

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 2 AUGUST 2016

Present: Councillor D J Stevenson (Chairman)

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman (Substitute for Councillor N Smith), R Boam, J Bridges, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, D Harrison, J Hault, G Jones, J Legrys, P Purver (Substitute for Councillor V Richichi), A C Saffell (Substitute for Councillor R Canny), M Specht and M B Wyatt

In Attendance: Councillors G A Allman, T Gillard, S McKendrick, T J Pendleton and V Richichi

Officers: Mr C Elston, Mrs C Hammond, Mr J Knightley, Mr J Mattley, Mr J Newton and Miss S Odedra

## **21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors R Canny, R Johnson, V Richichi and N Smith.

Councillor A C Saffell informed Members that Councillor R Canny had undergone minor surgery and requested that a get well soon card be sent from the committee.

## **22. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Before Members declared their interests the Legal Advisor stated the following:-

Before Members declare their interests in the applications being heard at this committee, I would just like to remind Members of the advice that was provided at the previous committee in respect of the Money Hill application, application A1 of the agenda. Some members were advised that they had a non-pecuniary interest in that matter due to them being members of the Labour Party and, therefore, if they came to the meeting with an open mind, were entitled to remain and take part in the decision-making on that matter. Despite this advice, some concerns were raised about their involvement in the process and they chose to leave when the item was considered having declared a pecuniary interest.

To clarify the position I can confirm that those members have again been advised that they have a non-pecuniary interest only. It is for each member to decide what interests they need to declare but should they choose to do so, my advice is that they can declare a non-pecuniary interest in item A1 providing they come to this committee and hear the application with an open mind.

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

Councillor R Adams and Councillor D Everitt declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A2, application number 14/00933/OUTM as members of Whitwick Parish Council.

Councillors R Adams, D Everitt and J Legrys stated that they had a non-pecuniary interest in item A1 due to being members of the Labour party and that they had come with an open mind and confirmed that they shall reach a decision based solely upon the information that they heard on the night and had read. They stated that they did declare a pecuniary interest in that application at the last committee although they had received advice that they only had a non-pecuniary interest. However, due to concerns that had been raised and the fact they had little time to consider their position, they felt the best option was to declare a pecuniary interest and take no part in the matter. Having received additional legal advice and had more time to consider their position, they were satisfied that their interest amounted only to a non-pecuniary interest and, therefore, they intended to remain and participate in the debate.

Chairman's initials

Councillor J G Coxon, declared a non-pecuniary interest in items A1, application number 15/00512/OUTM and A5, application number 15/00732/FULM as a member of Ashby Town Council.

Councillor J Houlton and G Jones declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A5, application number 15/00732/FULM as members of Ashby Town Council.

Councillor D Harrison declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A5, application 15/00732/FULM as the applicant was his son-in-law and stated that he would leave the meeting for the consideration of the item.

Councillor M Specht declared a pecuniary interest in item A6, application number 16/00562/OUT as a close associate of the applicant and a non-pecuniary interest in items A7, application number 16/00544/FUL and A8, application number 16/00311/OUT as a member of Coleorton Parish Council.

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

Item A1, application number 15/00512/OUTM

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman, R Boam, J Bridges, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, D Everitt, D Harrison, J Houlton, G Jones, J Legrys, P Purver, A C Saffell, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt

Item A2, application number 14/00933/OUTM

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman, R Boam, J Bridges, J G Coxon, D Everitt, J Legrys, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt

Item A3, application number 15/00951/OUTM

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman, J Legrys and M Specht

Item A5, application number 15/00732/FULM

Councillors J Cotterill and D J Stevenson

Item A6, application number 16/00562/OUT

Councillor M Specht

Item A7, application number 16/00544/FUL

Councillors R Boam and M Specht

Item A8, application number 16/00311/OUT

Councillors R Boam and M Specht

## **23. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2016.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor J Cotterill and

**RESOLVED THAT:**

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2016 be approved and signed by the Chairman of as a correct record.

Chairman's initials

## 24. 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 advised the Members that item number A3, application number 15/00951/OUTM had been withdrawn from this meeting and therefore would not be considered.

## 25. A1

### **15/00512/OUTM: DEVELOPMENT OF 605 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS INCLUDING A 60 UNIT EXTRA CARE CENTRE (C2), A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL (D1), A NEW NURSERY SCHOOL (D1), A NEW COMMUNITY HALL (D1), NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD RETAIL USE (A1), NEW PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM THE A511 AND NOTTINGHAM ROAD (OUTLINE ALL MATTERS OTHER THAN PART ACCESS RESERVED)**

Money Hill Site North Of Nottingham Road And South Of A511 Ashby De La Zouch  
Leicestershire

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

The Head of Planning and Regeneration presented the report to Members. He reminded Members that an almost identical application, save for the access arrangements via numbers 3 and 5 Nottingham Road, was permitted at appeal and the new application sought to provide a new access, with egress for the care home, car park, and up to 100 homes only onto Nottingham Road.

Councillor G A Allman, ward member, addressed the committee. He stated that one could measure the strong feelings about what wicked developments were being planned for the town which would irreversibly change it for our children. He highlighted that the impact of such a development would result in the junction with the A42 at Flagstaff island being oversaturated, and any such development should only take place once this had been mitigated. He asked what infrastructure plans there were for in place for this, and stated that the application was rendered undeliverable if there were none. He respectfully reminded members that planning applications had to be sensible, and he pleaded passionately with the committee to listen to the residents of Money Hill and Ashby de la Zouch as a whole. He quoted from the Local Plan which stated that the purpose of planning was to help achieve sustainable development, which meant ensuring that providing for the needs of the current generation did not make life worse for future generations, and the proposal in front of them most certainly would.

Mrs M Tuckey, representing the Town Council, addressed the committee. She advised Members that the Town Council objected to the development on the grounds that it was not sustainable, outside the Limits to Development, it would add to an already congested Nottingham Road and that the proposed access was in close proximity to the school. She acknowledged that the site was included in the draft local plan and neighbourhood plan, but stated that the Town Council had grave concerns over the safety of the pupils at the school. She urged the Members to refuse the application

Before addressing the committee, Ms L Titley sought clarification from officers on the proposal in front of Members in relation to the accesses.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration clarified that all would be able to access the site from both Nottingham Road and the A511 but only the 100 homes in phase one and visitors to the care facility and the car park would be able to exit onto Nottingham Road. All other residents would have to exit the site on to the A511.

Chairman's initials

Ms L Titley, objector, addressed the committee. She expressed concerns over the number of additional vehicles that would be using the access on to the development from Nottingham Road that was already congested. She also questioned why Ashby required another car park, which would also add to the high traffic volume in the area and asked why a Park and Ride scheme could not be considered. She highlighted that the proposed re-location of the bus stop, the nearby brow and inconsiderate driving of users of Nottingham Road could lead to many accidents. She felt that the development should be accessed off the A511 only and that it should not be permitted under pressure, but on what was right and safe.

Mr I Anderson, agent, addressed the committee. He advised Members that the consortium had an excellent working relationship with all partners and considering the scale of the development they had good duty of care. He informed Members that due to the size of the proposal the development would contribute a great deal to the Town including the provision of an additional car park. He stated that the proposed access would help to secure phase one of the development. He highlighted that there were no technical objections to the application and it was recommended approval.

Councillor M B Wyatt stated that he could not support the development and moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the Limits to Development and highways concerns. It was seconded by Councillor J Hout.

Councillor J Bridges stated that it was a difficult decision to be made by the committee, however a previous application had been granted by way of national and local policies at appeal. He highlighted to Members that he could not think of a reason to refuse the application and that there were no objections from technical experts. He added that morally he could not support the application and would prefer for the access road to be from the A511, but as there was no sound reason to refuse he would have to support the application. He stated that should the matter proceed to an appeal, the council would lose as the council would not be able to provide a reason for refusal which would stand up in front of an inspection.

Councillor G Jones stated that he was in a difficult situation as he was in favour of a new care facility for the town and car park, but could understand the concerns over safety and highways issues on Nottingham Road.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised Members that the Highway Authority, and the independent expert who he had approached, had each concluded that the impact of the access would not be severe, he reminded Members that the site was included in both the Publication draft Local Plan and Submission draft Neighbourhood plan, that impact on property values could not be taken into consideration, and clarified that Members were being asked to consider the access only as the principle of the development had already been established.

Councillor J Legrys stated that the committee was stuck between a rock and a hard place as the 605 homes had already been approved by the Secretary of State and the only issues to be discussed were the proposed access and traffic concerns. He stated that the site was in the previous Core Strategy and in the draft Local Plan that was moving forward. He stated that the principle of development had been the Council's will. He expressed concerns that the additional access had not been thought through well enough and that many of the residents would feel imprisoned as they would not be able to get out of the site and that he was not happy with the junction.

Councillor D Harrison shared the concerns raised and felt that it was an awful project to join Nottingham Road as even though it was only 100 homes that could exit, it could be 200 vehicles therefore more than 400 vehicle movements a day as all of the 605 homes could be accessed off Nottingham Road. He asked if the committee could just reject the

junction or would they have to refuse the whole application. He felt that there had been very little consultation in the proposed junction.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration stated that the application in front of them was for the whole site, the only difference being the access off Nottingham Road. He reminded Members that the site had permission in principle and therefore refusal on the grounds of being outside Limits of Development would not be a defensible reason for refusal, and reiterated that it was only the access arrangement via numbers 3 and 5 Nottingham Road that was for consideration.

Councillor D Harrison stated that the committee was being conned as the developer knew that the 605 homes had approval and that if the committee was to refuse the whole district would have to foot any costs awarded at appeal.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration stated that the Highways authority felt that the new access was the preferable option and that it was difficult to have restrictions if an application had been made relating solely to the access. He advised Members that refusing on highways grounds at appeal would be difficult to defend, and that when he had asked the independent consultant whether he would assist the Council in the event that the application was not approved and was subject to appeal, the response had been a resounding "no".

Councillor J Hoult asked if the Inspector had put both sites together as there had been mention of the access for 30 dwellings off Woodcock Way and then the stand alone development if 70 homes off Woodcock Way.

Councillor M Specht stated that many of the vehicles leaving the development would not drive into the town centre, but out of Ashby and that the sole access should be off the A511. He reminded Members that the Inspector had considered an application for no more than 30 dwellings could access off Woodcock Way and the rest off the A511.

In response to Members comments, the Head of Planning and Regeneration confirmed that the 70 homes scheme was separate to the application before them, and to the previous 605 application, being the Miller Homes scheme.

Councillor A C Saffell stated that he agreed with all his fellow Members and felt that it was a difficult decision to be made. He raised concerns about the increase of traffic on Nottingham Road and questioned why the developers could not start at the by-pass end as it would be easier for the construction traffic to access.

Councillor D J Stevenson stated that applicant had been debating the application for 10 years and that had they gone in from the by-pass end the development would be half built. He advised Members that the £150k at appeal would be a minimum and that as the reasons were so weak no one would represent the authority. He expressed that in his 40 years of being a Councillor the proposed development was the worst planning he had ever experienced. He questioned why the developers had not started at the top end of the site and added that he could not expect the whole district to bear the costs. He requested a recorded vote.

Councillor J G Coxon stated that permitting the development would unlock the door for others. He agreed that the development should be started from the A511 and that it was not the authority's fault that the consortium could not afford to build. He added that he had lived in Ashby for over 60 years and that local knowledge should be taken into account. He expressed concerns that there was no master plan for the site and stated that he could not support the application.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration warned Members that the applicant had indicated that they would appeal if the committee were minded to refuse, and that the appeal would be on the basis of egress from 150 homes as described in the application form, and not 100 homes as under consideration by the committee. He added that the council would bear significant costs, in that event, and clarified that he had a responsibility to protect the council by warning the committee in this manner.

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

For the motion:

Councillors J G Coxon, J Hout, G Jones, J Legrys, A C Saffell and M B Wyatt(6).

Against the motion:

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman, R Boam, J Cotterill, D Everitt, D Harrison, P Purver, M Specht and D J Stevenson(9).

Abstentions:

Councillor J Bridges(1).

The motion to refuse that application on the grounds that application was outside the Limits to Development and on highways grounds was LOST.

The officer recommendation was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor J Bridges.

For the motion:

Councillors R Adams, R Ashman, J Bridges, R Boam, J Cotterill, D Everitt, D Harrison, P Purver, M Specht and D J Stevenson(10).

Against the motion:

Councillors J G Coxon, J Hout, G Jones, J Legrys, A C Saffell and M B Wyatt(6).

Abstentions:

None (0).

RESOLVED THAT:

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

- 26. A2**  
**14/00933/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 7 DWELLINGS**  
**(INCLUDING THE RETENTION OF NO.191 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD) (OUTLINE -**  
**DETAILS OF PART ACCESS INCLUDED)**  
 191 Loughborough Road Whitwick Coalville Leicestershire LE67 5AS

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Planning and Development Team Manager presented the report to Members and read out a letter that had been received after publication of the update sheet.

Councillor T Gillard, adjacent ward member, addressed the committee. He stated that this was the fourth time an application had been submitted on the site, previous applications having been refused. He informed Members that the site was not sustainable as there was no bus route and no amenities, with a 30 minute walk to the nearest shop and bus stop. He highlighted that the development was outside the Limits to Development and that the application across the road had been refused. He reminded Members that when the

Chairman's initials

application across the road had been considered grave concerns had been raised over traffic issues such as speeding and he also expressed concerns over the flooding a few months previous and that the development would add to the water drainage issues that already existed. He urged the Members to refuse the application.

Mr F Duncombe, objector, addressed the committee. He informed Members that the application was not sustainable as it was a mile up a steep road and the residents of the new development would need to rely heavily on cars. He reminded Members that they had refused the application opposite to the one before them on the grounds that it was unsustainable and that the application before them was further away from the village centre. He highlighted that under the emerging Local Plan the site would be outside the Limits to Development, that 191 Loughborough Road had flooded in June and the dwellings would be visible to other residents. He asked the committee to refuse the application.

Mr R Woodward, on behalf of Whitwick Parish Council, addressed the committee. He highlighted to Members that the previous applications on the site had been refused, that the land rises and there was an inaccuracy as there were no dwellings behind the proposed site. He stated that the Parish Council had listed a number of objections as the site would be outside the Limits to Development and as Members had seen photos of the recent flooding added that the area would be exacerbated. He felt that the access was not suitable and there were several protected trees on the site. He queried as to why the existing dwelling was being left to dereliction. He urged the committee to refuse the application for all the reasons that had been stated.

Mr S Clarke, agent, addressed the committee. He reminded Members that each application should be considered on their own merits. He highlighted to the committee that officers were confident that there would be no adverse impact on the area, they were happy with the design and that there had been no technical objections to the application. He informed Members that local policy stated that developments should have a density of 40 dwellings per hectare as a maximum and the application was for 7 dwellings rather than the previous application for 34. He advised Members that there were no valid reasons to refuse the application and urged the Members to support the officer's recommendation.

Councillor R Adams moved that the application be refused on the grounds that that it was outside the Limits to Development, highways concerns and unsustainable location. It was seconded by Councillor D Everitt.

Councillor R Boam sought clarification from officers in relation to the access mentioned off Swannymote Road by the speakers and would the 6 dwellings currently inside the Limits to Development still be inside under the emerging Local Plan.

The Planning and Development Team Manager stated that the only proposed access was off Loughborough Road and that there would only be an access gate off Swannymote Road, and in relation to the Limits to Development in the adopted Local Plan the 6 dwellings were currently in and in the emerging Local Plan they would be outside.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he was not in favour of the application having seen photos of nearby properties following the recent flooding. He also expressed concerns that even though the 6 dwellings were currently within Limits to Development under the emerging Local Plan they would be out and felt that there should be definable areas of separation between urban and rural Whitwick. He highlighted that the area was in the SSSI and wildlife trust land and that the authority needed to ensure that the boundary was in the right place which it was now.

Councillor D Everitt expressed concerns that once again the countryside was to be blighted when there were Brownfield sites that could be developed and that should the application before them be permitted than an application would come back for the site opposite. He advised Members that vehicles came down the road into Whitwick at speed and left it until the last minute to reduce their speed. He felt that the development would destroy what was a beautiful part of the countryside and expressed concerns that the additional dwellings would make the flooding issues worse. He supported the motion to refuse the application.

Councillor R Ashman stated that as it stood the application was inside the Limits to Development, that issues or concerns that had been raised had been addressed, that the development would not be visible from the road and that it was a derelict site. He supported the officer's recommendation to permit.

Councillor D Harrison concurred with Councillor R Ashman adding that things were altering in planning constantly and that the site was semi derelict and may have become too hard to maintain. He added that the nation needed more homes, and that he supported the officer's recommendation to permit the application stating that it was lovely living in the countryside and the development would mean 6 to 7 families enjoying the countryside

The Head of Planning and Regeneration stated to Members that having considered the reasons for refusal he would advise that the application may be defensible on the basis that part of the site was outside the Limits to Development and the potential visual impact being harmful to the countryside.

The mover and seconder agreed to the reasons.

In response to comments made by Councillor A C Saffell, the Head of Planning and Regeneration stated that any new developments could not make any flooding issues worse and that they should improve the surface water runoff rate by 20%, resulting in improved water retention on the site. Therefore, by developing, it should in fact be improving the surface water flood risk profile of the land.

The motion to refuse the application on the grounds that it was outside the Limits to Development and it would have a detrimental visual impact was put to the vote and LOST.

The officer recommendation was moved by Councillor J Bridges, seconded by Councillor R Ashman and

RESOLVED THAT:

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

The Committee adjourned at 6.20pm and resumed at 6.25pm.

**27. A4  
16/00542/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 16 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE (OUTLINE - MEANS OF ACCESS FOR APPROVAL)**

Land At Worthington Lane Newbold Coalville Leicestershire

Officer's Recommendation: REFUSE

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Chairman's initials



Mr A Hasler, objector addressed the committee. He advised Members that the village was only a small settlement and was unequipped to handle a development of that size. He stated that the pub was only small, the village school was oversubscribed, there was limited public transport options and there were no other day to day services. He stated that residents of the new development would have to rely on private motor vehicle which would be contrary to both national and local green policies. He added the site was Greenfield and that the development would have a detrimental visual impact on the village and intrinsic views.

Mr A Large, agent, addressed the committee. He stated that each application should be considered on its own merits, there was a presumption in favour of development and that the officer accepted that the development would enhance the village. He informed Members that he disagreed that the development fell short of the environmental strand and that the development was sustainable as the village had many services such as a bus service, a school, a pub and a large playing field, that there were jobs advertised at local businesses and that a new development at the site in front of them would help to sustain services in the surrounding villages. He further stated that the local school had been threatened with being placed in special measures and that the S106 contributions secured by the development would help to improve it. He highlighted the number of letters in support of the application and urged Members vote against refusal.

Councillor J Bridges moved that the application be permitted as the location was sustainable.

Councillor R Adams stated that the hourly bus service would become a two hourly service as of September.

Councillor J Legrys seconded Councillor J Bridges' motion to permit the application, adding that even with a two hourly bus service the village was in a better position than others and with the mix of housing that would be available it would make the village more sustainable.

Councillor M Specht stated that there were more supporters of the application than objecting and when looking at the application the layout rounded off the village. He highlighted that the proposal would meet the golden triangle of sustainability as outlined in the NPPF. The location has limited services but was supported by surrounding villages with other services. He added that the mix of dwellings on the proposed development would help to sustain the village.

Councillor D J Stevenson stated that the application was in his ward and having seen the hedge around the site the development would not overlook. He informed the committee that he had lived in the area for 70 years and the village was more sustainable than ever with many employment opportunities, adding that the Post Office at Worthington supported the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted as it was a sustainable location with imposition of conditions and negotiation of a Section 106 agreement delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

Chairman's initials

- 28. A5**  
**15/00732/FULM: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING MILL AND ASSOCIATED BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 19 NO. DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.**  
 Holywell Mill Burton Road Ashby De La Zouch Leicestershire LE65 2LL

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

Having declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item, Councillor D Harrison left the meeting for the consideration of the item and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

The officer recommendation was moved by Councillor G Jones and seconded by Councillor J G Coxon.

Councillor J Legrys stated that it was an excellent application and that the mill had become an eyesore, possibly due to the building having gone beyond repair. He hoped that all the wildlife was relocated appropriately.

Councillor J G Coxon stated that whilst the loss of the building such as the mill would be a shame he felt that the number of dwellings was sufficient for the site and that the residents of the cottages nearby suffered with the heavy traffic and dust generated from the businesses. He felt that residential units better served the site but did not want to see a further application for more residential units.

Councillor D Everitt agreed that the application was good but expressed concerns over the lack of affordable homes on the site.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

Councillor D Harrison returned to the meeting.

- 29. A6**  
**16/00562/OUT: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THREE DWELLINGS WITH FORMATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO TOP ROAD (OUTLINE APPLICATION ACCESS AND LAYOUT FOR APPROVAL)**  
 Land At Top Road Griffydam Leicestershire

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

Having declared a pecuniary interest in this item, Councillor M Specht left the meeting for the consideration of the item and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

The officer recommendation was moved by Councillor D J Stevenson, seconded by Councillor J Bridges and

RESOLVED THAT:

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

Chairman's initials

Councillor M Specht returned to the meeting

**30. A7  
16/00544/FUL: ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED  
DETACHED GARAGE**

Land To The Rear Of George Inn Loughborough Road Coleorton Coalville Leicestershire  
LE67 8HF

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT Subject to Section 106 Agreement

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members

The officer recommendation was moved by Councillor J Bridges, seconded by Councillor  
J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

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

**31. A8  
16/00311/OUT: ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS AND GARAGES  
(OUTLINE - ACCESS AND LAYOUT INCLUDED)**

Land Adjacent To Wilford House Loughborough Road Coleorton Coalville Leicestershire  
LE67 8HH

Officer's Recommendation: REFUSE

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

Councillor D J Stevenson stated that the application had been deferred to allow the  
original reason for refusal to be considered further and an amenable conclusion had now  
been drawn and therefore the application should be permitted. It was seconded by  
Councillor R Boam.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted with imposition of conditions delegated to the Head of  
Planning and Regeneration

**32. A9  
16/00743/FUL: HAY AND AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY STORE**

Land To The Rear Of 56 Main Street Swannington Coalville Leicestershire LE67 8QN

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

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

The officer recommendation was moved by Councillor J Bridges, seconded by Councillor  
J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

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

**33. TO CONSIDER CONFIRMING A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER AT WILLESLEY LANE, ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH**

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

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The TPO be confirmed.

Councillor M B Wyatt left the meeting at 6.20pm.

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 6.57 pm