

# Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	<b>Planning Committee</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>Wednesday, 18 December 2024</b>
<b>Start time</b>	<b>6.00 pm</b>
<b>Venue</b>	<b>Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH</b>

## Present:

**Chair** J. Mason (Vice-Chair, in the Chair)

**Councillors**

I. Atherton	R. Browne
M. Glancy	M. Gordon
L. Higgins	D. Pritchett
A. Freer (Substitute)	R. Sharp (Substitute)

**Officers**

- Legal Services Manager
- Planning Development Manager
- Planning Development Team Leader (CP)
- Planning Officer (MK)
- Senior Democratic Services and Scrutiny Officer
- Democratic Services Officer (HA)

Minute No.	Minute
PL58	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b> Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allnatt, S. Atherton, Cumbers and Thwaites.</p> <p>Councillor Freer was in attendance as substitute for Councillor S. Atherton and Councillor Sharp was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Thwaites.</p>
PL59	<p><b>Minutes</b> Minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2024 were deferred to allow the speakers comments to be added.</p> <p>At 6:05pm, during the consideration of this item, Councillor I. Atherton entered the meeting.</p>
PL60	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b> No declarations of interest were received.</p>
PL61	<p><b>Schedule of Applications</b></p>
PL62	<p><b>Application 24/00793/FUL</b> <b>Location: Ashby Folville Manor, Gaddesby Lane, Ashby Folville, LE14 2TG</b> <b>Proposal: Partial demolition and remodelling of derelict lodge to create annex to the Manor including access works; erection of 5no. cottages; reinstatement of the former driveway and gates to the Manor and reinstatement of parkland in place of modern driveway; resurfacing of driveway and hardstanding surrounding the Manor; and restoration of bridge</b></p> <p>The Planning Officer (MK) addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application. Members asked questions for clarification.</p> <p>Pursuant to Chapter 2, Part 9, Paragraphs 2.8-2.28 of the Council's Constitution in relation to public speaking at Planning Committee, the Chair allowed the following to give a three minute presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Simon, Gaddesby Parish Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parish Council opposes application as it is contrary to Local Plan and the Gaddesby Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>- Location is unsustainable and lacks amenities.</li> <li>- No proven need for development within parish.</li> <li>- Two-bedroom houses but with rooms that can be converted into an additional bedroom which would exacerbate parking provision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Sharon Butcher, Supporter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applicant has done all they can to comply.</li> <li>- Applicant wants to rebuild the gate house and enhance the heritage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Chris May, Agent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applicant has listened to concerns and amended accordingly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- Few objections out of a population of 800.
- Scheme delivers heritage benefits.
- Replacement of two five-bedroom cottages and with five cottages is more in keeping with the area.
- Lodge has deteriorated and needs urgent restoration.
- Councillor Child, Ward Councillor
  - Only element that would bring a benefit is the partial demolition of the lodge.
  - Rest of the planning would have a detriment to the area.
  - New housing would be contrary to local plan and Neighbourhood Plan.
  - Proposed development is neither necessary or appropriate.

A Member commented that they were unsure how to balance up the policies with the heritage benefit.

The comment was made that the Committee are informed that they have to adhere to the policies and the application is contrary to the policies SS1, SS2 and SS3.

It was noted that the application is in an unsustainable location and that there is limited heritage to be gained.

Councillor Browne proposed to refuse the application and Councillor Pritchett seconded the motion.

### **RESOLVED**

**That the application be REFUSED.**

(For 7, Against 2, Abstentions 0)

Pursuant to the Constitution, Chapter 3, Part 1, Procedure Rule 17.6, Councillor Glancy indicated that her vote against the motion be recorded.

### **REASONS**

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would, if approved, result in the provision of five additional dwellings in an unsustainable location. The development occupies an unsustainable location where there are limited local amenities, facilities and jobs, and where future residents are likely to depend highly on the use of a private motor vehicle. The proposal does not meet an identified proven local need and would be contrary to Policies, SS1, SS2 and SS3 of the Local Plan which seeks to restrict development in such settlements to that which is based on a local proven need. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies HBE1 and HBE3 of the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The limited heritage benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused by the unsustainable location of the development.

PL63

**Application 22/00404/FUL**

**Location: Field OS 4100, Lake Terrace, Melton Mowbray**

**Proposal: Erection of 70no. dwellings with associated vehicular access,**

**parking, landscaping and public open space (as amended).**

The Planning Officer (MK) addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application. Members asked questions for clarification.

Pursuant to Chapter 2, Part 9, Paragraphs 2.8-2.28 of the Council's Constitution in relation to public speaking at Planning Committee, the Chair allowed the following to give a three minute presentation:

- Lance Wiggins, Agent
  - Revised the application in order to address concerns.
  - Scheme would provide 60 small houses and bungalows.
  - Also 10 houses would be for affordable housing and social rent.
  - Viability assessment has been independently verified and it was confirmed that it is viable so long as no contributions towards infrastructure are made.

During the debate it was commented that the application is in town, provides smaller sized houses and meets all local plan policies. There is no infrastructure levy, but the application satisfies statutory agencies.

Concerns were raised over water level near the site

Another comment recognised that it is a big site with a lot of affordable houses and whilst it is geographically close to the town, residents wouldn't be able to safely cross the main Leicester Road. The application satisfies the policy but doesn't support the community.

A further comment was made that whilst the housing mix is good, albeit the housing is too close together, the site isn't viable as there is no infrastructure funding or section 106.

Overall, the Committee were concerned about the lack of infrastructure funding from the site.

It was noted that the proposal would not make any contributions towards infrastructure requirements, due to viability reasons, thus giving rise to a significant conflict with Policy IN3 of the Local Plan and the Council's Developer Contributions SPD.

Councillor Higgins proposed a deferment and Councillor Gordon seconded the motion.

**RESOLVED**

**That the application be DEFERRED.**

(For 5, Against 1, Abstentions 3)

**REASONS**

To allow Officers time to seek infrastructure funding from the developers for the proposal.

At 7:27pm, the meeting was adjourned.

At 7:31pm, the meeting was reconvened.

At 8:10pm, upon the conclusion of this item, Councillor Higgins left the meeting and did not return.

PL64

**Application 24/00352/FUL**

**Location: The Bungalow, 25 Main Street, Holwell, Leicestershire, LE14 4SZ**

**Proposal: Change of Use of Existing Paddock to Residential Curtilage and Extension and Alterations to existing Dwelling.**

The Planning Development Team Leader, Chhaya Pancholi, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application. Members asked questions for clarification.

Pursuant to Chapter 2, Part 9, Paragraphs 2.8-2.28 of the Council's Constitution in relation to public speaking at Planning Committee, the Chair allowed the following to give a three minute presentation:

- Simon Wilkinson-Blake, Objector
  - One of 20 objectors.
  - Size of development is inappropriate for the area.
  - Result in substantial harm to the conservation area.
  - Harmful impact upon the neighbourhood dwelling.
  - Development into open countryside.
- James Botterill, Agent
  - Existing property is in need of renovation.
  - Opportunity to create a building with a better design.
  - Existing property makes a negative impact but the application would have a positive impact upon the conversation scheme.
  - No material harm to surrounding neighbourhood properties.
- Councillor J. Orson, Ward Councillor
  - Unspoilt village.
  - Unusual for applications to cause an issue.
  - 20 comments from 19 households.
  - Residential curtilage and don't know why it is necessary.
  - There would be impact upon visual on two residential properties.

It was noted that the application would have an impact on the neighbour and paddock.

Applicant and agent has been working with Planning Officers. In terms of building out, the building wouldn't stick out too much when compared to the rest of the street.

Councillor Pritchett proposed to accept the application with the conditions that work would only take place between 8am and 5pm Monday to Friday and 9am to 12pm

on Saturday and conditions outlined within the report. Councillor Glancy seconded the motion.

## **RESOLVED**

**That the application be APPROVED.**

(Unanimous)

## **REASONS**

An extension to a residential dwelling represents sustainable development and so is acceptable in principle in accordance with Local Plan policy SS1. The principle of the proposed change of use of part of the existing paddock to residential curtilage is supported under policy SS2 taking into account the limited expansion of the residential curtilage within the site context, and the fact that extensions an existing dwelling is a form of development considered necessary and appropriate within the open countryside.

The planning policy context has changed significantly between the 2004 application for extensions to the existing bungalow which was refused and the outline consent in 1984. The application is supported by a Heritage Statement, the scheme adequately shows the proposed development would have a neutral impact upon Holwell Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent listed cottages would be preserved in accordance with Local Plan policy EN13. The design of the proposed extension seeks to replicate the form of the neighbouring traditional agricultural outbuildings and the pallet of materials proposed would reference the local vernacular as required by Neighbourhood Plan H4. Therefore the siting, scale and design of the proposal is considered acceptable and would not result in an incongruous form of development in this location. There are also no identifiable adverse impacts on the character of the application site or wider settlement.

As a result of the segregated pedestrian access gate the proposal would represent a betterment to the treatment of the PROW which passes through the site. Furthermore, the proposal is acceptable in terms of its potential impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, highway safety and ecology. The development therefore also accords with Policies EN1, D1 and IN2 of the Local Plan in these respects.

PL65

### **Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at: 8.53 pm