

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on WEDNESDAY, 20 JUNE 2018

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman, J G Coxon, D Everitt (Substitute for Councillor J Legrys), D Harrison, R Johnson, V Richichi, A C Saffell, N Smith and M Specht

In Attendance: Councillors T J Pendleton

Officers: I Jordan, Mrs M Meredith, Mr I Nelson, Mr L Sebastian and Mr J White

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Legrys.

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no interests declared.

3 MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Local Plan Advisory Committee held on 14 March 2018.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor R Johnson and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting of the Local Plan Advisory Committee held on 14 March 2018 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

4 DRAFT LIST OF LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS

The Senior Conservation Officer presented the report to members and gave a presentation outlining the 10 themes in total, four of which were being brought forward for consultation, and highlighting the assets included on the draft list for public consultation.

In response to a question from Councillor J Bridges, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that through the public consultation it was hoped to identify any buildings that had been overlooked which fit the themes set out in the draft list, and to identify assets for the other themes to be incorporated at a later stage.

In response to a question from Councillor R Ashman, the Senior Conservation Officer referred members to page 80 of the agenda which set out which Anglican clergy houses had already been added to the statutory list. In respect of suburban and small country houses, the Senior Conservation Officer acknowledged that there was a large list of houses to consider and it was likely that some had been overlooked. He added that the public consultation was the correct forum to highlight those which had been omitted.

In response to comments made by Councillor R Johnson, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that in respect of places of worship, any built before 1751 were listed buildings and as such were protected. He added that St Mary's Church at Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Manor House were listed buildings. He explained that the aim of the document was to identify those assets which were currently unlisted.

Chairman's initials

Councillor R Adams commended the document and thanked the Senior Conservation Officer for his work.

In response to questions from Councillor N Smith, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that officers had not been able to identify a date for the rectories at Packington, Ravenstone and Stretton and he hoped further information would be brought to light during the public consultation.

Pinfolds and lock ups would come under one of the themes to be included at a later date.

In response to questions from Councillor M Specht, the Senior Conservation Officer referred members to the table of cemeteries set out on page 15. He advised that the London Road cemetery was not of the same quality as the Ashby cemetery which was of a similar date; there were no cemetery buildings at the site and the boundary wall had been demolished. He added that he was aware of the war grave at the cemetery which was afforded protection. He explained that the public consultation was the correct forum to bring this forward for further consideration.

Councillor M Specht referred to the communal bake house on in Coleorton dating to 1883. He advised that an attempt had been made to have this listed which had not been successful. He explained that this asset was in great danger as it was in a garden, and if the property changed hands it could be demolished. He advise that the current occupant was in full agreement to sign the asset over to the Parish Council and he would like to see it protected. The Senior Conservation Officer hoped to bring this forward in a future theme.

In response to a question from Councillor V Richichi, the Senior Conservation Officer explained that inclusion of an asset on the list did not remove permitted development rights, however if a planning permission was submitted for a property on a local list it would be a material planning consideration. He added that having a list in place was preferable to identifying assets on an ad hoc basis. In the future, members could also seek to provide greater protection to heritage assets through the use of Article 4 directions whereby permitted development rights were removed.

Councillor J Bridges welcomed this approach as he felt that the automatic removal of permitted development rights could cause greater issues.

In response to a comment from Councillor J G Coxon, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that the aim of the draft list was to identify the war memorials erected in the immediate aftermath of World War I, and as such modern war memorials had not been identified. He agreed that this context could be made clearer in the report.

In response to a question from Councillor J Bridges regarding the protection afforded to war memorials, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that a database of memorials was maintained by Leicestershire County Council, however war memorials were not protected unless they were listed. He added that he felt war memorials in North West Leicestershire were underrepresented.

In response to questions from Councillors D Harrison and R Adams, it was clarified that details of listed buildings were available on the Council's website and was listed by parish.

Councillor J Bridges suggested that members also contact their parish councils who may have further information.

In response to comments from Councillor A C Saffell, the Senior Conservation Officer felt that there was merit in considering the assets at Donington Park as a group.

In response to a question from Councillor N Smith, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that pumps would come under the theme of gardens, parks and urban spaces which would be considered as part of a future exercise.

In response to comments from Councillor N Smith, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that whilst it was not in the scope of this particular exercise, consideration was being given to a review of conservation areas and the removal of permitted development rights where appropriate.

In response to a question from Councillor R Johnson, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that turnpikes would come under the theme of parks and urban spaces infrastructure.

In response to a question from Councillor D Everitt, the Senior Conservation Officer advised that areas such as the old plateway could be brought forward as part of a list of transport buildings.

Councillor A C Saffell made reference to the Castle Donington village appraisal of around 100 buildings that were not listed. He asked about their status.

The Senior Conservation Officer advised that this list could be brought forward as part of a future theme on pre-Victorian dwellings. He added that a review of the Castle Donington conservation area was planned in the coming year.

It was moved by Councillor J G Coxon, seconded by Councillor R Adams and

RESOLVED THAT:

The public consultation regarding the draft list of local heritage assets be noted and supported.

5 OUTCOMES OF THE LOCAL PLAN ISSUES CONSULTATION

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented the report to members, drawing their attention to the review of the Local Plan which was required to commence within 3 months of adoption. He advised that an issues consultation had taken place in February, to which 72 responses had been received. He referred members to section 3.1 of the report which summarised the responses. He advised that many of the issues raised during the consultation were already being addressed, however a number of representations had suggested that the scope of the review should be wider than officers had intended due to the revisions to the NPPF. He added that taking into account some of the decisions made which were contrary to the Local Plan since its adoption suggested that there were some issues of the Local Plan which concerned members. He advised that there was now an opportunity for members to comment on which policies should be reviewed in more detail, and all members would be consulted on this shortly. He advised however that there would be implications for the timetable if a wider review was undertaken than originally anticipated. He added that if the Local Plan was not submitted within 2 years of the commencement of the review, the Local Plan would be deemed to be out of date and as such there were consequences of extending the review. He drew members' attention to the appendix to the report which summarised the representations made and the officer responses.

Councillor J Bridges welcomed the review and commented that some areas had specific needs which should be captured.

Councillor A C Saffell stated that a better relationship between job creation and the housing types being built was required. He referred to the disparity in his area between

the distribution jobs that were available which paid less than £25k, and the houses being built which were unaffordable at £150k. He added that the majority of people working in those distribution jobs did not live in the immediate area and the people living in the area were travelling out. He stated that consequently the roads were congested and this also affected local businesses who could not receive deliveries. He felt that a more strategic view ought to be taken in terms of relating employment and housing more closely.

Councillor V Richichi asked whether the completion date of this review would be affected by the memorandum of understanding. The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that this could have a knock on effect in terms of the content and timing of the review. He added that unfortunately this issue was not in the Council's control however the situation would be kept under review.

Councillor J Bridges expressed his view that the Local Plan should be submitted regardless of delays in progress with the memorandum of understanding. The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that members may also need to consider building in additional flexibility in this case.

Councillor R Johnson commented on the lack of open spaces in his village, which were important for health, and the lack of infrastructure in terms of roads and services. He felt this needed to be looked at.

Members made comments relating to schemes for building affordable housing for key workers. The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the issue of affordable housing did need to be reconsidered in a general sense, and this could include schemes for key workers.

Councillor M Specht expressed concerns regarding the issue of organic growth in villages, particularly in respect of Coleorton. He also expressed concerns about the lack of a self-build policy. He commented that his understanding was that the Local Plan Committee was to be a decision making body and he felt these issues should be brought forward as agenda items.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the Local Plan review was not yet at the stage where such decisions could be made. He added that he was aware of members' concerns relating to the organic growth of villages and advised that officers hoped to understand the concerns through the questionnaire referred to previously and address them in the review. He added that the matter of self builds and discounted housing needed to be considered as part of the affordable housing issue.

Councillor N Smith felt that clarify was needed on the issue of self-build as he felt this was being utilised as a tool for developers.

Councillor R Johnson felt that a policy was needed to address the issue of bungalows.

It was moved by Councillor D Harrison, seconded by Councillor V Richichi and

RESOLVED THAT:

The comments received on the recent Local Plan issues consultation, and officers' responses to these comments be noted.

6 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report to members, drawing their attention to the existing statement of community involvement at Appendix A and the proposed changes to the document.

It was moved by Councillor J G Coxon, seconded by Councillor V Richichi and

RESOLVED THAT:

- a) The need to revise the existing Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for the reasons set out in the report be noted; and
- b) The suggested revisions to the SCI as set out at Appendix A be supported for consultation purposes.

7 LOCAL GREEN SPACES

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report to members, outlining the scope of the proposed consultation to identify local green spaces. He advised that the consultation would be aimed primarily at parish and town councils to bring forward sites, however he was conscious that some areas were not covered by parish council and there may be some local groups in those areas that could assist with the consultation. He added that the consultation would be open to the public subsequent to the direct consultation with parish councils. Following the initial consultation, the list of sites would be assessed via an agreed methodology and the list of sites would be brought back to the Local Plan Committee at a later date.

In response to a question from Councillor R Adams, the Planning Policy Team Manager advised that designating a piece of land as a local green space would ensure no new development on the land without a very good reason.

In response to a question from Councillor M Specht, the Planning Policy Team Manager advised that it was intended to commence the call for sites next week and the consultation would continue for 8 weeks. He added however that the designation would have no status until the Local Plan was agreed.

Councillor R Adams asked that Councillor J Geary be notified of the consultation as Chairman of the Coalville Special Expenses Working Party.

Councillor A C Saffell referred to a piece of land in his area that the community wanted to protect which had current planning permission. He asked if there was an opportunity to protect this considering that the planning permission was due to expire. The Planning Policy Team Manger explained that it would be difficult to protect a piece of land with planning permission and suggested that this may need to be brought forward in a future review,

In response to a question from Councillor J G Coxon, the Planning Policy Team Manager explained that it would be a massive undertaking for officers to identify sites and the assessment of the sites brought forward would take some time. He felt that the identification of sites should come from the communities.

It was moved by Councillor J G Coxon, seconded by Councillor R Johnson and

RESOLVED THAT:

The Local Plan Committee supports the proposals that:

Chairman's initials

- a) Consideration be given to including local green space as part of the Local Plan review;
- b) a call for sites for the identification of potential local green spaces be undertaken as outlined at paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of this report; and
- c) the call for sites be open for an 8 week period to allow evidence to be gathered.

8 GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE ALLOCATION DPD:UPDATE

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report to members, drawing their attention to the previous draft document that was considered at the last meeting of the Local Plan Advisory Committee. He explained that the draft document was due to be considered by Council but was withdrawn because officers were made aware of the possibility of other available sites in the district which needed to be investigated. He outlined the proposals set out in the previous report. He explained that since the withdrawal of the draft document, officers had been looking at a potential range of sources of additional sites, and in order to maximise the chances of identifying alternative sites, it was recommended that a further call for sites be undertaken which would concentrate on provision for a transit site and for travelling showpeople. He added that there was no guarantee that any further sites would be put forward through the call for sites.

In response to questions from Councillor J G Coxon, the Planning Policy Team Manager explained that the time period of the call for sites would be consistent with the previous exercise. The call for sites would concentrate on any sites that had previously been omitted rather than revisiting sites, and also any sites where there had been a change such as refusal of a planning application.

Councillor A C Saffell commented that provision for travelling showpeople should only be made for those who were members of the showmen's guild.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that provision could not be restricted in such a way. Councillor A C Saffell agreed to provide contact details for the showmen's guild to the Planning Policy Team Manager.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor M Specht regarding the site at Sinope, the Planning Policy Team Manager advised that there was an extant planning permission in place and there was no action to be taken as long as the activity on the site was in accordance with the planning permission. In relation to the appeal on the Aylesbury Garden site at Swepstone, the owner of the Sinope site had made it clear that the site was available for the travelling community.

Councillor R Ashman commented that wherever the transit site was located would be contentious. He also hoped that the ward councillor would be involved at an early stage. He added that the manner in which this was dealt with would make a big difference.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor R Adams and

RESOLVED THAT:

- a) The update in respect of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD be noted;
- b) The proposal to issue a further call for sites be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.15 pm

Chairman's signature