

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 6 September 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair

Councillors

P. Baguley
G. Botterill
M. Glancy
E. Holmes

T. Bains
P. Cumbers
T. Greenow
B. Rhodes

Observers

Officers

Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
Development Manager (LP)
Administrative Assistant (JD)
Administrative Assistant (KS)

Minute No.	Minute
PL33	<p>Apologies for Absence Cllr Faulkner</p>
PL34	<p>Minutes Minutes of the meeting held on 16th August 2018</p> <p>The Chair advised that a member of the public had commented that the minutes do not accurately record the meeting. Members agreed that the minutes were correct.</p> <p>Approval of the minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Baguley. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.</p>
PL35	<p>Declarations of Interest Cllrs Rhodes and Posnett declared an interest in matters which may arise in relation to the County Council.</p> <p>The Chair advised that ordinarily Cllr Orson would speak on application 18/00633/FUL as he is Ward Councillor; however he declared a disclosable pecuniary interest.</p>
PL36	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL36.1	<p>17/01042/FUL and 17/01043/LBC Applicant: WTF Projects Ltd Location: The Red Lion, Grantham Road, Bottesford Proposal: Change of use and alterations (including demolition of rear extension and erection of new single storey rear extension) of existing public house building to form 2 dwellings, and erection of 1(No.) 3- bedroom dwelling.</p> <p>The Chair advised that both applications had been withdrawn from the agenda.</p> <p>The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services explained that this was because further information had been received and more time was needed to provide an updated report.</p>
PL36.2	<p>18/00632/OUT Applicant: Penland Estates Ltd Location: Field 6967, Grantham Road, Bottesford Proposal: Residential development for up to 60 dwellings with access from Grantham Road and associated drainage infrastructure and public open space.</p> <p>(a) The Development Manager (LP) presented the report and stated that: The application seeks outline planning permission for up to 60 dwellings with</p>

only details of access being considered at this stage, all other details are to be considered at Reserved Matters stage.

The application form part of the proposed allocated site BOT2 in the emerging Local Plan along with the recently permitted 17/01577/OUT, discussions with the agent have confirmed that as per the second part of the allocation a link can be provided between the two sites and members are encouraged within the report to consider whether this should be conditioned accordingly.

It should also be noted by members as per the report that the capacity number given in the emerging Local Plan is an estimated number only and is not a fixed amount, a minimum nor a maximum. The indicative layout shows how the 60 dwellings could satisfactorily be accommodated on the site.

Since the publishing of the report, Archaeology comments have been received from the County Council who raise no objections to the proposal following on from the additional information received.

There are no further updates to the report and the application is recommended for approval subject to Section 106 requirements and conditions as set out in the report.

(b) Cllr Chandler, the Ward Cllr, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Affordable housing included
- No traffic concerns
- 106 payment is acceptable
- Poor quality pasture land
- Ragwort present but can be treated
- Station improvements welcome

A Cllr asked if the contribution to health services was requested by the LPA, the NHS, or the local CCG.

The Development Manager confirmed that NHS England requested the s106 contribution.

The Chair asked Members if they would suspend standing orders to allow the agent, who arrived late, to speak. All Members were in favour.

(c) Andrew Gore, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Allocated site in the Local Plan
- No technical issues
- No objection from consultees
- Layout informed through meetings with Bottesford Parish Council and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan steering group
- Respects Local Plan policy
- Pedestrian connectivity between 2 sites by condition

A Cllr noted that there was no play area included.

Mr Gore stated that it is an outline application and therefore flexible. A public open space is provided and a play area could be included, however the Davidson's site nearby does have a playground.

A Cllr stated that there was no condition for pedestrian connectivity.

The Development Manager advised that the report leaves this up to the Members to decide.

A Cllr asked how many houses there are to the acre.

Mr Gore stated that the layout shows slightly less than 60. An upper limit had been set to allow flexibility. He advised there are 30 dwellings per hectare.

A Cllr had concerns about the junction to the 52.

Mr Gore stated that there was no objection from Highways.

The Chair asked for assurance that the developers will honour the percentage of affordable houses.

Mr Gore stated that the 106 has been signed on this basis and is viable.

A Cllr stated that they would like to see open space between houses and upon entrance to the site.

The Chair stated that a spacious buffer had been created at the back of the site, therefore the development needed to be further forward.

A Cllr asked if there could be a vehicular link between the two sites.

The Development Manager stated that both applications are outline with access so there is no restriction as present and can be conditioned.

A Cllr stated that the S106 contribution is modest and affordable housing should be insisted upon.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services advised that affordable housing could be conditioned, contingent on S106.

Cllr Rhodes proposed to permit the application with the condition of level of affordable housing as in report.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal with the inclusion of improvements made to the junction to the 52 as it is dangerous.

The Chair advised that this is Highways responsibility. Cllr Holmes was still happy to second the proposal.

A Cllr asked if a condition could be added to vehicular and pedestrian link the 2 sites.

The proposer and seconder were happy to include both.

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

Determination:

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 impact upon character are considered to be of limited harm.

This is because, in this location, 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.

PL36.3

18/00633/FUL

Applicant: Mr Scott Jones

Location: Reservoir at Six Hills Lane, Old Dalby

Proposal: Proposed conversion of Reservoir to one dwelling.

(a) The Development Manager (LP) presented the report and stated that:
The application seeks full planning permission to convert an underground reservoir to one dwelling. The NPPF is considered to form the policy basis for decision making in this instance and of particular importance to this application is paragraph 79 and 131 which allow for development in isolated locations in exceptional circumstances which this is considered to be.

There are no updates to the report and the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

A Cllr was concerned that the Saltway is a dangerous and busy road.

Cllr Greenow proposed to permit the application as per the recommendation.

Cllr Bains seconded the proposal.

A Cllr stated that it is a good scheme but the road is busy and fatalities have occurred. Asked if the road could be widened,

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that the proposal has sizeable site lines of 90m.

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

Determination: It is considered that given the provisions of paragraphs 79 and 131 of the NPPF and the proposed design of the building, sustainability credentials, limited extension and the reuse of an existing building, that the principle of the dwelling is acceptable in these circumstances.

PL36.4

18/00777/FUL

Applicant: Mr Jamieson

Location: The Hollies, 6 Cross Street, Gaddesby

Proposal: Proposed two storey dwelling

(a) The Development Manager (LP) presented the report and stated that:
The proposal seeks full permission for the erection of a two storey three bedroom dwelling which has been amended during the application process.

Since the publishing of the report three further representations have been received, no additional issues have been raised within those representations from those discussed within the report.

There are no further updates to the report and the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

(a) Gary Fox, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Housing Need Survey concludes a requirement for housing is 2 Affordable Housing, 8 Shared Ownership and 8 Open Market
- Planning permission given to 14 homes and considered for 11 dwellings
- Proposal does not satisfy requirement for housing need
- Not an extension to or enhancement of existing dwelling
- Conservation area
- Attractive, historical and peaceful setting
- Detracts from setting
- Loss of privacy for immediate neighbour
- Parking issues
- Pedestrian access issues
- Change to streetscene
- Not in keeping with area

(b) Austin Healey, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Dust and noise issues
- Overbearing
- Overdevelopment
- Overlooks property, privacy issues
- Hedging removal not possible – will struggle to keep alive
- Parking lots go over boundary into neighbouring property

A Cllr stated that the 2012 NPPF discouraged inappropriate development in a residential garden and asked what the policy is in the current version.

The Development Manager stated that it is the policy making that indicates the residential development within existing gardens. There is nothing to specifically state new development.

A Cllr stated that a development elsewhere had previously been refused for this reason.

Cllr Holmes proposed to refuse the application as it would be bad planning. The Silver Birch Trees should not be taken down. It is overdevelopment in a village, impacts negatively on the streetscene, and there are parking issues.

Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal to refuse due to loss of trees and changes to streetscene in a conservation area. A development should improve not harm to conservation area.

A Cllr stated that there would be an impact on the streetscene, changes to a conservation area and there are highways problems.

A Cllr stated that it would damage the rural character and asked if the proposer and seconder would include inappropriate development of a residential garden as a reason to refuse.

The proposer and seconder accepted the reason.

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

Determination: Refused for the following reasons:

The proposed erection of a new dwelling in this location is considered to represent overdevelopment of the site. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to conflict with Policy D1 a) of the emerging Local Plan, BE1 of the Melton Local Plan 1999 and the NPPF paragraphs 127 b) and 131.

The proposed erection of a new dwelling in this location would be out of keeping with the established character of the surrounding residential area. Accordingly, the proposal is deemed to conflict with Policy D1 a) and c) of the emerging Local Plan, BE1 of the Melton Local Plan 1999 and the NPPF paragraph 9, 127 c) and 130

The proposed erection of a new dwelling in this location would result in the inappropriate development of a residential garden. Accordingly, the proposal is deemed to conflict with NPPF paragraph 122 d)

PL37

Urgent Business

None

The meeting closed at: 7.04 pm

Chair