

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 2 DECEMBER 2014

Present: Councillor D J Stevenson (Chairman)

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, J Cotterill (Substitute for Councillor M Specht), J G Coxon, D Everitt, T Gillard, J Houlton, D Howe, R Johnson, G Jones, J Legrys, T Neilson, N Smith, R Woodward and M B Wyatt

In Attendance: Councillors D De Lacy, J Geary, P Hyde, T J Pendleton and S Sheahan

Officers: Mr S Bambrick, Mrs V Blane, Mr C Elston, Mrs H Exley, Mr J Knightley, Mr J Mattley, Mrs M Meredith, Mr J Newton and Ms S Worrall

77. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Adams and M Specht.

78. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, Members declared the following interests:

Councillors J Bridges and G Jones declared a non pecuniary interest in item A1, application number 14/00460/OUTM, as an acquaintance of the applicant.

Councillors G A Allman, J G Coxon, J Houlton, G Jones declared a non pecuniary interest in item A1, application number 14/00460/OUTM, as Members of Ashby Town Council.

Councillor N Smith declared a pecuniary interest in item A1, application number 14/00460/OUTM, as a friend and business associate of the applicant's family. He emphasised that he had no financial interest whatsoever in respect of this application.

Councillor D Howe declared a non pecuniary interest in item A3, application number 14/00893/FULM, as an active emh group shareholder.

Councillor J Legrys declared a non pecuniary interest in item A3, application number 14/00893/FULM, as a volunteer at Hermitage FM which was located adjacent to the site.

Councillor M B Wyatt declared a non pecuniary interest in item A3, application number 14/00893/FULM, having lobbied to have the building demolished.

Councillor R Johnson declared a non pecuniary interest in item A4, application number 13/00956/OUTM, as a Member of Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council.

Members declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of various applications as below:

Item A1, application number 14/00460/OUTM
Councillors, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Houlton, D Howe, R Johnson, J Legrys, T Neilson, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt.

Item A2, application number 14/00578/OUTM
Councillors G A Allman J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, T Gillard, J Houlton, T Neilson, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt.

Item A3, application number 14/00893/FULM
Councillors J Legrys and D J Stevenson.

Chairman's initials

Item A4, application number 13/00956/OUTM
Councillors G A Allman, J Cotterill, D Everitt, T Gillard, R Johnson, J Legrys, T Neilson, D J Stevenson, R Woodward and M B Wyatt.

Item A6, application number 14/00862/FULM
Councillors G A Allman, J G Coxon, J Houlton and D J Stevenson.

79. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2014.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor G Jones and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

80. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration, as amended by the update sheet circulated at the meeting.

81. 5. **14/00460/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (UP TO 81 DWELLINGS), ASSOCIATED OPEN SPACE (INCORPORATING COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE), DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE (OUTLINE - ACCESS INCLUDED)** Land Adjacent To Blackfordby House Farm Butt Lane Blackfordby

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT Subject to a Section 106 Agreement

Having declared a pecuniary interest in item A1, Councillor N Smith left the meeting during consideration of this item and took no part in the consideration or voting thereon.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Mrs D Whetton addressed the meeting on behalf of the Town Council. She stated that the Town Councillors had been consulted on the original application earlier in the year and had objected to the proposals. She added that this application had subsequently been amended with no opportunity to comment. She felt that the Town Council's objections were still applicable and the issues had not been addressed. She stated that the site was outside the limits to development, was unsustainable and would add pressure to the existing facilities. She added that there was no medical provision, no shops, and no space at the school. She commented that the Council had already identified its 5 year housing land supply and cars were overused in Blackfordby. She stated that action needed to be taken against the cars using the road as a rat run as it was dangerous to walk on the footpaths, and the road was being treated as a motorway. She added that flooding remained a real concern to the properties adjacent, and the ecological report was flawed. She accepted that adequate housing should be provided, but felt there were smaller pockets of land which were suitable for this purpose within the village. She concluded that the applicant had not addressed the concerns raised by Ashby Town Councillors and to permit the development would not be in the best interests of the village.

Chairman's signature

Mr R Nettleton, objector, addressed the meeting. He stated that he had lived within 100 yards of the application site all his life. He commented that the site was outside the village limits. He expressed concerns regarding flooding, unrecorded mining and unrecorded landfill at the site. He added that there had been issues with sewage for as long as he could remember. He felt that residents had been ignored despite the guidance advising planners to seek local knowledge and he had received a letter stating that officers were too busy to respond to his concerns. He added that he had been an eyewitness to the materials that had been dumped into the landfill and to the collapse of old workings on the site. He stated that none of these issues had been properly investigated and the risk of flooding had been ignored. He respectfully requested that Members listen to residents and seek accurate information now before making a decision.

Mr C Lindley, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He fully endorsed the officer's recommendation. He stated that the applicant had worked hard to listen to, and where appropriate, respond to comments raised by interested parties. He added that the proposal had received no objections from any statutory consultee. He commented that the Council must maintain a 5 year housing land supply and the application provided an appropriate form of development to maintain this. He added that for permission to be refused, the benefits of the scheme, which he outlined, would need to be significantly outweighed. He concluded that Members could be confident that the proposal embodied sustainable development and had no significant adverse impact. He respectfully requested that Members support the officer's recommendation.

Councillor T Neilson stated that in addition to visiting the site he had been out speaking to residents over the last few weeks to seek their views. He understood that the officer view was that the site fits within village envelope, which could be said taking into consideration the commercial properties. He commented however that the views toward the commercial properties were very restricted by vegetation and formed a natural barrier, which contradicted that viewpoint. He did not feel that development in this direction was useful as it was necessary to maintain a separation to Woodville. He also disagreed that the settlement was sustainable, as it could not be argued that residents could walk to the Norris Hill shops. He added that one of the speakers referred to the huge reliance on cars which suggested that residents would travel to the shops in Ashby de la Zouch, which doused the argument that the development would make existing facilities any more sustainable than they already were. He moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to policy S3, was outside the limits to development and in his view there was no evidence that the proposals would be sustainable.

The motion was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Chairman sought to move to the vote.

Councillor T Neilson requested a recorded vote.

Councillor J Legrys sought to raise a point of order as he had requested to speak to the motion.

The Chairman invited Councillor J Legrys to speak to the motion.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he was opposed to the development for a number of reasons. He commented that Mr Nettleton had made a powerful speech regarding what had happened to the backfill on the site, and this was in the days when landfill was completely and utterly uncontrolled. He added that Mr Nettleton had observed all sorts of things going into the landfill and it could not be known what was under the surface. He stated that he could not have it on his conscience if the Council started receiving complaints. He referred to recommendation on page 47 that the extraction of coal should be considered as a remedial measure prior to development taking place. He expressed

Chairman's signature

deep concerns that this was never mentioned in the application. He concluded that there was a great deal of uncertainty with this site which caused doubt in his mind. He stated that he would be voting in favour of refusal of the application.

Councillor G Jones expressed concerns regarding Mr Nettleton's observation that officers had sent out letters saying they were too busy. He sought clarification on whether this was true.

The Planning and Development Team Manager stated that the letter received by Mr Nettleton was a standard acknowledgement letter sent in reply to neighbour objections. He added that the team were not able to comment on every single objection from every objector, but that did not mean that the views expressed had been disregarded.

Councillor J Bridges sought confirmation that, taking into consideration the officer's report and local knowledge, conditions 9 and 11 would cover the concerns raised regarding ground investigations, and these conditions would protect the Council from development without the necessary items being confirmed.

The Chairman confirmed that this was the case and added that the same would apply with conditions 16, 24 and 25 in respect of flooding.

Councillor D Everitt commented that the application put him in mind of a previous application that had been quashed due to methane coming up from the landfill. He made reference to the cost of this and hoped that this had been investigated thoroughly.

The Chairman then put the motion to refuse the application to the vote.

A recorded vote having been requested, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors J G Coxon, D Everitt, D Howe, R Johnson, J Legrys, T Neilson, R Woodward and M B Wyatt (8).

Against the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, J Cotterill, T Gillard, J Hault, G Jones and D J Stevenson (7).

Abstentions:

None (0).

The motion was therefore declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to policy S3, was outside the limits to development and was not sustainable.

Councillor N Smith returned to the meeting.

82.

A1

14/00578/OUTM: DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 275 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, LANDSCAPING, OPEN SPACE AND DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE (OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS RESERVED APART FROM ACCESS FROM BURTON ROAD AND MOIRA ROAD)

Land Between Burton Road And Moira Road Shellbrook Ashby De La Zouch

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT Subject to a Section 106 Agreement

Chairman's signature

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Ms D Grice, objector, addressed the meeting. She stated that the application was a departure from policy S3, and commented that policies were useless if applications were still being considered regardless. She added that residents had expressed concerns regarding the impact on roads and pollution, and Ashby Town Council had objected on the grounds that the district's housing quota had been met. She stated that the development could lead to a saturation of houses. She added that there were issues in respect of flooding, design and access, and all properties on the boundary of the development would be overlooked and the streetscape would be adversely affected. She felt that the community feel of the area would be lost and the proposals would cause additional hazards on the footpath used by school children. She added that local residents were experiencing disruption on the road with the existing development and the delivery of heavy goods.

Mr R Garnham, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He stated that the planning merits of the application had been covered in the officer's report. He commented that every Council had to have a local plan and a land supply. He added that in order to show commitment to developing the site, the applicant proposed to amend the condition in respect of the reserved matters application to specify that this be submitted in 2 years rather than 3. He added that the proposals would provide a range of affordable housing including bungalows for older people. He added that the legal agreement would give first refusal to people in the local area, and the development would truly deliver local homes for local people. He commented that only 14 objections had been received from members of the public, which he hoped was a reflection of the huge efforts the applicant had gone to in respect of this scheme. He reassured Members that the application would meet the needs of local people and would do so in a timeframe that supported the Council's strategic needs. He respectfully requested that Members support the officer's recommendation.

Councillor J G Coxon stated that he had the opposite view to the officers. He moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to policy S3 and was not sustainable. He commented that the proposals would extend the limits of Ashby de la Zouch further and would put a belt or perimeter on the town. He made reference to the density of the application and added that the site was significantly overdeveloped.

The motion was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised Members that the sustainability issue had been given as a reason for refusal in respect of the site to the south of this development, and this was permitted at appeal. He advised that the Inspector had said this was not reasonable and therefore he felt that this could not be defended on appeal. He added that the change to the condition in respect of the reserved matters application would be welcomed and accepted. He advised that conditions were imposed which addressed the concerns regarding flooding, as was the impact of construction. He stated that visual impact was unavoidable on a development of this size and Members were asked to make a judgement given the existing structures, the proposed development to the south and the proposed forest planting. He advised that in respect of the affordable housing, the Council as the housing authority would have a say as to how the affordable housing was allocated.

Councillor J Hoult commented that the proposal was too close to Norris Hill and he expressed concerns about development in this general direction. He asked if the application could be refused on the grounds that it was too close to the next settlement.

Chairman's signature

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised that the application could not be refused on this basis as the same arguments would apply to the other sites. He added that the development would not extend significantly beyond the existing settlement.

The Chairman commented that the density of the proposal was quite low.

Councillor T Neilson stated that personally he could see very little difference between this site and the previous item, except that this was slightly closer to the amenities, which were far in advance of those at Norris Hill. Additionally local transport was available and he hoped this was taken into consideration. He Agreed with officers and did not feel the sustainability argument applied in this case because of the offer in the town. He felt that Money Hill as a proposal was far more sustainable than this one. He sought a view from the officer on how this would affect the ongoing appeal in respect of Money Hill as it was far closer to the town centre than this application.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised that the Money Hill appeal was at a very early stage so it was difficult to answer how this might be impacted. He advised that in principle, adding to stock of sites nearby would not hurt the Council's case as it would demonstrate that permission would be granted when a good site came forward that met the requisite criteria.

The Chairman urged Members to bear in mind the officer's advice.

Councillor G Jones stated that he was very concerned about stretching the envelope of the Ashby de la Zouch boundary. He added that the town had had to take more than its share of housing and immigration. He felt that it would be wrong to grant further permissions when there were existing developments that had not been commenced. He added therefore that he would be voting against the proposals.

Councillor T Gillard enquired about the potential cost of losing at appeal.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised that the costs could potentially escalate up to hundreds of thousands of pound if a public inquiry was held, which represented a significant amount of the budget.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he would be voting in favour of refusal of the application. He sought clarification about the proposed distributor road through the site and expressed concerns that this could create a western Ashby bypass which could encourage further growth in the area. He stated that he shared the concerns regarding extending the Ashby de la Zouch envelope towards the Moira boundary and the settlement of Shellbrook. He believed that extending Ashby in this direction was the wrong way to go. He stated that he supported any community who were having deep concerns regarding maintaining their community identity and proper areas of separation to the next town, which was why he would be supporting the motion to refuse the application.

The Chairman reminded Members that the internal roads associated with the development would be discussed at a later stage.

Due to the officer's advice in respect of the reasons for refusal, the Chairman requested a recorded vote on the motion.

The motion to refuse the application was then put to the vote.

A recorded vote having been requested, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, J G Coxon, J Hault, G Jones and J Legrys (5).

Chairman's signature

Against the motion:

Councillors J Bridges, J Cotterill, D Everitt, T Gillard, D Howe, R Johnson, T Neilson, N Smith, D J Stevenson, R Woodward and M B Wyatt (11).

Abstentions:

None (0).

The motion was therefore declared LOST.

The officer's recommendation was then put to vote and declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

83.

A2

14/00893/FULM: DEMOLITION OF PUBLIC HOUSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF 14 NEW ONE BED FLATS

The Pick N Shovel 2 High Street Coalville Leicestershire

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor J Legrys referred to the emh letting policy and sought clarification whether the properties would be let to single people over 30 years of age.

The Planning and Development Team Manager advised that this was his understanding of the policy, and this would be carefully assessed at the letting stage.

Councillor J Legrys felt that the development had to be welcomed, and he added that the community wanted this building demolished. He stated that he had been involved in the project that had been trying to acquire the building, and a lot of structural ironwork inside it had been removed by unauthorised people. He stated that the site needed to become part of the community again and needed to be in use. He commented that a lot of people were disappointed the site was not going to be returned to retail use. He felt however that this had to be outweighed by the fact that a Registered Social Landlord was on board who was willing to bring the site back to fruitful use. He added that he shared many people's scepticism that the project would not materialise and he sincerely hoped that emh could strike a deal with the current owner of the property. He welcomed the removal of the bay windows as they were unsightly and overhung the highway. He acknowledged that there would be problems with construction traffic and the local community would have to be aware that there would be some inconvenience for passing public and traders during the construction phase. He referred to the concerns raised in the community about unauthorised car parking, and the discussions that had taken place with enforcement officers regarding waiting areas, which would need to be kept under control. He welcomed the development and asked Members to support the proposals for benefit of the community.

Councillor G A Allman commended the application and felt that the external visage was a credit.

Councillor T Gillard agreed that the application was well overdue. He also paid tribute to the Council for committing funds to support the scheme.

Chairman's signature

Councillor M B Wyatt added that this was fantastic news and long overdue. He also thanked the Leader of the Council for taking up this opportunity.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he supported the proposals but urged caution regarding the design of the first floor windows. He commented that there was a similar scheme in Measham and the windows quickly became very ugly. He felt this would not add to the streetscene at all.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor T Gillard and

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration, subject to the amended conditions as outlined in the update sheet.

84.

A3

13/00956/OUTM: DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 2700 DWELLINGS, UP TO 2 HA FOR A NEW LOCAL CENTRE INCLUDING UP TO 2000 SQM FOR A1, A2, A3, AND A5 USES, UP TO 499 SQM FOR PUBLIC HOUSE RESTAURANT, UP TO 400 SQM FOR CHILDREN'S DAY NURSERY AND UP TO 500 SQM FOR NEW MEDICAL CENTRE; NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL, ON-SITE NATIONAL FOREST PLANTING AND AREAS OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACES, NEW BUS ROUTES AND BUS INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSOCIATED HIGHWAYS AND DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE. (OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS RESERVED)

Land Off Grange Road Grange Road Hugglescote Leicestershire

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT Subject to a Section 106 Agreement

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Dr T Eynon, County Councillor, addressed the meeting. She stated that she had no objection to the principle of development on the site and had nothing but praise for the way the agent had engaged with residents. She felt however that the application was premature from a highways perspective, and much more work needed to be done to make the scheme viable. She added that there would be a material impact on every junction of the A511. She noted that the original solution included a bypass, which had been delayed for years due to increasing costs. She added that the Planning Committee had now approved an application on the land set aside for the bypass. She stated that the link road which was intended to punch through the site was mired in difficulties and was likely to cost far more than the developer could hope to provide. She commented that monies from the transport and infrastructure pot from this development would be going towards the works at the Markfield junction in Hinckley and Bosworth. She asked the Committee to reject this offer until the officers have worked up a robust strategy to find the requisite funding for the bypass and the other infrastructure requirements as identified by the Highways Authority.

Mr W Jennings, representing the Parish Council, addressed the meeting. He stated that he was the Chair of the planning working party and since its inception, the Parish Council had engaged with higher authorities. He expressed concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure in what was by far the biggest application for the district. He stated that the proposals were in contravention of policy E21 as the parish identities would be compromised. He added that there was no infrastructure in place to support the development and the proposed punch through road was eighth on the list of priorities. He commented that phrase 'short term pain for long term gain' had been quoted, yet it was the communities that would pay the price. He stated that not only was the weight of traffic a prime concern, but also the roads expected to bear the traffic were not fit for purpose,

Chairman's signature

and the road proposed as the main thoroughfare was dangerous. He added that the school did not have spare capacity and the issues raised had not been addressed. He stated that the proposals were contrary to policy E4 as they were not in tune with the surroundings, as much of Hugglescote was Victorian. He added that the lack of affordable housing was also a concern and there were too many unanswered questions in respect of this development. He also questioned the CIL compatibility of the scheme.

Councillor P Hyde, Ward Member, addressed the meeting. He stated that the agent had done an excellent job and had involved the local community, parish council and district council Members, which was what everyone should do when submitting a scheme of this size which affected the area. He referred to the workshops which had been held and the overriding 2 points highlighted had been sewers and highways. He commented that he had been involved with the project since the beginning. He added that the major concern was the highways implications, as was evident in the report. He pointed out that no consultation had been done by the Highways Authority on this issue and HGVs cutting through the area was a problem. He felt that the scheme should be deferred to enable the highways issues to be resolved. He commented that originally there was a requirement for a bypass which would have to be funded by the developer; however now the advice was that there was less traffic and therefore a bypass was not needed. He assured Members that there was more traffic now than there was in 1995.

Mr G Lees, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He stated that the South East Coalville development represented the most significant component of achieving the sustainable growth of Coalville. He felt it was important to point out that part of site at the north was allocated for housing and the southern part was brownfield. He highlighted the clear and desirable benefits of approving the application, such as contributions to the regeneration of the town centre, walking and cycling routes, two new centres, two new primary schools and 44% of the site being allocated for planting. He referred to the key concerns regarding highways, and pointed out that there was now over £24 million on the table for infrastructure provision secured through planning permissions and the central government growth deal. He added that this was a chicken and egg situation, and without granting permissions, further central government funding would not be forthcoming. He commented that the offer in respect of affordable housing and education was above and beyond what other schemes were offering. He respectfully requested that Members accept the officer's recommendation.

It was moved by Councillor J Bridges and seconded by Councillor T Gillard that the application be permitted in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

Councillor R Johnson acknowledged that the land had been allocated for housing but questioned whether this application was really necessary for South East Coalville without having the proper highways infrastructure through the villages. He commented that to have two new villages within the Hugglescote Parish boundary was just plain daft. He added that one major element not included in the application by the consortium was the impact on the quality of residents' life, which was not acceptable. He added that residents had concerns regarding what impact the development would have on their village identities as there would be no area of separation. He commented that the villages should not be seen as a dumping ground for developers' profits. He felt that the application was premature, considering that Leicestershire County Council had just begun a consultation on the community centre and the future of the crossroads, the results of which would not be known until 2015. He added that this would affect roads further afield and there would be an impact upon Bardon Road also with the quarry increasing production. He expressed concerns regarding the access on Beveridge Lane. He commented that no amount of money thrown at all the road junctions and islands around the town would solve the traffic problems as there were still branches of highway which were not fit for a large development such as this. He added that the bypass would have partly solved the problem with the lack of infrastructure, but this was not an option, and the proposed punch

Chairman's signature

through road may never happen. He noted that the school would accommodate 420 pupils which was not a lot considering the housing numbers. He commented that the local centre may be forward thinking from the developers to include a proposed sustainable area. He referred to the widening of Grange Road which residents had previously been totally opposed to. He added that having access points of an only bus lane road onto one of the narrowest parts of Forest Road was a crazy idea, and to top it all the access point close to Newbridge School was on a renowned accident hotspot. He asked if this was reasonable. He commented that the plans looked wonderful on a piece of paper, but in reality there would be a lot of upheaval for residents for a very long time. He asked if it was worth it. He commented that the residents were not of the persuasion of the short term pain for long term gain scenario. In his view proper infrastructure was required before there could be any notion of building.

Councillor M B Wyatt commented that he wished he didn't have to support the proposal, but due to it being the only way to fund the relief road he felt he had no choice. He added that the residents understood that without this development there could be no relief road. He added that this application would go some way to relieving the highway situation. He pointed out the infrastructure plans were yet to be finalised in respect of Network Rail, and he was confident the ransom strip issue could be addressed. He added that he had spoken to a representative of the consortium and asked if they would be prepared to fund a feasibility study for the reintroduction of the Ivanhoe Line and they had indicated that they would do so if officers approached them for a contribution. He stated that he would be supporting the proposals.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he could not support the application, however he extended his personal thanks to the agent for the exemplary work he had done with the Parish and District Councillors. He stated that the crossroads at Broom Leys Road was already at capacity and the impact of the development had been demonstrated to be material. As part of the junction was in his Ward, he asked how long the short term pain was likely to last and how many properties would need to be demolished to provide the significant improvement required at the junction.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the strategy was designed to enable Leicestershire County Council to draw on the monies in a priority order so that most pressing issues could be addressed first, and therefore the timescales could not currently be known. He added that no detailed schemes had been drawn up yet, by the Highways Authority who would need to draw these up and address the priorities as they came forward.

In response to a comment from Councillor J Legrys, the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the junction was in an air quality management area and it had been concluded that the proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on air quality.

In response to comment from Councillor J Legrys, the Head of Planning and Regeneration clarified that the presence of a housing land supply was not a basis for asking the Planning Committee to reconsider an application, regardless of whether the Section 106 Agreement had been signed or the decision notice issued.

Councillor J Legrys asked if there was any likelihood that land at Park Lane was likely to come back before the Committee.

The Chairman reminded Councillor J Legrys to confine his comments to the application before him.

Councillor J Legrys commented that the issue was that the application would further increase the housing land supply, which he felt would jeopardise those permissions where the Section 106 Agreements hadn't been signed. Considering this, he expressed

Chairman's signature

concerns that residents were having to put up with long term pain for short term gain. He praised the agent's work on engagement and felt that where the developers had been let down was in breaking the logjam of highways improvements. He added that the bypass was sacrificed and the land now had a planning permission granted. He referred to the alternative offered by the failed Core Strategy which was the ransom strip belonging to Network Rail. He stated that he was of the opinion that the punch through road would go above the cost of whatever would be provided by central government. He referred to the 699 properties proposed on the Massarella land, which had not materialised due to housing marketability and the lack of proper highways. He added that no mitigation was proposed for the school and the inconvenience of school gate parking. He expressed concerns regarding the demolition and blitzing of the centre of Hugglescote and the additional traffic going into Ravenstone. He commented that the route was the old route between Leicestershire and Ashby de la Zouch, and he did not want to see traffic going through the village and using Corkscrew Lane to access the A42.

The Chairman reminded Councillor J Legrys that no Member may speak for more than 5 minutes without the permission of the Chairman. He asked Councillor J Legrys to conclude his speech.

As a point of personal explanation, Councillor J Legrys stated that he felt the application was premature and he was opposed to it.

Councillor T Gillard stated that he supported the application as he firmly believed it would go a long way to securing the Whitwick green wedge if successful.

Councillor R Woodward stated that Councillor T Gillard's comments had spurred him to speak. He stated that he agreed with what he was saying, however he commented he was claiming to be the saviour of the green wedge, but others had done so long before.

Councillor T Neilson commented that the application was outline so he did not see how it could be premature.

The Chairman called for order at this point in the meeting.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he shared the concerns that the fabled bypass would not see the light of day due to difficulties down the line. He felt that it was necessary to bear in mind that a lot of that work had a long way to go and what was currently needed was to establish the principle of development on the site. He stated that he supported the recommendation.

Councillor T Gillard requested a recorded vote.

The Chairman then put the motion to permit the application to the vote.

A recorded vote having been requested, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, T Gillard, J Hoult, D Howe, G Jones, N Smith, D J Stevenson, R Woodward and M B Wyatt (13).

Against the motion:

Councillors, R Johnson and J Legrys, (2).

Abstentions:

Councillor T Neilson (1).

The motion was therefore declared CARRIED.

Chairman's signature

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

- 85. A4**
14/00898/FUL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND THE ERECTION OF THREE TWO STOREY DWELLINGS
 34 Copson Street Ibstock Coalville Leicestershire

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor R Johnson requested that a condition be included in respect of the hours of construction, to restrict the working time to 7.30am to 5.30pm Monday to Friday, 7.30am to 1.30pm on Saturdays and no Sunday operating

The Chairman advised that a note to the applicant could be included to that effect.

Councillor J Legrys commented that he had some sympathy for neighbours in respect of car parking. He added that the access to the site was not grand, and may be difficult if there was no co-operation between neighbours. He also requested a note to the applicant in respect of construction traffic, and to ensure that further negotiations took place with the Highways Authority regarding how the access and visibility issues could be better mitigated.

It was moved by Councillor J Bridges, seconded by Councillor T Gillard and

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

- 86. A5**
14/00862/FULM: TEMPORARY CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURE TO A SOLAR FARM WITH CONTINUED AGRICULTURE AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE
 Site Opposite Ashby Rugby Club Nottingham Road Ashby De La Zouch Leicestershire

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

It was moved by Councillor J Bridges, seconded by Councillor G Jones and

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

- 87. A6**
14/00934/FUL: TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION CONSISTING OF A RESIDENTIAL ANNEXE
 Ambro Mill Slade Lane Wilson Melbourne

Chairman's signature

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Planning and Development Team Manager presented the report to Members.

It was moved by Councillor G Jones, seconded by Councillor T Gillard and

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

88.

A7

14/00976/FUL: FORMATION OF AN ACCESS RAMP FOR USE BY DISABLED PERSONS WITH THE ERECTION OF A STEEL HANDRAIL, FROM IBSTOCK HIGH STREET CAR PARK INTO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEISURE COMPLEX AND INSTALLATION OF DROPPED KERB COMPLIANT WITH DISABILITY REGULATIONS.

Ibstock Community College Central Avenue Ibstock Coalville

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

It was moved by Councillor R Woodward, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 6.43 pm

Chairman's signature