

# Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	<b>Planning Committee</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>Thursday, 25 July 2019</b>
<b>Start time</b>	<b>6.00 pm</b>
<b>Venue</b>	<b>Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH</b>

## Present:

**Chair** Councillor M. Glancy (Chair)

<b>Councillors</b>	P. Chandler	P. Cumbers
	J. Douglas	P. Faulkner
	L. Higgins	E. Holmes
	M. Steadman	A. Hewson
	R. Smedley	

## **Observers**

**Officers**

Solicitor To The Council (RP)  
Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services  
Development Manager (LP)  
Administrative Assistant (KS)

Minute No.	Minute
PL101	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b>  Cllr Posnett, who was substituted by Cllr Smedley  Cllr Wood, who was substituted by Cllr Hewson  Cllr Illingworth</p>
PL102	<p><b>Minutes</b>  Minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2019</p> <p>A Cllr wished for the spelling mistake of 'compliant' to be corrected on page 3, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph down.</p> <p>Approval of the minutes was proposed by Cllr Faulkner and seconded by Cllr Steadman. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.</p>
PL103	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b>  Cllr Chandler declared a personal interest in application 19/00560/FUL and stated that she would leave the meeting for the discussion and determination.</p>
PL104	<p><b>Schedule of Applications</b></p>
PL105	<p><b>19/00560/FUL</b>  Cllr Chandler left the meeting at 6.06pm</p> <p>19/00560/FUL</p> <p><b>Applicant: Duchess of Rutland</b>  <b>Location: Fields OS 2571, 4565 and 3251 Barkestone Lane, Plungar</b>  <b>Proposal: Retention of fertilizer silo and water tank.</b></p> <p>(a) The Development Manager (LP) presented the report and stated that:  The application is for the retention of a fertilizer silo and water tank at Barkestone Lane, Plungar, the requirement for a planning application has been raised by the proposal being retrospective and therefore not able to be considered under the prior notification assessment.  The site totals 35 sqm comprising a concrete base which supports a single 50 cubic metre liquid fertilizer storage tank and a 26,000 litre vertical sprayer tank, which are to be used in relation to the farming activities belonging to the Belvoir Estate.  Since the committee report has been published 2 additional representations have been received which raises concern over spill capture and visual impact, comments have now been received from the Canal and River Trust who recommend that Natural England are consulted in order to obtain appropriate advice to identify whether the proposal presents any likely risk to the SSI and if so, whether they can be adequately mitigated.  The application is recommended for refusal due to the prominent location causing</p>

visual harm to the open countryside and surrounding landscape contrary to Policy EN1 of the Local Plan. The siting in this location is also considered to cause harm to the setting of the Grade II\* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul and the Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse contrary to Policy EN13 of the Local Plan.

(b) Cllr Smith, from the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Lack of application
- Retrospective
- Substantial harm to setting
- Contrary to Policy EM1
- Insensitive siting
- Rural setting
- Planning permission should have been sought first
- No evidence of it being necessary in this location

A Cllr asked when the silos were built and when the complaints started.

Cllr Smith stated they were built approximately 2 years ago and complaints started before this year.

(c) Cllr Evans, the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Location concerns
- OS Survey trigger point
- Location of Grade II listed buildings
- Multitude of footpaths providing views
- Concern on late information circulated
- No justification of site
- A less intrusive site could be found
- Visual intrusion
- Lack of security and potential for vandalism
- Area is constantly used – there is often flytipping
- Concrete base would not contain fertiliser if it were to leak

**Cllr Holmes proposed to defer the application** as she had concerns about the late submission of information and it should be looked at properly and shared with the Parish Council and local people.

**Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to defer** and stated that Members should not be presented with extra information at the meeting and that it is needed well in advance.

A Cllr stated that they could not support a deferment and noted that the late letter would have been the agent's 4 minute speaking slot. If the application is refused it will need to come back to find a second location.

A Cllr asked if it needs planning permission as it is nearly 2 years since it was built.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that it needs planning permission because it is retrospective. If an application had been submitted before it was built it may have been built under 'Prior Notification'.

A Cllr stated that they may have considered other sites as a possibility if they had been told to.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that a Prior Notification application would have investigated this.

A vote to defer the application was taken. 2 Members voted in favour of deferment. 7 Members voted against.

**Cllr Faulkner proposed to refuse the application** as it is the highest point in the area, is the setting of 2 listed buildings, and is above a site of scientific interest.

**Cllr Steadman seconded the proposal to refuse.**

A Cllr was concerned about the possible contamination of the canal.

A Cllr supported the proposal to refuse and encouraged the applicant to work with the Parish Council and LPA to find a better site.

A Cllr asked if the application applied for temporary planning permission could Committee condition a limit, and ask for consultation on possible sites.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that the LPA could either approve for a temporary period of time or serve an enforcement notice, which will be served with a certain time scale.

The Chair wished for ample time to be given for removal.

A Cllr suggested 6 months would be sufficient.

The Solicitor to the Council advised that an enforcement notice could be served with this timescale in.

A vote to refuse the application was taken. 8 Members voted in favour of refusal. 1 Member abstained.

**Determination: REFUSE, for the following reasons:**

- 1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the silo, water bowser and associated concrete base in this location is considered contrary to Policy EN1 of the Melton Local Plan by reason of its prominent location and visibility, resulting in a imposing, adverse impact upon the intrinsic character of its open countryside location and to the detriment of its landscape setting.**

	<p><b>2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, The siting of this agricultural equipment has been insensitively placed, resulting in harm to the setting of the Grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul and the Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse. The proposal is therefore contrary to EN13 of the Melton Local Plan which states proposals should ensure the protection and enhancement of heritage assets, including their setting. No public benefits are present to outweigh this harm.</b></p>
PL106	<p><b>19/00217/FUL</b> Cllr Chandler returned to the meeting at 6.35pm</p> <p>19/00217/FUL</p> <p><b>Applicant: Countryside Properties (UK) Limited - Olivia Hoare</b> <b>Location: Land West of Bowling Green, Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray</b> <b>Proposal: 14 residential dwellings comprising 10 x 2 bed units and 4 x 3 bed units</b></p> <p>(a) The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report.</p> <p>(b) Chris May, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No technical objections</li> <li>• Social benefit outweighs concerns of Developer Contributions</li> <li>• Affordable mix of houses</li> <li>• Meets needs for affordable housing</li> <li>• £50,000 contribution from developer</li> <li>• Local people will occupy homes</li> <li>• Incorrect to assume increase in services is needed</li> <li>• Sustainable location</li> <li>• Travel contribution not necessary</li> <li>• Site will be left undeveloped if not accepted</li> </ul> <p>A Cllr asked what green aspect it will take and if there are plans for grounds, solar tiles, and materials.</p> <p>Mr May stated that the materials will be in keeping with the site, designed to a high specification and to Homes England requirements.</p> <p>A Cllr stated there will be over 100 houses in the area and asked what play facilities will be available, and the size of the leap.</p> <p>Mr May advised that there is a public open space to the north of the site and if a leap is required this can be secured by S106.</p>

A Cllr if the planning department are content to recommend to permit in the light of LCC response.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services confirmed they are because the LCC response was expected. There is a choice between delivering affordable housing and forfeiting developer contributions, or the need to follow Policy IN3.

A Cllr stated there are 111 properties and 53 of those will be affordable housing. However the previous application was for shared ownership or affordable rent, and there has been a huge change. The NPPF paragraph 64 says at least 10% affordable home ownership and the figures have to be contended. Did not think this proposal is policy compliant. Of the 53 affordable homes not one is affordable home ownership in terms of a starter home or a discount market home in perpetuity to the residents. Cannot support this type of application, however might be able to support subject to this being conditioned and negotiated.

A Cllr stated that if £187,000 from the County Council is divided by 14 it is £16,000 a house. Extra services are not needed as these are for local people. Suggested the application needs deferring to go into it in more detail.

A Cllr was concerned that it is too expensive and people cannot get on the housing ladder. Houses need to be affordable all the time and therefore must consider being green.

A Cllr stated that local people should be prioritised.

A Cllr stated that the agent said the developer would consider adding equipment to the play area but could we possibly ask for an amount of money towards a possibility of something in the south of the town.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that changing the tenureship as a condition of approval is beyond the scope of a condition and to pursue this the application would need to be deferred for further negotiations. Prioritising local people is built into the application as the people will be from the Council's waiting list and the 106 would reinforce this. In terms of green homes, these will be built to the regulations and our Policy says that extra green and efficiency measures would be welcomed. The leap will be included in the site, not be deflected elsewhere.

**Cllr Higgins proposed to defer the application** because the tenureship should reflect other people's needs that need accommodating as well as that provided for by than affordable rent or shared ownership, such as starter homes or in perpetuity discount market housing. If an offsite contribution for play equipment is preferred then this could be negotiated.

**Cllr Chandler seconded the proposal to defer.**

A Cllr stated that affordable homes are in demand and much needed. The benefits outweigh the harm. The location is sustainable and the area could remain undeveloped.

A vote was taken. 8 Members voted in favour of deferral. 1 Member voted against. 2 Members abstained.

**Determination: DEFER:**

**(i) to seek a revised housing mix and examine whether this would have a benefit in closing the shortfall below the County Council's s106 requests and the sums offered and;**

**(ii) Seek a financial contribution in lieu of on site provision for play equipment**

PL107

**18/00518/FUL**

**Applicant: McCarthy And Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd**

**Location: Catherine Dalley House, Scalford Road, Melton Mowbray**

**Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, erection of 46 retirement apartments, 10 bungalows, communal facilities, landscaping, access, car parking and ancillary development.**

(a) The Development Manager (LP) presented the report and stated that:

The application is for the demolition of existing buildings notably the former care home and Silverdale Lodge and proposes the erection of 46 retirement apartments, 10 bungalows, and associated works. Of the total 56 homes being proposed, 23 are 1 bed living apartments, 23 are 2 bed living apartments and 10 are 2 bed bungalows.

The scheme consist of a single building in the form of a 3 and 2 storey L shaped block occupying a similar part of the site to the existing car home building. Bungalows are proposed to have a dormer style and there is sufficient outdoor space associated with the development and additional tree planting and landscaping envisaged. The proposal will have traditional materials and the design will reflect the character of the original house.

A Financial Viability Assessment has been submitted as part of the proposal and independently assessed by the District Valuer Service which concluded that a planning policy compliant scheme is not viable, and that the proposed scheme can only viably support an affordable housing offsite contribution of £210,000 together with contributions towards the NHS of £24,307 and Libraries of £1,340 the agent has confirmed that an offer of £235,647 in line with the independent viability conclusion is made. In order for the scheme to be policy compliant a sum of £706,893 would be requested.

It is considered however that together with the positive nature of the scheme in design terms and the provision of a form of housing for which

there is a recognised need for this is sufficient to justify the shortfall in contributions and the application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and the requisite Section 106 agreement being made.

(b) Neil Martyn, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Well designed scheme
- Positive use
- No technical objections
- Lots of public support
- Sustainable location
- Meets identified local need
- Good mix of housing including bungalows
- Complies with Planning Policy

A Cllr asked if the site will be gated or if the green areas will be open to the public.

Mr Martyn stated that the garden space will not be accessible to the public as there is the safety of the residents to consider.

A Cllr asked if any trees will be taken down as these screen the noise and should be retained.

Mr Martyn stated that the trees at the front will be retained as these all have TPO's. The only tree being taken out is a small one to widen access.

The Chair stated there is a well established hedge and asked if the fence will be on the inside of the hedge, or if the hedge is being removed.

Mr Martyn stated that it depends on the ownership and that all existing landscaping will be attempted to be retained.

The Applications and Advice Manager advised that the plan states a 2m close bound fencing and there could be a condition requesting further landscaping above what has been submitted.

**Cllr Holmes proposed to permit the application** as it is a brilliant scheme, has a good ambience and is much wanted.

**Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to permit** and stated it is much needed, a lovely setting and a good use of the land.

The Chair asked if the proposer and seconder are happy to add a landscaping condition.

Cllr Holmes stated that a condition should be added to retain the hedge.

A Cllr had concerns about the swift nesting sites and asked if this could be

conditioned to be mitigated.

The Applications and Advice Manager stated that condition 17 covers this and 10 swift boxes will be provided.

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

**Determination: PERMIT subject to:**

- (i) Conditions as set out in the report;**
- (ii) Adjustment of or an additional condition to secure retention of hedges**
- (iii) Completion of a s106 agreement to secure the offered developer contributions for:**

- **Off site Affordable housing provision**
  - **NHS contribution;**
  - **Libraries contribution**
- for the sums set out in the report.**

**REASONS:**

**The site has a sustainable location close to the town centre, and the proposal would secure a beneficial use of a currently unused brownfield site. The scheme will bring much needed accommodation for older people in an accessible location, and with a resolution of the issue of developer contributions being offered, the proposal largely accords with the relevant and material provisions of the development plan including its housing objectives. The proposed development involves a high quality design that will enhance both the character and appearance of the local area. The proposal would secure a high standard of design and ensure satisfactory amenity for future and existing occupiers.**

PL108

**19/00365/FULHH**

**Applicant: Mr & Mrs A Abrames**

**Location: 42 Avon Road, Melton Mowbray**

**Proposal: Side and front extension to form an annex and a two storey rear extension to include demolition of existing garage.**

(a) The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report.

(b) Mr C Ward, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- More like a small bed and breakfast than an extension
- 5 bed home needs 3 parking spaces – insufficient space for this
- Extension comes out 5m from the front and prevents view
- Original extension and proposal exceeds permitted square footage the Council policy allows
- Boundary position on plan appears to be incorrect
- One of the datum points was taken from middle retaining wall
- Retaining wall belongs to neighbouring property and has right of access

- Wall already prepared for past neighbours at a cost of £750
- Drawing comes within 8 inches of retaining wall
- Distance between drawings and main wall of the house would be 51 inches
- Lift would cause excessive noise
- Lack of communication with LPA
- Extension is out of character

A Cllr asked if the window on the plan is the same window Mr Ward was referring to.

Mr Ward stated that if the building comes out past their property they would not be able to see down the road.

A Cllr asked if it will affect the light.

Mr Ward stated it will affect the view but a shadow from the extension may also affect the light.

(c) Mrs Abrames, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Extension is needed due to needs of mother and care for children
- More space and bedrooms are needed
- Windows are in roof so neighbour will not be overlooked
- Building lines kept back to reduce impact
- Structural Engineer hired to help
- Party Wall Act engaged
- View cannot be seen through dense trees
- Lift does not make noise
- Moving out of home to ensure building will be done quicker

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that there is a requirement for 3 spaces for which there is ample space on the property. There are no specified limits to the scale of a property and it should be judged on impact. There will be no shadowing or lack of light as it is due north. Right of access and the Party Wall Act is not a planning condition so cannot be adjudicated by the Committee as part of this determination.

A Cllr stated that the development takes the whole of the site and it is dangerous. If there was a fire at the back of the house there is no way to it. Could be configured differently.

A Cllr stated that it is a mass development and out of character of the area. It is a fire risk as there is no access to the back.

A Cllr stated that the view is not a planning consideration, however the wall is very close to the neighbour's window. Concerned about the use of the lift and how occupants will get out if there is a fire.

A Cllr noted there are no plans for the indoor designs therefore it is not known what the fire escapes are, and asked if fire risk comments had been received.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that this is an element of building regulations. There is no requirement to maintain a right of access to the back of the house. The extension would not come in front of the neighbour's window.

A Cllr stated that they were not happy with the design. It has a large impact on other dwellings.

A Cllr stated that it fills the whole front of land allocation, but so do the neighbouring properties. The neighbouring property already has issues with views and could not see a reason to refuse.

A Cllr stated that the design to the front could have been more sympathetic. The fire escape issues are for building regulations to deal with.

The Solicitor to the Council stated that the fire hazard is covered by Building Control and the development needs to be judged on overshadowing, streetscene, etc.

**Cllr Holmes proposed to refuse the application** due to over intensification of the site and the impact on streetscene. The development can be altered and designed better.

**Cllr Faulkner seconded the proposal to refuse** and stated that it is not sympathetic to the character and is against Policy D1.

The Chair stated that the scale of development is very large, has a negative impact on the street view, is overbearing and over-intensified, and against Policy D1.

A vote was taken. 7 Members voted in favour of refusal. 2 Members voted against. 1 Member abstained.

**DETERMINATION: REFUSED for the following reason:**

**The proposal represents and over-intensive use of the site by virtue of the width, mass and forward projection of the proposed extensions, which would result in an adverse impact on the street scene, would not sympathetic to the area and would fail to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would therefore be contrary to Policy D1 of the Adopted Melton Local Plan 2018.**

PL109

**19/00165/COU**

**Applicant: Mr Lewis Wardle**

**Location: 24-26 Pate Road, Melton Mowbray**

**Proposal: Proposed retention of a Crossfit Gymnasium. Change of use from B2 to D2.**

(a) The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report.

(b) Jeremy Watkinson, an objector, had a statement read out by the Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services and stated that:

Following the publication of the planning departments report and recommendation with regard the change of use of units 24-26 Pate Road, Leicester Road industrial Estate (Planning Application Number: 19/00165/COU) from B1/B2 to D2 use, My initial concerns I raised with the Council Chief Executive are now a grave reality, we are heading for a U turn on the Melton Plan.

The planning officer has decided that sport and recreation take precedence over what is meant to be a safeguarded space for industry and employment.

If MBC does not stand by the very comprehensive and meticulously constructed Melton Plan it will send completely the wrong message to businesses looking to move or expand in Melton, when MBC then makes changes so freely on what appears to be the recommendation of one planning officer to valuable industrial and employment space that had specifically been safeguarded for very good reasons in the Melton plan and was approved by the full council members.

It would appear that the author of the planning report is the same planning officer that had given pre-application planning advice to the applicant and so it could be seen as a conflict of interests and maybe why the planning report looks so biased with missing and incorrect key facts.

The amount of industrial space in the Melton plan is measured in square feet/meters and not in the number of industrial units. There would be a clear loss of B1/B2 space if the application was approved units 24-26 are 4160 square feet, the gyms previous unit number 32 was only 1400 square feet, this unit also had no change of use, so the space was included in the Melton plan reports for the total industrial area for Melton.

If the application is approved we will see a lose of 4160 square feet of B1/B2 industrial space this will mean businesses like my own will find it impossible to expand and take on additional staff without moving out of Melton.

The membership of the gym is given as 90+ in the applicants supporting statement with plans to increase the membership in the new site.

LHA in their original consultation response asked for the number of gym users so they could determine the amount of parking required, this question has never been answered?

The planning officer's report now only puts membership at 60-70??

Since the extra parking was created by the gym last month I have noticed we still get on-street parking from gym members when their own parking is full, please can we look at the true facts on these numbers.

My own business PPC Labels in units 16 & 18 has 4500 square feet and employs 12 full and part time staff, if we had taken on units 24-26 last November we intended to install two pieces of printing equipment and would have employed a further 4 people.

It gives you an idea of the potential employment use for industry compared with a one man gym operation. We also have a number of suppliers in Melton that benefit from our business so the bigger picture should be considered with industrial use. Just to be clear my objection is definitely not intended to close the gym down, I am sure a solution could be found where by the gym could move to another suitable site in or around Melton and units 24-26 retained for industrial use and employment. I am surprised that the planning officer has not considered or mentioned this possibility in the report.

I would strongly advise that this application is not passed and instead more time given into looking at a solution whereby the industrial space can be retained and another site found for the gym, this would result in a "win win" situation for MBC and the Melton plan left unscathed.

Other points to note:

Units 24-26 also have a large capacity 3 phase electricity supply, a vital resource for industrial and manufacturing use that is now being wasted, Western Power have no spare capacity at this end of Pate Road.

Just one more point to consider with regard the overall planning strategy for the estate and the promised future industrial development.

Since we purchased our units and moved my business to the industrial estate in 2011 we have seen a number of the two or three unit premises come on the market and sold to investors, they have then split the units up into small individual units, this is fine for small start up business but leaves the industrial estate desperately short on medium sized units. Unless MBC can push forward with their plans/promises of more industrial space and of suitable sizes to fill this gap we will find businesses have to move out of Melton due to the shortage of medium sized unit space.

With regard to Health and Safety: I am surprised that Leicestershire Fire dept. has not been consulted on the suitability of the building for a gym and if any work is required to bring it up to the required levels with the change of use. I am sure if a Pure Gym or a MBC owned property was to apply for change of use/ refurbishment a full plans application would be necessary and building regs followed, I would have thought it would also be appropriate in this case.

With regard the use of the road by the gym in their work out schedules, I did

question LHA at what number of users is an application required for this purpose I understand that with events on the public roads organisers are required to have carried out a risk assessment and have public liability insurance in place for ten million pounds, the gym members may be very careful but it is the other road users that must also be considered.

With regard the noise issue we have experienced over the last 7 months, now that Environmental Health have taken action we will see if it can now be controlled.

All these points that I have raised need to be fully looked into and clear answers given.

I very much hope that all the options available are looked into before this application is approved and the Melton Plan eroded.

(c) Brendan McMullan, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Prior to 1 objection no complaints were made in 4 years
- No net loss of B1 use
- Surrounded by B1 units
- Environmental Health have been worked with
- Acoustic tests carried out – no nuisance
- Applicant happy to have noise levels conditioned
- More than adequate parking
- 14 letters of support from businesses within estate
- No ambition to increase membership
- Positive and inclusive business
- Much needed to promote wellbeing and health

A Cllr asked what the busiest times were.

Mr McMullan stated there are 2 classes in the morning, midday and 5/6/7pm.

The Chair asked what the cap on membership is.

Mr McMullan advised 100 members.

(d) Cllr Posnett had a statement read out by the Chair and stated that:

- Retrospective application as applicant was not aware the unit was B1.
- No alterations or extensions
- Carpark extended at applicant's own expense
- Noise can be conditioned
- Environmental Health have already visited
- Local Plan promotes health and wellbeing
- Employs 2/3 people
- Fulfils 1 aim of the Local Plan

A Cllr had concerns that the application is a breach of the local plan and this may set precedent. Not convinced there is a surplus of B1 units.

**Cllr Cumbers proposed to permit the application** and stated that other industrial estates should perhaps include something like this as it services the people in the estate. There is a lot of new housing in the area and this will be an asset.

**Cllr Higgins seconded the proposal to permit** and asked if the COU could be just for this business and the unit go back to its original use if sold on.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that it could be personalised to specific use of a gym.

The Solicitor to the Council stated that there could be a limit to narrow the use and attach a condition to narrow to gym. This can be temporary and come up for reconsideration at the end of the lease; however it is rare to impose this.

A Cllr asked if it could be limited to 6 years.

A Cllr suggested it could be B1 and a gym.

A Cllr asked what constitutes as industrial activity as there is currently a café, offices and a kitchen showroom on the estate.

A vote was taken. 9 Members voted in favour of permit. 1 Member abstained. Cllr Chandler wished for her abstention to be recorded.

**DETERMINATION : PERMIT, subject to conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition limiting the use to a gym only and allowing reversion to B” should it become vacated**

**REASONS: Use as a gym is not strictly compliant with Local Plan Policy EC3 as this policy seeks to retain the units for industrial purposes on this site. However, the gym has been operating from this estate in a different, smaller, unit for some considerable time. It is in an estate of 100 or more units and would not therefore compromise the intended use of the overall site.**

**The unit from which this business has relocated has been re-let for its industrial purposes and as such there is no ‘net loss’ of available industrial units. The proposal would otherwise comply in terms of its visual, sustainable and highway requirements. Employment opportunities would be retained while promoting health and well being close to where people work in accordance with Policy C9**

PL110

**19/00513/FUL**

**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Wyles**

**Location: 9 Lyle Close, Melton Mowbray**

**Proposal: Single storey rear and first floor side extensions.**

(a) The Development Manager presented the report and stated that:

The proposal is a householder application for the erection of a single storey rear and first floor side extension to dwelling, the proposal is before you as the applicant is a member of staff.

The proposal would provide for a larger bathroom and additional bedroom at first floor level and the addition of a utility room to the ground floor. The development is considered to be subservient to the host dwelling and sympathetic to the character of the area, having no detrimental impact on either the street scene or the amenity of neighbouring occupants, and therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

**Cllr Chandler proposed to permit the application.**

**Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal to permit.**

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

**DETERMINATION: APPROVED, subject to the conditions as set out in the report**

**REASONS: The development would appear subservient to the host dwelling and be sympathetic to the character of the area, having no detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the site and the street scene. Proposed materials would ensure the development respects the existing dwelling and wider character of the area. The proposed development would therefore accord to Policy D1 of the Melton Local Plan and the overall aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.**

PL111	<b>Urgent Business</b> None
-------	--------------------------------

The meeting closed at: 8.38 pm

Chair