



Rural Capital of Food

Agenda

Meeting name	Meeting of the Full Council
Date	Wednesday, 25 April 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH
Other information	This meeting is open to the public

Members of the Full Council are summoned to the above meeting to consider the following items of business.

Edd de Coverly
Chief Executive

Membership

Councillors	P. Baguley	T. Bains (Chair)
	P. Chandler (Vice-Chair)	T. Beaken
	M. Blase	G. Botterill
	R. de Burle	P. Cumbers
	J. Douglas	P. Faulkner
	A. Freer-Jones	M. Glancy
	M. Graham	T. Greenow
	L. Higgins	E. Holmes
	J. Hurrell	E. Hutchison
	J. Illingworth	S. Lumley
	J. Orson	A. Pearson
	P. Posnett	B. Rhodes
	M. Sheldon	J. Simpson
	D. Wright	J. Wyatt

Quorum: 14 Councillors

Meeting enquiries	Lena Shuttlewood
Email	lshuttlewood@melton.gov.uk
Agenda despatched	Tuesday, 17 April 2018

No.	Item	Page No.
1.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
2.	MINUTES To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2018.	1 - 18
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Members to declare any interest as appropriate in respect of items to be considered at this meeting.	19 - 20
4.	MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS The Mayor to present his awards to the successful nominees for the Mayor's Awards 2018.	
5.	LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS	
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME <i>The Leader and Chairs of Policy Committees to answer any questions from the public of which notice has been given in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 of the Constitution.</i> <i>No questions were received by the deadline.</i>	
7.	PETITIONS <i>In accordance with Procedure Rule 24.1, the Chief Executive shall report the receipt of a petition to the next meeting of the Council where there shall be no debate or comment thereon.</i> <i>No petitions were received.</i>	
8.	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES	
	a) GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE: 27 MARCH 2018 - ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION 2017/18 <u>RECOMMENDED that</u> (2) Appendix A1 of the report (revised Substitute Policy) be approved, subject to the following amendment at clause 11 of the Policy 'If sufficient notice has been given, a Member substituting on the Planning Committee will be expected to attend the Planning Site Visit and/or the Briefing. But the Substitute Member could still take part in the Planning Committee meeting, even if they had not attended the Planning Site Visit and/or the Briefing'	

	<p>And</p> <p>Appendix A2 of the report (Revised Code of Conduct for Members and officers dealing with Planning matters) be approved;</p> <p>The report to the Governance Committee on 27 March 2018 on the Annual Review of the Constitution and associated appendices can be found here</p>																													
	<p>b) POLICY, FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE: 11 APRIL 2018 - ADOPTION OF A COMMERCIAL STRATEGY</p> <p><u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the Commercial Strategy at Appendix A is adopted.</p> <p>The report and Appendix A to the Policy, Finance & Administration Committee on 11 April 2018 on the Adoption of a Commercial Strategy can be found here</p>																													
9.	<p>QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS</p> <p>(a) The Chairs of Committees to answer any questions upon items of reports of Committees when those items are being received or under consideration by the Council in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.1 of the Constitution :-</p> <table data-bbox="343 1075 1173 1982"> <tr> <td>Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee</td> <td>13 February 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Planning Committee</td> <td>20 February 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recruitment Committee</td> <td>21 February 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recruitment Committee</td> <td>7 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee</td> <td>7 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ad Hoc Community & Social Affairs Committee</td> <td>8 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town Area Committee</td> <td>12 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Planning Committee</td> <td>15 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community & Social Affairs Committee</td> <td>20 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recruitment Committee</td> <td>22 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recruitment Committee</td> <td>27 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Governance Committee</td> <td>27 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Planning Committee</td> <td>5 April 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>*Policy, Finance & Administration Committee</td> <td>11 April 2018</td> </tr> </table> <p>*to follow</p>	Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	13 February 2018	Planning Committee	20 February 2018	Recruitment Committee	21 February 2018	Recruitment Committee	7 March 2018	Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	7 March 2018	Ad Hoc Community & Social Affairs Committee	8 March 2018	Town Area Committee	12 March 2018	Planning Committee	15 March 2018	Community & Social Affairs Committee	20 March 2018	Recruitment Committee	22 March 2018	Recruitment Committee	27 March 2018	Governance Committee	27 March 2018	Planning Committee	5 April 2018	*Policy, Finance & Administration Committee	11 April 2018	21 - 138
Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	13 February 2018																													
Planning Committee	20 February 2018																													
Recruitment Committee	21 February 2018																													
Recruitment Committee	7 March 2018																													
Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	7 March 2018																													
Ad Hoc Community & Social Affairs Committee	8 March 2018																													
Town Area Committee	12 March 2018																													
Planning Committee	15 March 2018																													
Community & Social Affairs Committee	20 March 2018																													
Recruitment Committee	22 March 2018																													
Recruitment Committee	27 March 2018																													
Governance Committee	27 March 2018																													
Planning Committee	5 April 2018																													
*Policy, Finance & Administration Committee	11 April 2018																													

	<p>(b) In accordance with Procedure Rules 10.3 and 10.5, a Member may ask the Mayor, Leader or the Chairman of any committee or sub-committee, a question on any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affects the Melton Borough.</p> <p>No questions were received by the deadline.</p>	
10.	<p>MOTIONS ON NOTICE <i>There were no Motions received in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.1</i></p>	
11.	<p>APPOINTMENT OF MONITORING OFFICER The Chief Executive to submit a report regarding the appointment of a new Monitoring Officer with effect from 25 June 2018.</p>	139 - 142

Minutes

Meeting name	Full Council
Date	Thursday, 22 February 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor T. Bains (Chair)

Councillors	P. Baguley	P. Chandler (Vice-Chair)
	T. Beaken	M. Blase
	G. Botterill	R. de Burle
	P. Cumbers	J. Douglas
	P. Faulkner	A. Freer-Jones
	M. Glancy	T. Greenow
	L. Higgins	E. Holmes
	J. Hurrell	J. Illingworth
	S. Lumley	J. Orson
	A. Pearson	P. Posnett
	B. Rhodes	J. Simpson
	J. Wyatt	

Officers

- Chief Executive
- Deputy Chief Executive
- Director for Corporate Services
- Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
- Solicitor to the Council (VW)
- Democracy & Involvement Officer
- Interim Director for Growth & Regeneration
- Corporate Services Manager

The Reverend Kevin Ashby offered prayers.

Minute No.	Minute
CO96	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Graham MBE, Hutchison, Sheldon, and Wright.</p> <p>Councillor Orson reported that Councillor Sheldon was now out of hospital and recovering well at home.</p>
CO97	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2018 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the Mayor.</p>
CO98	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Holmes: Declared a personal interest in application 14/00808/OUT Field No 3968 Melton Spinney Road, Thorpe Arnold as set out in minute number PL76.2 of the Planning minutes dated 1 February 2018.</p> <p>Councillor Posnett: Declared a personal and pecuniary interest in applications 14/00808/OUT Field No 3968 Melton Spinney Road, Thorpe Arnold and, 17/1019/FUL Gates Nurseries and Garden Centre, Somerby Road, Cold Overton as set out in minute numbers PL76.2 and PL76.9 of the Planning minutes dated 1 February 2018. Her interest in the Gates Nurseries application arose due to the fact she had relatives that worked for the company.</p> <p>Declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to her role as a County Councillor.</p> <p>Councillor Glancy: Declared a personal interest in application 14/00808/OUT Field No 3968 Melton Spinney Road, Thorpe Arnold as set out in minute number PL76.2 of the Planning minutes dated 1 February 2018.</p> <p>Councillor Pearson: Declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to his role as a County Councillor.</p> <p>Councillor Rhodes: Declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to his role as a County Councillor.</p> <p>Declared a personal and pecuniary interest in item 12 on the agenda – Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan: Consultation Response. His interest arose from being a member of the Members’ Advisory Group which had drawn up</p>

the SGP.

Councillor Orson:

Declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to his role as a County Councillor.

Declared a personal and pecuniary interest in item 11 on the agenda, Council Tax 2018/19 (page 227 of the document pack) as he was the chair of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police & Crime Panel which had supported the setting of the PCC precept.

Councillor Baguley:

Declared a personal and pecuniary interest in application 17/00507/COU The John Dory, 2 Rutland Square, Barkestone-le-Vale as set out in minute number PL76.5 of the Planning minutes dated 1 February 2018. Her interest arose as she was a trustee of the village hall committee.

The Chief Executive declared an interest on behalf of all Chief Officers in relation to item 13 on the agenda, Annual Pay Policy 2018/19.

CO99

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor

(a) reported on a number of recent civic engagements he had undertaken highlighting the Mayor's Carol Service back in December, the celebration of the Melton Community Lottery first birthday, and a 'row-athon' at the Waterfield Leisure Centre to raise funds for the local Parkinson's support group. He commented on how much he enjoyed attending the local events;

(b) thanked the Mayoress for her support and also the Deputy Mayor who had undertaken a number of engagements on his behalf recently whilst he had been away;

(c) welcomed Members' attendance at the forthcoming Civic Service on 4 March and thanked Councillors Freer-Jones, Greenow and Posnett for agreeing to participate in the prayers;

(d) reminded Members about the Fly the Flag for the Commonwealth Day at Parkside on Monday 12 March;

(e) encouraged members to support Councillor Greenow who was in training to run a marathon in aid of the Tommy's Charity for research into saving babies lives;

(f) referred to the visit that evening from the Melton 5th Scout Group which he had hosted before the meeting and welcomed the group who had stayed to learn about how a council meeting was run. He hoped that they would be encouraged to become young Mayors of the future;

(g) congratulated the Assistant Director of Strategic & Regulatory Services and his team for their work during the course of the recent Local Plan Examination;

(h) referred, in his absence, to Councillor Graham MBE who would shortly reach 30 years continual service on the Council and publicly commended this incredible achievement;

(i) invited Helen Chadwick to come forward to present to the Council on behalf of the Melton Fairtrade Steering Group a certificate marking the Council's support towards a Fairtrade Borough status. In presenting the certificate to the Mayor, Helen said that the recognition was for the whole of the Borough and invited Members to a special Fairtrade Breakfast that was taking place on 3 March at Sage Cross Methodist Church.

CO100

LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader reported on the following matters:

(a) Peer Challenge report: to be covered later on the agenda but he wished to inform Members that the new Local Government Minister, Rishi Sunak MP, had recently said that the Government was very keen that all local councils host a peer challenge. In that regard, Melton Borough was a step ahead. He expressed his gratitude for the insights the peer team had provided and for the acknowledgement of the things the Council was doing well, as well as those things it needed to change if it was to improve and modernise how it worked. For the Peer Challenge to have real value, however, the Council needed to respond. The report later in the agenda set out how it might do that;

(b) the Council was at a crucial time in relation to procuring a new waste collection contract. The details of the process were commercially sensitive and the matter would be considered as an exempt item later on the agenda. However, he wished to publicly commend officers and members of the working group for the work they had done in getting the Council to this point;

(c) Following a recent external assessment, the Council had for the second year secured Customer Service Excellence accreditation. This recognised the commitment the Council had to excellent customer services and its desire to continue improving. Key strengths identified were a strong customer focussed ethos and one that ensure specific support to vulnerable people. Colleagues worked hard to go the extra mile and want to support the residents with all their needs and not simply refer them on to someone else. However, the Leader stressed there was more work to be done and the Council was not complacent: the recent corporate restructure would help the Council re-shape its people based service and ensure it better managed transactional issues efficiently, as well as providing more joined up support for those with complex needs. Following the national increase in planning fees, the recent decision to boost resources in the planning team would improve the development control services. The Council was also continuing to look at how it could make the best use of technology to enable

people to access services when and how they want. He looked forward to sharing more about these developments with Members in due course.

CO101 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions to be put.

CO102 **PETITIONS**

There were no petitions to report.

CO103 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES: Governance Committee - 6 February 2018: G53 - Constitution Update 2017/18**

Councillor Cumbers referred Members to a copy of a report previously submitted to the Governance Committee which set out a number of new items and changes required to the Constitution. In moving the changes, she outlined the reasons for the changes and also proposed an amendment to the Substitutes policy which was attached as Appendix B i.e. paragraph 5 on page 26 of the agenda pack should be amended to read:

“ Due to Members of the Policy, Finance and Administration Committee also having the function to sit as the Investigating and Disciplinary Committee, these Members may not substitute on the Appeals Committee when it is considering an appeal against a decision in which the Member took part.”

For clarification, the amendment was set out on the order paper circulated at the meeting. In seconding the motion, Councillor Simpson thanked Councillor Cumbers for her work on this aspect. A vote was then taken on the changes en bloc which was carried unanimously.

RECOMMENDED: To approve the following changes to the Constitution for adoption:

(1) Contract Procedure Rules : EU Thresholds

To note that the Director for Corporate Services had exercised her delegation for a legislative amendment to the EU thresholds within the Contract Procedure Rules as set out at Appendix A and which came into effect from 1 January 2018 and will apply for two years.

(2) Substitute Policy amendment – recommendation from Policy, Finance and Administration Committee:

(i) amendment of this Council’s substitute policy to reflect the restriction on a Member of Policy, Finance and Administration Committee from being a substitute on the Appeals Committee and visa versa; and

(ii) a requirement for Members of the Policy, Finance and Administration Committee to undergo appropriate training prior to sitting as the Investigating and Disciplinary Committee.

The Substitute Policy be amended with the tracked changes as set out at Appendix B and as amended below in relation to para 5, page 26.

“ Due to Members of the Policy, Finance and Administration Committee also having the function to sit as the Investigating and Disciplinary Committee, these Members may not substitute on the Appeals Committee when it is considering an appeal against a decision in which the Member took part.”

(3) Part 3 – Scheme of Delegations to Officers – Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods

Following the departure of the Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods and the termination of the role in the Council’s management structure on 11 February 2018, the Scheme of Delegations to Officers be amended as set out in tracked changes at Appendix C.

**(4) Part 3 – Scheme of Delegations to Officers – Authorisation to act
The Officer Delegations be amended to state that the Director for Corporate Services is able to deputise and act for the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive.**

**(5) Part 3 – Scheme of Delegations to Officers – Debt Recovery
The Officer Delegations in respect of debt recovery be amended due to a change in policy for housing benefit overpayment. There is an addition to the existing delegation and a new delegation included as follows, changes shown in red :-**

‘To administer, formulate and amend the Council’s procedures to deal with debt recovery and Housing benefit overpayments and to take any action including the instigation of legal proceedings and the authorisation of officers to appear in court in connection therewith.

Any write off of Housing Benefit overpayments that are still within the Housing Benefit system will be dealt with in line with the Housing benefit overpayment policy’

(6) Management structure realignment – Consequential amendments to Parts 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10

To note that the Monitoring Officer has exercised his delegation to make minor procedural and operational changes to Parts 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 of the Constitution with regard to Officer job title changes as a result of the Management structure realignment approved by the Full Council on 12 December 2017.

CO104

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

(a) Members had before them the reports of the following committees upon which the Chairmen of Committees may be asked any questions upon items of reports of

Committees when those items are being received or under consideration by the Council in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.1 of the Constitution :-

Planning Committee	30 November 2017
Ad Hoc Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	4 December 2017
Ad Hoc Planning Committee	4 December 2017
Ad Hoc Policy, Finance & Administration Committee	7 December 2017
Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	10 January 2018
Planning Committee	11 January 2018
Community & Social Affairs Committee	23 January 2018
Ad Hoc Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	24 January 2018
Policy, Finance & Administration Committee	24 January 2018
Planning Committee	1 February 2018
Governance Committee	6 February 2018

(b) Councillor referred to the minutes of the Community & Social Affairs Committee held on 23 January 2018, minute number C50: Asset of Community Value Review – The Red Lion Car Park, Stathern. Councillor Higgins addressed his question to the Chair of that committee, stating that there had been complaints made over the way the Council had dealt with requests for parish councils to take on responsibility for assets of community value. He asked what steps had been taken to improve this process.

Councillor Pearson acknowledged that there had been some genuine confusion and misunderstanding of the legislation and he had therefore asked officers to review the policy to be presented to a special meeting of the CSA Committee. This should ensure that future requests could be dealt with more effectively.

(c) there were no questions put in accordance with Procedure Rules 10.3 and 10.5.

CO105

MOTIONS ON NOTICE

There were no Motions on Notice received in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.1

COUNCIL TAX 2018/19

The Leader presented the report prepared by the Director for Corporate Services, as circulated with the agenda, concerning the calculation and setting of the Council Tax for 2018/19, as required under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. Members' attention was drawn to an amended Appendix C which had been circulated at the meeting due to some rounding issues in the original document.

In proposing the recommendation as set out in the order paper, the Leader reported that at its meeting held the previous evening, the Leicestershire County Council had set its precept which represented a 5.99% increase for an average Band D Council Tax. The Police & Crime Commissioner's figure was 6.41%, the Leicestershire Fire Authority 2.98% and the Parish Councils represented an average increase to 5.43%. Overall, this represented an average increase of 5.57% which equated to an additional 1.8p per day for a Band D property. The increase in the parish precept for Garthorpe of 412.98% was highlighted.

The motion was then seconded by Councillor Higgins.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.5(b), a recorded vote was then taken.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Baguley	√			
Bains	√			
Beaken	√			
Blase		√		
Botterill	√			
Chandler	√			
Cumbers	√			
De Burle	√			
Douglas	√			
Faulkner	√			
Freer-Jones	√			
Glancy	√			
Graham				√
Greenow	√			
Higgins	√			
Holmes	√			
Hurrell	√			
Hutchison				√

Illingworth	√			
Lumley	√			
Orson	√			
Pearson	√			
Posnett	√			
Rhodes	√			
Sheldon				√
Simpson	√			
Wright				√
Wyatt	√			
Totals	23	1	0	4

RESOLVED: that this Council note the calculations and set the Council Tax for the year 2018/19, in accordance with regulations set out in the Local Government Finance Act 1992

[Councillor Rhodes left the meeting at this point at 7pm.]

CO107

LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN: CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Members had before them a report prepared by the Assistant Director of Strategic Planning & Regulatory Services which invited the Council to make comments on the Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) for Leicester & Leicestershire as part of its consultation exercise.

In presenting the report, the Leader

(a) reminded Members of the early draft SGP which was present to the Council at its December meeting for which approval had been sought to go out to consultation. This had been agreed by all parties and consultation had started in January. Comments were being submitted and an early sight of these included:

- Support for growth in Melton – and some opposition
- Potential to improve public transport links to major centres
- Need to relieve congestion
- Potential role as a centre for rural industries
- Relatively isolated location, lack of job opportunities
- Impact on historic centre and current traffic congestion

(b) reported that the Council's consultation arrangements had been completed as set out in the report and a drop in exhibition had been arranged for 14 March;

(c) explained that the SGP set out an approach to the delivery of growth and infrastructure in the Leicester and Leicestershire area to 2050. This followed objectives of developing Leicester as the 'core city' but with growth points elsewhere in the County of which Melton Mowbray was one. The SGP proposed a level of growth commensurate with the Council's Own Local Plan, but maintaining that going beyond the plan's horizons after 2036;

(d) emphasised that the main purpose of the report was to allow this Council to make its own contribution. The Council had commented at the draft stage and it was pleasing to note that these comments had been picked up in the Consultation Draft version. This included:

- The importance for Melton of connectivity to larger centres
- The proximity to the proposed A46 expressway
- The importance of broadband and other digital infrastructure
- Steering development pressures to major growth areas and away from villages

(e) stated that with this background he was happy to commend the SGP to the Council in its current form. The document would come back to the Council after the consultation process had finished and this was expected to be in late 2018;

(f) concluded by commenting on the relationship between the Local Plan and the SGP in the light of the recent Examination. There was clearly some uncertainty about the content of the Local Plan until the Examination result was known – one aspect of this being the level of growth in Melton Mowbray. There was a risk, believed to be quite small, that the proposed growth for Melton Mowbray may be reduced as a result of the Examination; several parties had argued to this effect. If this were to happen, the existing strong synergy between the Local Plan and the SGP would be weakened. Whilst this was hopefully an issue of timing, the Leader said it had been felt necessary to flag this up to the partners. With this caveat, he moved the endorsement of the recommendations as contained in the order paper. Councillor Higgins seconded the motion.

Before the vote was taken, a Member asked how many houses were being built at the present time. The Leader undertook to supply this information to the Member. The motion was then put to the vote and carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that to support the content of the Draft Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester & Leicestershire and highlights the potential issues set out at para 3.11.1 – 3.11.3 of the Assistant Director's report.

[Councillor Rhodes here returned to the meeting at 7.10pm]

CO108

ANNUAL PAY POLICY 2018/19

The Director for Corporate Services had previously provided Members with a report which sought the Council's approval for the 2018/19 Annual Pay Policy Statement

so that it could be published in line with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011. The report was presented by the Leader who moved that the Statement be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Higgins. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the 2018/19 Annual Pay Policy Statement be approved so that it can be published in line with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011.

CO109

PEER CHALLENGE REPORT

In a report previously circulated, the Chief Executive provided Members with the LGA Peer Challenge Report following the visit from the Peer Challenge team during 11 to 13 December 2017. The report summarised what the Peer team found including both areas of good practice and areas where the Council could improve. It also included a summary of what the Council had been doing up to this point and plans for the future.

The Leader, in presenting the report to Members and moving the recommendations it contained:

(a) reminded them of the background to the Council's decision to invite a Peer Challenge team to visit the Council in order to act as a critical friend and how this process operated;

(b) reported that the Peer team had found that staff, Members, and stakeholders were positive about the new direction of the Council and that there was a real opportunity for it to maximise the potential of the area. The new corporate management structure and new performance framework were seen as positive steps and would add capacity and accountability to the priority areas. They had identified that the Council had been well run financially but that it must ensure there was a wider recognition of the financial challenge and consider how it might utilise borrowing to fund future investment opportunities;

(c) explained that a shortage of capacity, turnover of key staff and vacancies were identified as key challenges currently. This was something that had been prioritised over the last few months and a recruitment drive was now underway to fill posts and a new Workforce Strategy under development which would be brought forward in the near future. Whilst this would undoubtedly help, the Leader stressed that the Council must recognise that some parts of the organisation remained extremely lean and it would have to explore whether further investment in some areas was required to support effective service delivery;

(d) stressed that, most crucially, the peer team confirmed the need for the Council to undergo a very focused prioritisation exercise. The Council's ambition and the commitment of its staff to deliver set it apart, but the Council must collectively ensure it was clear on its priorities and then resource them effectively. The Council also needed to ensure that its decision making and governance processes were clear and streamlined. To this end, the Council had already

commissioned the LGA to provide further support by working with officers and Members to review its governance processes and provide support during the prioritisation exercise;

(e) assured Members that they would be fully involved in these processes and the LGA would provide specific recommendations on what should be changed. This work would take place over the next couple of months and the aim was to have proposals for a refreshed set of corporate priorities, a new set of corporate values and an updated Constitution and Scheme of Delegation ready to present to the Annual Meeting in May;

(f) stressed that this remained an exciting time for Melton. The outcome of the Local Plan Examination and the submission to the Department for Transport for distributor road funding was awaited. The Council was exploring opportunities to build new homes in Melton and to create a wider place partnership which would enable it to maximise the potential of the 'Rural Capital of Food'. The Council could and should remain ambitious and the work it would do following the peer challenge would help ensure it was better equipped to deliver.

After the motion was seconded by Councillor Higgins, the Mayor moved to the vote which resulted in the motion being carried unanimously.

RESOLVED:

(1) to note the report and accept the recommendations as set out in the LGA Peer Challenge Report;

(2) to note what action has been taking place over recent months and the next steps as set out in the developing Action Plan (Appendix B of the report).

[Before moving to the exempt item, as the Scout Group would now need to leave the meeting, Councillor Greenow wished to publicly congratulate them for how well presented they had been and how pleasing it had been to hear their excited chatter before the start of the meeting.]

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: that the Public be excluded during the consideration of the following item of business in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Access to Information: Exempt Information) under paragraph 3.

CO110

WASTE PROCUREMENT

Members had previously been circulated with a copy of a report presented to the Melton, Economic, and Environmental Affairs Committee on 13 February 2018 on the outcome of the procurement process for the waste collection and street cleaning contract and which included a number of recommendations with regard to the award of the contract to the preferred bidder.

Following the MEEA Committee's consideration of this report, the Committee had made a series of recommendations which were now before the Full Council for its approval. The Leader presented this item and moved the recommendations as set out in an updated version of the exempt record of the MEEA Committee's decisions which was tabled at the meeting. This included an additional recommendation 2.9.

In support of his motion, the Leader stated that this contract had been a priority of the Council for the last two years and had involved a lot of work by the Task Group. He wished to place on record his thanks and appreciation to the team of officers who had supported the Task Group and the Members of the Task Group themselves who had faced a difficult job. The motion was seconded by Councillor Higgins.

After the Chief Executive had responded to a question raised on the green waste service, Members voted on the series of recommendations en bloc. The motion was subsequently carried.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the MEEA Committee from its meeting held on 13 February 2018 with regard to the waste collection and street cleaning contract be approved.

The meeting closed at: 7.30 pm

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Advice on Members' Interests

COUNCIL MEETINGS - COMMITTEE MINUTES : DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Interests need not be declared at Full Council in relation to Committee Minutes which do not become the subject of debate at Full Council (i.e. Minutes referred to solely on a page by page basis when working through the Minutes of each Committee.)

An interest must be declared at Full Council as soon as it becomes apparent that a relevant Committee Minute is to be debated – this applies even if an interest has been declared at Committee and is recorded in the Minutes of that Committee.

PERSONAL AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS

If the issue being discussed affects you, your family or a close associate more than other people in the area, you have a personal and non-pecuniary interest. You also have a personal interest if the issue relates to an interest you must register under paragraph 9 of the Members' Code of Conduct.

You must state that you have a personal and non-pecuniary interest and the nature of your interest. You may stay, take part and vote in the meeting.

PERSONAL AND PECUNIARY INTERESTS

If a member of the public, who knows all the relevant facts, would view your personal interest in the issue being discussed to be so great that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest and it affects your or the other person or bodies' financial position or relates to any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration then **you must state that you have a pecuniary interest, the nature of the interest and you must leave the room***. You must not seek improperly to influence a decision on that matter unless you have previously obtained a dispensation from the Authority's Governance Committee.

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS

If you are present at any meeting of the Council and you have a disclosable pecuniary interest in any matter to be considered or being considered at the meeting, if the interest is not already registered, you must disclose the interest to the meeting. You must not participate in the discussion or the vote and you must leave the room.

You may not attend a meeting or stay in the room as either an Observer Councillor or *Ward Councillor or as a member of the public if you have a pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest*.

BIAS

If you have been involved in an issue in such a manner or to such an extent that the public are likely to perceive you to be biased in your judgement of the public interest (bias) then you should not take part in the decision-making process; you should leave the room. **You should state that your position in this matter prohibits you from taking part.** You may request permission of the Chair to address the meeting prior to leaving the room. The Chair will need to assess whether you have a useful contribution to make or whether complying with this request would prejudice the proceedings. A personal, pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest will take precedence over bias.

In each case above, you should make your declaration at the beginning of the meeting or as soon as you are aware of the issue being discussed.*

*There are some exceptions – please refer to paragraphs 13(2) and 13(3) of the Code of Conduct

This page is intentionally left blank



Rural Capital of Food

Minutes

Meeting name	Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee (previously Rural, Economic & Environmental Affairs)
Date	Tuesday, 13 February 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair

Councillors

E. Hutchison (Vice-Chair)	T. Beaken
M. Blase	G. Botterill
R. de Burle	M. Graham
M. Glancy	L. Higgins
J. Simpson	J. Illingworth (Substitute)

Observers

Councillor P. Chandler

Officers

Chief Executive
 Business Manager (VC)
 Interim Director for Growth & Regeneration
 Director for Corporate Services
 Solicitor To The Council (SK)
 Waste & Environmental Maintenance Manager
 Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
 Solicitor

Minute No.	Minute
R23	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sheldon, Councillor Rhodes and Councillor Orson.</p>
R24	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest.</p>
R25	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES There were no recommendations from other committees.</p>
R26	<p>UPDATE ON DECISIONS There were no updates received.</p>
R27	<p>URGENT BUSINESS There was no urgent business.</p>
	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC RESOLVED that the Public be excluded during the consideration of the following item of business in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Access to Information : Exempt Information) under paragraphs 3 and 7.</p>
R28	<p>New Waste Collection & Street Cleaning Contract</p> <p>On behalf of the Chair of the Waste Task Group, Councillor Hutchison submitted a report to the Committee on the outcome of the procurement process for the waste collection and street cleaning contract and recommended the preferred bidder for the award of the contract.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the recommendations within the exempt report be approved.</p>

The meeting closed at: 7.00 pm

Chair

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Tuesday, 20 February 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Illingworth (Chair)

Councillors

P. Posnett (Vice-Chair)	P. Baguley
G. Botterill	P. Chandler
P. Cumbers	P. Faulkner
M. Glancy	T. Greenow
E. Holmes	J. Wyatt

Observers

Officers

Minute No.	Minute
PL78	<p>Apologies for Absence Cllr Posnett sent her apologies for being late to the meeting and missing the beginning of the first application.</p>
PL79	<p>Minutes Minutes of the meetings held on 11.01.18 and 01.02.18.</p> <p>In the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 11.01.18, Cllr Chandler noted that on page 5 in the first paragraph it reads “The application is outline only with a minimal level of information and though led than ideal”, this should be “less than ideal”.</p> <p>In the Minutes of the meeting held on the 01.02.18, Cllr Cumbers wished for the wording of the 11th paragraph on page 25 to be stronger and include a condition to involve ward councillors and Friends of the Country Park in the planting. Cllr Chandler stated that on application 17/01019/FUL the first speaker, Cllr Richard Bates, was not speaking on behalf of the Parish Council as recorded. Officers to write to the Parish Council for clarification.</p> <p>Approval of the minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Cumbers. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.</p>
PL80	<p>Declarations of Interest Cllr Orson declared an interest on 17/00671/OUT as he would ordinarily speak as Ward Cllr, therefore Cllr Higgins would speak as a representative for the Ward instead.</p>
PL81	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL81.1	<p>17/00671/OUT Applicant: Mr and Mrs William and Jane Grice Location: Land North of Main Road, Old Dalby Proposal: Outline application for residential development, car park and open space</p> <p>(a) The Applications and Advice Manager (LP) presented the report and stated that:</p> <p>This is an outline application for a residential development, car park and open space. Access is to be considered at this stage with all other matters reserved. The application documents state that the development will consist of 7 new dwellings, 3 number 3 bed bungalows and 4 number 4 bed chalet bungalows, along with a car park area for approximately 20 cars to be used by the playing field and school and would also provide some public open space. Since the publishing of the Committee report, three further letters of</p>

representation have been received, stating

- The proposal would transform Old Dalby into an urban sprawl with land that is present countryside being taken up by more housing.
- The proposal would bring negative consequences for residents and the environment, with an increase in volume of traffic passing through the village resulting in higher air pollution, accidents and traffic jams.
- Planning approvals have been granted for approximately 184 dwellings within Queensway/Dukes Road and Old Dalby with no increase in public facilities.
- The application is profit led with no regard for residents and the environment.
- It is doubtful that the proposed car park will be used with people picking children up and dropping them off outside the school gates.
- If the area is not lit then it will be a tempting area for young people away from prying eyes, if lit then there will be light pollution ruining the night sky.
- Old Dalby is a small rural village with very few amenities, and already going to have a lot of new housing
- The main road through the village already has to cope with cars speeding through on their way to the business park.

These points are similar to those already raised and responded to within the committee report.

A further representation has been received from Old Dalby Cricket Club, who have stated that they object to the notes referring to the application in that the car park is for the benefit of the playing field/cricket field. The cricket club have stated that this is not the case and that they have full use of the car park at the school which is totally sufficient for player/spectator parking, and that they would not like this to be used as part of the decision making as this isn't something that has been requested or supported as license holders of the playing/cricketed field.

They would also like to draw attention to the fact that the field has been, and is currently ankle deep in water since October last year, they are very concerned that this could pose a possible flooding threat to the cricket field, which would cause major problems and expense.

Along with these comments, clarification has been sought from the education authority with regards to the payment of contributions as part of this proposal should permission be granted. The Education Authority have confirmed that the threshold for seeking contributions is usually, the development of 10 or more dwellings; however there are a number of development of less than 10 dwellings within the catchment area of the Old Dalby Primary School, cumulatively the impact of these developments will have significant implications for education provision in the area. Section 106 contributions are therefore being sought to mitigate the impact of this and other developments. The funding will be used to expand the Old Dalby Primary School and either the Long Field School or John Ferneley College.

Therefore a contribution request of £29,534.79 as set out in the report is considered proportionate with the proposed development and is considered to be necessary and specific to the increase in pupils the propos would bring and is therefore considered compliant with CIL Regulation 122.

The agent has commented that there is a potential discrepancy in the report regarding the primary school numbers, in that the report states that there is a deficit of 19 school space, 17 existing and 2 created by this application. At the last committee meeting application reference 17/00397/FUL – Station Lane reported a deficit of 29 school spaces after approval of that application, the agent has therefore used the figure of 31 spaces in deficit should the application is approved.

The variation is due to timings between consultation feedback on the 2 applications, if members are minded to approve the proposal they may wish to request up to date figures to be obtained prior to a Section 106 agreement being instructed upon.

The Borough is considered to have a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites in line with current planning guidance, despite Old Dalby being considered a sustainable location for housing having access to various facilities, primary education, local shops and a regular bus service, the site is not allocated as a site for housing in either the emerging Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan.

In conclusion it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF especially in terms of housing supply, however the weight attached to the site not being allocated for housing and also the location of the site being outside of the built up confines of Old Dalby on land that provides part of the rural setting to the village outweigh the benefits in this instance, as such the application is recommended for refusal for the reason as set out in the report.

The Chair asked Members if they would suspend standing orders to allow two objectors to speak.

Cllr Holmes proposed to allow this, and was seconded by Cllr Wyatt. It was unanimously decided that it would be allowed.

(b) Cllr George Schmidt, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Site is not designated for housing
- Outside of proposed limits of development
- Not supported by the Neighbourhood Plan
- Designated area of separation
- Site is separated from school land by Dalby Brook – harm to environmental setting
- Lack of need for car park
- Harm to setting

Cllr Posnett joined the meeting at 6.22pm. Due to missing the start of the

application, she was unable to vote.

- (c) Victoria Lee, on behalf of the pre-school, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Neutral to the proposal
 - Pre-school has no requirement for a car park so should not be a reason to permit

A Cllr noted that houses that have already been passed will be built and there will more than likely be pre-school children from this.

Ms Lee stated that the pre-school is not currently at its full capacity. They are less likely to need the carpark because of the age of the children – parents will not walk the distance from the carpark to the pre-school with young children.

A Cllr asked if there was any school transport at Old Dalby.

Ms Lee stated that there was some transport to John Ferneley, and a bus to Nether Broughton but not to Melton.

A Cllr clarified that a service bus goes from Nether Broughton to Queensway to Old Dalby.

- (d) John Harper, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Contrary to Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan
 - Area of separation – contravenes Neighbourhood Plan
 - Unsustainable
 - Adverse impact
 - Harm outweighs benefits
 - Outside specifications limits to build
 - Need to protect the green space and wildlife
 - No support from residents
 - Inappropriate location
 - School adopted neutral approach, parents will not use

- (e) Richard Cooper, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Balance of competing objections
 - Benefit to community
 - Addition of open space and play area
 - Contributions of £14,000
 - Newly approved developments will add to carpark problems
 - School is landlocked
 - Community amenity – Policy CF2 supports this
 - Screening and appearance will be dealt with in full application
 - Benefits outweigh harm
 - Provides options for the future

A Cllr asked what process the applicant had gone through to include parking.

Mr Cooper stated that there was a long history, but the applicant had been approached by members of the community.

- (f) Cllr Leigh Higgins, as Ward Councillor representative, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Support recommendation
 - Encroaches on area of separation
 - Contrary to Local and Neighbourhood Plans
 - Carpark is not a benefit - would prefer further negotiation of what could be achieved
 - Application is only outline and could change at the full application stage

A Cllr asked where the area of separation is.

The Applications and Advice Manager showed the Members the location of the area of separation from both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan. Clarified reason for refusal and stated that the area of separation is not in the recommendation and if minded to refuse this wording needs to be added.

Cllr Chandler proposed to permit the application as bungalows are much needed.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal to permit and added that bungalows are affordable and elderly people like to live in bungalows.

A Cllr disagreed with this and stated that not all elderly people like to live in bungalows and that the argument to allow the application just because of the bungalows is insufficient.

A Cllr agreed with this and stated that the main factor is that it goes against the Local and Neighbourhood Plans.

A vote to permit the application was taken. 2 Members voted to permit. 6 Members voted against. 2 Members abstained.

Cllr Wyatt moved to refuse the application.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to refuse and added the reason of the site being an area of separation.

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

Cllrs Chandler and Holmes wished for their votes against refusal to be recorded.

DETERMINATION: REFUSED, for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed dwellings would occupy a site outside of the built up confines of Old Dalby on land that provides part of the rural setting to the village and forms part of a designated area of separation. The introduction of seven residential units and parking would result in the erosion of the rural character and appearance of the open countryside, eroding the clarity of the eastern approach to the village through a new development which would detract from the open nature of this rural approach. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and OS2 of the Melton Local Plan, Policies S2, H1, ENV1 and ENV7 of the Broughton and Dalby NP, Policies SS2 and EN4 of the emerging Melton Local Plan and the NPPF. These policies seek to ensure a satisfactory appearance to development and to restrict inappropriate development in the countryside and to protect important open spaces and areas of separation.

PL81.2

17/00996/OUT

Applicant: Breydon Construction

Location: OS Field Number 0349, Manor Road, Easthorpe

Proposal: Erection of up to 18 dwellings with associated access, drainage infrastructure and amenity open space.

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager presented the report and stated that: This application seeks outline planning permission for up to 18 dwellings with associated access, drainage infrastructure and amenity open space. The details of the access have been submitted for approval at this stage, all other details would be subject to a separate reserved matters application. Since the publishing of the report, there have been several updates received. The Conservation Officer has submitted his comments to the proposal, members will have seen these in full but to summarise the comments conclude that conservation recognises the viability of development in this location and does not object to the principle of new housing in this location. Development along the fringes of the application site would represent a logical continuation of the surrounding urban grain, while additional plots, reduced in size, could be located at the immediate rear of the street facing properties in the style of agricultural outbuildings. However it is clear this would not amount to 18 dwellings and recommends that a significant reduction in the number of units is agreed, and the harmful density of the scheme addressed, before any approval is granted. Archaeology have also commented further on the submitted information, the site has since been subject to trial trench evaluation, which identified remains of contemporary date to the scheduled monument to the immediate north. It is recommended that this information is provided by the applicant to inform both the current determination and any further detailed layout and landscaping designs for the site. In principle archaeology do not object to

the application, provided an appropriately worded condition is applied to any permission granted. However, they would advise that the application should seek to preserve main in situ where possible, in combination with the use of landscaping and public open space. Where it is not possible they would expect a level of mitigation to be undertaken. In this case, it is likely that archaeological area excavation would be the only mitigation appropriate. Conditions requiring a programme of archaeological work and the submission of a written scheme of investigation and its publication have been requested, these can be found as suggested conditions 12, 13 and 14 within the committee report.

Going back to the application details, the Borough is considered to have a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites in line with current planning guidance.

It is considered that balanced against the positive elements are the specific concerns raised in representations, particularly the development of the site from its greenfield state and the impact on the character of the rural village and the allocated area of separation, however in conclusion it is considered that on 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 green field site and the area of separation are considered to be of limited harm.

This is because, in this location the site benefits from a range of services in the immediate vicinity and nearby which mitigate the extent to which travel is necessary and limits journey distance, the character of the site provides potential for sympathetic design, careful landscaping, biodiversity and sustainable drainage opportunities, the site is also allocated for development in the submitted Melton Local Plan, albeit for a reduced number to that proposed.

As such the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

(b) Cllr Bob Bayman, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Description of Easthorpe as a rural hub is incorrect
- No facilities – closest is Bottesford
- Hamlet of 77 homes with 8 more being built. This application will mean a growth of 33% which is too much
- 1 layer deep hamlet – this application will create more depth
- Within area of separation

A Cllr asked what stage of the Neighbourhood Plan has reached.

Cllr Bayman stated they are at consultation stage.

(c) Joanne Althorpe, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Site allocated for 12 dwellings in emerging Local Plan

- Application informed by technical evidence and illustrative layout
- Rounds off the development to the west
- Mixed dwellings including smaller affordable units
- Suitable density
- Screened from scheduled monument and listed buildings
- Some impact on setting of conservation area although the screening means the impact is less than substantial
- Historic England stipulated that to limit impact on the monument the existing frontage planting should be retained and access taken from Green Lane, which are accounted for
- Not cramped
- Deemed appropriate by technical consultees
- Adds to housing land supply
- Benefits outweigh harm
- Addition of affordable housing and open space
- Close to facilities in Bottesford

A Cllr asked for clarification on the range of services available in the immediate vicinity. Bottesford is not immediate.

The Applications and Advice Manager confirmed that this was referring to Bottesford.

Cllr Chandler proposed to permit the application as the land is pasture land, there is a good mix of houses – 37% of which are affordable. There was an application previously refused on the grounds that the area was unsustainable however it was passed at appeal because of the facilities in Bottesford.

Cllr Botterill seconded the proposal to permit and stated that it would be a nice development.

A Cllr noted that whilst they were happy to support, there should be a condition to include a play area as per Policy H11.

The proposer and seconder were happy to include this.

The Applications and Advice Manager highlighted that condition 3 only provides a mixture of types and affordable housing needs adding in as a condition.

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

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition:

The reserved matters as required by condition 2 above, shall provide full

details of an on-site play area (including grass seeding/turfing, planting, fencing, safety surfacing, play equipment, seats, litter bins and lighting). The approved play area shall be so retained solely for the purpose of children's recreation.

REASONS: The Borough is considered to have a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites in line with current planning guidance, with the most recent evidence pointing to more than seven years.

Affordable housing provision remains one of the Council's key priorities. This application presents some affordable housing that helps to meet identified local needs. Accordingly, the application presents a vehicle for the delivery of affordable housing of the appropriate quantity, in proportion with the development and of a type to support the local market housing needs. Easthorpe is considered to be a relatively sustainable location in close proximity to Bottesford therefore having access to employment, health care facilities, primary and secondary education, local shops, and regular bus and train services. It is considered that there are material considerations that weigh in favour of the application.

There are a number of other positive benefits of the scheme which include surface water management in the form of a sustainable drainage.

It is considered that balanced against the positive elements are the specific concerns raised in representations, particularly the development of the site from its green field state and the impact on the character of the rural village and the allocated area of separation.

In conclusion 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 green field site and the area of separation – are considered to be of limited harm.

This is because, In this location, the site benefits from a range of services in the immediate vicinity and nearby which mitigate the extent to which travel is necessary and limits journey distance, the character of the site provides potential for sympathetic design, careful landscaping, biodiversity and sustainable drainage opportunities, the site is also allocated for development in the submitted Melton Local Plan.

PL81.3

17/01139/FUL

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Jinks

Location: Land adjacent The Hall, Main Street, Gaddesby

Proposal: Proposed two storey dwelling (with ground floor being subterranean).

- a) The Conservation Officer (TE) presented the report and stated that:
The proposal seeks planning permission for a proposed two storey dwelling with the ground floor being subterranean within the grounds of Gaddesby

Hall. The proposed development site is located within the immediate setting of Gaddesby Hall a grade II listed building as well as the wider setting of the Grade I listed church of St Luke's.

Since the publication of the report the applicants have submitted a letter which sets out their justification of the proposal in terms of Access, trees, Conservation Area, The site and the Development Principles, this letter has been circulated to members at the request of the agent. A further letter of objection has been received which raises concern in terms of archaeology, North Hall Drive and the Melton Local Plan, these points have been discussed and considered as part of the committee report.

Going back to the application details, the primary consideration to arise from neighbour objections relates to the addition of more cars on a private drive that is only single width. The increased capacity of cars using the drive through the provision of one new dwelling is not considered sufficient grounds to warrant a refusal.

It is considered that the issue of new residential development in a sensitive location within the Gaddesby conservation area requires good quality contemporary design, to ensure there is limited impact and harm to the character of the conservation area and the legibility of the listed buildings. Strict conditions have been suggested on materials as part of any subsequent approval to ensure the innovative design appears in accordance with the plans submitted as such the application is recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the report.

b) David Batchelor, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Road dangerous at exit to Main Street
- Cars park on road and traffic comes through at 30mph
- Wide vehicles have to negotiate a narrow road and steep incline
- Harmful impact on setting of the church – not heavily screened

c) Helen Broadhurst, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Within village envelope
- Sympathetic to conservation area
- No objection from Historic England
- Uncluttered
- Only view of lower storey is from the driveway
- Screening retained and additional provided
- No glare or reflection on church
- Additional landscaping
- No protected species
- Road upgraded to provide passing places
- No objection from LCC Highways
- Historic sensitivity addressed

A Cllr asked if the willow tree will be retained.

Ms Broadhurst stated that it would.

A Cllr asked if the yew trees would be protected.

Ms Broadhurst stated that all trees on the boundary will be retained and protected.

A Cllr asked if an archaeological study had been done.

The Conservation Officer stated that LCC Archaeology has been contacted and this has been asked for as a condition.

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

- Road entrance widened and improvements made with the inclusion of passing places
- Supported by closest neighbour
- Difficult to see the church due to houses on both sides anyway

Cllr Baguley proposed to permit the application as it is a wonderful design and was pleased the trees will be retained.

Cllr Glancy seconded the proposal to permit and stated that it will be a good prospect provided it stays as intentionally planned.

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

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

It is considered that the application is acceptable for its location by virtue of its high quality design and architectural detailing. The building provides an innovative response to the provision of a new dwelling in a sensitive position with two listed building flanking its front / rear elevations. The accommodation is provided by introducing a subterranean element at basement level with the ground (upper) floor level remaining at standard single storey eaves height. The use of English garden wall bond reclaimed brickwork will ensure the building appears as a contemporary interpretation of an outbuilding to a country house / hunting lodge.

Any identified harm to the adjacent heritage assets caused by the new development will be mitigated by the removal of an unsightly close boarded fence around the perimeter, to be replaced with attractive hedge planting. The site presently appears as an undeveloped plot of building land and if a new dwelling is to be provided in this location, it is the consideration of MBC Conservation that this is the most viable solution.

The primary consideration to arise from neighbour objections relates to the addition of more cars on a private drive that is only single width. The increased capacity of cars using the drive through the provision of one new dwelling is not considered sufficient grounds to warrant a refusal.

The applicant has submitted a comprehensive heritage statement which has identified the significance of the adjacent listed buildings, and it is clear that the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with paragraph 131 of the NPPF which recognises the desirability of new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The proposal would make an overall neutral / marginally positive contribution to the historic environment at Gaddesby Hall.

It is considered that the issue of new residential development in a sensitive location within the Gaddesby Conservation Area requires good quality contemporary design, to ensure there is limited impact and harm to the character of the Conservation Area and the legibility of the listed buildings. Strict conditions have been placed on materials as part of any subsequent approval to ensure the innovative design appears in accordance with the plans submitted.

Applying the 'test' required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits; it is considered that on the balance of the issues, permission should be permitted.

PL81.4

17/01389/FUL

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Kavan Brook Shanahan

Location: Butlers Cottage, 11 Somerby Road, Pickwell

Proposal: Demolition of dwelling and the construction of 5 "Alms Style" 2 storey dwellings and associated gardens and garaging off a new single access from Somerby Road.

The Chair advised that there had been a very late submission by the agent this afternoon which needs to be reviewed.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services added that the new submission introduces a new aspect to the scheme and creates a significant change.

The Chair proposed to defer the application.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal to defer.

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

DETERMINATION : DEFER to allow the recently submitted amendments to the proposal to be considered.

PL81.5

17/01552/FULHH

Applicant: Mr John Leach

Location: The Poplars, Waltham Road, Thorpe Arnold

Proposal: Convert and alter existing kennels to form double garage and annexe.

(a) The Applications and Advice Manager presented the report and stated that:
This is a householder application to convert and alter an existing block of kennels to form a double garage to the front and annexe accommodation to the rear. The application is presented to the committee due to the applicant being related to a member of council staff.

The proposal will form internal works and the walls will be raised by one layer of block work with a pitched roof also being added, the original building is not being extended as part of the proposal.

The proposal is to be conditioned to be ancillary to the main dwelling, and is therefore acceptable, with no impact upon highway safety nor impact upon neighbouring dwellings, as such the proposal is recommend for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

Cllr Wyatt proposed to permit the application.

Cllr Botterill seconded the proposal to permit.

A Cllr had concerns that the house could be split in future and 2 dwellings created. Asked for permitted development rights to be removed.

The proposer and seconder were happy for this to be included.

Cllr Chandler stated that she would not vote as she had not attended the site visit.

A vote was taken. 10 Members voted to permit the application. 1 Member abstained.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition removing permitted development rights

REASONS: Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 or any subsequent amendment to that order, no development within Class A, B, C and E shall be carried out unless planning permission has first been granted for that development by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The proposal would convert an existing building into an annexe which would be ancillary to the main dwelling and could be controlled by a condition; as such, the proposal is acceptable in principle. The proposed development has been designed to have limited impact on adjoining properties and would reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on highway safety. Accordingly, the proposal complies with the above policies and guidance and permission is warranted.

PL82

Urgent Business

The meeting closed at: 7.38 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Recruitment Committee
Date	Wednesday, 21 February 2018
Start time	9.30 am
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Orson (Chair)

Councillors L. Higgins (Vice-Chair) P. Cumbers
M. Glancy E. Holmes
J. Illingworth

Observers

Officers Chief Executive
HR & Communications Manager

Luke Judd - Consultant

Minute No.	Minute
RC1	Apologies For Absence
RC2	Minutes Being the first meeting of this new Committee there are were no previous minutes to confirm.
RC3	Declarations of Interest The Chief Executive noted that there would be knowledge of internal candidates and those from Ashfield Council. This will apply to others on the panel as well.
RC4	Recommendations from other committees There were no recommendations from other committees.
RC5	Update on decisions Being the first meeting of this new Committee there are were no updates to be reported.
RC6	Urgent Business There was no urgent business
RC7	<p>Director Recruitment - Director for Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>The Chief Executive submitted a report to consider and agree the long list for the Director recruitment. The Chief Executive introduced Luke Judd from Gatenby Sanderson to take Members through the applications and longlist process.</p> <p>The recruitment consultant talked members of the committee through each of the candidates and the assessments made against the role requirements and person specifications. Members asked questions and considered the following recommendation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION:</p> <p>The Committee considers and agrees a longlist for the Growth and Regeneration Director post. Those selected to be put through to the technical assessment process to be completed by Gatenby Sanderson week commencing 26 February 2018</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The Committee considered and agreed a longlist for the Growth and Regeneration Director post. Those selected above to be put through to the technical assessment process to be completed by Gatenby Sanderson week commencing 26 February 2018.</p>
RC8	<p>Director Recruitment - Director for Legal and Democratic Services</p> <p>The recruitment consultant talked members of the committee through each of the candidates and the assessments made against the role requirements and person specifications. Members asked questions and considered the following</p>

recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee considers and agrees a longlist for the Legal and Democratic post. Those selected to be put through to the technical assessment process to be completed by Gatenby Sanderson week commencing 26 February 2018.

RESOLVED THAT: The Committee considered and agreed a longlist for the Legal and Democratic post. Those selected above to be put through to the technical assessment process to be completed by Gatenby Sanderson week commencing 26 February 2018.

The meeting closed at: 11.30 am

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Rural Capital of Food

Meeting name	Recruitment Committee
Date	Wednesday, 7 March 2018
Start time	9.30 am
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Orson (Chair)

Councillors L. Higgins (Vice-Chair) P. Cumbers
M. Glancy E. Holmes
J. Illingworth A. Pearson

Observers Councillor John Wyatt

Officers Chief Executive
HR & Communications Manager

Luke Judd - Consultant

Minute No.	Minute
RC9	<p>Apologies For Absence There were no apologies</p>
RC10	<p>Minutes These were approved.</p>
RC11	<p>Declarations of Interest The Chief Executive noted that there would be knowledge of internal candidates and those from Ashfield Council. This will apply to others on the panel as well.</p>
RC12	<p>Urgent Business There was no urgent business</p>
RC13	<p>Director Recruitment - Director for Growth and Regeneration The Chief Executive submitted a report to consider and agree the short list for the Director recruitment. The Chief Executive introduced Luke Judd from Gatenby Sanderson to take Members through the results of the technical assessment and the short list process.</p> <p>The consultant explained that a technical interview had taken place over three days for both posts. Due to the inclement weather adjustments were made to see candidates via skype where they were unable to attend in person. A summary sheet had been provided for Members detailing the views from both the consultant and professional technical assessor, along with all the candidates' application forms. Candidates have been split into 3 sections, the A's being recommended to proceed through to the next stage, B's being marginal to the C's not recommended. The Consultant confirmed that the next step following the shortlist would be a 2 day assessment centre to include a final interview panel with Members of the Recruitment Committee.</p> <p>The Chief Executive submitted a report to consider and agree the short list for the Director recruitment. The recruitment consultant talked members of the committee through each of the candidates and the assessments made against the role requirements and person specifications. Members asked questions and considered the following recommendation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee considers and agrees a shortlist for the Growth and Regeneration Director post. 2. That delegation be granted to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Consultant from Gatenby Sanderson and HR and Communications Manager, to approve the programme for the assessment centre including the final questions and presentation for the Member panel. <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee considered the recommendations from the consultant and made a unanimous decision to accept the recommendation to put forward the selected candidates to the assessment centre. Additionally the committee made the decision to also put forward one other candidate. 2. Delegated authority be granted to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Consultant and HR and Communication Manager to approve the final programme for the assessment centre including final questions and presentation topic.
RC14	<p>Director Recruitment - Director for Legal and Democratic Services</p> <p>The recruitment consultant talked members of the committee through each of the candidates and the assessments made against the role requirements and person specifications. He advised that one candidate had not attended the interview and was therefore ruled out and another had withdrawn from the process. Members asked questions and considered the following recommendation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee considers and agrees a shortlist for the Legal and Democratic Director post. 2. That delegation be granted to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Consultant from Gatenby Sanderson and HR and Communications Manager, to approve the programme for the assessment centre including the final questions and presentation for the Member panel. <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee considered the recommendations from the consultant and made a unanimous decision to accept the recommendation to put forward the selected candidates to the assessment centre. Additionally the committee made the decision to also put forward a further candidate. 2. Delegated authority be granted to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Consultant and HR and Communication Manager to approve the final programme for the assessment centre including final questions and presentation topic.

At the conclusion of the meeting all Members were asked to consider and comment on suggested draft questions for the final interview panel. Comments were noted to be fed into the final decision.

The meeting closed at: 11.10 am

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Rural Capital of Food

Meeting name	Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee (previously Rural, Economic & Environmental Affairs)
Date	Wednesday, 7 March 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair

Councillors

E. Hutchison (Vice-Chair)
M. Blase
R. de Burle
L. Higgins
J. Illingworth (Substitute)

T. Beaken
G. Botterill
M. Glancy
B. Rhodes

Observers

Officers

Minute No.	Minute
R55	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sheldon, Councillor Simpson, Councillor Graham and Councillor Orson.</p>
R56	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 100118 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the chair.</p> <p>The exempt minutes of the meeting 100118 were approved to be signed by the Chair</p> <p>The minutes from the Ad Hoc Melton Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee meetings held on 240118 and 130218 will be deferred for approval at the next committee meeting.</p>
R57	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Rhodes declared a personal interest in anything relating to County Council.</p>
R58	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES</p> <p>There were no recommendations from other committees.</p>
R59	<p>Capital Programme Monitoring April 2017 to Jan 2018</p> <p>The Director of Corporate Services submitted a report to update the Committee on the progress of schemes within the Capital Programme to 31st January 2018.</p> <p>The Corporate Services Manager drew members' attention to 5.2 of the report, noting a budget allocation of just over £1m.</p> <p>An underspend of -£31k was explained as being a result of the Lake Terrace Waste Depot Refurbishment. As per Appendix A, negotiations and subsequent business case for necessary works required on the site are expected to be finalised by 2018/19 and so the project will be carried forward.</p> <p>A member asked what proportion of the Lake Terrace Refurbishment Biffa is responsible for.</p> <p>The Corporate Services Manager noted that it will be expected for them to rectify situation, however this requires negotiation.</p> <p>All members were in favour.</p>

RESOLVED that the progress made on each capital scheme, attached as appendix A, be noted along with the year end forecast position.

R60

Revenue Budget Monitoring April-Dec 2017

The Director of Corporate Services submitted a report to provide information on actual expenditure and income incurred on this Committee's services compared to the latest approved budget for the period 1st April 2017 to 31st December 2017.

The Corporate Services Manager noted that Appendix A gave a summary of key services under this committee. It was noted that the suggested overspend of approximately £162k in 3.3 of the report relates to items detailed in 3.6.1:

Car parks and bus stations.

Income expected from car park is down. This is thought to be as a result of free parking and 20 minute or 20p spaces available on St Mary's way. Additional income of £9k from the leasing of the Thorpe End car park reduces the expected shortfall, however due to other costs, the budgeted income for car parking fees will not be met.

Cattle Market

The overall budget predicts an approximate £200k surplus. The 2017/18 net expenditure has been reduced by handing the business rate charges over to Gillstream. There has been an increase in usage from the new development, however the expected figures may be more optimistic than actually thought

Building Control

A £3k overspend on salaries is due to an overlap of senior officers of one month. The shortfall projection is based on current levels of demand continuing. Fee paying applications are falling and application values have also been lower.

Economic Development

The expected overspend in this area is due to a shortfall of income. This is slightly offset by salary savings due to vacant posts at varying time

throughout the year.

A member asked if the fall in car park usage is due to the price increase.

The Corporate Services Manager advised that the price increase is not a fundamental impact of falling usage.

A member enquired that car park usage was thought to have increased since changes and strategies and advised it would be useful to see data showing long term usage.

The Corporate Services Manager noted that officers will be looking at current strategy with regard to car parking.

All members were in favour.

RESOLVED that the financial position and year end forecast on each of this Committee's services to 31st December be noted.

R61

Frisby Neighbourhood Plan

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services submitted a report to inform members of the progress of the Frisby Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) and determine whether it should proceed to Referendum.

The Chair advised members that he proposed that be deferred due to recent contact from Frisby Neighbourhood Plan Group on 8th March. Members were asked to arrange an ad hoc meeting of this committee, possibly on 200318.

A member asked why it was necessary to defer. The examination is strong and if a community wants to challenge it then there is a process to do so through the Referendum .

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that the challenge was not about site selection, the group have submitted proposed alternatives to the Examiner's recommendations addressing some policy wording. The subsequent work for the Committee report required more time than available to present to committee.

A member asked if Parish Councils were a parent body of neighbourhood planning groups and if so, were the Committee doing the right thing if the

Parish voted unanimously to accept the examiner's report.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services advised to defer and confirm details.

A member noted it was necessary to consider liability if the decision departs from Examiner.

A member noted that the Examiner, as an unelected body, is not part of the democratic process.

The Chair that the group are seeking clarification on certain areas including limits to development.

A member asked if anything was incorrect with the recommendation of the report.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that the decision of the Parish Council needs to be confirmed as the vote was only taken on the previous evening of the 7th.

A member asked if the committee could move the recommendations subject to the Parish Council's vote and added that the Parish Council must have taken into account the views of the planning group.

A member asked what areas need amending.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services confirmed that five or six points were raised of which 'limits to development' is a significant one. It is possible to add or detract from the Examiner's decision as we see fit but only if it means that the recommendations meet basic conditions.

A member drew members' attention to page 59 of the report and read the examiner's summary.

A member advised that it may be safer to refer the item.

A member noted that if the Parish Council agreed then the e-mail received by members stating the Parish Council's decision to accept the report would be sufficient.

A member noted that he was happy to be steered by the ward councillor of Frisby as to defer or move recommendations.

The Chair noted that it may be better to defer to reduce risk.

A member asked if the Parish Council's view of the new information from the group was known.

A member proposed the recommendation. Another member seconded.

A member asked if the group were advised that there would be an ad hoc meeting.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services read an e-mail proposing a postponement of the item.

A member asked if the group's proposals were in line with the examiner.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that amendments were minor but not in line with the Examiner's recommendations.

The Chair noted that the intentions of the group seem to be clarification of points via dialogue with the Examiner.

A member noted that he saw no reason to withdraw the proposals and that to do so would follow the correct procedure.

A member asked if the recommendations of the report could be amended to include the preference of the Parish Council on the 6th March.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services advised members that before when the report was submitted, the matter was for this Committee to decide if Frisby Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum, as per 2.1(i) of the report.

As the recommendations had already been proposed and seconded. The Chair asked that members took a vote. All members were in favour to move the recommendations with an additional recommendation.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the Committee approves the Examiner's recommended modifications and agree that the Frisby Neighbourhood Development Plan (as amended y said modifications_ (2017) (Appendix A to this report) should proceed to Referendum.
- (2) members note the unanimous decision made by Frisby Parish Council on 060318 to accept the Examiner's modifications.

R62

Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2016 following consultation

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services submitted a report to invite the Committee to adopt the proposed revisions to the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services directed members to the proposed changes as attached as Appendix B and C and noted that the main changes seek to adopt a three yearly

	<p>renewal and changes to criminality details.</p> <p>A member asked -with regards to vehicle testing (2.4 of App A) – there is an implication of there being only three Council approved taxi testing stations, if the policy is limited to this number.</p> <p>The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that there is no reason that this number could not increase and is not prohibited to do so by the policy.</p> <p>A member asked where the official taxi ranks are located in the town as arranging carriage that would be further than the town centre is difficult. As such, it may be worth publicising this policy as well as the designated taxi ranks.</p> <p>The Chair sought a proposer and seconder.</p> <p>All members were in favour.</p> <p>RESOLVED that members agree to adopt the Policy for the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy at Appendix A.</p>
R63	<p>Taxi Licence Fees</p> <p>The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services to submit a report to follow to determine the fees for the taxi vehicle, driver and operators licenses for 2018/19.</p> <p>This item was removed from the agenda and will be brought back to this committee at a later date.</p>
R64	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There was no urgent business however, Cllr Rhodes noted the approval for the Long Clawson, Hose & Harby Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to referendum with 44% turnout and 90% approval.</p>

The meeting closed at: 7.41 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Community & Social Affairs Committee
Date	Thursday, 8 March 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor A. Pearson (Chair)

Councillors T. Beaken M. Blase
P. Chandler P. Posnett
D. Wright

Observers

Officers Deputy Chief Executive
Community Policy Officer
Administration Assistant (HA)
Solicitor to the Council (VW)
Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager

Minute No.	Minute
C54	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies of absence were received from Councillor Lumley and Councillor De Burle.</p>
C55	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest.</p>
C56	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES There were no recommendations from other Committees.</p>
C57	<p>ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE - UPDATED POLICY AND PROCESSES The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report to Members seeking to review and approve an updated policy regarding Assets of Community Value (ACV).</p> <p>The Deputy Chief Executive explained to Members how Melton Borough Council needs to have a better policy framework in place for dealing with ACV nominations due to multiple nominations and appeals being received since the legislation came into effect from 21st September 2012.</p> <p>Attention was drawn to the existing process on Page 11 of the Agenda Pack and the proposed process on Pages 35/36 of the Pack. For ease of reference single sheet copies of these two processes were circulated at the meeting so that they could be compared against each other. The Community Policy Officer then highlighted all of the proposed changes to the process. It was specifically highlighted that when a nomination is received the decision is no longer undertaken solely by the Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods but by an 'ACV Panel', consisting of Community Policy Officer, Local Planning Officer and the Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager.</p> <p>It was further highlighted that when an appeal review is received from an owner, as per Appendix B, the review would be carried out by a Director within MBC and not by the CSA Committee.</p> <p>Members raised concerns that there would be no Member involvement, that any local concerns would not be considered and that they would not have an opportunity to input any community interest and showed concern about the legal implications. Members were reminded that through this report they were being asked to approve a new policy framework, which included at pages 37/38 of the Pack some examples of the kind of things that might contribute to furthering the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. It was pointed out that this was not an exhaustive list and members could add to it or take away from it if they wished.</p> <p>The Deputy Chief Executive advised that the Council needed to recognise and work within the legislation and that research by officers of what was in place at other councils had not identified any other examples similar to our existing</p>

process. If Members wanted to be involved at any stage of the decision making then training would be needed.

It was suggested by members that relevant Ward Councillors could be included in the process when the initial nomination is received through being invited to make comments and provide any relevant local information for officers to consider, without the need to be formally trained. The Principal Solicitor advised that the process could be changed to include Members in the way suggested.

The Chair sought a proposer and seconder to move this. All Members were in favour.

RESOLVED THAT

1. The updated Policy Framework and Nomination, Assessment and Appeal Process for Assets of Community Value, as shown in Appendix B, be approved, subject to an amendment to seek the comments/views of Ward Councillors at the time when nominations for new ACV's are received for consideration by officers.

C58

URGENT BUSINESS

There was no Urgent Business.

The meeting closed at: 7.10 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Town Area Committee
Date	Monday, 12 March 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor M. Glancy (Chair)

Councillors S. Lumley (Vice-Chair) T. Beaken
M. Blase P. Cumbers
P. Faulkner T. Greenow
J. Illingworth A. Pearson

Observers J. Orson

Officers Chief Executive
Deputy Chief Executive
Corporate Services Manager
Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager
Waste & Environmental Maintenance Manager
Administrative Assistant Elections & Member Support

Minute No.	Minute
T26	<p>Apologies for Absence Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bains, Douglas, Freer-Jones, Hurrell, Posnett and Wyatt.</p>
T27	<p>Minutes The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2017 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the Chair.</p> <p>The Minutes of the Consultation meeting held on 12 February 2018 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:</p> <p><u>Minute T17 – Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>Councillor Cumbers submitted her apologies for the meeting.</p> <p><u>Minute T18 – Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>‘Councillor Bains declared a personal interest and here left the meeting’ would be removed.</p>
T28	<p>Declarations of interest Councillor Orson who was present as an observer and Councillor Pearson declared personal interests in any matters relating to the County Council, due to their roles as County Councillors.</p>
T29	<p>Recommendations From Other Committees There were no recommendations from other Committees.</p>
T30	<p>Update on Decisions There were no outstanding decisions to consider at this meeting.</p>
T31	<p>Revenue Budget Monitoring April to December 2017 On behalf of the Director for Corporate Services, the Corporate Services Manager</p> <p>(a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) which provided information on actual expenditure and income incurred on this Committee’s services compared to the latest approved budget for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 December 2017;</p> <p>(b) gave a brief overview of the report, highlighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring up to 31 December • the summary of income and expenditure for this Committee’s services, as detailed at Appendix A of the report

- the summary of the income and expenditure for this Committee's services compared to the approved budget at December 2017, as detailed at 3.3 of the report, showing a predicted underspend of £430

Upon proposal and seconding of the recommendation at 2.1 of the report, Members voted and it was

RESOLVED that the financial position on each of this Committee's services to 31 December 2017 and year end forecast be noted.

Members agreed to consider the recommendation at 2.2 of the report in private session and it was

RESOLVED that the Public be excluded during the consideration of the following item of business in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Access to Information: Exempt Information) under Paragraphs 3.

Members discussed the Skate Park Lease at Schedule 1 of the report and it was

RESOLVED that the skate park lease arrangements proposed at exempt Schedule 1 of the report be agreed in principle, with final terms of the lease to be brought to a future meeting of this Committee for Member consideration.

[The meeting resumed in public session]

T32

Capital Programme Monitoring April 2017 to Jan 2018

On behalf of the Director for Corporate Services, the Corporate Services Manager

- (a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) updating the Committee on the progress of schemes within the Capital Programme to January 2018;
- (b) gave a brief overview of the report, highlighting
 - spending against budget for schemes within this Committee up to 31 January, as detailed at Appendix A of the report
 - the overall position for all capital schemes falling within this Committee, as detailed at 5.2 of the report
 - the Kirby Fields and Honeysuckle Way scheme completed in line with the budget
 - the Project Mandate as detailed at Appendix B of the report, seeking the release of capital funds (£20k) for new play equipment at Melton Country Park Climbing Forest and Kirby Fields
 - the Project Mandate as detailed at Appendix C of the report seeking Members' support making a purpose built 'Equalities Act' compliant Path for All at Melton Country Park. Members were encouraged to provide comments, which would be fed back to Community and

Social Affairs Committee.

A Member stated that a number of residents had contacted them because the old play equipment at Honeysuckle Way had been taken away a considerable time before the new equipment had been installed. The Member queried if the equipment had been removed because it was unsafe and the Waste and Environmental Maintenance Manager confirmed that this was correct.

A Member highlighted the £20k cost for new play equipment at Melton Country Park Climbing Forest and Kirby Fields, querying if sponsorship or grant funding had been considered to fund all or part of this cost. The Waste and Environmental Maintenance Manager confirmed that sponsorship and grant funding possibilities were always explored and although grant funding was limited, it was hoped that such funding would be secured for the proposed Path for All project.

There being no further comments or questions, it was

RESOLVED that

- (1) the progress made on each capital scheme, as detailed in Appendix A of the report, together with the year end forecast position be noted;
- (2) the Project Mandate, as detailed in Appendix B of the report be approved for inclusion in the 2018/19 Capital Programme;
- (3) Member comments concerning the inclusion of the Path for All Mandate into the Capital Programme be referred to Community and Social Affairs Committee;

T33

Community Action Groups - Alignment with Council Services

On behalf of the Deputy Chief Executive, the Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager

- (a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) enabling Members to acknowledge the impact of community action groups and explore future ways of closer partnership working and potential future formal partnership/alignment;
- (b) highlighted
 - this Council liaised in different ways (on a daily basis) with community groups. The aim was to standardise an inconsistent approach to liaison to improve reporting processes and equality of response from services;
 - this Council was not currently aligned or affiliated with any community group but acknowledged that collaboration with these groups would be valuable. The Council recognised them as a resource to the Borough, both as a focal point for voluntary action and as an

important issue identification and notification tool, with an active online presence and dedicated social media following;

- the proposal that he as Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager assesses how each group reports issues to this Council

(c) Requested that Members provide guidance on setting out the terms of liaison with community groups

A Member commented that partnership working was key to this Council's successful delivery of services. They added that it was important that Council Partners were constituted organisations/groups.

The Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager advised that this Council received significant call of demand from a number of groups, some of whom were not constituted and he reiterated that the Council recognised the value of its liaison with them. He confirmed he would raise the issue of constitutionalising themselves with the groups.

Another Member commented that Councillors' direct liaison with the local community was invaluable and information received from the public was heavily relied upon. Members should readily avail themselves for discussion with the public and make every effort to provide them with information. As a resource, these groups should be 'tapped into' but it was important to demonstrate caution in engagement and formal alignment with non-constituted groups. Highlighting 5.2 of the report and further commenting that MBC logos on garments of those not employed by this Council may be confusing for the public, the Member queried what the insurance implications of such alignment would be.

The Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager confirmed that these comments were noted. The intention was to improve and manage the reporting of issues procedures for community groups in the most effective way to result in the highest number of positive outcomes possible. Communication via digital apps, Customer Services, direct to each service, online forms and single liaison point should be explored.

A Member commented that the management structure and style of this Council was changing. In the past, there had been a lack of engagement with many community groups. Our community groups had much to offer. This Council should be proactive in working with the groups and could even consider offering them community projects to undertake. The Member disagreed with previous comments stating the importance of these groups being constituted. Issues such as dog fouling and 'who is our Councillor' had been raised and these groups had every right to utilise social media to highlight their areas of concern. These groups should be embraced and used. Overlooking these groups would be done at the peril of this Council.

Other Members reaffirmed the view that such groups should be constituted. Any group could report issues to this Council but if a group purported to act on behalf of others it should be a constituted group, ensuring there was guidance on its remit.

They expressed concern that Members had not been made aware of complaints within their wards and requested that they be informed in future.

Another Member added that rather than being critical of community groups it was important to reflect on why Members were not aware of the complaints which community groups were reporting on behalf of local residents.

The Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager advised that upon receipt of a complaint/notification of an issue, this Council's focus was on resolving the matter but consideration would be given to informing Members in future.

A Member commented that they had set aside any scepticism they once held concerning a particular community group and had decided to embrace the ethics of the group. The Council and this group desired to work for the community and the Member was happy to collaborate to maximise positive outcomes. They highlighted that collaboration between this Council and community groups required commitment from both and the Terms of Reference and framework of alignment needed to be regularised.

Another Member commented that community groups who were eager to help improve Melton should not be discouraged from doing so. The Member advised that they had previously raised the possibility of employing a Social Media Officer, responsible for monitoring Facebook and Twitter feeds, enabling early identification of local concerns. It was also essential to ensure there were staff resources in place to deal promptly with issues reported to this Council.

A Member further commented that issues reported to the Council generated a massive demand on resources. Currently the Human Resources and Communications Manager and Community Safety Officer monitored social media. A Constitution, Annual General Meeting and Terms of Reference were fundamental to proper management of these groups and provided some form of accountability for these self-appointed groups.

The Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager agreed that an active Council presence on social media was vital to its relationship with the community and standardising the procedure for reporting issues would increase efficiency. He reiterated that he would raise the importance of being constituted with the groups.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the principle of increased partnership/collaborative working with community action groups be supported by Members;
- (2) responsibility for engaging with community action groups, including standardising reporting processes and regular liaison be delegated to the Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager;
- (3) the guidance to officers regarding points 5.1 and 5.2 of the report be noted

as, 'there should be clear rules of engagement with community action groups. The groups are not employed by Melton Borough Council but are friends of the Council and will be supported by the Council as far as reasonably possible';

- (4) the Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager would provide this Committee with a progress report and proposed operating framework towards the end of 2018/19.

T34

Neighbourhood Management Update

On behalf of the Deputy Chief Executive, the Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager

- (a) submitted a report providing Members with an updated position statement regarding the ongoing neighbourhood management project within the Melton Borough and providing Members with updated information regarding recruitment of a dedicated neighbourhood resource, the planned operations of the recruited officers and the greater alignment with communities within the Borough.
- (b) advised that the report set out the work which the proposed two full time Neighbourhood Officers would do once in post
- (c) highlighted
- Full Council had recently approved an increase in funding to accelerate the recruitment of two full time Neighbourhood Support Officers
 - Funds would be released in the 2018/19 financial year and would be focussed on the four 'priority areas' within Melton, identified as Egerton Ward, Fairmead Estate, Town Centre Flats and Queensway Estate (and would also cover the wider town area)
 - A recruitment phase would begin in April 2018. The scope of remit for officers would evolve over the year and the resource would remain flexible, with a review of responsibilities and roles within the first six months of implementation. Progress would be reported to this Committee on a quarterly basis
 - Policy for enforcement was on 'our agenda'. However, officers would not from the outset have any specific enforcement responsibilities or delegated powers. It was anticipated they would have the responsibility to
 - I. identify a particular need for action and recommend a specific response to service areas
 - II. identify and deal with issues such as littering, dog fouling, fly tipping etc
 - III. engage with our residents more effectively and have better presence in the community. Quarterly reports on progress instead of six monthly.

A Member queried what were the proposed working hours for the officers and the Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager confirmed the hours of work would be flexible to include week days, evenings and weekend.

Another Member commented that this action was very positive for residents and asked if it included the borough as well as the town. The Housing, Welfare and Safer Communities Manager advised that the issues identified within the report were predominantly town issues and so this action was principally for the town area. The Deputy Chief Executive added that the funding originated mainly from the Special Expenses for the town (as well as the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account). However, if there was a particular need outside the town, action through this resource could be considered.

There being no further comments or questions, it was

RESOLVED that

(1) the outline roles for the Neighbourhood Support Officers be approved.

T35

Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at: 8.05 pm

Chair

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 15 March 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Illingworth (Chair)

Councillors

P. Posnett (Vice-Chair)	P. Baguley
G. Botterill	P. Chandler
P. Cumbers	P. Faulkner
M. Glancy	T. Greenow
E. Holmes	J. Wyatt

Observers

Officers

Solicitor To The Council (SP)
 Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
 Planning Officer (GBA)
 Planning Officer (JL)
 Applications And Advice Manager (LP)
 Administrative Assistant (MF)

Minute No.	Minute
PL83	<p>Apologies for Absence There were no apologies for absence.</p>
PL84	<p>Minutes The members reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>Cllr Holmes proposed to approve the minutes of the previous meeting. Cllr Greenow seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>A Vote was taken to approve the previous minutes. 11 Councillors supported the motion. 0 Councillors opposed the motion. 0 Councillors abstained from the vote.</p> <p>The minutes were unanimously approved.</p>
PL85	<p>Declarations of Interest Cllr Botterill declared a prejudicial and pecuniary interest in agenda item 4.7 – 17/01253/FUL.</p>
PL86	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL86.1	<p>16/00352/OUT Applicant: Mr Andy Norris Location: Field 3957, Manor Road, Easthorpe Proposal: Proposed residential development.</p> <p>The case officer (JL) stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further details of the flood compensation scheme have been submitted, with the following slide showing the field where this is proposed to be located. • A condition is included to restrict height of development – the application is for outline permission and the elevations are indicative. • LCC Ecology and Highways have raised no objection to the application. LLFA and EA are satisfied, subject to inclusion of conditions, including finished floor levels. • The proposed flood alleviation details have been included in the report – this would involve digging down in the relevant field which would allow overflow near to the culvert, reducing water flow to further down stream in Easthorpe/ Bottesford. <p>Councillor Bayman was invited to speak, but was not present.</p> <p>Ian Sparrow, as an objector, was invited to speak, and stated that:</p>

- He is a resident of Muston Lane, which is lane serving the application site
- Access to the site is off Muston Lane
- The new development would overshadow Muston Lane, and ruin all views
- In response, all residents would build large fences to create privacy from the new development
- The development is outside the village curtilage
- There is no need for local housing in the area
- Wildlife in the area will suffer
- There is a sewage issue in Easthorpe, and in Muston Lane in particular
- Muston Lane is very narrow and not suitable for development
- There are highways and traffic issues with the site
- Muston Lane has flooded, and this new development will only make that worse

A Cllr sought clarification on the fencing issue.

Mr Sparrow responded that neighbours to the development will be forced to build large fences to protect their privacy from the overshadowing from the new development.

A Cllr queried how often the site flooded.

Mr Sparrow responded that Muston Lane has flooded twice in the last 20 years.

Clive Wicks, as the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The development is of very high quality
- The scheme has the support of both the LLFA and Highways Authority
- Environment Agency have no issues with the scheme
- New hedgerows will be planted on the site, and the original hedgerow will be retained
- 2 starter homes are within the scheme
- The scheme is close to the village
- The houses are only two stories with roof space
- The floor levels on the site are higher to reduce flood risk on site
- There is no contamination risk from this site, unlike other local sites
- The scheme will redirect water from the village
- The scheme is sustainable, and encourages members to support officer recommendation for approval

Cllrs had no questions for Mr Wicks.

The Case Officer responded to matters raised:

- The height and number of storeys can be limited through conditions of approval
- This is an outline application; elevation and siting are only indicative and would be the subject of reserved matters if approved.
- There are no objections raised by the LLFA, Environment Agency, Highways Authority or Ecology Issues
- There is a flood alleviation scheme included in the plans

Cllr Chandler stated that there is a sewage issue in the area, but this comes from Muston, and is a utility issue rather than a planning issue. There are hedgerows included within the scheme, so it is possible to condition against new fencing in the conditions for approval. This is a small site so will allow for individual design that will be welcomed within the area, and can condition for no dormer windows within the scheme. The scheme includes a flood alleviation scheme that is needed in the area and 2 starter homes. **Cllr Chandler proposed to permit the application, subject to an additional condition to limit the development to two stories.**

Cllr Holmes seconded the motion to permit, and agreed to the extra condition.

A Cllr queried whether planning permission would be needed for the installation of Velux windows.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that this is included in condition 15, which does not allow development of over two stories.

A Cllr stated their agreement with the condition for no dormer windows, yet believed that a condition on no fencing would be onerous, particularly as parents want fencing with small children in the garden.

The Case officer (JL) stated that a specific condition can be implemented for no dormer windows, and that Permitted Development Rights would be removed by condition 15. Fencing would be resolved at a reserved matters application stage, and the current layout is indicative as it is only an outline application.

A Cllr stated that home owners can build their own fences at a later stage if they want or need to.

A Cllr sought clarification on condition 5.

The Case officer (JL) stated that condition 5 is a highways condition, and to help visibility and meet visibility splay requirements.

A Cllr queried the hedge and road figures of 2.4m

The Case officer (JL) stated that this means that the visibility splays are calculated from 2.4m back from the junctions (rather than height), and anything within the splay must have a maximum height of 0.6m, as it mentioned in the conditions.

A Cllr stated that fencing may be necessary to stop and restrict livestock from the surrounding area.

A Request was made for the Ward Councillor to be involved with the scheme and design of the scheme at reserved matters stage.

A vote was taken on the motion to permit.

11 Councillors supported the motion.

0 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

The motion passed unanimously. The application was permitted.

DETERMINATION: APPROVED: in accordance with the recommendation in the report and an additional condition limiting the houses to 2 storey.

REASONS:

The proposed development will provide up to 6 dwellings, with two of these properties proposed to be starter homes and of a considerably smaller size than the other 4 proposed dwellings. It is considered that the proposed development does not provide a good mix of housing size due to the number of larger properties proposed. The Agent has stated that the larger houses are proposed so to attract potential business owners for the new business units to be built in Bottesford (Orston Lane). In preparation for the local plan, the housing need for the Borough has been assessed and it is considered that there is more of a demand for two and three bed properties. However as the application is for outline permission only (with indicative elevations provided), it is possible to restrict the size and heights of the dwellings to be submitted at reserved matters stage by means of a condition.

A sequential test has been submitted for the application which has considered the availability of other sites in the Easthorpe and Bottesford area. This concludes that there are not other sites that may be available for development, at a lesser risk of flooding. It has been demonstrated that flooding issues on the application site can be overcome through the design of the site, including raising the levels of the houses to a level above 1:100 year flood risk. (In accordance with the proposed conditions by the EA and LLFA). Additionally the applicant has proposed including a flood alleviation scheme on a site known locally as Pacey's Field which they consider would have wider benefits for Bottesford further downstream which is considered to bring wider public benefits and as such the Exception Test can be passed.

In conclusion, the proposed development is in a sustainable location, can overcome the flooding issues and would provide sustainability benefits to the wider community, due to the inclusion of two starter homes.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Kavan Brook Shanahan

Location: Butlers Cottage, 11 Somerby Road, Pickwell

Proposal: Demolition of dwelling and the construction of 5 "Alms Style" 2 storey dwellings and associated gardens and garaging off a new single access from Somerby Road.

The Case officer (JL) stated that:

2 further comments have been received in support of the application. Much of the comments raised are already covered in the report.

Pickwell is the adjacent village to Somerby a Tier-2 village which has a variety of local resources including a Shop, Pub, Dr's Surgery, and a school. Somerby would easily be able to support the needs of these new home-owners in Pickwell. A variety of Somerby local businesses would also benefit significantly from increased local revenues.

Application is proposed to demolish 1 dwelling and erect 5 dwellings, just outside the conservation area. The applicant has proposed that one will be provided at 80% Market rental value, however it would be difficult for the council to have control over this.

Cllr Fynn, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak, and stated that:

- This is a welcome development in the area
- The scheme is to a high specification and integrates with the village
- It will not disturb local wildlife
- It creates a new footpath to the village centre
- No detriment to anybody locally
- Impacts do not outweigh the benefits
- Pickwell is not an unsustainable village
- Disagree with recommendation to refuse the scheme
- In the neighbourhood plan, there is support for local small schemes and small units
- There is proven local demand in the area
- Local support for the scheme in the village

A Cllr asked if there had been any comments against the scheme.

Cllr Fynn responded that there had been no objections to the application.

A Cllr asked that the potential harm of the scheme was.

Cllr Fynn responded that there was no foreseeable harm to the scheme

Maurice Fairhurst, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The applicant currently lives at Pickwell Manor
- There is proven local demand for housing
- The village and scheme is connected to Somerby, it is less than 1km
- The village is not unsustainable
- The scheme is for traditional Alms housing
- This is not a significant development
- Lots of care and thought within the application
- The scheme will maintain highway safety
- The scheme will offer competitive local rents
- One of the houses will be offered for 80% market rent value to local people
- Parish Council support the application
- Conservation officer supports the application
- There are no objections to the scheme
- The benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm

Cllrs had no questions for Mr Fairhurst

Cllr Higgins, local Ward Councillor, requested to address the committee.

As Cllr Higgins was not registered to speak, Cllrs held a vote on whether to allow a new speaker.

Cllrs voted unanimously to allow Cllr Higgins to address the committee.

Cllr Higgins, the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak, and stated that:

- The scheme contains very high quality housing
- This sets a high standard for local people
- It has the support of local people
- This scheme will enhance the village
- The conservation officer states that the scheme will provide “Significant Gains” to the village and the area
- This scheme will enhance the village, the whole ward and the entire borough

Cllrs had no questions for Cllr Higgins.

The Case Officer (JL) had no updates to report.

Cllr Holmes proposed to permit the application, with the condition that the dwellings must match the current plans. This scheme will be beneficial for the village and the ward. Small properties enable local people to buy locally, and not leave the area. Supports the condition of priority for local people, especially at 80% of market rental value. The Benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm.

Cllr Posnett seconded the motion to permit. Agree with the Parish Council, in that Pickwell is not unsustainable as it is so close to Somerby, and the benefits outweigh the harm.

A Cllr stated that this is a very good scheme.

A Cllr stated their support for the condition that one property will be offered to local people at 80% market rental value to encourage local people.

A Cllr stated that this is a great scheme, and agree with the proposal.

The Applications and Advice Manager (LP) stated that some parts needed clarification as this scheme would be subject to an S106 Agreement. Would prefer either the Local Authority Cascade or the Cascade suggested by the agent.

Cllr Holmes responded that we should go with the Cascade suggested by the Housing Policy Officer.

A Cllr queried whether there was a condition to remove Personal Development rights.

The Case Officer (JL) responded that this was already included in the conditions.

The Applications and Advice Manager (LP) sought clarification on the conditions proposed, and whether the bedroom numbers were being conditioned.

Cllr Holmes agreed to condition that there would be 1 3 bedroom house and 4 2 bedroom houses within the scheme.

A Cllr stated that materials for the scheme should be decided between the officers and the ward councillor.

A Cllr noted that the highways conditions should be included within the scheme.

A Vote was taken on the motion to permit.

11 Councillors supported the motion.

0 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to conditions, the content of which was

delegated to the assistant Director of Planning and Regulatory Services.

REASONS: It is considered that the development of 5 houses to replace one dwelling would be of significant benefit which would outweigh the harm of the siting of a development in this unsustainable location.

The proposed development would provide an element of affordable housing for local people, the application form has stated that the development would be for market housing. On the balance of the issues, there are benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply. However, the balancing issues – the poor sustainability of the village and the conflict with the Pre Submission version of the Local Plan – are considered to be of limited significance and outweighed by the benefits.

Applying the ‘test’ required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would “significantly and demonstrably” outweigh the benefits; it is considered that on the balance of the issues, permission should be granted.

Cllrs Greenow and Holmes left the meeting at 18:58

Cllr Greenow returned at 19:00

Cllr Holmes returned at 19:01

PL86.3

17/00048/FUL

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Simon Read

Location: Field Nos 1586 And 9982, Washstones Lane, Frisby On The Wreake

Proposal: New dwelling and outbuilding.

The Case Officer (GBA) stated that:

This is a full planning application for one house on land off Washstones Lane, Frisby on the Wreake.

There are no updates to the report

This is an application for a single dwelling proposal with all matters of design, access and landscaping for consideration. Whilst located in a sustainable village and therefore being acceptable in principle the specific location on this site is deemed to be too remote from the village to be classed as part of the village. Walking to the centre of the village to access its services is challenging and therefore this further means that the development is difficult to describe as sustainable.

Finally, there are unresolved concerns of flooding as an acceptable sequential test is yet to be provided.

As such the application is recommended for refusal.

Members agree unanimously to let the Ward Councillor address the committee, despite not being a registered speaker.

Cllr Baxter, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Frisby is a small and rural village
- This application is outside the village envelope
- The neighbourhood plan is past examination and is going to referendum, so has significant weight
- The local plan says that Frisby needs to take an allocation of 68 dwellings, and the neighbourhood plan allocated 78.
- 98 permissions have already been granted within the village
- There is the risk of urban sprawl across Frisby
- The original consent for the site has not been adhered to
- This development is for another new dwelling
- This application should be refused with the officers recommendation

Councillors had no questions for Cllr Baxter.

Jonathon Ball, as an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- This is a countryside development
- This application will set a precedent within the village
- The site is within flood zone 2
- High risk of flooding, so a sequential test is required
- The sequential test with this application is not sufficient
- It is near the railway line, which cannot be mitigated against
- There are highways issues on site, and it is near a blind bend and within a 60mph limit
- Location is too remote to the village

Councillors had no questions for Mr Ball

Liam Doherty, as the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- This is a brownfield site
- It is on the edge of the village
- Previous permission for barn was granted in 2013
- This will be a carbon neutral home
- Sequential test is sufficient
- Gate and footpath link to the village
- The development is sustainable

- This is an exceptional design
- The benefits outweigh the harm for this application

A Cllr questioned the increase in hardstanding area on site for the increasing flood risk.

Mr Doherty replied that it was not significant as it is a brownfield site.

Cllr Hutchinson, as Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There used to be a football pitch near this site, before a cricket pavilion was built near the site roughly 15 years ago
- This pavilion had to be built an extra 4ft higher due to the increased flood risk
- This site is still within flood zone 2
- Frisby has already met its allocation in both local plan and neighbourhood plan
- The access is on a 60mph road
- This site is near to the railway line

A Cllr questioned the frequency of flooding on the site

Cllr Hutchinson responded that the site is within flood zone 2, and floods regularly.

The Case Officer (GBA) responded that the Highways issue is not significant, according to the Highways authority. The sequential test could be a lot better. Carbon neutrality is a positive, but does not outweigh all the negatives. The footpath would not be well used, and it is outside the village envelope.

Cllr Holmes proposed refusal of the application, in line with officer recommendations.

Cllr Baguley seconds the motion for refusal, due to the risk of flooding, it is outside of the village envelope and has pedestrian issues.

A Cllr commented that the sequential test is poor, and was seen on the site visit, and must be consistent in decisions with other applications.

A Cllr commented that they agree with the motion for refusal, in line with the neighbourhood plan, as it is outside of the village envelope.

A Cllr stated that the report was very good and agree with the reasons for refusal.

A Vote was taken on the motion for refusal.

11 Councillors supported the motion.
0 Councillors opposed the motion.
0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

The motion passed unanimously. The application was refused.

REASONS:

1. The development, if permitted, would result in an unjustified form of sporadic development, beyond the settlement confines of Frisby-on-the-Wreake and remote from the village centre, and would be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area and street scene, contrary to the aims and objectives of policy BE1 of the Melton Local Plan and objectives of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 14, 17, 55 and 109.

2. The Local Planning Authority consider insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate under a sequential test that, given the application site's status under land designated as Flood Zone 2, alternative sites with a lower probability of flooding could accommodate the proposed residential development. The proposal therefore is contrary to Paragraph 102 of the NPPF.

PL86.4

17/01346/FUL

Applicant: PDRH Limited - Peter Dunn

Location: Bottesford Filling Station, Grantham Road, Bottesford

Proposal: Proposed retail convenience store, associated external works and access alteration.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that the recommendation for this application had changed to a recommendation to defer due to the number of late representations and new information that had come forward, that needed time to be considered, so should be deferred.

The Chair proposed a deferral of the application.

Cllr Posnett seconded the motion for deferral.

A vote was taken on the motion to defer.

11 Councillors supported the motion.
0 Councillors opposed the motion.
0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

The motion passed unanimously. The application was deferred.

DETERMINATION: DEFERRED in order to consider the content of the recently submitted representations.

PL86.5

17/01098/OUT

Applicant: Chris & Ian Carr

Location: Field 7900, Wartnaby Road, Ab Kettleby

Proposal: Construction of 10 new dwellings with community carpark and bus turning area.

The Case officer (JL) stated that:

The agent states that they can provide a footway on the North side of the road but it will not meet 6c's guidance of 2m width – but neither do most footways in the village. Notwithstanding this the applicant would agree to using the Southern footway if more acceptable to the Highways Authority.

The agent highlights the Parish Council's comment was relating to dwellings "to attract young families as the plot is adjacent to the school" – the outline mix of houses is for two 2 bed, six 3 bed & two 4bed – this meets the requirement. There is no policy requirement for "affordable" social housing to be provided on a site of this size.

The application seeks outline permission, however access and flooding issues have been resolved. The site is not allocated in the local plan and does not form an exception site (as not providing affordable housing). The site is outside the village envelope.

Richard Cooper, as the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Ab Kettleby is a rural hub in the local plan
- Allocation site ABK1 is on the wrong side of the A606
- This site has support from the Parish Council
- Neighbourhood plan research shows that the village needs more housing
- The village is sustainable, as it is a rural hub
- Additional housing will improve the viability of the village
- This site provides a play area and a bus turning area
- This is only an outline application
- Impacts do not outweigh the benefits

A Cllr queried the bus turning area

Mr Cooper responded that it is designed for the local school bus, which currently turns in a dangerous spot near to the school itself.

A Cllr stated that Ab Kettleby needs more housing or the village will die out. There is no bus service in the village but there are a lot of traffic issues and parking is problematic. This application has a lot of both positives and negatives.

A Cllr reiterated that there is no bus service within the village, but there is a bus organised four days a week by County Hall, that visits the village and Melton

Mowbray town centre.

A Cllr queried how many dwellings have already been approved within the village. The Applications and Advice Manager responded that 3 dwellings had been approved.

A Cllr stated that the current bus turning area is very dangerous, and that this scheme has a lot of positives and negatives.

A Cllr commented that this site is not allocated in the local plan, so cannot support the application.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services commented that the relevant Neighbourhood Plan is at the very early stages.

A Cllr commented that the neighbourhood plan should have no weight and that the local plan still only has limited weight, and this type of scheme should be supported.

Cllr Baguley proposed to refuse the application, in line with officer's recommendation.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the motion for refusal, in line with officer's recommendation.

A Cllr queried the location of the allocated local plan site within the village.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that the allocated site is on the other side of the A606, and is for the same number of dwellings at 10.

A Cllr commented that this scheme has a lot of positives, and that a refusal may be inconsistent with the earlier approval of a similar scheme in Pickwell.

A Cllr stated that this scheme has a lot going for it, and that without development the school and the village will die out. This scheme is similar to the approved scheme in Pickwell earlier this evening.

A Cllr commented that this scheme is very different to the approved scheme in Pickwell.

A Cllr commented that all members supported the local plan and site allocations at full council meeting, so now need to support the local plan.

A Cllr stated that this scheme is against the local plan, and extends out into the countryside.

A Vote was taken on the motion to refuse the application.

8 Councillors agreed with the motion.

2 Councillors opposed the motion.

1 Councillor abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: REFUSED, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would represent an unwarranted extension into the surrounding countryside which contributes to the village setting and would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the village, and detrimental to the character of the countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy OS2 and BE1 of the adopted Melton Local Plan, Policy SS3 and D1 of the Emerging Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not considered that there are material considerations present which suggest that the decision should depart from these policies.

PL86.6

17/01421/OUT

Applicant: Mr Robert Bindloss

Location: 37 Main Street, Great Dalby

Proposal: Erection of one three bedroom bungalow with additional detached garage.

The Case Officer (JL) reported that there were no late items to report.

Cllr Johnson, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There are concerns about this site
- There are a change in ground levels on the site
- There are surface water issues within the village
- There are right of way and footpath issues on this site
- This site is outside the village envelope
- Support the officer's recommendation for refusal of application
- This site used to be paddock land
- This is a greenfield site

Councillors had no questions for Cllr Johnson.

Robert Bindloss, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There were five years of negotiation before buying this land
- Wife suffers from progressive Arthritis, so needs a bungalow
- Want to remain part of the village
- There was lots of rubbish and fly tipping on the site
- The footpath was previously unpassable
- Pond on site will be cleaned

- Footpath will be far larger than it is now
- The drainage and flooding issues nearby will be relieved
- The site is not overlooking neighbours
- There are no highways or traffic issues
- The two traffic issues on site were caused by drunk-driving and not due to other issues

A Cllr asked how the flooding issues would be relieved.

Mr Bindloss responded that there will be a land drain created and a new drainage system.

The Case Officer (JL) stated that there were no further updates.

A Cllr stated that there is a lot of back land development within the village, which is supported by PINS, and there has been a lot of appeals recently in the area.

A Cllr stated that in this application, the benefits do not outweigh the impacts.

A Cllr stated that if the scheme is well designed, it may not damage the conservation area, and that the current application is only an outline.

Cllr Wyatt proposed to permit the development, as there is no substantial harm from the site.

Cllr Posnett seconded the motion to permit, as there were no objections from any statutory consultees, the land is within their ownership and the footpath will not be an issue.

A Cllr raised concerns about the footpath width, as it looks quite narrow.

A Cllr responded that the footpath will now be alongside and the length of the driveway.

A Cllr stated that they cannot support the motion to permit, as it is against the officer's recommendation.

A Cllr stated that this application is only an outline application, so need more information before the impact on the conservation area can be accurately assessed.

The Case Officer (JL) stated that the conservation area is for a linear village, a fact which has been repeatedly been mentioned in appeals and appeal decisions.

A Cllr stated that they had concerns about the site access and the footpath.

A Vote was taken on the motion to permit the application.

3 Councillors supported the motion.
8 Councillors opposed the motion.
0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

The motion failed.

Cllr Faulkner proposed refusal, in line with the Officer's recommendation.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the motion for refusal, in line with the Officer's recommendation.

A Vote was taken on the motion to refuse the application.

8 Councillors supported the motion.
2 Councillors opposed the motion.
1 Councillor abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: REFUSED, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of infilling an important green open area which lies outside of the defined village envelope would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area contrary to the local plan policy OS2 and BE1. The proposal whilst providing some benefit or providing housing of a category to which the Borough is currently deficient is not considered to be of sufficient benefit to outweigh the provisions of the local plan and fails the core planning principles of the NPPF in particular Chapter 11 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment and Chapter 12 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets).

Cllr Botterill left that meeting at 20:04

PL86.7

17/01253/FUL

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Richard Botterill

Location: Church End, 29 Middle Street, 29 Middle Street, Croxton Kerrial

Proposal: Construction of new dwelling and alterations to existing access.

The Case Officer (GBA) reported that:

This is a full planning application for one house on land off Middle Street, Croxton Kerrial.

Two updates following the publication of the report:-

a) Two further separate representations from the residents of 27 Middle Street who maintain concern of how the size and position of the proposed building would be an overbearing impact on their home and view of the village from the approach. There is also concern of the windows of the proposed building will be directly visible to and from bedroom windows.

As previously commented, there is no objection to the principle of the building, rather the current size in relation to our home and the remainder of the village with suggested changes.

b) The parish council have responded showing an appreciation for the reduced the height of the house and the scale by removing the garage and changing the overall design. They have no objection to the house in principal but are concerned about the height, relationship to the Grade II* listed church and the impact on the northern entrance to the village. Consider it needs to be 'hankered down into the landscape with other suggestions made which align with the views of the MBC planning department.

Despite this the applicant wishes to have determination as the house currently sits and is designed.

This is a single dwelling proposal with all matters of design, access and landscaping for consideration. Whilst located in a sustainable village and therefore being acceptable in principle the specific location on this site is deemed to have an impact on the conservation area and the grade II* listed church. The development of this site would result in the loss of what is considered one of the most important aspects of green infrastructure within the conservation area, where the open, undeveloped nature of the site accommodates expansive views from the approach / departure into the village, and most significantly towards the adjacent Grade II* listed St John the Baptist Church.

For this reason on balance, it is considered that the benefits of one house in an area where there is many allocations for housing already does not outweigh the impacts of impact to the conservation area and listed building.

In reference to the concerns over neighbour amenity it is viewed that the 8.6m distance is sufficient for a one and half storey extension.

There is also no window proposed on this side to be considered an impact in terms of privacy.

However owing to the concerns of heritage impact, the application is recommended for refusal.

Richard Botterill, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There is no adverse effect on the church
- No adverse effect on the conservation area
- No views of church from the proposal site
- 72m from site to the church
- Other approved applications have had a greater impact on the church
- It is in keeping with local buildings
- The building is set down into the site

- There is no policy protection on the site
- This application creates no harm
- There are lots of benefits to the application
- This will create a new building within the village to attract new villagers

A Cllr questioned the relative size of the dwelling

Mr Botterill responded that the dwelling is of a similar size to the neighbouring properties, and that he is happy to accept any conditions relating to this.

A Cllr queried the Parish Councils stance to the application.

Mr Botterill responded that the Parish Council is now neutral to the application, after the amended plans were submitted.

The Case Officer (GBA) confirmed that the Parish Council is now neutral to the application.

A Cllr queried whether there is a policy for agricultural need need within the local plan.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that it relates to exceptional circumstances, and that the policy in the emerging Local Plan is very similar to NPPF paragraph 55.

A Cllr commented that this application has limited impact on the church when entering the village from the direction from Knipton.

A Cllr stated the agreement with the previous comments.

A Cllr stated that farmhouses need to be large dwellings, so had no issues with the proposed size of the dwelling.

A Cllr queried whether the dwelling classed as a farmhouse or not.

A Cllr answered that the new dwelling would be surrounded by their farmland. The Applications and Advice Manager responded that this application is not presented as agricultural need.

A Cllr stated that this application could be really nice, and create a good entrance to the village. It is Belvoir Estate land that is farmed, but that is not a planning issue. There is no garage included within this application.

The Case Officer (GBA) commented that the garage was removed when amended plans were submitted.

Cllr Wyatt proposed to permit the application, as there would be no adverse effects on the setting of the church or the conservation area.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the motion to permit. Cllr Cumbers proposed a condition that permitted development rights be removed from the new dwelling. Cllr Wyatt agreed to the condition.

A Cllr commented that this application will affect the church and agree with the Officer's report, so cannot support the motion to permit.

A Cllr commented that the ridge height had been reduced with the amended plans submitted.

A Vote was taken on the motion to permit.

8 Councillors supported the motion.

2 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to conditions the details of which were delegated to the Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services, for the following reasons:

It is considered that the development would meet a housing need and there would be no adverse effects on the setting of the church or the conservation area or unacceptable impact on surrounding properties. The development was therefore in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, adopted Local Plan and emerging Local Plan policies.

Cllr Botterill returned to the meeting at 20:21

PL86.8

17/01295/FUL

Applicant: Mr Michael Jackson

Location: Brook House, 6 Main Road, Twyford

Proposal: Storage Building

The Case Officer (JL) stated that:

No late items to report. Proposal is for a storage building, located in Flood Zone 3. The building is not within the residential curtilage of the property for which it is associated with and it is proposed that the building will be used to store general maintenance equipment. The application is before the committee as it is contrary to planning policy as it is outside the village envelope.

Mr Jackson was invited to speak, but was not present.

Cllr Holmes proposed to approve the application, in line with the Officer's

recommendation.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the motion to approve the application, in line with the Officer's recommendation.

A Vote was taken on the motion to approve the application.

11 Councillors supported the motion.

0 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

The motion passed unanimously. The application was approved.

DETERMINATION: APPROVED subject to the conditions as set out in the Committee report, for the following reasons:

The adjacent land is used for recreation by the applicant, and the building is required for storage of equipment used to maintain the land. It is considered that given the relationship with the applicants dwelling, and the proposed siting, with adequate access from Main Street, that the proposed storage building for personal use is acceptable in this location. It has been demonstrated that there has not been a detrimental impact upon the countryside resulting from small scale development which is considered to be of appropriate design. Likewise the sensitive siting set well back from the highway ensures that the intrinsic character of the area is not harmed.

PL87

Appeal Update for 16/00100/OUT
Update for Appeal for application 16/00100/OUT

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services distributed a new report for the appeal update for application 16/00100/OUT.

A Recess was taken at 20:29 to allow Councillors to read and take in the new report.

The meeting continued at 20:35.

Councillors are asked to note the findings from the report.

DETERMINATION: the content of the report was noted.

PL88

Urgent Business

A Cllr queried the timing of the next site visit, as it is scheduled to take place on Easter Monday.

The Applications and Advice Manager responded that the site visit will take place on Tuesday 3rd April instead of Easter Monday.

A Cllr stated that the Ward Councillor should be called on first in the debate, as

they are often more knowledgeable of the application and the area.

The meeting closed at: 8.39 pm

Chair

Minutes

Meeting name	Community & Social Affairs Committee
Date	Tuesday, 20 March 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor A. Pearson (Chair)

Councillors R. de Burle (Vice-Chair) T. Beaken
M. Blase P. Chandler
A. Freer-Jones P. Posnett
D. Wright

Observers

Officers

Minute No.	Minute
C59	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lumley and Councillor Sheldon.</p>
C60	<p>MINUTES The minutes of the meeting held on 230118 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the chair.</p>
C61	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Councillor Pearson and Councillor Posnett declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the County Council due to their positions as County Councillors.</p>
C62	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES There were no recommendations from other committees.</p>
C63	<p>CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING The Director for Corporate Services submitted a report to update the Committee on the progress of schemes within the Capital Programme to 28 February 2018.</p> <p>The Corporate Services Manager gave an overview of the report and drew Members' attention to 5.2 of the report that shows an underspend of £408k. It was noted that this is predominantly due to underspends listed in 5.3 of the report:</p> <p>The Public Conveniences underspend is being carried forward into 2018/19. Works were delayed due to additional planning permission and the inclement weather.</p> <p>Disabled Facilities Grant – this underspend can be carried forward.</p> <p>Leisure Vision – It has been confirmed that the Football Foundation will not be able to claim the second grant of £45k and as a result of the interim agreement for the management of the MSV site to continue for another 4 years whilst the longer term vision is developed the capital cost incurred to date would have to be funded through revenue.</p> <p>There has been some repayment of the warm homes grant which can be used to off-set the initial funding provision.</p> <p>Project mandate for the 'Footpath for all' was considered by the Town Area Committee at the recent meeting in March as part of their consultaton role and the feedback was that they were supportive of this project being approved.</p> <p>A member stated being disappointed in the delays in procurement.</p> <p>The Corporate Services Manager noted that in terms of the Housing Revenue</p>

Account this could potentially be due to resourcing in the team as well as time consuming contracts. It was noted that projects are being delivered on budget at this point which is positive and delays with the Beckmill Court Refurbishment are outside of our control.

A member asked what the reason for the delay on affordable housing in the HAMP is.

The Interim Director for Growth and Regeneration advised that this was a straightforward matter and updated members that he had been asked to sign off on the purchase of the property in question and so the matter had been resolved.

A member asked in which area are properties having new doors and windows as per Appendix A and if West Avenue and Sysonby Street can be expected to have replacement fittings.

The Chair noted that this is an ongoing project and so doors and windows are being replaced as and when necessary in all properties.

The Interim Director for Growth and Regeneration noted that as part of the Decent Homes Programme this is on track and is an ongoing process for all properties.

Councillor Holmes, as an observer, enquired about the public conveniences. Councillor Posnett and Councillor Chandler exited the room at this point, declaring an interest in this matter due to their positions on the Planning Committee.

The Chair noted that the new public conveniences will save money as new system will be semi-automatic and will require less staff. The project was delayed due to a planning issue.

Councillor Holmes noted that these toilets are used predominantly by visitors and tourists who arrive by coach to visit the town and wanted to know how the project was progressing.

The Chair sought a proposer and a seconder.

All members were in favour.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the progress made on each capital scheme, attached as Appendix A, be noted along with the year end forecast position
- (2) it is recommended to the Policy Finance and Administration Committee that the financing of the Warm Homes Grant project is amended as paragraph 5.4 refers

- (3) it is recommended to the Policy Finance and Administration Committee that the source of funding for the leisure vision is amended from external funding to leisure vision capital receipts as paragraph 5.3 refers
- (4) after taking on board any comments from the Town Area Committee, the Project Mandate as attached at Appendix B is approved for inclusion within the 2018-19 and 2019-20 capital programme as paragraph 5.5 refers
- (5) the adjusted HRA capital programme, as referred to in Appendix A is noted. It should be noted that the budgets are being adjusted between projects and the total programme has not changed as paragraph 5.6 refers.

C64

BUDGET MONITORING APRIL TO DECEMBER 2017

The Director of Corporate Services submitted a report to provide information on actual expenditure and income incurred on this Committee's services compared to the latest approved budget for the period 1st April 2017 to 31st December 2017.

The Corporate Services Manager introduced the report and directed members to section 3.3 of the report which gives a summary of the income and expenditure for this Committee's services in comparison to the approved budget at December 2017. Members were made aware that there is a overspend against the latest budget for general expenses of £159,100. This was explained as being due to the following services/projects, as per 3.6 of the report:

Public Conveniences

Leisure Vision

Homelessness

Lifeline

Wheels to Work

It was noted that the overspends on the Homelessness and Lifeline services are predominantly due to aged debt being written off. In these areas, money was deemed to be unrecoverable due to the length of time that had passed as well as the sensitivity of the cases.

A member asked how debts have accumulated for services such as Lifeline as customers pay by direct debit.

The Corporate Services Manager noted that a lot of the debt is very old and could not have realistically pursued.

The Chair added that in terms of Homelessness, the people who received the service were vulnerable and so a lot of cases would need to be written off.

A member asked whose responsibility it is to monitor debt.

The Corporate Services Manager noted that debt recovery falls on the revenue team, however it is also the responsibility of the service area and budget holder to

	<p>monitor debt and approve actions. This process has recently had stronger enforcement behind it so as to avoid large write offs in the future.</p> <p>The Deputy Chief Executive noted that in light of these points and the discussion around lifeline specifically, there will be a review of this service to be addressed as a priority. The Lifeline service has recently become more commercial and so payment systems can be reviewed alongside this.</p> <p>The Chair sought a proposer and seconder.</p> <p>All members were in favour.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the financial position on each of this Committee's services to 31st December 2017 and year end forecast be noted.</p>
C65	<p>HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT - BUDGET MONITORING 1 APRIL 2017 - 31 DECEMBER 2017</p> <p>The Director for Corporate Services submitted a report to provide information on actual expenditure and income incurred on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) , compared to the latest approved budget for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 December 2017.</p> <p>The Corporate Services Manager gave an overview of the report and directed members to section 3.3 of the report and noted that this gives a summary of the total income and expenditure for the HRA. Members were made aware that this shows a total expenditure underspend of £212k. Section 3.6 of the report shows budget variances that details a staffing underspend as well as an underspend for repairs and maintenance.</p> <p>The Chair sought a proposer and a seconder.</p> <p>All members were in favour.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the financial position on the HRA to 31 December 2017 and the yearend forecast be noted.</p>
C66	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There was no urgent business.</p>
C67	<p>Wheels to Work</p> <p>The Director of Growth and Regeneration submitted a report to outline the recommended future funding commitments and revised future operating area for the Wheels to Work (W2W) scheme.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the recommendations within the exempt report be approved.</p>

The meeting closed at: 7.25 pm

Chair

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Recruitment Committee
Date	Thursday, 22 March 2018
Start time	9.00 am
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Orson (Chair)

Councillors L. Higgins (Vice-Chair) P. Cumbers
M. Glancy E. Holmes
J. Illingworth A. Pearson

Observers

Officers Chief Executive
HR & Communications Manager

Luke Judd - Consultant

Minute No.	Minute
RC15	<p>Apologies For Absence There were no apologies for absence.</p>
RC16	<p>Minutes The minutes of the 07 March 2018 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the chair</p> <p>The minutes of the 21 Feb 2018 were signed by the chair having been previously approved at the meeting of the 07 March 2018.</p>
RC17	<p>Declarations of Interest There were none to be declared.</p>
RC18	<p>Urgent Business There was no urgent business.</p>
RC19	<p>DIRECTOR RECRUITMENT - DIRECTOR FOR LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES</p> <p>The Chief Executive submitted a report to the committee, to consider and agree the successful candidate for the appointment of Director for Legal and Democratic Services.</p> <p>The Consultant confirmed that it has been a good interactive day and that there had been consensus from the various panels on the strength's and weaknesses of the candidates.</p> <p>A suggestion was made that the profile of the candidates should be sent to Members before the lunch as an aide memoire for the panel.</p> <p>Following the interviews The Committee discussed their findings and agreed to make an appointment to the role.</p> <p>A further recommendation was made that the Chief Executive be delegated authority to make a second offer if negotiation with the recommended candidate fell through. This was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Glancy.</p> <p>The Consultant confirmed that references had been taken up for all the candidates and there were no issues to report as a result.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS that the Committee:</p> <p>2.1 Following the selection process including interview, agree a successful candidate to make an offer of appointment to the post of Director for Legal and Democratic Services.</p> <p>2.2 That in event of 1 being made delegation be granted to the Chief Executive</p>

in consultation with the Consultant from Gatenby Sanderson and HR and Communications Manager, to agree the final offer of employment to include salary and start date with the successful candidate.

2.3 That the Chief Executive be delegated authority to make a second offer if negotiation with the recommended candidate fell through. This was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Glancy.

RESOLVED THAT:

2.1 The offer of appointment for the post of Director for Legal and Democratic Services be made to the selected candidate.

2.2 That the Consultant and Chief Executive make the offer of employment followed up with contracts and relevant information from the HR and Communications Manager.

2.3 That in the event that the formal offer was not accepted by the selected candidate, that the Chief Executive be delegated authority to make an offer to one of the other candidates.

The meeting closed at: 1.00 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Recruitment Committee
Date	Tuesday, 27 March 2018
Start time	9.00 am
Venue	Phoenix House, Nottingham Road, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 0UL

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Orson (Chair)

Councillors L. Higgins (Vice-Chair) P. Cumbers
M. Glancy E. Holmes
J. Illingworth A. Pearson

Observers

Officers Chief Executive
HR & Communications Manager

Luke Judd - Consultant

Minute No.	Minute
RC20	<p>Apologies For Absence There were no apologies for absence</p>
RC21	<p>Minutes The minutes of the 22 March 2018 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the chair.</p>
RC22	<p>Declarations of Interest There were none to be declared.</p>
RC23	<p>Urgent Business There was no urgent business.</p>
RC24	<p>DIRECTOR RECRUITMENT - DIRECTOR FOR GROWTH AND REGENERATION</p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting and discussed an email sent the previous evening by one of the committee members outlining a concern regarding the process. This email was acknowledged however it was noted that the recruitment process was being followed in accordance with that approved by Full Council and therefore no further action was required. The meeting continued.</p> <p>The Chief Executive submitted a report to the committee, to consider and agree the successful candidate for the appointment of Director for Growth and Regeneration. It was explained that the previous day, 5 candidates had taken part in a variety of panels and activities. At the end of the day there had been a feedback session where it was felt two of the candidates fell below the standard required for the Director role. As a result 3 of the candidates were being put forward for the Member Panel interview.</p> <p>The Consultant confirmed that it had been a good interactive day and that there had been consensus from the various panels on the 2 candidates who fell short of the standard.</p> <p>The consultant advised that the candidates have been given a presentation topic and 30 minutes to prepare a 10 minutes presentation using a flip chart. This will be the first part of the interview and a series of set questions will follow to be put to each of the candidates in turn.</p> <p>The Chair of the Committee confirmed that no supplementary questions are to be asked unless they are for clarification purpose. All questions to candidates to be asked in the same way.</p> <p>The order for the interviews was confirmed.</p> <p>Following the interviews The Committee discussed their findings and agreed to make an appointment to the role.</p>

A further recommendation was made that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader be delegated authority to make a second offer to the second placed candidate if negotiation with the recommended candidate fell through. All members were in favour.

The Consultant confirmed that references had been taken up for all the candidates and there were no issues to report as a result.

RECOMMENDATIONS that the Committee:

2.1 Following the selection process including interview, agree a successful candidate to make an offer of appointment to the post of Director for Growth and Regeneration.

2.2 That in event of 1 being made, delegation be granted to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Consultant from Gatenby Sanderson and HR and Communications Manager, to agree the final offer of employment to include salary and start date with the successful candidate.

2.3 That the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader be delegated authority to make a second offer to the second placed candidate if negotiation with the recommended candidate fell through.

RESOLVED THAT:

2.1 The offer of appointment for the post of Director for Growth and Regeneration be made to the selected candidate.

2.2 That the Consultant and Chief Executive make the offer of employment followed up with contracts and relevant information from the HR and Communications Manager

2.3 That the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader be delegated authority to make a second offer to the second placed candidate if negotiation with the recommended candidate fell through if negotiation with the recommended fell through.

The meeting closed at: 1.55 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Governance Committee
Date	Tuesday, 27 March 2018
Start time	6.30 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor P. Cumbers (Chair)

Councillors

J. Simpson (Vice-Chair)	M. Blase
P. Chandler	J. Douglas
P. Faulkner	A. Freer-Jones
M. Glancy	J. Illingworth
M. Graham (Substitute)	

Observers

Officers

- Chief Executive
- Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
- Head of Internal Audit
- Administrative Assistant Elections & Member Support

Minute No.	Minute
G55	<p>Apologies for Absence Apologies for Absence were received from Councillor Beaken. Councillor Graham attended in her place.</p>
G56	<p>Minutes The minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2018 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the chair.</p>
G57	<p>Declarations of Interest There were no declarations of interest.</p>
G58	<p>Recommendations From Other Committees There were no recommendations from other Committees.</p>
G59	<p>Update on Decisions There were no outstanding decisions to consider at this meeting.</p>
G60	<p>Internal Audit Update The Head of Internal Audit</p> <p>(a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) which updated the Committee on progress made in delivery of the 2017/18 Annual Audit Plan and key findings arising from audit assignments completed;</p> <p>(b) advised that since the last Committee meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • three reports had been finalised as summarised at Appendix A, Section 2.5 of the report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Financial System Key Controls</u>: This was the annual audit of key controls in financial systems. Sample testing confirmed 100% compliance with key controls on BACS payments, control account reconciliation, invoice processing and credit notes. Housing rents were reviewed and it was confirmed that updates to records had been made in a timely manner. Internal Audit made a recommendation around ensuring a reconciliation between the rent roll and the property records and also recommendations around improving the procedural guidance for council tax and NNDR relief, discounts and exemptions. Overall, good levels of assurance and minor organisational risk remained. ii. <u>Leisure Vision Phase 2</u>: The scope of the Phase 2 project had initially been to procure a design, build, operate and manage

model for the Melton Sports and Leisure Village. A large procurement process took place involving key officers from Legal and Procurement Sections and a project group, including consultants/specialists. Following dialogue with potential bidders, it was established that the full procurement should not go ahead and instead a contract for the operation of the ongoing facilities was awarded. The project management and decision making arrangements around the project were reviewed and given a good level of assurance with minor organisational risk overall.

iii. Waste Contract Procurement: This was the second review of the project management arrangements this year. Based on the evidence provided of decision making, risk management, issue management and communications, good assurance ratings had been maintained. The project planning had been strong with timely highlight of any slippage and all recommendations from Internal Audit's previous report to this Committee had been implemented effectively

- there remained a number of overdue recommendations, which Internal Audit were monitoring with Management. It was anticipated that an improved position would be reported at the next meeting of this Committee in June 2018.

(c) highlighted the update on fraud investigation work. This was the outcome of the investigation which Internal Audit had been working on over the last year. Court proceedings had concluded and guilty verdicts were passed in respect of the former officer of this Council and his wife. The officer was sentenced to twenty months in prison and his wife received a suspended sentence. This information would be included within the annual fraud report to this Committee in June 2018. There would also be a further report to this Committee concerning the recovery of monies through this fraud.

The Chair thanked the Head of Internal Audit for her excellent work.

A Member asked why the project management budget for consultancy support on the Waste Project had to be increased from £99k to £154k. The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services advised that there had been six bidders, leading to more additional work to support rounds of dialogue, assessment and evaluation etc and also due to prudential borrowing and financial advice. The revised budget would be sufficient to complete the project.

The Member also queried why a meeting which was due to take place in February 2018 (with a software supplier) and which had to be cancelled was rearranged for May 2018. Could an earlier date not have been agreed? The Head of Internal Audit advised that the meeting had been cancelled due to adverse weather conditions and the Chief Executive advised that he did not have further details but would look into this.

Another Member referred to Financial Systems Key Controls, asking whether processes had now been implemented to ensure user access was revoked when staff changed roles, left this Council etc. The Head of Internal Audit confirmed that this would be examined as part of the Cyber Security review. However, there was a process in place to ensure access rights were updated for leavers.

There being no further comments or questions forthcoming from Members, it was

RESOLVED that the report be noted together with the progress made by the Internal Audit team in delivery of the Audit Plan.

G61

Internal Audit Annual Plan 2018/19

The Head of Internal Audit

- (a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) which provided the Committee with a copy of the draft Internal Audit Plan for 2018/19, for review and formal approval, in line with the requirements of the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards
- (b) stated that the plan at Table one of the report had been developed in accordance with the risk based approach discussed with Members in November 2017 and agreed with Management Team;
- (c) advised that the plan aimed to address this Council's key risks, add value in improving this Council's controls and governance and was intended to inform Internal Audit's opinion and provide management and Committee assurances;
- (d) confirmed that any consultancy assignments were stated as such;
- (e) highlighted a 'reserve list' of audit areas at Table 2 of the report, which if not covered during 2018/19, would be included in Audit Planning 2019/20.

A Member queried what IR35 compliance was and the Head of Internal Audit advised that this referred to new legislation relating to agency workers. The Member also noted that a total of sixteen and a half audit days had been spent working on Key Financial Controls during 2017/18 but only fifteen days had been allocated to this for 2018/19. The Head of Internal Audit confirmed that Internal Audit were comfortable with the allocation of fifteen days.

Another Member advised that during discussion of the plan in November 2017, they had suggested 'controls around S106 spending' as an audit assignment and queried if this would be audited as part of Key Financial Controls. The Head of Internal Audit reminded the Committee that it had been agreed to audit controls around S106 spending in 2019/20 and this had been noted for the next year's audit plan.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the Internal Audit Plan for 2018/19 be approved;
- (2) delegated authority be given to the Director for Corporate Services in consultation with the Chair of the this Committee, to agree amendments to the Plan during the financial year if required.

G62

Local Government Association Governance Review

The Chief Executive

- (a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) providing the Committee with the Local Government Association's (LGA) Governance Review report and recommendations, enabling Members to consider initial next steps;
- (b) advised that following the LGA Peer Challenge in December 2017, a report with a list of recommendations and Action Plan had been accepted by Full Council. One of the recommendations was to improve this Council's governance and decision making arrangements and the LGA were invited to assist in this work;
- (c) confirmed that a review of this Council's current arrangements was held on 12 to 14 March 2018. The remit of the review was to explore where the Council could improve, streamline and clarify its policy development, Committee system and decision making arrangements;
- (d) Highlighted
 - i. that having already provided some initial verbal feedback, the LGA's report was attached as Appendix A of the report. He noted that this was a challenging report for Members and officers.
 - ii. the recommendations at paragraphs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, which provided the opportunity for this Committee to receive the report and establish an informal development group, consisting of a small group of Members and officers to work together to develop proposals to improve, streamline and clarify the Committees and associated structures. Their proposals would be presented at a future ad hoc meeting of this Committee in April 2018 and the report proposed that any recommended changes would then be considered at the Council Annual General Meeting in May 2018. This would set clarity of direction and focus for the new municipal year. It was also proposed that this group undertake further research on the other recommendations within the report, which would take more time to consider.

The Chair highlighted recommendation 2.4 that the Leader be asked to nominate up to four Members to be part of the informal governance development group.

A Member commented that there was very little within the LGA's report that they did not agree with. Systems needed to be strengthened and there was a vast amount that could be actioned quickly. They cautioned against moving towards a Leader and Cabinet model of governance.

A Member stated that they did not agree that the Leader nominate which Members would form part of the group. The small group should be a proportionate representation of this Council.

Another Member highlighted that if the small group was to include an independent representative, it would not be a proportionate representation of this Council, which was made up of 90% Conservative Councillors.

The Leader urged Members to approve the recommendations commenting that there had been considerable overlap on this Council's Committees in recent years. This needed to stop, in order for the Council to improve. He confirmed that his nominations would reflect the nature of this Council as far as possible and that all Members would have the opportunity to consider the recommendations at the Council meeting.

The Chief Executive advised that this would be an informal group and did not require political balance. He highlighted that the findings of the informal group would be submitted to this politically balanced Committee for formal consideration.

A Member added that they would like to think that the Leader would nominate to the small group appropriately.

Another Member stated that they did not feel it appropriate that the proposals from the small group be presented at the Annual General Meeting in May 2018 and it was suggested that a meeting of Extraordinary Council to be held prior to the Annual General Meeting, to enable Member to consider this.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the report and recommendations from the Local Government Association's Governance Review be received and noted;
- (2) the establishment of an informal Member and officer development group to review the findings and develop proposals to improve, streamline and clarify the Committee and related group structures be supported. These proposals to be considered by an ad hoc meeting of this Committee in April with a view to any agreed changes being recommended to an Extraordinary Council in May;
- (3) the development group be asked to undertake further research in relation to the other findings and recommendation set out in the Local Government Association's report;

(4) the Leader of the Council be asked to nominate up to four Members to work with him and officers within the development group.

G63

General Data Protection Regulations Update

On behalf of the Monitoring Officer, the Chief Executive

- (a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) advising the Committee of the current state of preparations to implement the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)
- (b) advised that the report detailed the work which had been done and the work which remained to be done, in readiness for the 25 May implementation deadline, to provide assurance to Members.
- (c) confirmed that Legal and Democratic Services' Principal Solicitor would be GDPR Statutory Data Protection Officer. He, as Head of Paid Service would ensure that the duties were discharged in the interim by an appropriate officer, until the Principal Solicitor was in post.

There being no comments or questions forthcoming from Members, it was

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

G64

Eaton and Waltham Community Review

On behalf on the Deputy Chief Executive, the Chief Executive

- (a) submitted reports (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) advising the Committee of the Terms of Reference for the Eaton Parish Council Community Governance Review and of a request for a Community Governance Review by Waltham on the Wolds and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council and to inform Members of key issues associated with such a review;
- (b) commented that it was good practice to consider conducting Reviews every ten to fifteen years (except in the case of areas with very low population, when less frequent reviews may be adequate). Reviews were triggered either by elapse of time or by request of the local (Parish) Council
- (c) advised that Eaton Parish Council and Waltham on the Wolds and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council had requested Reviews and this Council had responsibility for undertaking the review;
- (d) highlighted the reasons for the Community Governance Review of Eaton Parish Council as
 - i. The distribution of Councillors between the two Parish Wards within Eaton Parish Council, with one of the Parish Council seats from Eaton

Ward of the Eaton Parish Council to the Eastwell Ward of the Eaton Parish Council

- ii. The renaming of the Eastwell Ward within Eaton Parish Council to the Eastwell and Goadby Marwood Ward

and the reasons for the Community Governance Review of Waltham on the Wold and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council as

- i. To increase the number of Parish Councillors from six to eight;

- (e) Confirmed that there would be no alterations to the parish boundaries as part of the Reviews

A Member queried who the LGBCE were and the Chief Executive confirmed this referred to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. The Member requested that future reports contain the extended term before the abbreviated form, so Members are able to reference it.

There being no further comments or questions forthcoming from Members, it was

RESOVED that

- (1) the Terms of Reference for the Eaton Parish Council Community Governance Review, as set out at Appendix A of the report be agreed;
- (2) the undertaking of a Community Governance Review of the Waltham on the Wolds and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council area be agreed and the Terms of Reference, as set out at Appendix A of the report be agreed.

G65

Annual Review of the Constitution 2017/18

On behalf of the Monitoring Officer, the Chief Executive

- (a) submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) to enable the Committee to consider an annual review of the Council's Constitution and any amendments for onward referral to the Council for approval, as well as note changes to the Constitution approved by the Council since November 2016;
- (b) gave an overview of the report, confirming that an extensive review of the Constitution for 2017/18 had been undertaken, to ensure it was up to date. As well as this annual review, it was current practice that any additions or changes to the Constitution be brought to this Committee's attention as soon as these came to light;
- (c) highlighted
 - i. an amendment at clause 11 of Appendix A1, the revised Substitute Policy, to include the wording 'and/or the Briefing' where Planning Site

- Visits were referred to
- ii. there were a number of Planning related and other changes
 - iii. the proposed Calendar of Meetings 2018/19 at Appendix C of the report.

A Member queried if it was premature to agree the changes to the Constitution at this meeting and suggested waiting for the outcome of the forthcoming Governance Review (discussed earlier at this meeting).

Another Member referred to Appendix A of the report, Review of Constitution 2017/18 Items for Consideration, asking why 'To exercise the enforcement powers and duties of the Council and Returning Officer in relation to elections' would transfer to Policy, Finance and Administration Committee rather than to this Committee.

The Chief Executive suggested that the recommendation at paragraph 2.1 be amended to propose that actions set out at Appendix A of the report be considered by the informal development group (discussed earlier at the meeting), rather than approved here. Members agreed.

A Member referred to the Example Attendance Register Procedure for Substitute Members, asking if a column could be added to the Register with the heading 'Substitute for Who'. This would remind Members to add the details to the Register. The Chief Executive confirmed this would be fed back to the Senior Democracy Officer.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the proposed actions, as set out at Appendix A of the report be referred to the governance development group for consideration as part of the wider Governance Review. A comprehensive set of recommendations to be considered at an ad hoc meeting of this Committee in April;
- (2) Appendix A1 of the report (revised Substitute Policy) be approved, subject to the following amendment at clause 11 of the Policy

'If sufficient notice has been given, a Member substituting on the Planning Committee will be expected to attend the Planning Site Visit and/or the Briefing. But the Substitute Member could still take part in the Planning Committee meeting, even if they had not attended the Planning Site Visit and/or the Briefing'

And

Appendix A2 of the report (Revised Code of Conduct for Members and officers dealing with Planning matters) be approved;

- (3) it be noted that any changes to the Constitution may be subject to

amendment following the review of Governance arrangements as explained at paragraph 3.2 of the report;

- (4) the items which have been approved for inclusion in the Constitution at Council Meetings since December 2016 and which are set out at Appendix B of the report be noted;
- (5) Part 3 – Terms of Reference of Policy, Finance and Administration
It be noted that the Monitoring Officer has exercised his delegation to make a minor procedural and operational change to the Constitution in respect of an amendment to the existing Terms of Reference to the Policy, Finance & Administration Committee to remove the words in brackets being '(5 Members, politically balanced)' at item 14 to align with the previously approved wording at Full Council on 12 December 2017;
- (6) the proposed Calendar of Meetings 2018 19 as at Appendix C be referred to the Annual Meeting of the Council.
- (7) It be noted that due to the Constitution being a living document there may be requirements for changes within the year. Therefore as well as the annual review, items would continue to be referred to the Committee as these arise;
- (8) It be noted that the Monitoring Officer has delegated authority to make amendments following legislative or other statutory changes and minor procedural and operational changes. Such changes would be reported to the Governance Committee and subsequently the Council, as soon as practicable thereafter.

G66

Code of Conduct Update

On behalf of the Monitoring Officer, the Chief Executive submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) which updated the Committee on the latest position with regard to standards matters including the Code of Conduct, the Registration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Interests and any complaints against Councillors dealt with under the Council's process.

There being no comments or questions forthcoming from Members, it was

RESOLVED that the update on the position of standards matters including Parishes' Registration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Interests and complaints against Councillors dealt with under the provisions of the Localism Act be noted.

G67

Mayor's Award of Merit Scheme : Awardees 2017/18

On behalf of the Award of Merit Task Group, the Chief Executive submitted a report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) presenting the recommendations of the Award of Merit Task Group.

The Chair highlighted paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 of the report, stating that this

Committee had previously discussed the possibility of the Task Group merging the Mayor's Awards with the Melton Times' Community Awards. The Task Group had reconsidered this option and due to the high number of award nominees, had agreed that the Mayor's Awards remain as a separately promoted event by the Mayor.

There being no further comments or questions forthcoming from Members, it was

RESOLVED that

- (1) the list of proposed awardees as at exempt Appendix A be approved;
- (2) it be noted that presentations would be made by the Mayor to the Awardees at the meeting of Full Council on Wednesday, 25 April;
- (3) the arrangements for presentations to be made by the Mayor to awardees at the meeting of Full Council on Wednesday, 25 April, at the be noted;
- (4) the Mayor's Awards continue as a separately promoted event by the Mayor.

G68

Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at: 7.43 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 5 April 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Illingworth (Chair)

Councillors	P. Baguley	G. Botterill
	P. Chandler	P. Cumbers
	M. Glancy	T. Greenow
	E. Holmes	J. Wyatt
	L. Higgins (Substitute)	B. Rhodes (Substitute)

Observers

Officers

- Solicitor To The Council (SP)
- Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
- Planning Officer (GBA)
- Applications And Advice Manager (LP)
- Administrative Assistant (AS)

Minute No.	Minute
PL89	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Cllr Faulkner, who was substituted by Cllr Rhodes</p> <p>Cllr Posnett, who was substituted by Cllr Higgins</p> <p>Cllr Holmes was not present at the beginning of the meeting, whilst the Chair was making his housekeeping announcements (Cllr Holmes arrived at 6.06pm)</p> <p>The Chair announced that this would be Cllr Chandlers last planning committee due to her being on leave for the next one and then taking up her new position as Mayor. He thanked her for her contribution to the planning committee and wished her well in her term as Mayor. Cllr Chandler thanked the committee members.</p>
PL90	<p>Minutes</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting held on 15th March 2018</p> <p>Cllr Chandler noted that on page 8 of the minutes regarding item 86.2, application 17/01389/FUL, where a Cllr had asked whether there was a condition to remove personal development rights, should read as '<u>permitted</u>' development rights.</p> <p>Approval of the minutes was proposed by Cllr Chandler and seconded by Cllr Holmes. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record, subject to the above amendment.</p>
PL91	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Cllr Rhodes noted that he is also a member of LCC and may have contributed to some information in the papers to be viewed at the meeting whilst in this role.</p>
PL92	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL92.1	<p>17/00821/FUL</p> <p>Applicant: Mr Jonathan Chastney – Talavera Estates</p> <p>Location: Land adjacent Crompton Road, Crompton Road, Asfordby Hill</p> <p>Proposal: Erection of 16 dwellings</p> <p>(a) The Applications And Advice Manager stated that:</p> <p>The application before you seeks the full planning permission for 16 dwellings off Crompton Road, Asfordby Hill, the site forms part of ASFH1 which is an allocated site in the emerging Melton Local Plan.</p>

There has been one additional representation received since the publishing of the report which are comments from the Parish Council, they read as follows:-

“The Parish Council object on the following grounds:

1. The site does not form part of the resubmitted Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish council believes this alone should mean the applications rejected.
2. The site is on greenfield prime agricultural land.
3. There is a surplus of brownfield land available in the area of Asfordby Hill which should be used for new developments. The residents of Asfordby Hill would like to see tis brownfield land developed.
4. There are few amenities in the area which means for most things residents would need to drive even to avail themselves of quite rudimentary facilities.

I would like to remind members that the status of the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan has changed, and there is now a revised version submitted to the council for consultation which is running until 1st May .

The proposal is recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

(b) Sam Silcocks, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Support the officers recommendation to permit.
- The site is part of a residential allocation identified in the emerging local plan which should be given significant weight.
- Committed to the housing allocation.
- It would form part of the 5 year land supply target.
- There would be no adverse impacts arising from this site.
- The possible benefits for the scheme have been maximised.

(c) Cllr Ronnie de Burle, Ward Councillor for Asfordby, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Representing the residents of Asfordby Hill who are opposed to this application.
- Reject an application on agricultural land. Until recently it had been farmed.
- Outside of the village boundary.
- Although it is an allocated site in the emerging plan, it is unresolved.
- Objection from Historic England
- The report doesn't highlight that it is in area of separation.
- Housing allocation should be given greater weight.
- There are more appropriate brown fields sites in the hamlet.
- Asfordy have resubmitted their neighbourhood plan on the advice of the LPA.

- Full support of the community to develop brown fields sites.
- Report says there are local amenities such as shops and a Dr's surgery but this is incorrect.

Cllr Higgins asked for clarification regarding Historic England's objection to the local plan, as they didn't mention this particular site and wondered about the specifics.

Cllr de Burle responded that he couldn't answer but that it is a fact.

Cllr Higgins asked officers for further information regarding the scheduled ancient monument.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that it was not discussed in meetings but featured in the Statement of Common Ground between Historic England and Melton BC produced for the Local Plan that explained that agreement had been reached that the policy for ASFH1 be amended to read "The design, layout and boundary treatment of any development proposed must conserve and enhance the setting of Kirby Bellars Scheduled Monument". He also referred to the site plan and reminded members that they are dealing with the red part on the site plan not the blue part, so this site is not as close to the boundary.

Cllr Wyatt asked if the houses displayed in the top section of the site plan are already built.

The Applications and Advice Manager responded that they were and that the new road would take you round and join up.

Cllr Cumbers asked for the location of the local area of play.

The Applications and Advice Manager indicated on the site plan that it would be located in the bottom corner.

Cllr Greenow proposed to permit the application in line with the officers recommendations as there was no significant reason to refuse.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal and added that it would cause no harm and will complete the route around for access.

A Cllr raised concerns regarding the further development of adjacent land and its suitability for arable work.

A Cllr asked for clarity regarding the neighbourhood plan and the local plan

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan was advanced but has now been quashed. It has gone back a few steps and the local plan is now more advanced. We're in the final throes of the local plan so it carries weight. The neighbourhood plan

carries limited weight at present having set back to earlier stages.

A Cllr asked if this site was challenged during the Neighbourhood plan.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that it was challenged. It was found against by the Examiner and also support for the Local Plan allocation as received from the applicant.

A Cllr raised concerns regarding the location of the local area of play and the traffic that may pass by it.

A vote was taken. 10 Members voted for the proposal and 1 Member abstained.

Determination: PERMIT, subject to the completion of a s106 agreement and conditions as set out in the report

Reason: The proposed development would provide housing on a site which has been allocated in the Emerging Local Plan. Additionally, the proposed development would provide a good mix of housing types and tenures (including social rented and intermediate housing), which have been identified as in need. Asfordby Hill is a location which is considered to perform well in sustainability terms and adequate access and parking can be provided. 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 and contribution to key infrastructure. Applying the ‘test’ required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would “significantly and demonstrably” outweigh the benefits; it is considered that permission should be granted

PL92.2

18/00044/FUL

Applicant: Mr Daniel Parnham

Location: Land adjacent to 51 Stathern Lane, Harby

Proposal: Erection of three dwellings

(a) The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that:

- Application for three dwelling off Stathern Lane, Harby
- Full application with materials and landscaping for consideration
- One update confirming distance to neighbours from development 17 not 15m
- Two points of clarification over permitted developments regulations and that the trees to the front of the site will be protected.

(b) Nick Bacon, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- It is a small scheme which will benefit the village.
- Necessary for the 5 year land supply.
- There will be 3 small houses which would be suitable for young couples or elderly villagers who wish to downsize.
- The appearance has been designed so it's not imposing.
- Two bedrooms in the roofs with dormer windows so as not to impose on the houses opposite.
- Harby neighbourhood plan should be given weight.
- Concluded that it is not a valuable open space.
- Three car parking spaces are required and they have been provided.
- It will not make green lane any worse.
- There are considerable benefits and it will supplement and complement the village of Harby.

Cllr Baguley proposed to permit the proposal with the added condition that any further permitted development rights are removed. She added that she is pleased to see the trees being retained.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal and added that she would particularly like the condition regarding PD rights included. She felt that any further development would lead to more car ownership and noted that this doesn't stop development but that they would just have to ask for planning permission first.

Some Cllrs noted that they were pleased to see smaller housing and the retention of the trees, and that it would meet the housing needs and the neighbourhood plan. They felt the parking was extremely important.

A Member raised concerns regarding the proposed materials of bricks and stone with the suggestion that bits of ironstone would be randomly placed amongst the bricks. They asked if the proposer and seconder would agree which materials are used as it is a prominent area and on the road.

There was a discussion regarding the merits and pitfalls of conditioning the materials.

A Member noted that condition 2 mentioned materials and the use of them being in strict accordance with those specified in the application.

The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that they could ask for more specific materials.

The Chair noted that the application is very specific and that they need to be more flexible with materials and asked officers to revise the wording of the condition as such.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services added that the wording could be amended to, notwithstanding the plans submitted, materials

to be agreed by Officers and Ward Cllrs.

A vote was taken and the Members voted unanimously to permit.

Determination: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, but with condition 2 amended to read:

Notwithstanding the details specified, revised details of the external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The development proposed is for a relatively small scale residential development of the type required in the local area. The design is sympathetic to Harby and has raised no objection from the Leicestershire County Council highways authority provided that stringent conditions are adhered to. The development accords with the Development Plan for the area (the CHH Neighbourhood Plan) and as such permission should be granted unless there are material considerations to indicate otherwise. The Local Planning Authority can demonstrate a five years supply of housing sites and as whilst the policies of the NP retain full weight., this should be not treated as a minimum. As this application will improve an open space with disused hard standing to three well designed dwellings in a sustainable location the proposal is viewed as acceptable that accords with local, neighbourhood and national planning policies. No material considerations have been identified that justify a departure from the Development Plan.

PL92.3

17/01508/FUL

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Waldron

Location: Jubilee House, Station Road, John O Gaunt

Proposal: Conversion of existing stables and rear extension to form a new dwelling

(a) The Applications And Advice Manager stated that:

The application before you seeks full planning permission for 1 dwelling in John o Gaunt by converting and extending an existing stable.

There has been 1 representation received since the publishing of the report which states

The planned conversion would appear to be a very good way of improving the future life-style of the occupants of jubilee House without having any adverse effects on the nature of the local countryside.

It is considered that this additional comment does not raise any further points that haven't already been addressed with the report.

The proposal is recommended for refusal as per the 2 reasons in the officer report, which consider design and sustainability.

(b) Cllr R S Johnson, on behalf of Twyford and Thorpe Satchville Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The applicant has the unanimous support of the parish councillors and support from local residents.
- The house is currently too large for the applicants but they don't wish to move away.
- They need ground floor accommodation due to ailing health and may need live in care in the future.
- Not visible from the road.
- The rear extension would only be visible to one neighbour who finds it sympathetic to the local surroundings.
- The turning circle would avoid the need to reverse in to the road.
- This would improve the lives of the applicants and release on to the market a 4 bedroom home for a family wishing to move to John O Gaunt.

(c) Maurice Fairhurst, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- He was going to say a lot of what the parish council had said.
- The property is currently too large for the applicants needs and they don't want to move away.
- The stables are redundant.
- There is a continuous footpath between John O Gaunt and Twyford which enables them to take advantage of the facilities of Twyford.
- It is not an unsustainable location and will not attract much additional traffic.
- Can't be seen from the road.
- Only 50% of the extension is two storeys in height.
- It will enable the applicants to live longer in their community.
- It will provide another dwelling.
- It won't damage the street scene or the amenity of neighbours.
- No up to date local plan.
- The benefits outweigh the harm.

Cllr Higgins asked for clarification as to why the design formed part of the recommendation for refusal and asked if the officer had come back to him about the design.

Mr Fairhurst responded that he was not sure why the officers think it is a poor design and it hadn't been explained why it is inappropriate. The elevation shows that it would be of limited view to the public.

The Applications And Advice Manager advised that the recommendation for refusal with regards to the design, is due to the size of the extension and the limited floor. It is not so complementary to the existing floor plan.

Cllr Holmes proposed to permit the application and added that the residents

know the area and the floor plan has been designed to give more room when someone is less mobile. Permitted access granted in 2001. The redundant stables will be made in to a house. There are more plusses than the negatives.

Cllr Rhodes seconded the proposal and asked for clarification regarding the location of the proposed site in relation to Jubilee House.

Cllr Higgins advised that it will be attached to Jubilee House.

A Cllr noted that the benefits outweigh the harm and that it will be enhanced by the extra storey.

A Cllr stated that they didn't agree with the recommendation with regards to sustainability and noted an appeal decision on 26.10.15 in the Burrough on the Hill, where it cited we should support the local economy. A cluster of villages is the way to go here but does understand the officers reason.

Some Cllrs added their support and were pleased that the building would be put to good use instead of costly maintenance to an unused building. Pleased to see it will retain the character of a traditional stable block. They were mindful of the support it had received from the parish council and neighbours and please to see it would be providing another home. They felt the Ward Cllr should have input into the design.

The Chair reminded Members that the Ward Cllr has involvement in all materials.

Some Cllrs offered their further support and added that it won't make a lot of significance to the street scene. It is providing for a need and they are making their own facility for the future.

The Chair reminded Members that individuals specific needs are not a planning matter and that there is nothing to stop it becoming an open market property once completed. He asked if there could be the usual conditions and add one that specifically states that the applicant be the first occupant of the property.

A Cllr noted that the applicants have looked at other sites and had quite a journey to get to this application. If they were unable to occupy a house in John O Gaunt they would try in Twyford.

A vote was taken and the Members voted unanimously to permit.

Determination: PERMIT, subject to conditions, the details of which were delegated to the Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services but to include a condition limiting occupancy of the dwelling to the applicant and his family only, to reflect their specific personal need.

Reason: the development will involve the conversion of the stable block, by means of a two storey extension is proposed to the existing single storey building. It is considered that this proposed extension, and the proposed detached garage with

	car port, would make good use of the building and secure its retention, without unduly intruding into the landscape. There are also benefits accruing from the proposal in terms of fulfilling the housing needs of the applicant. The balancing issues – the poor sustainability of the hamlet and the conflict with the Submission version of the Local Plan – are considered to outweigh the harm.
PL93	Urgent Business None

The meeting closed at: 7.05 pm

Chair

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

25 APRIL 2018

REPORT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

APPOINTMENT OF MONITORING OFFICER

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek confirmation for the handover to a new Monitoring Officer with effect from 25 June 2018.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **In accordance with Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the new incoming Director for Legal and Democratic Services, Adele Wylie, commence as the Council's Monitoring Officer and replace the Deputy Chief Executive in this role with effect from 25 June 2018.**

3.0 KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 Under section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the Council must appoint a Monitoring Officer.
- 3.2 The Monitoring Officer is a statutory post and as with other statutory posts, such as the Chief Executive, this appointment must be confirmed by the full Council.
- 3.3 At its meeting on 12 December 2017, the Council approved the Chief Executive's recommendations to realign senior management responsibilities and to cease the shared arrangement for legal services with Harborough District Council and establish an in-house Legal and Democratic Services team. A Director for Legal and Democratic Services was approved within the new structure and it was also resolved that once this post is filled, the Council should appoint the postholder as Monitoring Officer and replace the Deputy Chief Executive in this role.
- 3.4 Following a recent recruitment exercise, Adele Wylie has been appointed to the position of Director for Legal and Democratic Services. Ms Wylie commences employment with Melton Borough Council on 25 June 2018 and it is proposed that this will be the date she will replace the Deputy Chief Executive as the Council's Monitoring Officer. Adele Wylie joins the authority from Rutland County Council where she held the post of Head of Legal and Corporate Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer. Previous to that she spent 8 years with Bolsover District Council/North East Derbyshire District Council as Legal Services Manager across the two authorities.
- 3.5 The Monitoring Officer has statutory powers to appoint one or more Deputy Monitoring Officers.
- 3.6 A recruitment exercise has also taken place for the post of Director for Regeneration and Growth to which Ms Pranali Parikh has been appointed. Ms Parikh will join Melton Borough Council on 9th July 2018 from High Peak Borough

Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council where she currently heads up the regeneration service as part of a joint management team for the two authorities.

4.0 POLICY AND CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Strong Corporate Governance is important in order to ensure high ethical standards are maintained and the Monitoring Officer ensures this and that the Council acts within the requirements of the Localism Act.

5.0 FINANCIAL AND OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The financial implications are as stated in the Chief Executive's report to Full Council on 12 December 2017.

5.2 There will be a managed transition of duties from the existing Monitoring Officer to the new incumbent and this will reduce any risks faced by the new Monitoring Officer.

6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS/POWERS

6.1 In accordance with Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the Council must appoint a Monitoring Officer. The statutory power given to the Monitoring Officer enables them to appoint one or more deputies.

7.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY

7.1 There are no specific community safety implications in this report.

8.0 EQUALITIES

8.1 Advertising and recruitment for new posts are carried out with full regard to Equalities legislation.

9.0 RISKS

9.1

L I K E L I H O O D	A	Very High				
	B	High				
	C	Significant				
	D	Low		1		
	E	Very Low				
	F	Almost Impossible				
				Negligible 1	Marginal 2	Critical 3

IMPACT

Risk No	Risk Description
1	To not appoint a Monitoring Officer would mean the Council was not fulfilling its legal requirements and could affect the Council's ability to make formal decisions and evidence that it acts with propriety.

10.0

CLIMATE CHANGE

10.1 There are no climate change implications in this report.

11.0 CONSULTATION

11.1 There has been consultation with the individuals concerned.

12.0 WARDS AFFECTED

12.1 All indirectly.

Contact Officer: Edd de Coverly, Chief Executive
Date: April 2018
Appendices: None
Background Papers: Localism Act 2011
Reference: X: Full Council/2017-18/250418

This page is intentionally left blank