

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 9 JUNE 2015

Present: Councillor D J Stevenson (Chairman)

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, J Bridges, R Canny, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary (Substitute for Councillor R Adams), D Harrison (Substitute for Councillor V Richichi), J Hoult, R Johnson, G Jones, J Legrys, N Smith, M Specht and M B Wyatt

In Attendance: Councillors R D Bayliss, J Clarke, F Fenning and S McKendrick

Officers: Mr C Elston, Mr D Gill, Miss E Mattley, Mr J Mattley, Mr J Newton and Mrs R Wallace

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Adams and V Richichi.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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

Councillor J Bridges declared a non pecuniary interest in item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM as an acquaintance of the applicant and during the meeting he declared a non pecuniary interest in item A6, application number 14/01140/OUT as he had an application himself within the district for a care facility.

Councillor J G Coxon declared a non pecuniary interest in item A4, application number 15/00196/FULM and item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM as a member of Ashby Town Council. He also declared a further non pecuniary interest in item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM as a previous customer of the applicant.

Councillor J Hoult declared a non pecuniary interest in item A4, application number 15/00196/FULM and item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM as a member of Ashby Town Council.

Councillor G Jones declared a non pecuniary interest in item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM as an associate of the applicant.

Councillor J Legrys declared a pecuniary interest in item A7, application number 15/00257/FUL as a volunteer at Hermitage FM. He left the meeting during consideration and voting on the application.

Councillor N Smith declared a non pecuniary interest in item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM as a friend and business associate of the applicant. He left the meeting during consideration and voting on the application.

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

Item A1, application number 13/00959/OUTM

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary, D Harrison, J Hoult, R Johnson, G Jones, J Legrys, N Smith, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt.

Item A2, application number 13/01002/OUTM

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary, D

Chairman's initials

Harrison, J Hoult, R Johnson, G Jones, J Legrys, N Smith, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt.

Item A4, application number 15/00196/FULM

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary, D Harrison, J Hoult, R Johnson, G Jones, J Legrys, N Smith, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt.

Item A5, application number 15/00083/OUTM

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Hoult, R Johnson, G Jones, J Legrys, N Smith, M Specht and D J Stevenson.

Item A6, application number 14/01140/OUT

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J Hoult, J Legrys, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt.

Item A7, application number 15/00257/FUL

Councillor D J Stevenson.

3. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2015.

Councillor M Specht referred to a statement on page 5 and asked for the following factual amendments:

Reference to Bakewell Way be amended to Bakewell Lane and reference to the A42 be amended to A512.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

Subject to the amendments, the minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2015 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

4. 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.

The Chairman informed the Committee that item A3, application number 14/01106/OUTM had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant and therefore would not be considered at the meeting.

In relation to item A1, application number 13/00959/OUTM and item A2, application number 13/01002/OUTM, the Planning and Development Team Manager read out the following letter from Andrew Bridgen MP to the Chairman of the Planning Committee:

'I am writing with regards to the above applications which following a judicial review, are once again requesting planning permission in the village of Packington. I have received a number of objections to the various planning applications from residents of the village and I understand around 100 have been lodged with the Council. I have had the issues of principle and sustainability of the proposal and associated flood risks raised in correspondence to me and the application is outside the limits of development and

Chairman's initials

represents a significant increase in the size of the village.

I would ask that your committee consider all of these local objections to the application and whether this scale of house building is appropriate in the village.'

5.

A1

**13/00959/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR UP TO 42 DWELLINGS
(OUTLINE - DETAILS OF ACCESS INCLUDED)**

Land At Spring Lane/Normanton Road Packington

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

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

Parish Councillor C Miles addressed the Committee. He believed that the application did not meet the National Policy Framework or the Local Plan and gave the following reasons to reject it; protection of the historical environment, the school was already at full capacity, it was not the preferred site, it was not sustainable and was contrary to the NPPF. He explained that there had already been approval for other developments in the area which meant that there would be enough new housing in line with all policies and plans. He referred to an email from the Minister for Housing and Planning, Brandon Lewis MP, which stated that he was ensuring countryside was being protected. He concluded by urging Members to refuse the application.

Ms A Walters, objector, addressed the Committee. She explained that she was a planning solicitor who had been appointed by the residents of Packington to represent them. She listed the following objections to the application:

- It was outside the limits of development and unsustainable
- It would have a harmful impact on Packington House
- The proposals would have a disproportionate impact on the size of the village and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the countryside contrary to Policy E4 and the NPPF.
- There had been no formal assessment of the cumulative impact of development of this site together with the Normanton Road site and as to whether the village could sustain such an increase in size.
- The District Council now had a five year housing land supply and therefore did not need the development.
- If the application was permitted, the judicial review that would be requested by residents would be very costly to the District Council.

Mr S Lewis-Roberts, agent, addressed the Committee. He explained that the site was sustainable with good access to local facilities and there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. He stated that the scale of the development was not disproportionate to the size of the village. He reported that after extensive discussions with the Urban Design Officer, the proposals were for a high quality development that would provide much needed affordable housing. The application submission made it clear that the proposals would have no impact on Packington House and the Conservation Officer was in agreement. He concluded that all necessary assessments had been undertaken and as it was a good site he urged Members to permit the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

Councillor N Smith moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits to development, there was already a seven year land supply and that the original planning permission had been quashed. It was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

Chairman's initials

Councillor N Smith commented that Packington Parish Council and the local residents strongly objected to the application and it was important to listen to their views. He stated that there were other applications in the pipeline for the area which were more appropriate as they were within the limits to development. He strongly urged Members to protect the beautiful village and not to breach the natural boundaries as this would encourage more development. He urged Members to refuse the application.

Councillor J Legrys stated that only he and one other Member voted against the application when it was considered by Committee previously and he still believed it was wrong as it was outside the limits to development. He expressed the importance of listening to the people of Packington and urged the Parish Council to establish a neighbourhood plan. He also expressed concerns regarding the additional traffic the development would generate and Members needed to think carefully if they wanted a future for the village. He was happy to support refusal.

Councillor G Jones asked for clarification on the housing land supply figure. The Head of Planning and Regeneration explained that the District Council currently had 6.08 years of housing land supply.

Councillor G Jones expressed concerns that if the application was refused the village would miss out on the Section 106 money for the school and health centre. The Head of Planning and Regeneration explained that planning obligations are imposed to mitigate the development and not to make up for existing shortfalls in an area.

Councillor J G Coxon supported the views of the local people and the motion to refuse the application as put forward by Councillor N Smith.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration clarified the following points. The amount of housing land supply that the District Council had was not a reason to refuse permission. The application site was outside the limits to development but as it was adjoining an existing settlement its impact was acceptable. The scale of the proposal was sustainable. Traffic concerns were not supported by the Highway Authority as there were no technical objections. The Committee should consider the current application on its own merits.

The Planning and Development Team Leader referred to the grounds for refusal and offered his advice to Members. He explained that the site being outside the limits to development was a valid reason if Members felt the scheme would adversely impact on the countryside. The impact of the development on Packington House, a listed building would also be a valid reason for refusal, albeit not a view shared by the Council's Conservation Officer. However, reference to the previous permission being quashed was not a valid reason for refusal and therefore would be difficult to defend in the case of an appeal.

Councillor N Smith confirmed that his grounds for refusal were that the site was outside the limits to development and would adversely impact on the countryside, there was more than a five year housing land supply and detrimental impact on the setting of Packington House.

Councillor J Legrys having requested a recorded vote, the vote was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary, R Johnson, J Legrys, N Smith and M B Wyatt (11).

Against the motion:

Councillors J Bridges, D Harrison, G Jones, M Specht and D J Stevenson (5).

Chairman's initials

Abstentions:
Councillor J Houlton (1).

The motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits to development, there was more than a five year housing land supply and detrimental impact on the setting of Packington House.

**6. A2
13/01002/OUTM: ERECTION OF 30 DWELLINGS, INCLUDING 8 AFFORDABLE HOMES (OUTLINE - ACCESS INCLUDED)**

Land South Of Normanton Road Packington Ashby De La Zouch

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

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

Parish Councillor C Miles addressed the Committee and listed the following objections:

- The application was on a Greenfield site.
- It was outside the limits to Development.
- The proposal was not sustainable.
- There was already a healthy five year land supply.
- The development was not plan led.

He concluded that there was already enough development in the area and therefore urged Members to refuse the application.

Ms A Walters, objector, addressed the Committee. She explained that she was a planning solicitor who had been appointed by the residents of Packington to represent them. She listed the following objections to the application:

- The proposal was contrary to Policy S3.
- The development would be harmful to Packington House.
- There would be a loss of countryside and agricultural land.
- The application did not sit well with the NPPF.
- The scale of the development was too large.
- There had been an overwhelming objection from local residents.
- The Council would be at risk from judicial review.

Mr J Steedman, agent, addressed the Committee. He said that, the concern about the relative increase in the size of the settlement was no longer so great now that the first application had been refused. . With regards to the site being outside the limits to development, he commented that the policy was 13 years old and therefore was not relevant.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration explained that a large number of objectors was not a planning consideration and clarified once again that the District Council had 6.08 years housing land supply which included a buffer of 20 percent but there was still a need to maintain a five year housing land supply.

Councillor N Smith moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits to development. It was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

Councillor N Smith commented that there had been many planning applications submitted on the site for many years and every one had been refused. He stated that the Parish

Chairman's initials

Council did support development in Packington but not this particular application. He could not find any reason to permit the application.

Councillor J Legrys agreed that that application was outside the limits of development and supported Councillor N Smith.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised Members, if minded to refuse the application, to consider whether to add that the development was harmful to the landscape and setting of Packington. This was agreed.

Councillor J Hoult expressed that he was concerned because he believed that if the application went to an appeal the Council would lose and it would cost a lot of money.

Councillor M Specht commented that he could remember when Packington was more of a hamlet than a village and developments had been built over the years to ensure that future generations could stay in the village, this application was no different. He was strongly against the refusal of the application.

Councillor D Everitt commented that he supported the application as it was a more acceptable site and all villages needed to take their share of new houses. He concurred with Councillor M Specht as there was a need for new homes in the area so people could stay in the village.

Councillor J Legrys having requested a recorded vote, the vote was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors R Boam, R Canny, J Cotterill, J Coxon, J Legrys, N Smith and M B Wyatt (7).

Against the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, D Everitt, J Geary, D Harrison, J Hoult, R Johnson, G Jones, M Specht and D J Stevenson (10).

Abstentions:

(0).

The motion was LOST.

The Chairman then put the officer's recommendation to permit to the vote.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

7.

A4

15/00196/FULM: ERECTION OF 41 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING THE PROVISION OF PLAY SPACE AND COMBINED CYCLE AND FOOTPATH (RESUBMITTED 14/00520/FULM)

Land At Wells Road And Willesley Road Ashby De La Zouch Leicestershire

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT subject to the signing of the Section 106 Agreement

The Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Parish Councillor M Ball addressed the Committee. He commented that Ashby was a beautiful part of the district and because of that there had been an endless queue of

Chairman's initials

developers for many years. He believed that unfortunately, what made Ashby special would be lost if it continued to be developed. His main concerns were that the development was outside of the urban area of Ashby and would destroy the countryside; and the distance to nearby services was too far which would mean an increase of vehicle use in the area. He stated that other nearby brown field sites would be better for the development than the current site and as the council had more than six years of land supply, the development was not necessary in Ashby. He urged Members to refuse the application.

Mr F Bedford, objector, addressed the Committee. He stated that the same application was considered by the Committee in November 2014 which was refused and nothing had changed since then. He felt that the area was an important gateway to the town and the amount of objection from local residents and Ashby Town Council justified refusal of the application. He raised concerns that the development would significantly harm the look of the landscape and added that it was contrary to the NPPF as it refers to the protection of countryside locations. Also he believed that the distances to services as stated within the report were incorrect. He concluded that as the Council had given the site a high landscape value of '9' and there was already a five year land supply, he urged Members to refuse the application.

Ms H Guy, agent, addressed the Committee. She began by commending the officers for the report. She explained that she had worked closely with officers to achieve the sustainable, deliverable and appropriate scheme that Members had in front of them. She reported that it was the second time that the application had been presented to the Committee, and further evidence had been included to show that the previous reasons for refusal could not be upheld. She assured Members that the distances to services stated within the report were correct and reminded the Committee that there were no objections from the statutory consultees.

Councillor G Jones moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits to development. It was seconded by Councillor J G Coxon.

Councillor J G Coxon agreed that he felt the application was outside the limits of development but also that it was unsustainable. He stated that he voted for refusal previously and would do so again. He then requested a recorded vote.

Councillor J Bridges stated that if the application was to be refused he believed that the Council would lose if the decision went to an appeal. He understood the objections and concerns of the local residents but there were no strong planning grounds for refusal.

The Planning and Development Team Manager advised the Committee that the reason for refusal put forward would not be strong enough on its own and asked the mover and seconder of the motion if they wanted to include sustainability as another reason. Councillors G Jones and J G Coxon as mover and seconder of the motion agreed.

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

As a recorded vote was requested, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors R Canny, J G Coxon, J Houl, G Jones, J Legrys, N Smith, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt (8).

Against the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, R Boam, J Cotterill, D Everitt, J Geary, D Harrison, R Johnson and M Specht (9)

Chairman's initials

Therefore the motion to refuse was LOST.

The chairman then put the officer's recommendation to permit to the vote and the motion was LOST, the application was therefore undecided.

The officers' recommendation to permit was moved again by Councillor M Specht and seconded by Councillor J Bridges.

At this point the Legal Advisor requested that the meeting be adjourned so that he could seek further legal advice. The meeting was adjourned at 6:08 pm and re-convened at 6.25 pm.

On the advice of the Legal Advisor and under procedure rule 13.1.9 of the Council's Constitution, the Chairman moved that the Committee proceed to the next item of business. It was seconded by Councillor J Bridges.

RESOLVED THAT:

The Committee move to the next item of business.

**8. A5
15/00083/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (UP TO 81 DWELLINGS),
ASSOCIATED OPEN SPACE, COMMUNITY AND DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE
(OUTLINE - ACCESS ONLY) RE-SUBMISSION OF 14/00460/OUTM
Land On The East Side Of Butt Lane Blackfordby**

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

Having declared an interest in the item, Councillor N Smith left the meeting during the consideration and voting thereon.

The Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor S McKendrick, Ward Member, presented the report to Members. She stated that the application was one step closer to destroying Blackfordby and that the development was not necessary. She expressed highway concerns as there were no pathways and longer vehicles would struggle on the narrow roads. Also, Blackfordby would be used as a cut through for traffic and the surrounding areas would also be affected by the increase in vehicles. She stated that local residents did not believe that assessments had been carried out and questioned the accuracy of the report. She believed that local knowledge should be taken into account when considering the application and urged Members to refuse.

Parish Councillor M Ball addressed the Committee. He stated that Blackfordby was a delightful village which residents were very proud of and the proposals would destroy this. He felt that the separation between the villages was important and there was no reason to go against Policy S3. He also expressed the following concerns and urged Members to refuse the application:

- The development would mean that the village would have over a 20 percent growth.
- The local school was already full to capacity.
- There were no services within the village.
- New residents of the development would be reliant on cars and the roads were not equipped to deal with this.
- The scale was not sustainable.
- Current flood issues would worsen.

Chairman's initials

Mr R Nettleton, objector, addressed the Committee. He stated that Members were considering the same application that was presented in December which had been refused, he emphasised that there were no changes. He commented that the site was unsustainable with no services at all in the village. He also felt that local knowledge was being ignored as there were flooding and sewerage problems in the area and former mining on the site which had been ignored and dismissed. He added that he believed the consultants flood model was flawed.

Mr C Lindley, agent, addressed the Committee. He began by endorsing the officer's recommendation. He explained that they had worked with officers on the proposals and thoroughly considered the sustainability. The development was appropriate to maintain the housing land supply and brought many benefits to the area. He concluded by reminding Members that there had been no objections from the statutory consultees and urged to permit in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

The Planning and Development Team Manager read out the following letter received from Andrew Bridgen MP to the Chairman of the Planning Committee:

'I am writing once again in opposition to the above planning application. As the Committee will note, 89 letters were received relating to the original plan raising a number of objections and the plan was voted down by the Committee.

My principal concerns then, and that of many residents is the coalescence between Blackfordby and Woodville and the fact that this development would virtually remove the separation between Woodville and Blackfordby. The development does not easily link in with the rest of the village and has no link to Main Street. There are also highway issues with the road layout for traffic approaching from Moira and flooding issues as demonstrated by the floods that have historically occurred on Strawberry Lane. I see no evidence that there is any change in these positions.

This application site lies outside limits to development as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan and the Council is able to demonstrate a five year land supply. Given the scale of this development and its impact on the character of the village, I urge Members to once again reject this planning application.'

Councillor J Bridges asked for clarification on the housing land supply figure and what the figure meant. The Head of Planning and Regeneration confirmed that there was currently 6.08 years of housing land supply, this meant 3079 houses, of which 2928 currently benefit from planning permission. This figure included the 20 percent buffer, without the buffer included it would be 7.29 years of housing land supply.

Councillor J Bridges commented that the village was an established and sustainable area, and he could not think of a legitimate planning reason to refuse the application. He added that he used to be the Ward Member for this area and therefore could understand the resident's objections but as the appeal process would cost a significant amount of money he asked the Committee to support him as he reluctantly moved the officer's recommendation. It was seconded by Councillor G A Allman.

Councillor J Legrys expressed concerns with flooding in the area and although he understood concerns regarding the separation of the villages, it was not a consideration for the Committee. He commented that the Committee had to consider the tax payers money with regards to the possible appeal if the application was refused but as an elected Member, he believed he had to support the local residents. He was also not convinced that the contaminated land had been mitigated within the report. Overall he felt that it was a bad application with little information regarding how it would benefit the residents of Woodville and Blackfordby.

Councillor G A Allman commented that he could not see a reason to justify refusal of the application.

Councillor M Specht referred to conflicting advice within the report as it referred to policies S3 and H4/1 being both relevant and out of date, he asked for clarification. The Head of Planning and Regeneration assured Members that the policies were saved and should be treated as being up to date. He explained that the original reports on the Packington applications from 2014 were appended to the current Packington reports on this agenda , and that when these applications were first considered in June 2014 the District Council did not have a five year land supply, therefore that advice was correct at that time.

Councillor J G Coxon felt that he would need to side with local residents and the Parish Council as he did not believe that the site was sustainable and it was outside the limits to development.

Regarding Councillor J Legrys' comment on the issue of contaminated land, the Head of Planning and Regeneration explained that conditions 11, 20, 21 and 26 were designed to manage the issue. Regarding flooding concerns, he reminded Members that there had been no objections from the Lead Local Flood Authority or Environment Agency and that conditions 24 and 27 were designed to address the issue.

The Chairman put the officer's recommendation to permit the application to the vote.

Councillor J Legrys having requested a recorded vote, the vote was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, R Boam, J Cotterill, D Harrison and J Hoult (6).

Against the motion:

Councillors R Canny, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary, R Johnson, J Legrys, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt (9).

Abstentions:

Councillor G Jones (1).

The motion was LOST.

The Legal advisor asked Members to provide reasons for refusal.

Councillor J Legrys moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits to development and unsustainable. It was seconded by Councillor J G Coxon.

Councillor M Specht commented that after visiting the site he felt that the lane would be substandard on highway grounds and suggested that this be included in the grounds for refusal. Councillor J Legrys stated that he did not want this included as it was a weak ground for refusal.

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

The Chairman having requested a recorded vote, the vote was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors R Canny, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Geary, R Johnson, J Legrys, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt (9).

Against the motion:

Chairman's initials

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, R Boam, J Cotterill, D Harrison and J Hoult (6).

Abstentions:

Councillor G Jones (1).

The motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits to development and unsustainable.

Councillor N Smith returned to the meeting.

9.

A6

14/01140/OUT: ERECTION OF RESIDENTIAL NURSING HOME (C2 USE) AND FORMATION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING (OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS RESERVED)

Ibstock House 132 High Street Ibstock

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor J Clarke, Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He reported that earlier in the day plans had been submitted by the applicant for an extension to the property and if that was the case, the application should be deferred so that they could both be considered together. He explained that the current facilities were already stretched and the new developments in the area would only make matters worse. There was a need for a bigger surgery with access to more doctors, not a nursing home and he felt that the site was not large enough for both. He believed that the opinions of local people were being ignored along with many requests for information. He also raised concerns regarding highway safety and traffic. Councillor J Clarke urged the Committee to either defer the application so all aspects of development could be considered together or refuse the application.

Mr M Stack, applicant, had returned to the surgery and therefore was no longer at the meeting to address the Committee.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration explained that a drawing had been provided earlier that day, and shown to Members during the site visit. He confirmed that there was no planning application for an extension to the surgery, and that the drawing that had been provided had no formal status. He urged Members to determine the application in front of them on its own merits.

The Chairman commented that plans for a nursing home had been agreed on the site in the past and therefore moved the officer's recommendation. It was seconded by Councillor M Specht.

Councillor R Johnson commented that Ibstock was growing rapidly and he felt that if the application was for the surgery only he would have been happy with it. His opinion was that the application should be deferred so that the Committee could see what the plans were for the future. He stated that the area deserved better and as the application had no merits, moved that the application be deferred. It was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The motion to defer the application was put to the vote and was LOST.

Chairman's initials

Councillor J Bridges stated that he had mixed views on the application as a care facility such as the one proposed needed to be on a bigger site where it could provide gardens and open space which were essential. He added that he believed another facility would be needed in the area in the future as this had no room to develop further.

Councillor J Legrys concurred with the views of Councillor J Bridges as he also had mixed views. He reported that the late Dave De Lacy had spoken at length with the doctors of the surgery about the use of the Section 106 provision that was available to them and it was still uncertain as to why they were refusing to use it. He agreed that the site did need room to develop and he had sympathy with the officers for having to deal with recipients of Section 106 money that failed to spend it. He stated that if the application was approved, Members needed to put trust in the officers to put together a good scheme. Councillor J Legrys added that he felt it was bad practice to produce an additional plan at the site visit as it could cause an element of doubt for Members. He requested that if the outline permission was passed that the full detailed planning permission be brought to Committee for consideration.

Councillor N Smith raised his concerns as he felt that there was a need for care homes with room to expand and as there were no gardens or open spaces, he could not vote for the application to be permitted.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration reminded Members that the application before them was for outline permission only and therefore if permitted, the officers would work closely with the applicant to achieve the right development for the site.

Councillor J G Coxon stated that he was in favour of the application.

The officer's recommendation was put to the vote.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

10.

A7

15/00257/FUL: ERECTION OF A RADIO TRANSMISSION MAST

Summit Bardon Hill Copt Oak Road Markfield

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

Having declared an interest, Councillor J Legrys left the meeting during this item and took no part in the consideration or voting thereon.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Mr J Sketchley, applicant, addressed the Committee. He explained that the transmission equipment was the first stage to upgrading from a FM format to a DAB format and would help to ensure the future of the radio station.

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor J Bridges and seconded by Councillor D Everitt.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration, as amended by the Update Sheet.

Chairman's initials

Councillor J Legrys returned to the meeting

- 11. A8**
15/00212/FUL: ERECTION OF A GRAIN STORAGE BUILDING
Land At Scaffacre Farm From The Green To Unnamed Road At Top Merrill Grange
Diseworth

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

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

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor J Legrys and seconded by Councillor J Hout.

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 7.32 pm