

# Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	<b>Planning Committee</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>Thursday, 2 July 2020</b>
<b>Start time</b>	<b>6.00 pm</b>
<b>Venue</b>	<b>By remote video conference</b>

## Present:

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

**Councillors**

P. Posnett MBE (Vice-Chair)	R. Bindloss
R. Browne	P. Chandler
P. Faulkner	L. Higgins
E. Holmes	R. Smedley
M. Steadman	P. Wood

**Officers**

- Assistant Director for Planning and Delivery
- Planning Development Manager
- Locum Planning Solicitor
- Democratic Services Manager
- Democratic Services Officer (SE)

Minute No.	Minute						
	<p><b>Chair's Introduction</b> The Chair welcomed everyone to the Planning Committee meeting. She introduced Members and Officers as well as referred to the public speakers who would be speaking on individual applications.</p> <p>It was confirmed that all Members present could hear and see the proceedings and Members could also see the Chair and each other. The Chair explained that Members would use the functionality of the software to raise their hands to speak and each Member would be asked in turn for their vote at the appropriate time.</p> <p>The Chair explained that should the remote conferencing connection be lost there would be an adjournment. She advised that the meeting would be recorded and live-streamed on You Tube.</p>						
PL24	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b> There were no apologies for absence.</p>						
PL25	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b> Councillor Posnett declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to her role as a County Councillor.</p> <p><u>Minute PL27 - Application 20/00391/FUL - 3 Main Street, Grimston</u> Councillor Posnett added that she had received a complaint of being predetermined as she had indicated support for a tweet which demonstrated that the community were supporting the pub which she felt was positive. She confirmed that she came to the meeting with an open mind on the application.</p> <p>Councillor Holmes said that although she had previously lived in Grimston, she had no interest in the application.</p> <p>Councillor Browne confirmed that he would be representing his ward on this application by making a representation to the Committee. He would therefore leave the meeting during debate and voting on this item in accordance with the Council's Procedure Rules.</p>						
PL26	<p><b>Schedule of Applications</b> The Chair advised that application 20/00096/FUL had been withdrawn.</p>						
PL27	<p><b>Application 20/00391/FUL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="288 1688 1433 1899"> <tr> <td><b>Reference:</b></td> <td>20/00391/FUL</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Location:</b></td> <td>3 Main Street Grimston Melton Mowbray LE14 3BZ</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Proposal:</b></td> <td>Change of use: Part conversion of public house to 2 bedroom flat. Alterations to first floor flat access. Conversion of outbuilding to 2 bedroom dwelling. Retain part public house.</td> </tr> </table> <p>(Councillor Browne declared his intention speak as Ward Councillor on this application and therefore here left the Committee and moved into the public speaking gallery.)</p>	<b>Reference:</b>	20/00391/FUL	<b>Location:</b>	3 Main Street Grimston Melton Mowbray LE14 3BZ	<b>Proposal:</b>	Change of use: Part conversion of public house to 2 bedroom flat. Alterations to first floor flat access. Conversion of outbuilding to 2 bedroom dwelling. Retain part public house.
<b>Reference:</b>	20/00391/FUL						
<b>Location:</b>	3 Main Street Grimston Melton Mowbray LE14 3BZ						
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change of use: Part conversion of public house to 2 bedroom flat. Alterations to first floor flat access. Conversion of outbuilding to 2 bedroom dwelling. Retain part public house.						

The Planning Development Manager addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application.

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 Henrietta Maddocks-Wright, Chair, Grimston, Saxelbye & Shoby Parish Council

In response to a Member question on the number of bed and breakfast premises in the area, Councillor Maddocks-Wright responded that there was one other in Grimston and a couple in the surrounding area.

- Mike Petty, Objector
- Haydn Wakefield, on behalf of the Applicant

In response to a Member question, Mr Wakefield responded that the applicants had seen the accounts 3 years ago before purchasing the property and the pub was profitable at that time. With regard to the Council's coronavirus support grant, it was noted that as the pub was not trading on 11 March 2020 it was not eligible for a grant. It was pointed out that the proposal was not for a micro-pub but had allocated a smaller space for the public house function.

- Councillor Ronan Browne, Ward Councillor spoke on the application

Following mention of the community's interest in retaining the pub possibly as an asset of community value, it was asked how the community was going to raise the capital to finance the proposal. Councillor Browne responded that there was interest in buying the pub at the market value and options were under discussion with the Parish Council and other interested parties. He added that the community needed at least 6 months to consider all the options to retain the facility.

The Solicitor advised that the question of the pub becoming an asset of community value was not given as a planning reason for refusal.

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that the application was not for a micro-pub as this was a different type of business, the proposal was to retain part of the building as a public house.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- Reference was made to the coronavirus support grant which was only available for businesses that were trading on 11 March 2020 and as this business was not trading at that time, the applicant was not eligible for the grant;
- The issue of whether there was a proposal for the pub to become an asset of community value was not a planning consideration nor a reason for the recommendation for refusal in the report;
- Grimston was a conservation area and an unsustainable village and there was no proven need for more housing;
- It was mentioned that the previous pub business had thrived on its food offering and the reduced pub floorspace proposed would restrict capacity for this type of trade in the future;

- There was concern at the deterioration of the property and a previously successful business. It was said that the property/business was only worth the market value or what a buyer was willing to pay for it;
- The pub was previously well known as a great asset to the village and local area and its closure was regrettable;
- The proposal was contrary to policy C7 due to Grimston being an unsustainable village due to a lack of facilities and no public transport;
- There was a borough-wide need for 2/3 bed houses but not in this village and pubs were not included in the recent Government statement regarding proposals to introduce new regulations to make changing commercial properties to residential use easier;
- The proposal was also in conflict with policy SS3 and its closure would result in a loss of community life, employment as well as bed and breakfast facilities in the area.

Councillor Posnett proposed to refuse the application and Councillor Faulkner seconded.

**RESOLVED**

That application 20/00391/FUL be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

(Unanimous)

**REASONS**

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal would, if approved, result in the provision of additional dwellings in an unsustainable location. The development occupies a location where there are limited local amenities, facilities and jobs, and where future occupiers are likely to depend highly on the use of a private motor vehicle. The proposal does not meet an identified proven local need and would be contrary to Policy SS3 of the Local Plan which seeks to restrict development in such settlements to that which is based on a local proven need (and subject to other criteria).

The proposed development would result in the loss of a valuable community facility, to the detriment of the life of the community, contrary to Policy C7 of the Melton Local Plan and Paragraphs 83 and 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Insufficient justification has been supplied that shows compliance with these policies with limited other facilities in the village. It is not considered that sufficient detail has been submitted to demonstrate that the Public House can no longer be utilised as such.

(Councillor Browne here re-joined the Committee.)

PL28

**Application 19/01386/FULHH**

<b>Reference:</b>	19/01386/FULHH
<b>Location:</b>	The Elms, 11 King Street, Scalford LE14 4DW
<b>Proposal:</b>	Construction of a two storey extension.

The Planning Development Manager addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the application. It was mentioned that revised plans which reduced the overall height of the extension had been received but these were not significant enough to change the recommendation.

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:

- Zoe Sibree, Applicant

In response to a Member question, the applicant responded that the brick barn would eventually be converted into a TV room.

The Planning Development Manager explained that the offer to reduce the height of the extension was not relevant to the reasons for refusal as this alone did not reduce the size of the extension which had the effect of making the host house subservient to the extension. It was noted that the existing building should remain the prominent feature on the site and the materials proposed were sympathetic and in-keeping with the host property.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- There was a view that did not agree with the recommendation and felt that the applicant should be encouraged to refurbish the farmstead as there were not many left with surrounding land. It was felt to be a well known property and its renovation and investment should be supported as to not do so could put the property into a state of disrepair;
- The Solicitor advised that the reasons given for the recommendation for refusal in the report in terms of adverse impact were subjective, however robust planning reasons would be required in order to overturn the officer's recommendation;
- There was clarification that it was felt the harm and scale of the extension was not detrimental to the site as indicated in the officer's report;
- There was concern at supporting permission as the Conservation Officer had objected to the proposal and it was against local plan policies;
- There was a suggestion for deferral which could offer an opportunity for further discussions with officers to come to a compromise within the agreed policies;
- It was felt that consistency to make decisions in line with policies was important but further dialogue could bring a compromise proposal;
- Some Members felt that as the extension could not be seen from the village or neighbouring roads and therefore could not be considered harmful as overbearing then the proposal was acceptable;
- It was mentioned that the applicant did not intend to build on the large green area to front of the site and the renovation would be an asset to the village;
- The Solicitor pointed out that the green space referred to was not part of the application and was therefore not relevant to the proposal;
- It was advised that conditions could be imposed should the application be approved.

Councillor Chandler proposed to permit the application as it was considered that the harm and scale of the extension was not detrimental to the site as indicated in the officer's report. Councillor Bindloss seconded.

**RESOLVED** that contrary to the officer's recommendation,

Application 19/01386/FULHH be **APPROVED** subject to standard conditions imposing the statutory time limit and specification of plans, and that the use of materials as included in the submitted plans.

	(6 in favour, 5 against)
PL29	<b>Application 20/00096/FUL</b> This application had been withdrawn.
PL30	<b>Urgent Business</b> The Chair advised that the following additional Planning Committee meeting dates had been circulated and these meetings would only go ahead if there was a business need to do so : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Thursday 6 August 2020</li><li>• Thursday 3 September 2020</li><li>• Thursday 1 October 2020</li></ul>

The meeting closed at: 7.44 pm

Chair