

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 16 August 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Illingworth (Chair)

Councillors

P. Posnett (Vice-Chair)	P. Baguley
T. Bains	G. Botterill
P. Cumbers	P. Faulkner
M. Glancy	T. Greenow
E. Holmes	B. Rhodes

Observers

Officers

- Solicitor To The Council (RP)
- Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
- Development Manager (LP)
- Planning Officer (GBA)
- Planning Officer (JL)
- Administrative Assistant (AS)

Minute No.	Minute
PL25	<p>Apologies for Absence None</p>
PL26	<p>Minutes Minutes of the meeting held on 26th July 2018</p> <p>Approval of the minutes was proposed by Cllr Greenow and seconded by Cllr Holmes. It was unanimously agreed by the members present at the previous meeting that the Chair sign them as a true record.</p>
PL27	<p>Declarations of Interest Cllr Rhodes and Cllr Posnett both declared a personal interest due to their roles as County Councillors.</p> <p>The Chair stated that Cllr Orson would like it noted that he would not be speaking as Ward Cllr regarding the Old Dalby item (item 6 on the agenda) due to a pecuniary interest.</p>
PL28	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL28.1	<p>16/00664/OUT Applicant: First Provincial Properties Ltd – Mr Nigel Griffiths</p> <p>Location: Millway Foods Ltd, Colston Lane, Harby</p> <p>Proposal: Residential development of up to 82 dwellings, following demolition of existing buildings & structures (Amended from:- Residential development of up to 31 dwellings & 10,000 square feet of workshop (Class B1) employment space, following demolition of existing buildings and structures)</p> <p>(a) The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that: The following application is for 82 dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access which has been deemed acceptable by colleagues at Leicestershire County Council highways. Please note however this access is from Colston Lane not Pasture Lane as per the report.</p> <p>The application has been revised during the process of the determination from originally 31 dwellings with 10k square feet of office space.</p> <p>The matter of how this revision has been made has been commented on by a number of members of the public; I trust that pages 20-21 give clarity on</p>

this.

In summary, as the application has been re-consulted upon in full with a full suite of new plans and all parties have had the opportunity to make comment it is viewed that this is acceptable under what is called the Whitfield principle.

The proposal is primarily adjudged against the Clawson, Hose and Harby neighbourhood plan being the development plan relevant in this area.

Owing to its housing number being well more than the figure identified by the neighbourhood plan with no compelling other material considerations adjudged to be more important to go against this development plan and approval has already been established for 53 dwellings.

It is the officer recommendation that planning permission should be refused due to this conflict with neighbourhood plan policy as per the report.

- (b) Cllr Phillip Tillyard, on behalf of Clawson, Hose And Harby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:
- They concur with the officers report.
 - Outside the neighbourhood plan.
 - Harby has accepted a total of 128 houses to be developed over the next 20 years, against a residual of 78 so this would be in excess of that. Can also expect a windfall on top of that.
 - An increase in 29 dwellings would be most unwelcome and unnecessary.
 - If it is to be approved, could we ask for a condition for a S106 pro rata contribution to the village hall and existing play ground facilities.
- (c) Gary Holliday, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Been a resident for 26 years.
 - The residents have accepted the need for new development and the neighbourhood plan provides for more homes than are required by the emerging local plan. This is across 3 sites including the former dairy footprint.
 - Understand the need for new houses. Not objected to the other sites but do object to this one.
 - This development goes well beyond the dairy footprint, taking in the meadow area that stretches down to the canal.
 - Plans show a strip of land adjacent to the canal which is being called a country park. It would not be a country park or reasonable buffer as it is not big enough.
 - The meadow area is not brownfield and has quite a different character and appearance from the derelict dairy.
 - At odds with the policies in the neighbourhood plan.
 - The approved 53 dwelling scheme may not be viable but will be better located when other schemes are completed.
 - Can't justify extending all the way to the canal.
 - Unnecessary, inappropriate and unwanted.

The Planning Officer (GBA) noted that no viability assessment has been made.

Cllr Rhodes, Clawson, Hose and Harby Ward Cllr, proposed to refuse the application in accordance with the officers recommendations and added that it has been a controversial site for many years. The previous application for 53 homes was refused but was overturned on appeal. It has been accepted now and the 53 homes have consent and there should be no more. The land down to the canal should remain as green field.

Cllr Faulkner seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken and the members voted unanimously to refuse the application.

Determination: REFUSED, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed application, by virtue of the extent of the site and the number dwellings, is in contrary to policies H1, H2 and H3 of the Harby, Hose and Long Clawson Neighbourhood Plan. No material considerations have been identified which it is considered are sufficient to override this direct conflict.

PL28.2

17/01325/REM

Applicant: Bellway Homes

Location: Land of Great Lane, Frisby on the Wreake

Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters – 16/00491/OUT – Outline application for residential development with associated landscaping, open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian access.

(a) The Development Manager stated that: This is a reserved matters submission for the erection of 53 dwellings, the proposal was deferred at the committee of 26th April 2018 for the following reasons.

- Reduce or revisit the parking for plots 9, 10 and 11
- Revisit the house types including single storey dwellings, across the front of Great Lane
- Relocation of the play area
- The number of houses to 48
- Increase the number of bungalows

The application was further deferred at the meeting of 14th June 2018 to Allow for further discussions between the applicants with the ward councillor and parish council (to be facilitated officers)

A meeting was held between those parties and revised information submitted for consideration.

- o The parking provision has been amended as requested
- o Two additional bungalows have been submitted on plots 1 and 2 which front

Great Lane

- o Additional drainage has been submitted in relation to the Play Area and further confirmation that natural surveillance would be provided to the play area.
- o With regards to the housing number this remains at 53, and it should be noted that no legal requirement by way of condition was attached to the outline permission which restricted the development to 48 dwellings.

It is considered that the revised information submitted meets the requests of the Committee and earlier deferrals and the recommendation remains as approval subject to a number of conditions which will need updating from the original report of 26th April 2018.

- (b) Cllr Sercombe, on behalf of Frisby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:
- The compromise in the main is satisfactory.
 - Developer within their rights to apply for more than 48 dwellings which were muted at outline but villagers feel betrayed.
 - Overdevelopment upon overdevelopment.
 - Along with other developments in the village this will take the numbers to way above what is in the local plan and what they should naturally be.
 - Concerns have been addressed but not to universal satisfaction of all the residents.
 - Ask committee to ensure all the points are resolved and put down in writing for perpetuity.
 - To ensure requested covenants and conditions that have been agreed by the developer are watertight and there is no wriggle room for the future.
 - Ensure roads and drainage infrastructure are properly adopted by the relevant authorities.
 - The number and type of houses is set in stone and the mix is in keeping with the local plan and neighbourhood plan.

A Cllr asked if the Parish Council is as satisfied as they can be.

Cllr Sercombe responded that it is not unanimous. Some people still believe the neighbourhood plan should carry more weight. Reached a compromise that is as fair and equitable as it can be for both parties. The residents most greatly affected would have liked more bungalows and more restrictions, however that was not deliverable. Still a lot of angst in the village regarding this.

A Cllr noted that the report states that the Parish Council are unhappy with the play area but that it had not been mentioned this evening. Are they now satisfied?

Cllr Sercombe responded that in an ideal world the play area should be more centrally located as per the recommendation but in the overall scheme of things it is a good as we'll get. The play area is overseen by a large number of houses. There were other issues we prioritised more so it's a fair compromise.

- (c) Shaun Groom, on behalf of the objectors, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Echo the majority of the comments of the Parish Council.
 - Underline concerns and disenchantment that residents have experienced:-
 1. In Spring/Summer of 2016, residents were consulted via a letter box ballot, village meetings and an open day. Which were hosted by, the previous agent, Richborough Estates. Quoted text from documents which was to appease and satisfy the residents in pursuit of their outline permission - 'lower building heights to tie in with existing street scene, new buildings set back to retain the rural feel along Great Lane, meandering residential lane, garages between new buildings to create larger gaps and also indicated on the plan, lower density down to 20 DPH along the back of Great Lane'.
 2. The play ground was shown located on higher ground and more centrally. Not in the wettest, steepest part of the field. Due to it being a dry year, the current ground conditions don't show the true state of the field.
 3. We were under the understanding that these points would be considered and included in any amended/final revised plans.
 - Ask that the developer is held to account in fulfilling the requirements to the letter.

A Cllr asked if any of the conditions were written down at the open day.

Mr Groom responded that the residents were presented with a glossy idea of what it might look like and believed that the outline was for 48 dwellings. The concern now is the density of the 53 dwellings. The document I have was also presented and is on the Councils on line files.

A Cllr noted that the indicative plan has to be treated with caution.

- (d) Sally Smith, on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that: Meeting held to reach a compromise on the 5 reasons for deferral:-
1. Parking - It was agreed that the proposed parking arrangements were acceptable, although there was an amendment to the proposed garage on plot 7, which has been moved further away from the site boundary.
 2. Great Lane frontage – two additional bungalows have been added on plots 1 & 2 to address the concerns of residents. Also moved plot 53 further away from the boundary and given a commitment to apply covenants to retain the hedgerow along the Great Lane frontage. We have amended plot 3 from a 5 bed, 2 ½ storey dwelling to a 4 bed, 2 storey dwelling.
 3. Play area location – overlooked by 26% of properties so natural surveillance is achieved.
 4. Drainage– details have been provided which indicate run off from the open space is limited to its own area which is minimal. To alleviate any concerns a land drain will be provided along its northern boundary being the low point of the POS.
 5. Number of dwellings – the number was not defined in the outline permission. The design is thought to respect the sites location and optimises the use of available land which is a requirement of the emerging local plan and the

NPPF. The increase in the number of bungalows is now 11% of the whole development. As a result of the house changes, the scheme has become even more policy compliant in terms of housing mix.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding the drainage in the play area.

Ms Smith responded that it is part of the scheme and that any rain on the play area will drain in to the land drain.

A Cllr asked if developers propose one idea and then are inclined to change it and increase the number of dwellings.

Ms Smith responded that they had bought the land from Richborough and that the information they received in terms of planning permission didn't restrict the number of dwellings. We had a pre-app meeting and raised that we weren't following the indicative plan and it wasn't raised as an issue as the scheme wasn't overdeveloped. Richborough obtained the outline permission and when we bought the land, we didn't follow their commitments as they weren't documented .

A Cllr raised concerns regarding the dimensions of garage G4 and noted that it is not designed in accordance with the LHDG and not suitable for use as a garage.

Ms Smith responded that it depends on the size of a car and that there is a certain requirement but wasn't sure of the actual dimensions.

The Cllr responded that if they are starting with a blank canvas it should be built to the specifications mentioned.

- (e) Cllr Hutchinson, Ward Cllr for Frisby, was invited to speak and stated that:
- At the meeting to reach a compromise, an improved outline proposal was reached. It involved some concessions from both sides.
 - Disappointed that there were no concessions on reducing the number of homes.
 - Overdevelopment on overdevelopment.
 - We should not have accepted an open ended housing capacity at outline and feel we were hoodwinked by Richborough Estates.
 - Note that the other 2 developments at Frisby both have maximum capacities and conditions on their outline applications.
 - The agreed amendments regarding reducing the reduction of bedrooms and moving plot 53 further away from the boundary and the covenant to retain high hedges have significantly improved the gate way entrance.
 - Some of the concerns regarding the play area have been helped by improved drainage, ground works and a site visit.
 - Concerns regarding roads and drainage and would like the following conditions:- All roads must be constructed to the 6C standard that is adoptable by the local County Council. All sewerage and drainage must be constructed to the 6C standard that is adoptable by Severn Trent. All covenant hedges should be a minimum height of 1.8 metres. All boundary

- fence materials should be agreed with adjoining residents.
- Significant improvement since the first REM application.

The Chair noted that the suggested condition regarding the boundary fence should be in consultation with the Ward Cllr, but the residents can contact the Ward Cllr with their views.

A Cllr asked if there was anything written down about how the development was going to be. Ms Smith has previously said that Richborough hadn't passed it on. It should match the outline that was agreed in the first place.

Cllr Hutchinson responded that there was a booklet like a planning design statement which was circulated by Richborough. The opening paragraph of which talks about 48 houses. It stated that the application was outline and all matters will go to reserved matters. Would think Bellway have seen this document.

The Development Manager advised that this is allocated within the neighbourhood plan for "approximately 48 dwellings". It is inaccurate to claim a developer can't just do as they wish; they have to work within any restrictions imposed and ultimately their proposals need to be found satisfactory in their own right. This application is in accordance with the outline; there were no guarantees regarding the figure of 48 and whilst there were a lot of Indicative diagrams, these are not 'binding'.

A Cllr commented that Bellway Homes were not legally bound by their predecessors indicative document and that number given by the previous applicant. It is a higher number than was wanted by several parties but does commend the Ward Cllr, the Parish Council and Bellway Homes for progressing the application and reaching a compromise.

A Cllr raised concerns about the increase in the number of homes. The approximation of 48 being 53 is an increase of 10% which is stretching the credibility.

A Cllr commented that they should have put it in the outline permission previously.

Cllr Glancy proposed to permit the application but would like more information on the county highways conditions being included. Also would like the garage size to be checked and make sure it is fit for purpose.

Cllr Greenow stated that he may second the proposal but as well as Cllr Glancy's request regarding the highways he also wanted more information regarding the drainage.

The Development Manager responded that highways is able to be addressed by conditions because design standards are not prescribed by other legislation. However the drainage is governed other legislation so should not be duplicated through the planning decision. There is a drainage pond near by which is part of

another application.

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services added that the highways adoption don't extend to cul de sacs. The issue with drainage is governed by separate legislation and planning aren't meant to duplicate conditions that already exist.

The Solicitor to the Council confirmed that with regards to the drainage, the appropriate standards will be covered by and imposed by other legislation.

Cllr Greenow seconded the proposal subject to the condition regarding roads being built to an adoptable standard. He didn't think the hedges could be conditioned but that this could be covered by the boundary materials, which he would like to be agreed in consultation with the Ward Member. It is not reasonable to condition a hedge. Asked officers to confirm that the conditions will include the plans that have been amended.

The Development Manager confirmed.

Cllr Glancy the proposer, confirmed that she would accept the additional conditions.

A Cllr expressed their disappointment regarding the 1.8 metre height of the hedge.

Cllr Greenow noted that he had not added this condition as seconder as he believed it formed part of the next condition regarding the boundary materials.

A Cllr was concerned regarding: -

- Drainage and the clay soil.
- The classification of the roads as service vehicles do not need to come on to unclassified roads.
- Frisby is very rural and green and they need the hedges to retain the character.

The Development Manager noted that there is already a condition regarding drainage which has led us to the pond which is part of a discharge for a separate application. Bellway have also offered further land drains. All of that would be part of a condition.

A Cllr asked if the proposer and seconder would agree to a condition that drainage needs to be in place before the building work commences.

The Chair advised that they could request it before first occupancy but not before building commences.

A vote was taken. 10 Members voted to permit the application and there was 1 abstention.

Determination:

- (a) **PERMIT**, in accordance with the conditions as set out in the report and the additional conditions that highways are built to an adoptable standard.
- (b) that discharge of conditions relating to boundary treatment are carried out in consultation with the Ward Member;

For the following reasons

Outline planning permission was granted on the basis that the advantages were judged to outweigh the disadvantages, including the contribution that the development would make to housing supply, both in the market and affordable sectors in a location which performs reasonably well in sustainability terms.

This development brings forward a reasonable mixture of housing which would contribute to identified needs and provides 21 affordable homes. It accords with the outline permission and s106 provisions in this respect.

The detailed layout shows a well designed development laid out with separate groups of dwellings, many of which take advantage of views over landscaped or public spaces. The landscaped areas incorporate SUDs schemes and areas of buffer planting. There is space around the site to sustain wildlife habitats and provide good levels of privacy and amenity for neighbours and the occupiers of the new dwellings.

The proposal is one that is allocated for housing in both the Local and Neighbourhood Plans, both of which are well advanced, and this adds significant weight to the proposal.

There are matters of concern that have been raised through representations received, however these predominantly relate to matters of drainage and highways, both of which are to be further considered through the submission of further details to both the Local Planning Authority and the County Highway Authority for formal consideration.

Amendments to the application have been achieved to mitigate some of the concerns raised by residents and the Parish Council to reach a satisfactory compromise.

PL28.3

17/01570/FUL

Applicant: Scalford Court Care Home

Location: Scalford Court Nursing Home, Melton Road, Scalford

Proposal: Erection of a single storey 36 Bed Care Facility and 5 Extra Care Cottages

- (a) The Planning Officer (JL) stated that: Email has been received raising concerns in relation to the sewage and whether it can take on the extra capacity. Therefore it is proposed that an additional condition will be added

to read: The development hereby permitted shall not commence until drainage plans for the disposal of foul sewage have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use. Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage as well as reduce the risk of creating or exacerbating a flooding problem and to minimise the risk of pollution.

Slight re-word to condition no 15: The cottages hereby permitted shall be occupied by residents of the care home (and their dependant or widow/widower) and shall not be severed from the care home and occupied as separate, market dwelling houses.

Application seeks full planning permission to erect a 36 bed extension to the nursing home and five extra care cottages. The proposal will result in the loss of some trees on site, however there are a number of trees which will be retained and views in/out of the site will not be affected. The trees will also provide a natural screen to the development. The development will allow for the extension of an existing business and would provide 36 full time and three part time jobs. Additionally it will provide a specialist type of housing which is in need in the Borough.

(b) Cllr Andrew Thorn, on behalf of Scalford Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- In principal they are in favour, however there is an environmental concern regarding sewage going in to a ditch.
- Impermeable ground for this to soak away. During extreme weather events potential risk of polluted water and risk to farmland.

A Cllr commented that concerns should be allayed as the sewage has gone through treatment plants and will be tested.

Cllr Thorn responded that there have been reports of sewerage going in to the ditch.

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

- Concerns for wildlife in the area and the mature woodland.
- Increase in traffic and noise.
- Limited bus services. Residents will be isolated.
- Scale of the development will change the character of the area.
- Increase in noise and light pollution.

(d) Jeremy Lord, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- We have been working with the council on this project and have covered all aspects and issues raised.
- Facility demand is increasing. Offer an all inclusive support with the cottages providing a lighter care touch so help is on hand to residents who need more support.

- Investors in people.
- Increase employment. Increase to over 100 staff in the fullness of time.
- Little increase in traffic as the residents don't have transport and there are no restrictions on visiting times so there will be a gentle spread of visitors traffic.
- Biodiversity would be better managed. Removing self set in trees in favour of sustainable ones.
- Protected species survey which satisfied ecology.
- Drainage has never failed on a test. The new upgrade would cover any upsurge.

The Planning Officer (JL) noted there was a proposed additional condition regarding the sewerage. There are no objections from the LLFA, Severn Trent Water, Ecology or Highways. There is a mini bus for residents to access facilities. There was an appeal decision for the previous extension to existing care . A condition will ensure the cottages are tied to the nursing home and not used as market properties.

Cllr Holmes, Ward Cllr for Scalford, proposed to permit the application and noted that these sort of facilities, especially with care houses are excellent. Concerns regarding sewerage but wants to see these put right. Also had concerns regarding access and egress .

The Chair advised that the access is not controlled by the applicants.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning And Regulatory Services confirmed that the access is being dealt with separately.

Cllr Posnett seconded the proposal and added that the condition regarding the bungalows should be strongly worded so they can't go on the market at a later date. This type of facility is really needed within the town.

A Cllr wanted to ensure that the extra condition regarding foul sewerage was in place.

The Chair added that it is the duty of the applicant not make a situation worse. There is room to make it better and he urged the developer to do everything they can to reassure us.

The Planning Officer (JL) confirmed that the recommended extra condition regarding sewerage disposal and the adjustment of condition 15 regarding the cottages would be added.

A vote was taken. The Members voted unanimously to permit the application.

Determination: PERMIT subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the following additions/adjustment:

(i) Additional condition: The development hereby permitted shall not

commence until drainage plans for the disposal of foul sewage have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use. Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage as well as reduce the risk of creating or exacerbating a flooding problem and to minimise the risk of pollution.

- (i) Amend condition no 15 to read: The cottages hereby permitted shall be occupied by residents of the care home (and their dependant or widow/widower) and shall not be severed from the care home and occupied as separate, market dwelling houses.

Reasons: It is considered that on balance, although the proposed development would not accord with the Saved Local Plan, the proposal would provide a type of accommodation which has been identified as in need in the Borough. Whilst the proposed development would result in a loss of a number of protected trees, it is considered that a sufficient number of trees will be retained on the site following the development. The trees proposed to be retained will provide natural screening to the development and therefore is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the open countryside. Whilst the application site is not located within a village and there will be some reliance on the car to access the site, the existing use of the site and previous appeal decision need to be taken into account.

It is considered that the proposed development is compliant with the emerging Local Plan and the policies contained within the NPPF and there are no material considerations which would justify the refusal of the application.

PL29	<p>18/00002/TPOMBC - Tree Preservation Order REF: 151/900/41 St Marys Church, Church Street, Melton Mowbray Report of the Assistant Director for Strategic Planning And Regulatory Services to consider whether the provisional Tree Preservation Order should be confirmed.</p> <p>Cllr Cumbers proposed to move the recommendation and added that it doesn't bind the church forever.</p> <p>Cllr Baguley seconded the proposal and added that it is only provisional. There are not many mature trees in the town and would be a shame to lose any.</p> <p>A Vote taken. 10 Members voted to confirm the TPO and there was 1 abstention.</p> <p>DETERMINATION: Tree Preservation Order Ref: 151/900/41 St Marys Church, Church Street, Melton Mowbray is confirmed.</p>
PL30	<p>16/00157/OUT Land Adjacent The Woodlands, Station Road, Old Dalby Updated report from the Development Manager to consider a request to remove</p>

planning obligations for the provision of affordable housing.

The Chair advised Members that the agent would like to speak and although it is not normal to speak regarding a report, he would allow it for clarification to assist with making the decision.

(a) The Development Manager presented that updated report.

The Chair noted there was some confusion with the amounts regarding the viability and the loss.

(b) Adrian Kerrison, agent on behalf of the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There is confusion regarding negative viability and deliverability.
- -£ ½ million without affordable housing.
- This is a contingency risk which the developer would allow for.
- Narrows by £200,000.
- Allows 15% added together which gets rid of £1/2 million problem.
- In summary significant and abnormal costs on this site.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding if the acoustic fencing was a total cost or additional.

Mr Kerrison responded that it was an extra over cost.

A Cllr noted that the condition was always there and so it was always required.

Mr Kerrison responded that it was not a normal cost.

A Cllr asked for clarification regarding the drainage.

Mr Kerrison advised that it is not standard drainage.

Cllrs raised concerns that affordable housing was totally being taken away and that they aren't fulfilling the policy regarding affordable housing.

Mr Kerrison advised that the viability assessments don't calculate site specific abnormals.

A Cllr raised concerns that with the loss of the affordable housing the council are giving everything and what benefits are the Council receiving.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning And Regulatory Services commented that whilst foregoing affordable housing, there were still benefit in terms of housing supply generally, delivered early, and the cleansing and solving of a contaminated site.

Cllr Bains proposed to accept the report and supported the recommendation.

Cllr Rhodes seconded the proposal and added that we'll get 25 more homes which we need to get built to avoid problems of not meeting targets. Concede on this one.

The Chair noted it is a loss of 6 affordable homes which is a reluctant give.

Some of the Cllrs noted that the developer would have know of these costs some time ago and that the acoustic matters would have been reflected in the cost of the land.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted in favour and 5 against. Cllrs Faulkner, Botterill, Cumbers and Glancy requested that their votes against the motion be recorded.

DETERMINATION: that a Deed of Variation is agreed to allow the removal of the Affordable Housing requirement from the Section 106 Agreement

PL31

Performance Report - 2018/19, Quarter 1

Report from the Development Manager reporting performance in Q1 of 2018/19.

The Chair noted that the figure of 50% for appeals being refused is actually only 2 out of 4 at this time.

Cllr Greenow asked how many of the planning decisions are delegated and how many go to committee.

The Development Manager confirmed that they would find out and report back.

PL32

Urgent Business

Cllr Cumbers asked if there would be planning committee training to insure there are sufficient substitutes.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning And Regulatory Services confirmed there would be for the new NPPF.

Cllr Cumbers asked if there would be more general training.

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning And Regulatory Services responded there would be if there is a need.

The meeting closed at: 7.54 pm

Chair

