

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 13 January 2022
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor P. Posnett MBE (Chair)

Councillors

M. Steadman (Vice-Chair)	R. Browne
P. Chandler	J. Douglas
E. Holmes	J. Illingworth
D. Pritchett	R. Smith
T. Webster	C. Evans (Substitute)

Officers

Assistant Director for Planning and Delivery
Solicitor
Senior Planning Officer (RR) (via remote connection)
Senior Democratic Services & Scrutiny Officer

Minute No.	Minute						
PL60	<p>Apologies for Absence An apology for absence was received from Councillor Wood and Councillor Evans attended as his substitute.</p>						
PL61	<p>Minutes The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December were confirmed as a true record.</p>						
PL62	<p>Declarations of Interest 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> <p>Minute PL65 – 21/01035/FUL – Field End, 10 The Green, Stathern Councillor Steadman advised that she would be representing her ward on this application by making a representation to the Committee. She would therefore take no part in the debate nor vote on this item in accordance with the Council’s Procedure Rules.</p>						
PL63	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>						
PL64	<p>Application 21/00834/FUL - Withdrawn This application was withdrawn from the agenda.</p>						
PL65	<p>Application 21/01035/FUL</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="288 1227 1441 1397"> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1227 504 1267">Application:</td> <td data-bbox="504 1227 1441 1267">21/01035/FUL</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1267 504 1308">Location:</td> <td data-bbox="504 1267 1441 1308">Field End, 10 The Green, Stathern -</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1308 504 1397">Proposal:</td> <td data-bbox="504 1308 1441 1397">Demolition of existing barn and 2 existing dwellings and their replacement with 3 new dwellings</td> </tr> </table> <p>(At 6:04 pm, Councillor Chandler entered the meeting.) (Councillor Steadman declared her intention to speak as Ward Councillor and moved into the public gallery, took no part in the debate nor voted on this application.)</p> <p>The Assistant Director for Planning and Delivery addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application and advised that since publication of the report, the Highway Authority had responded that they were happy with the parking provision despite mentioning that the access was not desirable but given the low traffic flow and small scale development they did not object to the application and provided conditions which were already included in the recommendation. Mr Worley also advised that a letter of objection had been received from the Parish Council which reiterated comments in the report about the age of the technical documents around flood, archaeology and wildlife and they related to the wider site rather than directly to the proposal. It was also queried as to whether the mains</p>	Application:	21/01035/FUL	Location:	Field End, 10 The Green, Stathern -	Proposal:	Demolition of existing barn and 2 existing dwellings and their replacement with 3 new dwellings
Application:	21/01035/FUL						
Location:	Field End, 10 The Green, Stathern -						
Proposal:	Demolition of existing barn and 2 existing dwellings and their replacement with 3 new dwellings						

sewerage system could accommodate this development and that an application had been made to the relevant authority to make a connection, during which they would assess capacity to be able to this demand.

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 Cherry Underwood of Stathern Parish Council
- Helen Broadhurst of Vale Planning Consultants
The Chair advised that an apology had been from Ms Broadhurst due to illness and the Chair read out her presentation.
- Councillor Mel Steadman, Ward Councillor

During discussion the following points were noted:

- It was disputed that the existing building was categorised as a barn and was considered to be a shed.
- There was concern that the application's supporting material mainly related to the previous application for 9 houses.
- The Assistant Director advised that the same issues were relevant from the previous report for 9 dwellings as the current report for 3 dwellings in relation to archaeology, geology and viewpoints. The drainage arrangements had changed as the new application referred to mains connection and the previous application included an attenuation pond.
- Emergency vehicles access was considered a concern as was turning into the development.
- It was felt the site was over-developed and offered 3 dwellings in an area where there should be 2 and there was no lack of housing supply in Stathern.
- It was considered parking was tight on the development and tandem parking was not desirable and went against the aim to raise standards.
- The development was considered to be in conflict with Local Plan Policies SS1, SS2, SS3, D1, EN1, EN6 and EN13. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan was included initially but this was not felt relevant at this time.
- It was felt the applicant should reconfigure the application and work with the Parish Council for a less intensive development.
- It was felt there was no justification for extending any building beyond the village and into the hillside.
- The Assistant Director advised that SS3 was not relevant to this site.

Councillor Browne proposed that the application be refused due to being in conflict with Local Plan Policies SS1, SS2, D1, EN1, EN6 and EN13. Councillor Pritchett seconded the motion.

RESOLVED

That the application be REFUSED, contrary to the Officer recommendation. The application represents overdevelopment which is out of character and unsympathetic to the site and its surroundings and would be harmful to the

character of this part of Stathern and the nearby Conservation Area. It is therefore in conflict with Local Plan Policies SS1, SS2, D1, EN1, EN6 and EN13.

(Unanimous)

(Councillor Steadman re-joined the Committee.)

PL66

Application 21/00056/FUL

Application:	21/00056/FUL
Location:	Penman Spicer Community Hall, Park Lane, Melton Mowbray, LE13 0PT
Proposal:	Conversion of existing Penman Spicer Community Hall to provide x5 studio 1 bed and 2 bedroom apartments and associated alterations and extensions

The Senior Planning Officer (RR) addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application and that there had been further discussions between the Case Officer and the agent regarding the location of the wheelie bins storage which the conditions would cover. There was also reference to the scooter charging and cycle storage.

It was also noted from dialogue with the agent that there had been a decline in community use at the site and the investment, repair and upgrade needed to make it fit for purpose was not viable hence this application for redevelopment.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that a letter of objection had been received which disputed the lack of use of the community facility and considered that the decline had been due to a lack of maintenance and promotion of the site which had made potential users look elsewhere.

With regard to the proposed flats meeting the decent homes standard, this was covered by condition 6 and there would need to be assurances signed off by Environmental Health and any breaches could be subject to enforcement action.

The Senior Planning Officer did not know who owned the brick wall at the rear of the property.

It was raised that with regard to paragraph 4.11 of the report which referred to alternative community facilities being Springfield Street and The Cove, these were currently not available for community use and their future was unknown. Clarification was provided that the statement had come from the agent that these other community sites were available for use.

Members were concerned that such a statement was published in a report that was untrue and had not been checked or validated. Clarification was provided that this part of the report conveyed the applicant's justification as submitted.

There was also concern that the development would impact upon a sense of place, heritage, use of the town, importance to visitors, economy and crime.

Due to the above concerns, there was a suggestion as to deferring the application however it was noted that the speakers needed to address the Committee before a proposal could be put.

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:

- Laura McMullen of Hayward McMullen, Agent
Ms McMullen responded to a Member query that it had been the Planning Officer who had added the specific alternative community facilities into the report and not the agent as suggested.
She advised that the wall at the rear of the property would be landscaped as part of the scheme and the target audience was the smaller, starter homes' market.
- Councillor Chris Fisher, Ward Councillor

During discussion the following points were noted:

- Clarification was provided to demonstrate that the references to alternative community facilities were drawn directly from the applicant's Design and Access Statement submitted in January 2021 by means of reading its content.
- There was a view that the Council should be looking to improve community centres and assets and provide more space for leisure and activities for young people and young families.
- It was felt that covid had increased people's desire to spend more time with those in their communities and this proposal would create a significant loss when the Council should be cultivating community cohesion.
- The proposal was for squashed housing and was to the detriment of enhancing and promoting well-located community space.
- There was concern at the health and safety as well as fire risk in housing the wheelie bins in porches.
- It was noted that older people also could make use of this type of community space should it be retained.
- There was concern at the current dilapidated condition of the facility and whether it was viable to refurbish and be maintained in the future.
- It was felt that 5 units was too many in such a space and there were inconsistencies in that there was only cycle access for 2 of the units.
- Members considered that they needed to raise standards and although smaller housing was needed, this proposal was not fit for purpose and was poorly designed.
- It was felt that more time and thought was needed to design something that fitted with the heritage of the building and took into account better and safer storage arrangements for bins and cycles etc.

Councillor Browne proposed that the application be refused due to being in conflict with Local Plan Policies D1 and EN13. Councillor Pritchett seconded the motion.

RESOLVED

That the application be REFUSED, contrary to the Officer recommendation, due to being in conflict with Local Plan Policies D1 and EN13. The proposal represents overdevelopment resulting in inadequate provision of facilities for residents such as storage for bins and cycles and would be contrary to Policy D1 of the Adopted Melton Local Plan.

The development would fail to make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the Conservation Area with which it is located and is not a use which would contribute to the conservation of the special character of the Conservation Area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy EN13 of the Adopted Melton Local Plan.

(Unanimous)

PL67

Urgent Business

The Committee was reminded of the mandatory planning training session to be held on Monday 31 January 2022 at 6.30 pm and to respond to Democratic Services regarding their attendance.

The meeting closed at: 7.22 pm

Chair