

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 9 November 2017
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
P. Faulkner	M. Glancy
T. Greenow	E. Holmes
J. Wyatt	B. Rhodes (Substitute)

Observers

Officers

- Solicitor To The Council (SP)
- Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
- Regulatory Services Manager
- Planning Officer (GBA)
- Administrative Assistant (AS)

Minute No.	Minute
PL54	<p>Apologies for Absence Cllr Posnett sent her apologies and was substituted by Cllr Rhodes.</p>
PL55	<p>Minutes Minutes of the meetings held on 28th September 2017, 17th October 2017 (Special Meeting of the Planning Committee) and 19th October 2017.</p> <p>Approval of the minutes was proposed by Cllr Wyatt and seconded by Cllr Baguley. It was unanimously agreed, by all Members who were present at the previous meetings, that the Chair sign them as a true record.</p>
PL56	<p>Declarations of Interest Cllr Rhodes declared that he is a County Councillor and that there may be references to the County Council during the meetings discussions.</p> <p>The Chair announced that he had been asked by Cllr Orson, who is the Ward Member for Old Dalby, to note that he was unable to fulfil his role as Ward Member for the two applications to be discussed, due to a disclosable pecuniary interest.</p>
PL57	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL57.1	<p>17/00743/OUT Applicant: HSSP Location: Longcliff Hill, Old Dalby Proposal: Outline application for the development of seven dwellings (amended description from six to seven dwellings)</p> <p>A Cllr raised a question regarding how Cllrs could declare an interest in this application if the applicant is unknown.</p> <p>It was confirmed that HSSP Architects are both the agent and the applicant.</p> <p>(a) The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that: Just a couple of updates, the first relating to both reports for Old Dalby. It has been observed that the wording in the report on how Old Dalby is one of the most sustainable in Melton is too definitive. Its position as performing relatively well in terms of its facilities was concluded in the settlement roles report of April 2015 to support the new local plan. He advised that the case discussion of Queensway on page 7 is now considered not relevant and should be ignored.</p> <p>In relation to the application itself it proposes an outline only with access application for 7 dwellings from a revised original submission of six. The proposal relates well to the village and therefore will provide additional</p>

homes in a location with good access to services.

In the absence of an adopted neighbourhood nor local plan advising otherwise, we are therefore considering the proposal in line with the NPPF which promotes development in the most sustainable locations which includes Old Dalby according to our most up-to-date research.

For this reason therefore an approval recommendation is given.

- (b) Cllr Bennett, on behalf of Broughton and Dalby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:
- The Parish Council are opposed to the application.
 - Proposes further housing which is not required.
 - Site is in open countryside.
 - The already approved applications in Old Dalby have filled the available capacity of the local primary school.
 - The nearest surgery at Long Clawson is already under pressure.
 - Poor transport links and these have also recently been downgraded, increasing the reliance on motor cars.
 - Melton local plan approved by Cllrs and submitted for examination. This would not be consistent with policies recently voted for by Cllrs.
 - Recent decisions in Waltham (outlined in the minutes of 19th October 2017) gave significant weight to the emerging local plan policies and to Walthams own neighbourhood plan.
 - Minimal housing requirements have been fully met already.
 - Not on land identified for development.
 - Outside proposed limits to development.
 - Two recent appeal decisions were both refused. The Planning Inspector confirmed that policy OS2 carried weight and also sighted sustainability concerns.
 - Cumulative effect of other approved applications on the limited resources available in Old Dalby.

A Cllr asked if Cllr Bennett knew who the landowners are.

Cllr Bennett responded that he had been told in confidence but could confirm that it was a limited company and not a resident of Old Dalby.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services sought confirmation that these questions were intended to assist with their consideration of Member interests only - the identity of an applicant were not a planning consideration.

A Cllr raised a query with regard to the Local Plan and the weight it had held with the Waltham applications.

- (c) James Botterill, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Application is for 7 dwellings together with an improved access off Longcliff

Hill.

- The site runs along an existing private drive leading to East Lodge located to the north east.
- Contained by the existing public foot path to the north, the existing private residential drive to the south and Longcliff Hill to the west.
- It represents an odd gap between the existing residential dwellings along Longcliff Close and the recent planning consent obtained by Cllr Orson to the north.
- This application would link the adjacent development back to the village and together will create a more coherent residential development.
- Good mix of house types set in a sustainable location.
- Received no technical objections from consultees.
- The scheme offers to extend the existing public footpath along Longcliff Hill to the south up to the site entrance and improve public connections for both our site and Cllr Orsons.
- Housing layout sympathetic to the surrounding context. Two much needed 3 bedroom units.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding access rights along the private driveway.

Mr Botterill confirmed that the landowner has access rights along that driveway which will go to the residents of the new houses.

A Cllr noted that Ecology had referenced a mature hedge and had requested a revised layout and asked if the applicant would be willing to have that as part of conditions.

Mr James Botterill responded that they had made recent changes due to the comments received and have introduced a 2 metre wild life corridor to run alongside the northern boundary.

A Cllr noted that Cllr Orson had applied for the recently approved application as a private individual and not as a Cllr.

A Cllr asked for further clarification regarding the road and rights of access.

Mr Botterill responded that both landowners have been talking together and that it the reason why the applications have come in together. There is an agreement between them regarding access. The road will be widened to meet LCC highways recommendations and there will be consent to travel over it.

A Cllr asked would happen if one of the applications got approved and the other didn't. Would access over the road still be allowed.

Mr Botterill stated that it would have to otherwise you wouldn't be able to get to the development.

The Chair reminded Members that land ownership is not a planning matter.

The Planning Officer (GBA) noted that at the current time there can be limited weight attached to the local plan or neighbourhood plan. According to records the surgery are still taking patients which suggests there is capacity. With regards to the appeal decisions, Queensway and Nether Broughton, these are isolated schemes and were refused for their own reasons. Every application is judged on its own merits.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services advised Members that the local plan and neighbourhood plan, even though they are incomplete, are still material considerations. It is up to Members to decide how much weight they have taking in to consideration the level of advancement, the degree of contention and the compliance with the NPPF. Officers advice is that with regards to the local plan and the applicable neighbourhood plan the weight it limited. Members may conclude differently and in terms of the Waltham applications mentioned Members did conclude differently. In that case quite significant weight was given to the combined effects of the neighbourhood and local plans and they are cited in the reasons for refusal on the three applications that were refused that evening.

As Mr Bennett said, this is clearly contrary to the neighbourhood plan. However he was not so convinced that it is contrary to the emerging local plan because that makes provision for windfall development of unallocated sites in Policy SS3, in sustainable locations, which this is considered to be, where they fulfil an identified need and meet a series of criteria. Not all the same influences of Waltham so it is not a perfect comparison.

Cllrs raised concerns regarding the 5 years land supply and Old Dalby already taking more than its fair share of housing. Further concerns regarding the sustainability of the village and the number of bedrooms in the proposed dwellings as they are big houses and more affordable housing is required. According to the local plan the housing allocation has already been fulfilled with permitted applications.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services commented that the apportionment for housing in Old Dalby has been met and exceeded by a small amount.

A Cllr asked how many affordable houses and bungalows have already been approved in Old Dalby and noted that small houses are rare anyway.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded all applications dealt with so far have been outline therefore non of them have a precise mix of house type. Each of them is a S106 either completed or in hand which requires affordable housing. There is one exception which is the site at Woodlands. They are all at 37% and Woodlands is slightly diminished at 20%. The new local plan policy for Old Dalby demands 25% and the average of the examples provided is higher.

A Cllr noted that they thought the windfall sites would relate to the housing need. We don't need 4 and 5 bedroom houses, what we do need is a mix of bungalows and smaller houses. This is outline so not discussing the housing mix at present. Would there be any scope to include the housing mix in a condition.

The Chair noted that if a proposer and a seconder appear they can add that condition if they wanted to.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services confirmed that the allocation for Old Dalby, in the emerging local plan is 28 and it has been exceeded. The sizes of house are illustrative so if Members considered to necessary to control a mix of houses by means of a condition it would be legitimate.

Cllr Glancy proposed approval of the application with a condition requiring the housing mix to more accurately reflect the needs and a minimum of 2 metres of wildlife corridor incorporated. If refused it, it would not stand up to an appeal.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal and also raised concerns regarding the size of the illustrated dwellings.

The Planning Officer (GBA) provided clarification of the requested condition – A scheme to be provided to illustrate the housing needs of Old Dalby. The current needs assessment suggests that it is two 2 bedroom, three 3 bedroom and one 4+ bedroom dwellings (of 3.4% for a single bedroom, 33% for 2 beds, 48% for 3 beds and 14% for 4+ beds, i.e. application from the Housing needs study , august 2016)

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that we would expect a reserved matter application to reflect this.

A Cllr questioned if there was a need for a one bedroom dwelling as no provision had been mentioned for this.

The Planning Officer (GBA) noted that it would be difficult to do 3.4% of 7 dwellings as this is a small development anyway.

A Cllr asked for clarification that there is a need for bungalows and the Planning Officer (GBA) confirmed that there is.

A Cllr noted that for builders to erect one bedroom homes costs just as much as two bedroom homes.

A vote was taken. 8 Members voted for the application to be permitted and 3 Members voted against. Cllr Chandler and Cllr Holmes asked for their votes against permit to be recorded.

Determination: PERMITTED subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition requiring that at 'reserved matters' stage house types reflecting identified local needs are provided.

REASONS: While the provision of housing would contribute to the NPPF's objectives of boosting housing supply, the Borough is considered to have an adequate housing land supply and. Therefore the weight attached to the provision of a small number of houses is limited.

There are a number of other positive benefits of the scheme which include surface water management in the form of a sustainable drainage along with developer contributions to mitigate impacts upon local services.

Old Dalby is considered to be a reasonably sustainable location for housing development. The site is well related to the village and previously approved housing schemes, which mitigates its impact upon the countryside and the setting of the village.

In conclusion it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply. The balancing issues – development of a green field site and impact upon setting of the village– are considered to be of limited harm.

This is because, In this location, the site benefits from a range of services in the immediate vicinity and nearby which mitigate the extent to which travel is necessary and limits journey distance, the character of the site provides potential for sympathetic design, careful landscaping, biodiversity and sustainable drainage opportunities.

PL57.2

17/00822/OUT

Applicant: Mr G Gray

Location: East Lodge, Longcliff Hill, Old Dalby, LE14 3LP

Proposal: Outline planning permission for 8 dwellings and access (some matters reserved).

- (a) The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that: This specific application proposes eight houses north of the previous scheme along an access road to the property of Longcliffe Hill House. Despite having the sustainable credentials as previously discussed however, this development proposes a development that in planning terms fails to respect the character of Old Dalby and therefore outweighs any benefits the scheme may have demonstrably and significantly and therefore is recommended for refusal.

Prior to taking up his allocated speakers slot Cllr Bennett requested confirmation of the address as the Planning Officer (GBA) had referred to Longcliffe House. The Planning Officer extended his apologies and confirmed that the report referred to East Lodge.

- (b) Cllr Bennett, on behalf of Broughton and Dalby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- The parish council agreed with the recommendation of refusal and that additional planning matters should be taken in to account.
- The Planning Committee Members set a precedent with how much weight it applies to the emerging local plan and the advanced neighbourhood plans, in the recent decisions on proposals in Waltham on the Wolds, at their meeting on 17th October 2017.
- Inconsistent with both policies in both plans. It does not form part of the plan development and thus is considered windfall, lying outside the proposed limits to development.
- Old Dalby has already exceeded its minimum housing requirement.
- Recent appeal decisions for our parish also update the interpretation policies. These should also be given weight.
- The housing mix proposed is incorrect.

(c) James Botterill, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There are many positive aspects to the scheme.
- No technical objections.
- In a sustainable location and will assist in providing much needed housing.
- The Officers report has been written as if previous recent approvals do not exist. In fact they add a substantial material weight to the application of this site.
- The Officers recommended refusal for Mr Benbow's application for the same reasons as this one. It is about 100 metres to the west of our site. However the Members approved that application. The applications are very similar.
- The approvals for Mr Orson and Mr Benbow have set an enormous precedent for residential development for this part of the village.
- Our scheme can't be considered any more disjointed to the village than these.
- By travel distance the siting of our dwellings are significantly closer to the existing built fabric of the village. Resulting in shorter walking distances to the local amenities.

A Cllr asked where you draw the line with planning permissions as they could keep going on.

Mr Botterill responded that this particular scheme is well contained with a private drive to the east which forms a natural boundary and also got the existing house of East Lodge to the East. Natural boundary to the south which is the road and natural boundary to the west which is Mr Orsons approval. We are no further north into the open countryside that the other previously approved application mentioned.

The Planning Officer (GBA) noted that this application stresses the relationship with the built form of Old Dalby. This application protrudes too far into the countryside.

Cllr Chandler proposed refusal of the application as per recommendation.

Already have 5 year land supply and can't add more harmful houses to the village when they already have their entitlement. Lifestyles have changed as people don't

use the local shops and amenities anymore.

Cllr Holmes seconded the proposal.

Members offered their support to the Officers recommendation and agreed that it is disjointed with the village.

A vote was taken. 10 Members voted for refusal and 1 Member voted against refusal.

Determination: REFUSE for the following reason:

The application site is in a location which is poorly related to the built form of Old Dalby and would appear disjointed and incongruous, failing to respond to the exiting build form of the village. Development of the site would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside which contributes to the setting of the village, and is contrary to the adopted Local Plan Policies OS2, BE1 and H6, The Proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, particularly paragraphs, 56, 61 and 64. The proposal's identified harm in this regard would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivery of housing, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

PL57.3

17/00391/REM

Applicant: MHB Planning Ltd

Location: Field 1357, Melton Road, Waltham On The Wolds

Proposal: Reserved Matters application for 45 dwellings.

(a) The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that:

- The application was for reserved matters pursuant to outline permission
- The applicant is aware of concerns regarding the use of stone and has sought the Committee's guidance in this regard
- He highlighted the areas of the application that have been the subject of contention, particularly where it adjoins houses on Melton Road.

(b) Martin Lusty, on behalf of Waltham on the Wolds Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Clarified that the Parish Councils letter in July wasn't specifically an objection. Generally in support of the application and want to see the houses built and be an asset to the village.
- Raised some issues and a number of them have been addressed.
- Still concerns regarding the aesthetics and road safety.
- Would prefer stone instead of substitute products. Disagree with the mix of brick and stone. Should be 100% in stone.
- There is a requirement for road safety traffic calming within the site but would like to see some outside of the site.
- Speed watch data and recent activity show that drivers are still exceeding the speed limit.
- A speed indicator was proposed years ago but hasn't happened because of funding. Could this be funded by this scheme?

- Concerns regarding the junction.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding the speed indicator and it was confirmed that it is the type of board which flashes with the speed at which you are travelling.

The Chair commented that almost one third of the current dwellings in the village are rendered or brick with no stone.

Mr Lusty confirmed that he was aware but that had been due to bad planning decisions in the past. Some of those houses are inconsistent with a conservation village.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services advised Members that with regards to the junction there were plans to adjust the width of road, relocate the central island and contributions to a beacon crossing. Although Waltham contains a Conservation Area, it is not the whole village and doesn't include this site. In his opinion, insistence on stone seems unjustified for some parts of the site.

A Cllr raised concerns regarding the use of stone and insisted all houses at the front of the development should be 100% stone. They also had concerns regarding the width of the road and road safety.

The Chair reminded Members that the Ward Cllr can be involved in the process regarding materials used.

Cllr Holmes proposed approval of the application and noted that the houses would all look different anyway however there were still concerns regarding road safety. Asked if the Planning Officer could liaise with applicant regarding their concerns.

The Chair noted that the access/junction had previously been granted at outline and that they were now dealing with reserved matters.

Cllr Holmes added to her proposal requesting speed monitoring signs and for the entrance to be widened if possible.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that they would try and open dialogue with applicant and reminded Members that access is not part of the application. They would be unable to pursue signs at this stage. The access road is a formal 2 way road that can accommodate 2 cars and has pavements either side.

Cllr Rhodes seconded the proposal and actioned planning officers to try to facilitate an improved access to the site. He supports that action being taken but understood it can't be a condition.

A Cllr asked if the play area is equipped.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that there is a S106 which states that the play area will be equipped and maintained.

A Cllr asked what percentage of the houses would be stone and the Chair noted that the Ward Cllr will be involved regarding the building materials used.

A vote was taken and the Members voted unanimously to permit.

Determination:

- (i) PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report**
- (ii) That discharge of the external materials is delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services in consultation with the Ward Member.**

PL57.4

17/00836/FUL

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Newton

Location: Field 8636 Eastwell Road Waltham

Proposal: Relocation of Hop Inn Rabbit Hotel and construction of storage buildings.

(a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that:

Updates –

1. Parish Council concerns about sustainability and viability of new dwelling in this location .

2. Email from agent – considers that email of 5th Sept 2017 has not been addressed . The points in that email were summarised and answered by the RSM. In summary, he did not consider that it raised any material considerations of sufficient relevance or weight to make a difference to the recommendation to recommend that permission should be refused.

The proposed site is a 7 acre plot of land in the open countryside on the road between Waltham and Eastwell. The adjacent triangular piece of land bordered by the road network has over past years been subdivided up into various paddocks and small farming enterprises.

Hop Inn provides pet boarding facilities which accommodate House Rabbits and Guinea Pigs and involves the storage and sale of pet play products “Hop Inn” branded speciality tunnels, cubes and hideouts. Hop Inn was established 5 years ago in a barn attached to a grade 2 listed building situated in the conservation village of Stonesby.

The applicants argue that there is an established business model and client base of 150+ and that there is now the opportunity to create the first bespoke rabbit and guinea pig hotel in the UK.

The proposal comprises accommodation, both residential to the occupant and

business to the rabbits with increased outdoor grazing area, the applicant also wishes to broaden the operating base by growing and selling quality meadow hay and continuing to grow Christmas Trees (existing on land) and would also provide education services at the new business location. The proposal also includes a number of storage buildings, garages and barns.

The NPPF at para 55 states that should avoid isolated dwellings in the countryside unless there are special circumstances . It is not considered that there are sufficient special circumstances in this case.

Support expert advice that this is a non-rural enterprise proposed to relocate on a green field in the open countryside. It should be assessed under normal planning policies and not as an agricultural dwelling or other rural occupation

- (b) Mr Richard Cooper, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:
- 28.5% increase in profit.
 - Business is financially sustainable.
 - There is a need for a dwelling.
 - They will seek to protect the countryside.
 - Supports sustainable growth in rural areas and assessed as suitable.
 - Additional use of all land for grazing.
 - Increase business by the sale of meadow hay, Christmas tree growing and supporting vet students.
 - Social and economic benefits.
 - They would consider a tie on dwelling to prevent future use without the business.

A Cllr asked if the applicant was in receipt of a single farm payment.

Mrs Newton stated she was unable to answer the question.

A Cllr asked for clarification of the garden access for the rabbits.

Mrs Newton responded that the house rabbits go outside and graze as well as living in house. They have evenings in the home but they need to graze for their health and well being.

A Cllr commented that they didn't feel that the budget could accommodate paying extra staff and also felt the current location had further potential to house more animals.

Mr Cooper responded that it is the grazing area that needs the relocation. It also for diversification which can't be done in their current location.

Cllrs raised question regarding the occupancy and length of stays.

Mr Cooper noted that there are currently 3 pairs of rabbits, 2 single rabbits and 2

guinea pigs residing at the hotel. The business is on track for November occupancy. December is busier. Demonstrated there are peaks and troughs throughout the year.

Mrs Newton stated that the animal often stay for 2 weeks but sometimes longer. Some stay for 2 months.

A Cllr asked how much grazing space the animals need at the highest level of capacity.

Mrs Newton responded that they need space to move the hutches rounds on to clean bits of area.

Mr Cooper stated 1100 square metres. In the context of residential lawns of 80 square metres. To allow for peak occupancy and rotation of runs.

A Cllr asked what the space in the buildings would be used for.

Mr Cooper responded that there would be 3 buildings. 1 barn for agricultural equipment, 1 for storage for the internet business and 1 housing people and rabbits.

The Regulatory Services Manager noted that the NPPF states that isolated dwellings should not be encouraged unless in defined circumstances. This is due to the sustainability of an isolated dwelling. The NPPF does have an economic role

Cllr Rhodes proposed approval of the application. We should promote and encourage rural enterprise and it is not going to be significant harm. Don't agree with agricultural appraisal.

Cllr Glancy seconded the proposal.

Cllrs raised concerns regarding the unsustainability, the proposed income from the meadow hay and Christmas trees, the viability of the site and the safety of the animals from surrounding wildlife and the temperature when outside. It was suggested that they could approve temporary living accommodation until the business proves viable.

The Chair reminded Members that the welfare of the animals is not a planning matter.

A Cllr felt that it was not trying to be an agricultural business but was a business in a rural location and offered their support.

The Regulatory Services Manger advised Members that they could condition the occupancy, tying it to this particular business.

Cllrs felt that this would be unenforceable once the dwelling was built.

There were discussions regarding other rural businesses such as kennels and catteries and the Chair reminded Members that the dwellings were there before they became those type of businesses.

A vote was taken. 5 Members voted for approval and 6 Members voted against. The proposal to permit was lost.

Cllr Faulkner proposed refusal of the application on the grounds recommended by officers.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal but added that she may consider a mobile home but not a dwelling.

Cllr Faulkner commented that he did not wish to add to his proposal.

Cllr Cumbers noted that she would still second the proposal.

Another vote was taken. 6 Members voted in favour of refusal and 5 Members voted against.

Determination: REFUSE, for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would, if approved, result in the erection of a residential dwelling in an unsustainable location. The development is in an unsustainable village location where there are limited local amenities, facilities and jobs, and where future residents are likely to depend highly on the use of the car, contrary to the advice contained in NPPF in promoting sustainable development. It is considered that there is insufficient reason to depart from the guidance given in the NPPF on sustainable development in this location and would therefore be contrary to the "core planning principles contained" within Paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

PL57.5

17/00582/FULHH

Applicant: Dr and Mrs Lobo

Location: The Byre 10 Church Lane Redmile NG13 0GE

Proposal: First floor extension

(a) The Regulatory Services Manager stated that:
A number of messages from 3 neighbours (4,8,and 12 Church Lane)
making the following comments:

The report is inaccurate and does not give sufficient weight to their concerns and objections about overlooking have not been addressed – the report (pages 106-107) addresses key issues of residential amenity and privacy .

Consider that proposal is noticeable from Church Lane, contrary to report – accept that extension would be seen from Church Lane

Parking is already a problem – no evidence that an additional bedroom

would make a significant difference to the situation

Request that Members visit their properties to appreciate the impact upon them - most of the Committee members have done so

Scale is not in keeping

Will be overlooked – not significantly and note that roof lights are above head height

Request that PD rights be removed as more windows would exacerbate the situation – this is a matter for Members to consider , it is not considered an unreasonable request

Issue is not loss of view, but loss of light – understood and addressed in report

Difference in levels is an issue - Accept that application site is slightly higher than neighbours

Adverse impact upon heritage assets – RSM site is in conservation area and addressed by conservation officer in report (page 104)

Disruption from building works – this was agreed , it would be inevitable for a limited period

Message from applicant – considers that he has done all that he can to minimise impact upon neighbours.

The application seeks planning permission for a first floor extension to form master bedroom/en-suite and dressing room. The proposal as amended measures 0.8 metres in height and spans 10.2 metres across the existing dwelling, providing 2.3 metre high living accommodation at ground floor and 2.2 metre high living accommodation at first floor. The proposed materials are red reclaimed brick to walls, and existing pantiles will be used for the roof. The site is located within Redmile and forms part of the designated Conservation Area.

It is considered that the main issues relating to the application are:

- The impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties
- The visual impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the settlement

The impact on neighbours has been reduced by an amendment which reduced the height of the proposal by 0.5m. It is considered that while there may be some impact upon neighbours to the east ,particularly No.8,this would not have a significantly adverse impact upon the amenities of these neighbours.

There would be some impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Members may wish to consider whether it would be appropriate to remove PD rights as requested by one of the neighbours.

- (b) Cllr Amanda Johnson, on behalf of Barkestone, Plungar and Redmile Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:
- The location plan is about 25 years out of date and there are a lot of buildings which aren't on the plan.
 - Large number of objections.
 - Lack of parking.
 - Overintense and overdevelopment.
 - Impact on residential amenity.
 - Volume of property when originally built was of concern. Was a 4 bedroom property with a snug. This would increase in bedrooms to 5 and 6 if the snug was to be used as a bedroom.
 - A 5 bedroom property would need 4 parking spaces. This only has 2.
 - Some houses nearby have no off road parking. Some park on the path as it is a narrow lane.
 - Conservation area. It does not preserve or enhance the character of the area.
 - Material parking matters. Already covers 50% of the plot.
 - Double storey will cause considerable harm to neighbours.
 - Loss of sunlight and views to the sky.
 - Congested plot.
 - Negative impact.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding the number of bedrooms.

The Regulatory Services Manger explained that the current plan shows 3 bedrooms and that the proposal would create a fourth bedroom and noted that anyone can use rooms for any purpose in their property.

Cllr Amanda Johnson responded that it was being advertised on right move as a four bedroom property and the snug was called a study on the plan.

A Cllr asked for clarification of the number of rooms.

Cllr Amanda Johnson responded that there are 2 reception rooms, 4 bedrooms, a kitchen, a bathroom and an en-suite downstairs which was on the snug.

Ms Turnball, an objector and speaker, wished to hand photographs out to the Members.

The Chair advised that this is not allowed.

Ms Turnbull expressed that she was disappointed that the planning department didn't do what they were asked to do.

It was confirmed that they were part of the committee slide presentation.

(c) Oonagh Turnbull, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:

- It is a heavily congested elevated site.
- Does not enhance the character.
- No public benefits.
- Conservation officers view is misleading, the buildings are heritage assets.
- Residential amenity – it is on the boundary of number 8. Would reduce amenity and light. Overbearing and hemmed in.
- Car parking - No provision has been made and there is no space for this.
- Access over a shared drive way.
- Highway impact should be given consideration.
- Will cause congestion and conflict.
- Concerns regarding vehicle movements on a congested site in a residential area.
- Judicial review is likely on the application conservation area law and policy.

A Cllr asked if the property was previously a cow shed.

Ms Turnbull confirmed that it was.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding the road and parking.

Ms Turnbull responded that it is a narrow road and that cars have to park illegally on the pavement.

A Cllr asked to be shown on the presentation slide the properties affected.

Ms Turnbull pointed out the shared drive and various properties surrounding.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services noted that officers needed to consider conservation law and policy further and wished to change their recommendation to allow this.

Cllr Rhodes proposed to defer the application as per the officers recommendation.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken. The Members voted unanimously to defer.

Determination: DEFERRED to review the consideration of conservation law and policy

PL58.1	<p>Report from the Head of Regulatory Services regarding Long Clawson, Hose and Harby Residents Petition</p> <p>The Chair noted the report and the recommendation to consider the petition and decline the proposed request to halt development until the neighbourhood plan is examined and passed.</p> <p>He advised he was offended that it had been suggested that Members have a lack of concern and cited a substantial series of examples which demonstrated this to be unjustified. The included those where Members had sought expert advice regarding traffic, flooding and schooling. And they had also gained substantial financial contributions for education, traffic calming on Melton Road, and contributions towards the village hall in Harby. Improvements to the bus stop and the access on to Colston Lane, Harby. They had secured a sustainable drainage system and measures to improve pedestrian safety. The Chair also questioned the wisdom of postponing decisions to await something that there is no guarantee would be achieved.</p> <p>Cllr Rhodes, Ward Cllr for Long Clawson and Stathern, commented that the petition has been signed by the vast majority of Long Clawson residents. The right thing to do would be to delay applications until the local plan and neighbourhood plan has gone further forward. Opposed to the recommendations.</p> <p>Members expressed their concerns regarding the request and some sympathised with Long Clawson due to the flooding and understood their frustrations as they had previously not received money promised to them to help alleviate flooding.</p> <p>Cllr Botterill proposed to decline the proposed request in line with the officers recommendations and offered his support to them.</p> <p>Cllr Glancy seconded the proposal and noted that she was disappointed that the public don't trust Members to continue to make these decisions.</p> <p>A vote was taken. 9 Members voted for the proposal and 2 Members voted against.</p> <p>The Chair expressed the Members thanks to Patrick Reid, The Regulatory Services Manager, for all his support and work over the last 4 years and wished him well in his retirement.</p>
--------	--

The meeting closed at: 8.41 pm

Chair