

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