benefit to the community, having strong local support and being supported in principal by the National Planning Policy Framework which states that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. In addition, the proposal is considered to be well designed to have a minimal impact upon the overall character and appearance of the park, and the change in materials will have ensure a significant reduction in noise when the park is in use. As such, the proposal is considered to meet the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and local plan policies OS1 and BE1.

---

**D18 REPORT BY HEAD OF REGULATORY SERVICES – SITE INSPECTION PROCEDURES**

**Cllr Illingworth** proposed deferment of this item. It was seconded by **Cllr Wyatt**.  
**A vote was taken with 10 In Favour (Unanimous)**

**D19 URGENT BUSINESS**

None

**The Meeting commenced at 18:05 and closed at 21:00**