

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 6 May 2014

Present: Councillor D J Stevenson (Chairman)

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

In Attendance: Councillors R D Bayliss, A Bridges, N Clarke, D De Lacy, T J Pendleton, J Ruff and L Spence

Officers: Mrs V Blane, Mr C Elston, Mr D Hughes, Mr J Knightley, Mr J Mattley, Mr A Mellor and Mrs R Wallace

#### **74. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Legrys.

#### **75. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

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

Councillors D Howe and D Everitt declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM and item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM.

Councillor R Woodward declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A1, application number 14/00047/FUL, item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM and item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL.

Councillor J Geary declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM, item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM, item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL and item A9, application number 14/00102/FUL.

Councillor R Johnson declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM, item A5, application number 13/00818/OUTM and item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL. He also declared a non pecuniary interest in item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM as a member of Hugglescote and Donington Le Heath Parish Council.

Councillor T Neilson declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM, item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM and item A9, application number 14/00102/FUL.

Councillor R Adams declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM, item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM, item A5, application number 13/00818/OUTM and item A6, application number 13/00991/OUTM.

Councillor M B Wyatt declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A1, application number 14/00047/FUL, item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM, item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM and item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL. He also declared a non pecuniary interest in item A11, application number 14/00151/FULM as a business owner at Belvoir Shopping Centre.

Chairman's initials

Councillor G A Allman, J Houlton and G Jones declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM. They also declared a non pecuniary interest in item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM as members of Ashby de la Zouch Town Council.

Councillor J G Coxon declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM and item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL. He also declared a non pecuniary interest in item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM as a member of Ashby de la Zouch Town Council.

Councillor T Gillard declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM and item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL.

Councillor M Specht declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM, item A4, application number 11/01054/FULM, item A5, application number 13/00818/OUTM, item A6, application number 13/00991/OUTM, item A7, application number 14/00219/FUL and item A9, application number 14/00102/FUL.

Councillor J Bridges and N Smith declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00335/OUTM.

Councillor D J Stevenson declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number, 13/00335/OUTM and item A10, application number 12/00390/VCU.

## **76. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2014.

It was moved by Councillor G Jones, seconded by Councillor R Adams and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2014 be approved and signed as a correct record.

## **77. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS**

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

The Chairman announced that item A2, application number 13/00249/OUTM had been withdrawn by the applicant and therefore would not be considered at the meeting.

## **78. A1 14/00047/FUL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF 7 NO. DWELLINGS**

242 Melbourne Road Ibstock Coalville Leicestershire

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor J Ruff, Ward Member, addressed the Committee. She explained that as there had been numerous objections from local residents, she was speaking as their representative. She stated that the application had changed very little from when it was previously considered and Plot One was still overbearing. As the development was small it would not contribute to any of the services within the village, local schools would be

Chairman's initials

affected and the heritage of the village would be lost. She explained that a main concern was that the development was close to two roundabouts and it would increase the amount of traffic on an already busy road. She was happy with the change to the access as the previous proposal was dangerous but she felt that the proposed change from one to two bungalows was not appropriate for the site. She urged Members to refuse the application.

Mr S Freakley, objector, addressed the Committee. He thanked the developer for listening to the concerns regarding the access but he now felt that the current driveway was only built for one bungalow, so the proposal for two bungalows was inappropriate. He believed that the proposed pedestrian access would take away the privacy of neighbouring properties and could lead to anti social behaviour and littering, just like the local green. He also stated that the proposal for refuse collection was not appropriate due to the lack of space for leaving the bins at the kerb side.

Mr C Lawrence, agent, addressed the Committee. He assured Members that the proposal was for a good scheme that included a controlled pedestrian access, onsite parking, careful consideration of layout and landscaping, and no vehicular impact on Linden Close. He stressed that there was a need for bungalows in the area. He concluded that the developer had worked thoroughly with officers to get to this stage and urged Members to endorse the officer's recommendation to permit.

Councillor R Woodward commented that he had seconded the motion to defer the application at the previous meeting due to concerns regarding access and the closeness of the development to the neighbouring property's secondary windows. He stated that he would prefer to defer the application once again so that a better scheme could be achieved but if this was not possible he could not support approval. On the advice of the Head of Regeneration and Planning, the Chairman reported that if the application was deferred the applicant would likely appeal against non-determination, therefore Members should make a decision on the application.

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor G Jones and seconded by Councillor J Hault.

Councillor M Specht referred to the report regarding the distance to neighbouring properties being acceptable but he felt by looking at the photographs of the site it was obvious that the development would be overbearing, therefore he did not agree with the report.

Councillor J Bridges asked if the distance to neighbouring properties was something that could be negotiated with the applicant if the Committee were to approve the application. The Head of Regeneration and Planning explained that this would not be possible as it was a full application and he could not see any way of further improvement.

Councillor T Neilson concurred with the comments made by Councillor R Woodward regarding the secondary windows of the neighbouring property as he did not approve of having a wall two metres away from windows that let in light.

Councillor J Geary stated that the secondary windows of the neighbouring property might be the only light source to the top of the stairs and approving this would take that away. The Head of Regeneration and Planning confirmed that a landing area was not a living space so it was not necessary to have windows for light.

The motion was put to the vote and LOST.

The Chairman then asked for an alternative proposal with sufficient planning grounds.

Councillor R Woodward moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was overbearing and therefore contrary to Planning Policy E3. It was seconded by Councillor M Specht.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Planning Policy E3.

- 79. A2**  
**13/00249/OUTM: EMPLOYMENT USES (B2/B8) OF UP TO 1,300,000 SQFT (120,773 SQM APPROX) WITH ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY USES AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING A NEW ACCESS FROM BEVERIDGE LANE AND OFF-SITE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS, EARTHWORKS AND GROUND MODELLING, TOGETHER WITH NEW LANDSCAPING, INCLUDING HABITAT CREATION AND PROVISION OF A NEW COMMUNITY WOODLAND PARK (OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS OTHER THAN PART ACCESS RESERVED)**

Land At Little Battleflat Farm Beveridge Lane Coalville Ellistown

As the application had been withdrawn from the agenda by the applicant, it was not considered.

- 80. A3**  
**13/00335/OUTM: DEVELOPMENT OF 605 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS INCLUDING A 60 UNIT EXTRA CARE CENTRE (C2), A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL (D1), A NEW HEALTH CENTRE (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 WOODCOCK WAY (OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS OTHER THAN PART ACCESS RESERVED)**

Money Hill Site North Of Wood Street Ashby De La Zouch Leicestershire

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor R D Bayliss, Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He stated that he could marginally accept the proposal for social housing provisions but his main concern was the access off the A511 and Woodcock Way, especially as the improvement to junction 13 of the A42 was yet to be resolved. He stated that he understood that national policy influenced decisions made by the Committee and that Ashby was willing to take some of the burden for housing development but he stressed that it needed to be done under the Council's terms.

Ms M Tuckey, Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee. She reported that the Parish Council had discussed this development on five occasions, received two presentations from the developer and have objected each time the application had come to the Planning Committee. She highlighted that the main concerns were traffic implications and the proposed drainage strategy. She went on to list each time the application had been to the Planning Committee and how the Parish Council had objected. She concluded that the Highways Authority recently conducted a two week traffic assessment in Ashby and the result was a five percent increase in traffic flow since September 2011, the increase in traffic from the proposed development would only cause a further increase.

Mr M Ball, objector, addressed the Committee. He stated that the traffic levels through the town had increased in recent years due to businesses and new homes, and there were many accidents at the Grammar school. He stressed that another link road out of the town was urgently needed but this had not been proposed in any of the conditions. He added that he felt a full highway review should be undertaken as it was not appropriate to have the access to such a large development from the one island at the A511. He also believed that the access from Woodcock Way should be ruled out all together. He

Chairman's initials

concluded that local residents had campaigned against the development from the start due to access concerns and asked Members to refuse the application.

Mr R Sutcliffe-Smith, agent, addressed the Committee. He reported that the developer had tried to address all concerns raised by the local residents and had continued to engage with both local residents and officers. He explained that the access on Woodcock Way had been restricted and the access from the A511 was achievable. He concluded that there was an opportunity to create something special on the site and the proposed scheme was future proof.

Councillor G Jones asked for confirmation that the access on Woodcock Way could be restricted to 30 units as proposed. The Head of Regeneration and Planning confirmed that this could be conditioned as part of the planning permission.

Councillor T Neilson commented that the development had now been discussed on a number of occasions and it had not really moved forward. He stated that he was not against the development of the site in principle but the scheme needed to be right for Ashby. He referred to condition five which mentioned a master plan for the whole of the site and asked for a definition of the whole of the site. The Principal Planning Officer referred to the plan within the report and explained that the whole application site was outlined in red.

Councillor T Neilson commented that the developer had proposed highway contributions for Ashby but not specified what they would be used for. He asked for further details as it was difficult to make a decision without anything in writing. The Head of Regeneration and Planning reported that there were a number of offsite improvements proposed but the details had not yet been worked up. Once the application had been approved in outline form the Section 106 contributions could be used to obtain specific plans.

Councillor J Bridges referred to condition 32 and asked if more specific wording could be used to restrict the Woodcock Way access to 30 units as it was currently very open. After some discussion over the planning terms used and the preference to have clearer wording in layman's terms, the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that more specific wording could be used as well as the condition requested by Councillor G Jones.

Councillor G A Allman reported that the Town Council still had major concerns and he felt that the application was still muddled with unresolved matters. For those reasons he moved that the application be refused. It was seconded by Councillor J G Coxon. On the advice of the Head of Regeneration and Planning, it was agreed that the original reasons for refusal when the application was previously considered be used.

After further discussion regarding whether the proposed cul-de-sac off Woodcock Way should be removed as a reason to refuse as Members were happy with the condition to restrict the access, it was decided to leave it as one of the original reasons for refusal.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds of unacceptable access in terms of connections to the town centre and vehicular access to Woodcock Way, adverse impacts on the operation of Junction 13 of the A42 and the under provision of affordable housing.

81.

**A4**

**11/01054/FULM: ERECTION OF 188 NO. DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING/PARKING, INFRASTRUCTURE, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS OFF FREARSON ROAD AND FORMATION OF OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND BALANCING POND**

Land Off Frearson Road Coalville Leicestershire LE67 2XA

Chairman's initials

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Ms K Tudor, Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee. She stated that the report still did not clarify the concerns of the Parish Council and that the contributions offered were not enough. She felt that play areas were desperately needed in the area not green spaces as proposed and the contributions should be spent locally not at the Hermitage Leisure Centre. She concluded that contributions were necessary for the Hugglescote crossroads but not for the Community Centre to be demolished.

Mr R Spurr, objector addressed the Committee and listed the following concerns:

- The development would add an unacceptable amount of traffic to the Hugglescote crossroads and the traffic assessment used was 18 months old, so not up to date.
- He believed that under Planning Policy S3, the application was not sustainable.
- The development had very little affordable housing.
- The MPPF and other Planning Policies stated that the land was only to be used as a last resort.
- Great crested newts were established on the site.

Mr R Spurr added that as the contribution from Leicestershire Constabulary had been reduced, the money should be used for children and adult play. He concluded by urging the Members to refuse the application.

Mr G Phillipson, applicant, addressed the Committee. He stated that he had lived in the area for 48 years and was the Chairman of the Thomas Harley Charity which owned 70 percent of the application site. He explained the background of the Charity and identified where the money was currently donated to. He concluded that if the application was approved the charity would benefit greatly and would be able to continue its good work.

Councillor R Johnson stated that he had looked at the merits of the application but was very disappointed that the developer had not engaged with the Parish Council in the last three years as they had promised. He referred to the Localism Act which stated that a developer should consult with the Parish Council as well as local residents and details of this should be included within the application when considered by the District Council, he believed the developers had not been transparent by not consulting. He then stated the following concerns:

- The original proposals were for 43 affordable homes, which was under the Council's recommended percentage. The current application did not have any affordable homes within the development which was not acceptable, especially as the Council's website specifically refers to affordable housing in the District.
- He believed the land should be protected as there were great crested newts in the area and it is of high agricultural quality.
- There had been many objections to the application including Andrew Bridgen MP, Campaign to Protect Rural England and the Donington and Hugglescote Action Group.
- He believed the development was not sustainable as the nearest supermarket was over a mile away, the local school was two miles away, plus there were no bus routes or a doctor's surgery.
- The transport assessment was out of date as it was 18 months old and the Hugglescote crossroads was already overused, especially as other applications had been approved that would also have an impact.

- Out of all of the new homes built in the District, 51 percent were in the Hugglescote and Donington le Heath area.

Councillor R Johnson urged Members to refuse the application as the developer had not engaged, plus the documents on the website were not up to date.

Councillor J Geary raised concerns on the lack of affordable housing as they were desperately needed in the villages, also with other applications being permitted without any affordable housing there was a danger of setting a precedent. He referred to a recent article published which highlighted that developers were using viability of affordable housing in developments as an excuse to not include them in applications and he felt that Members could not let this continue. He also raised highway concerns as he believed that the opinion of the Highway Authority was a grey area. He felt that the development would have an adverse impact on Hugglescote cross roads and the Council was selling off affordable housing for a highway improvement with no details available. It was his opinion that the Council seemed to get this wrong and therefore could not support the application.

Councillor R Johnson moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Planning Policies E3 and E4, failure to comply with the Localism Act due to lack of engagement and the lack of affordable homes.

The motion was put to the vote and LOST.

The chairman then put the officer's recommendation to the vote.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

82.

**A5**  
**13/00818/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 135 DWELLINGS INCLUDING THE DEMOLITION OF 138,140 AND 142 BARDON ROAD ALONG WITH NEW ACCESS AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS TO BARDON ROAD AND ASSOCIATED OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING (OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS OTHER THAN PART ACCESS RESERVED)**

Land Rear Of 138 Bardon Road Coalville Leicestershire

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor N Clarke, objector, addressed the Committee. He stated that the Highway Authority used a formula to calculate the traffic impact which resulted in 80 more vehicular movements on an already busy road, yet they still raised no objections which he found hard to believe. He also added that the Highway Authority were aware of the dangerous junction at Bardon Road as the plan was to close off the access once the link road was built, unfortunately that may never happen. He reported that the original proposal was for ten percent of affordable housing but the new proposals did not allow for any due to it being unviable, Councillor N Clarke asked for evidence of this. He expressed concerns that if developments were continuously approved with no affordable housing, it would be impossible to reduce the amount of housing benefit being claimed which was rising.

Councillor T Neilson moved that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety and the lack of affordable housing. The proposal was not seconded.

The Chairman clarified that the application had already been approved previously and that Members were being asked to consider the variation of affordable housing not the full

Chairman's initials

application. The Planning and Development Team Manager confirmed this to be the case.

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor M Specht and seconded by Councillor G Jones.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

**83. A6**  
**13/00991/OUTM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 90 DWELLINGS**  
**(OUTLINE - ALL MATTERS OTHER THAN PART ACCESS RESERVED)**

Land To The West Of 164- 222 Bardon Road Coalville Leicestershire

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Ms S Morrell, objector, addressed the Committee. She confirmed that she lived at 188 Bardon Road and that she did not receive an initial consultation letter. She explained that the proposed access was dangerous due to vehicles turning right onto Bardon Road and raised concerns at the lack of affordable housing. She concluded that she felt that the noise and dust from the building works would be disruptive to the neighbouring properties.

Mr J Deakin, applicant, addressed the Committee. He stated that the developer had a strong commitment to developing the District and the proposal conformed to the South East Coalville development brief. He reported that the development had a number of benefits including employment opportunities, contributing to the development plan and contributing to highway infrastructure. He concluded that although there were viability concerns regarding affordable housing, the developer was prepared to make contributions to affordable housing in the area.

Councillor M B Wyatt commented that there was already highway congestion in the area which was a problem and he could not justify voting in favour of the application. He therefore moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was outside the limits of development and local knowledge of highway safety. It was seconded by Councillor T Neilson.

In response to a question from Councillor J Bridges, the Senior Planning Officer reported that the full viability reasons for affordable housing had not yet been received; this would be required before planning permission was officially given.

Councillor J Geary reported that it was likely that Bardon Quarry was increasing its output by 25 percent which would mean an increase in traffic movements too. He believed local residents would not be impressed if the Committee approved the application. The Chairman reminded Members that the Committee could not rely on speculative information when consideration applications.

Councillor M Specht stated that he could not see any reason to refuse the application.

Councillor M B Wyatt requested a recorded vote; therefore the vote was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors R Adams, R Johnson, J Geary, T Neilson, R Woodward and M B Wyatt (6).

Against the motion:

Chairman's initials

Councillors G A Allman, J Bridges, J G Coxon, D Everitt, T Gillard, J Houlton, G Jones, N Smith, M Specht and D J Stevenson (10).

Abstentions:

Councillor D Howe (1).

The motion was LOST.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

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

84.

**A7**

**14/00219/FUL: ERECTION OF THREE NO. SINGLE STOREY DETACHED DWELLINGS AND ONE NO. TWO-STOREY DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED GARAGING**

191 Loughborough Road Whitwick Coalville Leicestershire

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Ms L Marjoram, objector, addressed the Committee. She raised the following concerns:

- Members have been told that the development was sustainable because it was inside the Coalville Urban Area when in reality it was not sustainable as there were no local shops in the vicinity and a mile away from the nearest bus stop.
- She felt that the roof height of the bungalows was too high and would be overbearing on the neighbouring properties. Approving the application could set a precedent for back garden development.
- Plot 1 was too close to the other plots and she reminded Members that they could choose to remove the plot.
- The granite on the site had not been properly investigated.
- The refuse collection arrangements had not been resolved as a refuse vehicle would not be able to access the road.

Councillor R Woodward stated that even though the proposal was for single storey units, they were still as high as the previous proposals for two storeys; he felt the height was an issue. He did not believe that the development was sustainable as the nearest bus stop was some distance away which meant people would rely on their own vehicles instead. He also felt that the proposed pitched roofs were unacceptable. Councillor R Woodward moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was not sustainable, overbearing and flooding concerns. It was seconded by Councillor T Gillard.

Councillor D Everitt also expressed concerns regarding the height of the proposed development.

Councillor G Jones commented that he could not see any issues with the application.

Councillor T Gillard asked if the Committee could use Planning Policy H4/1 as grounds for refusal as it was referred to within the report. The Planning and Development Team Leader explained that Planning Policy H4/1 was out of date but it was still necessary to make reference to it within the report, therefore he advised that it was not an appropriate ground for refusal. The Head of Regeneration and Planning recommended that the Committee used Planning Policies E3 and E4 as grounds for refusal. The mover and seconder agreed.

Chairman's initials

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that the development was contrary to Planning Policies E3 and E4.

- 85. A8**  
**14/00196/FUL: ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLING ALONE WITH DETACHED GARAGES AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS WORKS**  
 30 Clements Gate Diseworth Derby DE74 2QE

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Although the agent had registered to speak, he declined the opportunity to address the Committee.

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor D J Stevenson and seconded by Councillor T Gillard.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

- 86. A9**  
**14/00102/FUL: CHANGE OF USE TO COMMUNITY PLAY AREA AND BEER GARDEN, EXTENSION TO EXISTING CAR PARK, BUFFER ZONE, PROVISION OF POST AND RAIL FENCING AND HEDGING AND INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL LIGHTING**  
 Halfway House 65 Church Street Donisthorpe Swadlincote

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

Mr P Taylor, on behalf of Ms N Whitehouse who had been taken into hospital, addressed the Committee. He explained that the nature of the public house had changed over the past four years with five to ten outside events each year which has meant noise disturbance for Ms Whitehouse. She now has to spend the night away from her home during the events due to the level of noise, swearing and anti social behaviour. Ms Whitehouse had no objections to the play area or car park as her main concerns were for the beer garden as it would mean a loss of privacy and noise disruption.

Mr P Riley, applicant, addressed the Committee. He clarified that he had held five events in the last four years and had never received any noise complaints from the neighbouring residents. He explained that the events were designed for families and the accusations of anti social behaviour and swearing were not true.

Councillor J Bridges commented that during the site visit he could see that there was a 10 metre distance from the neighbours to the sound barrier and this was acceptable. He felt that the public house would bring life back into the village and was in support.

Councillor R Woodward commented that he felt lots had been done by the applicant to protect the neighbours from any noise disturbance.

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor G Jones and seconded by Councillor T Gillard.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

- 87. A10**  
**12/00390/VCU: VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION**  
**08/00362/FUL TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF CARAVANS THAT**  
**CAN BE STATIONED ON THE SITE AT ANY ONE TIME TO 5, OF WHICH 2 CAN BE**  
**OCCUPIED AS RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION AT ANYTIME.**  
46 Bardon Road Coalville Leicestershire LE67 4BH

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

Councillor J Geary moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Planning Policies E3 and E4. It was seconded by Councillor R Woodward. The motion was put to the vote and LOST.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

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

- 88. A11**  
**14/00151/FULM: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING TOILET BLOCK, PROVISION OF NEW**  
**ENTRANCE CANOPY, NEW PAVING AND OTHER EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS**  
**INCLUDING CHANGES TO THE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**  
Coalville Market Belvoir Shopping Centre Coalville Leicestershire

The officer's recommendation was moved by Councillor R Woodward and seconded by Councillor J Bridges.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.10 pm

Chairman's signature