

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 22 July 2021
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor M. Glancy (Chair)

Councillors

P. Posnett MBE (Vice-Chair)	R. Browne
P. Chandler	A. Hewson
L. Higgins	E. Holmes
J. Illingworth	M. Steadman
P. Wood	J. Douglas (Substitute)

Observers

Officers

- Assistant Director for Planning and Delivery
- Planning Development Manager
- Senior Solicitor
- Senior Planning Officer (RR)
- Senior Planning Officer (AC)
- Democratic Services Manager
- Senior Democratic Services & Scrutiny Officer
- Democratic Services Officer (SE)

Minute No.	Minute						
PL9	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>An apology for absence was received from Councillor Bindloss and Councillor Douglas attended as his substitute. Councillor Hewson was not present at the start of the meeting.</p>						
PL10	<p>Minutes</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2021 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the Chair.</p>						
PL11	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Councillor Posnett held a standing personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to her role as a County Councillor.</p>						
PL12	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>						
PL13	<p>Application 20/01135/REM</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="288 927 1431 1144"> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 927 496 972">Reference:</td> <td data-bbox="496 927 1431 972">20/01135/REM</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 972 496 1016">Location:</td> <td data-bbox="496 972 1431 1016">Field OS 6260, Canal Lane, Hose</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1016 496 1144">Proposal:</td> <td data-bbox="496 1016 1431 1144">Application for the approval of reserved matters for layout of 34 dwellings and appearance and scale of 5 dwellings in relation to outline consent 19/00859/OUT</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Senior Planning Officer (AC) addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application and summarised that the recommendation was for approval.</p> <p>Members raised the following and officers responded :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing mix and high number of 3 bed plus homes and the low number of affordable homes. Response: The housing mix was in line with the policy and Neighbourhood Plan. Should the balance be tilted with further applications on the site, the percentage of smaller sized homes would then change. • Concern at the Severn Trent Water condition not being required as detailed in the report. Response: This was already included in the outline consent and to include it again would be a duplication. • The water supply and pressure to villages in the Vale was already poor yet Severn Trent Water had raised no concerns to this development. It was felt this was due to commercial benefit rather than assessing the water supply. Response: This matter had been raised with Severn Trent Water and the 	Reference:	20/01135/REM	Location:	Field OS 6260, Canal Lane, Hose	Proposal:	Application for the approval of reserved matters for layout of 34 dwellings and appearance and scale of 5 dwellings in relation to outline consent 19/00859/OUT
Reference:	20/01135/REM						
Location:	Field OS 6260, Canal Lane, Hose						
Proposal:	Application for the approval of reserved matters for layout of 34 dwellings and appearance and scale of 5 dwellings in relation to outline consent 19/00859/OUT						

company were partners in producing the local plan so were aware of the housing need. Discussions were ongoing with Severn Trent Water to address this concern at a strategic level as it is a recurring issue.

- In terms of the s106 agreement, when building larger houses, did this increase the viability meaning communities could receive more from larger sized housing. Response: Contributions were related to needs and infrastructure that was agreed on the principle of development not on housing type. However it was noted that all parties had been satisfied to receive what they had requested on this development.

It was mentioned that the housing mix would also be addressed for future applications on the site.

There were no public speakers registered for this application.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- The Ward Councillor and Parish Council supported the proposal
- The bungalows, architecture and design of the development was acceptable
- The applicant should note that the next phase needed 3 bed housing and affordables not bungalows
- It was mentioned that youth provision was needed for villages with significant new development for family homes such as this
- It was requested that the Parish Council be involved in allocating affordable homes and it was noted that a cascade plan was already in place and would be applied which included consultation with the Parish and Ward Councillors
- There was concern at the Severn Trent Water provision
- It was mentioned that due to more people working from home, 4 bed homes would become more desirable to accommodate home office space

Councillor Higgins proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Posnett seconded the motion.

(Councillor Hewson entered the meeting at 18.19 and took no part in the debate nor the vote on this application.)

RESOLVED

That application 20/01135/REM be APPROVED subject to conditions set out at Appendix C.

(Unanimous)

REASONS

The application site is allocated for housing in both the Melton Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan and outline planning permission for the development has been granted. The principle of the access and the number of units proposed were approved at outline stage.

The proposal as revised would result in a form of development that would be sympathetic to the character of the locality by virtue of its appearance and scale of 5 of the dwellings and the layout of all 34 dwellings.

The development would not unduly compromise residential amenity, or be harmful to highway safety. The scheme is considered to be respectful to the character of the area and would not cause substantial harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

PL14

Application 20/01388/REM

Application:	20/01388/REM
Location:	Spinney Campus - Brooksby Melton College, Melton Road, Brooksby
Proposal:	Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of development at the site comprising 70 dwellings and associated infrastructure (Outline Consent 19/01371/VAC)

The Senior Planning Officer (RR) addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application. He referred to a late representation that had been received from the Chief Executive of the SMB College Group outlining the benefits to the college and the community of approving the application which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. He updated the Committee on an error in a table in the report relating to home office rooms which were interpreted as additional bedrooms owing to their potential to be used as such. The updated table was as follows:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed
Market	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25 (35.7%)	39 (55.7%)

These percentages were based on the market housing only – the remaining 6 affordable housing representing the final 8.6% of the overall total of 70 dwellings on the site. He summarised that the recommendation was for approval.

Members raised the following and officers responded :

- The housing mix and high number of 4 bed plus homes. However it was noted that the Parish Council was in support of the allocation.
Response: Policy C2 allows for deviation from the optimum mix taking into account, amongst several criteria, site characteristics and was considered acceptable in relation to the isolated site.
- Steps were shown at the front door to some of the homes and accessibility was a concern.
Response: The photographs were purely shown for materials used on other sites and were not representative of this site.
- The volume and speed of traffic on the main road that leads to the entrance to the site.

Response: The Highway Authority was considering this and traffic lights was an option. However it is not one of the 'reserved matters' included in this application.

- Members felt a 40mph speed limit would be more beneficial for safety reasons than imposing traffic lights in a rural setting on such a major road between Leicester and Melton.

Response: The Highway Authority was looking into the matter and this was not part of the application at this meeting.

Pursuant to Chapter 2, Part 9, Paragraphs 2.8-2.28 of the Council's Constitution in relation to public speaking at Planning Committee, the Chair allowed the following to give a 3 minute presentation:

- Councillor Stuart Robinson, Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council

Councillor Robinson responded to Member queries that the Parish Council considered that housing needs were met for this site and its location and considered that the Parish Council had been fully involved in finalising the housing mix for the site. He added that the area would become its own hamlet and add to the vibrancy of the wider local community. He also felt that Severn Trent Water had a responsibility to provide water for the site and would like to work with partners in reducing the speed limit to 40 mph of the Leicester Road.

- Dawn Whitemore, CEO and Principal, SMB College Group

Ms Whitemore stated that investment such as the benefits from this development was critical for the college sector. She responded that road safety it was a major concern for the college and they would like to see a 40mph speed limit imposed.

- Sally Smith, Planning Director, Bloor Homes East Midlands

It was noted that the population projections were based on the 2012 housing needs study.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- Members were impressed by the Parish Council support and strong endorsement of the bigger picture including the wider impact of improvements to the college, theatre and local economy
- The Parish Council and community had undertaken a significant journey and the overall scheme complied with the Neighbourhood Plan and delivered more affordable housing than previously presented
- Although it was an isolated site the Planning Inspector had already given permission for the development of the site
- The benefits which included regeneration of the town centre and ensured the viability of the college in the town helped to make the development worthwhile for approval
- The green credentials for the development were appreciated

- A common sense approach was needed for improved road safety
- There was a request to add a condition for screening the pumping station
- There were requests for instructions that the affordable homes be retained in perpetuity and a nesting box be provided
- There was concern as to whether Members would be liable for accidents along the Melton to Leicester Road at Brooksby and the Senior Solicitor advised that as a consultee and partner, it was the Leicestershire County Council as the Highway Authority which was responsible for the safety of the road

Councillor Browne proposed that the application be approved with an additional condition relating to screening the pumping station. Councillor Illingworth seconded the motion.

RESOLVED

That application 20/01388/REM be APPROVED subject to the conditions set out at Appendix C and an additional condition relating to screening the pumping station.

(Unanimous)

REASONS

The application site benefits from outline planning permission with access for residential development comprising up to 70 dwellings. The principle of the access and the number of units proposed were approved at the outline stage.

The proposal, as amended following negotiations, would result in a form of development that would be sympathetic to the character of the locality by virtue of its appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and would not unduly compromise residential amenity.

The scheme is considered to be respectful of, and responds to, the topography of the site with limited intrusion upon the landscape arising from engineering works. It is considered that the proposal would fit in with and enhance the site in a positive manner.

The scheme is considered to satisfy the requirements of the applicable Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies, including Policy 15 specifically applicable to this site.

PL15	<p>Urgent Business There was no urgent business.</p>
------	---

The meeting closed at: 7.48 pm

Chair