

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2017

Present: Councillor D J Stevenson (Chairman)

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

In Attendance: Councillor T J Pendleton

Officers: Mr C Elston, Mrs H Exley, Mr A Mellor, Mrs M Meredith, Mr J Newton and Miss S Odedra

## **92. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Adams, J G Coxon, D Harrison and N Smith.

## **93. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

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

Councillor J Legrys declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A1, application number 16/01408/FUL.

During the debate, Councillors J Houlton and G Jones declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A1, application number 16/01408/FUL, as members of Ashby Town Council.

Councillors J Bridges, G Jones and D J Stevenson declared that they had been lobbied without interest in respect of item A2, application number 16/01059/OUT.

Councillor D J Stevenson declared a non pecuniary interest in item A5, application number 16/01127/VCU, having called in the application.

## **94. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2017.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2017 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

## **95. 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.

Chairman's initials

**96. A1**  
**16/01408/FUL: ERECTION OF 9 NO. DWELLINGS**

Land At North Close Blackfordby DE11 8AP Derby

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

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

Mrs K Brady, objector, addressed the meeting. She expressed concerns in respect of access and egress, the blocking of drains, the loss of green space which is used by children although she appreciated that there was a football pitch nearby, the mix of social housing and the elderly, a perceived risk that antisocial behaviour would result from social housing being built, and the devaluing of properties. She felt that bungalows would be more appropriate and more aesthetically pleasing.

Ms Y Sharma, applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. She stated that the proposals would have no impact on highway safety, as 2 parking spaces per home provision was proposed. She added that the width of the road was sufficient for two cars to pass and there were no objections from the Highway Authority. She advised that a number of amendments had been made to the design in consultation with the Council's Urban Designer. She highlighted that there were other green spaces within walking distance of the site, and that the design included gaps between properties to enable views to the church spire to be retained, and therefore the proposals would not result in a significant detrimental impact upon the amenities of local residents. She added that the proposal was entirely comprised of affordable housing and would contribute to the social sustainability of the village. She concluded that the proposals fully accorded with local and national planning policies and she respectfully requested that members approve the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

Councillor M B Wyatt stated that he had listened to the concerns of local residents regarding the mix of social housing with the elderly, and his experience was that more complaints were being received from elderly residents who felt very vulnerable and did not like coming out into the local community. He stated that he would not be supporting the proposals.

Councillor R Johnson expressed concerns regarding the width of the road and the impact of construction traffic. He stated that an application for 9 bungalows would blend in with the rest of the community and therefore he would not be supporting the application.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration drew members' attention to condition 7 relating to the construction traffic management plan. He reminded members that an application for 9 bungalows was not before the committee for determination.

Councillor G Jones expressed doubts regarding the mix between social housing and the elderly occupiers, however he felt the development was needed in the village and on balance would support the application.

Councillor J Bridges stated that he was not opposed to development of the site in principle, however he felt that the dwellings should be bungalows and for that reason he would not be supporting the proposals.

Councillor J Legrys commented that more affordable housing was required, however the road was very narrow and the emergency services found it difficult if not impossible to access, adding that the coach driver had refused to reverse down the road, during the site visits. He felt that the development should fit in with the existing housing mix and he expressed deep disappointment that negotiations had not taken place to achieve that mix. He believed that a better scheme could have been put forward considering that the

Chairman's initials

Council owned the land at the time. He stated that he would not be supporting the proposals.

Councillor J Geary agreed with Cllr J Bridges, noting that many of the existing bungalows had alarm boxes on them.

Councillor M Specht reiterated the need to judge the application on its own merits. He stated that none of the statutory consultees had raised any objections, social housing was desperately needed and there was a football ground nearby providing open space. He noted that the coach driver had also hit the kerb elsewhere during the site visits. He made reference to his own experiences with antisocial behaviour and expressed incredulity at the suggestion that all social housing tenants were anti social. He reminded members that the only reason this application was before the Planning Committee was that the land was under the Council's ownership, otherwise the application would have been permitted under delegated powers.

Councillor J Clarke commented that the proposals would result in a limited increase in the number of residents and he was opposed to the grouping together of the elderly. He expressed confidence that nine homes would not be a major problem.

Councillor D J Stevenson stated that he felt ashamed at the suggestion that all youngsters in social housing were antisocial. He reminded members that the width of the road would be the same whether bungalows or houses were built.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor J Hoult and

RESOLVED THAT:

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

97.

**A2**

**16/01059/OUT: DEMOLITION OF FARM BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF FIVE DETACHED DWELLINGS (OUTLINE WITH ACCESS AND LAYOUT INCLUDED)**

Quarry Lane Snarestone Swadlincote Derby DE12 7DD

Officer's Recommendation: REFUSE

The Planning and Development Team Manager presented the report to members, highlighting that it was considered the proposal in respect of the transfer of the land, redbrick building and the contribution of £100,000 to Snarestone Primary School would not comply with the relevant policy tests in the NPPF and the CIL regulations, and therefore did not form a material consideration and should not be taken into account when determining the application.

Mr A Large, applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He advised that during initial discussion on the application, his clients had been made aware of the need for additional space at the Snarestone Primary School and the need for a new school room. The application had been revised accordingly and the offer of the transfer of land, the redbrick building and the financial contribution had been agreed with school governors. He made reference to the fallback position and examples where an alternative conversion had been taken as a material consideration. He added that the removal of diffuse water pollution would provide a clear benefit to the River Mease and he considered this to be a material consideration. He made reference to the level of services in the village and accepted the concerns in this respect. However he felt that the offer of a school room shifted the balance. He concluded that he believed this was one of the best applications he had put forward and asked members to support the proposals.

Chairman's initials

Councillor J Bridges felt that the application added to village life and to controlled growth in the area. He commented that villages which were not sustainable could become so by allowing controlled development. He stated that he understood and respected that the contribution to the school was not a material consideration, however expressed concerns that the education authority was not requesting a contribution. He expressed support for the application.

Councillor J Legrys felt vehemently that the officer's recommendation was wrong. He made reference to another application nearby which was outside the limits to development and had been permitted under delegated powers. He felt that this was contradictory. He said that the site would be tidied up by the development and village services would benefit from increased trade. He concluded that the application was appropriate for the village and he could not see why people should be prevented from living in the village.

Councillor J Clarke sought clarification on the position of Snarestone Parish Council. The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised that the application had been unanimously approved by the Parish Council.

Councillor V Richichi expressed concerns in respect of inconsistency. He felt that the reasons for refusal were weak and the application would have no adverse impact. He noted that the committee had been told that the village only had a two hourly bus service, but expressed his opinion that bus services were not good anywhere in the district.

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

Subject to a Section 106 Agreement, the application be permitted on the following grounds:

- a) The application constituted a sustainable form of development
- b) The application would improve the visual appearance of the site
- c) The application would improve access to housing in the village
- d) The application would support village vitality

**98.**

**A3**

**16/01269/OUT: ERECTION OF ONE DETACHED DWELLING (OUTLINE - MEANS OF ACCESS AND LAYOUT APPROVAL)**

78 Loughborough Road Peggs Green Coalville Leicestershire LE67 8HG

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to members.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, 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

99.

**A4****16/01080/OUT: ERECTION OF ONE DETACHED DWELLING INCLUDING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE (OUTLINE - LAYOUT AND ACCESS INCLUDED)**

Mount Pleasant Nottingham Road Peggs Green Coalville Leicestershire LE67 8HN

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to members.

Mrs L Read, objector, addressed the meeting expressing concerns regarding the safety of the access and overlooking of her own neighbouring property.

Mr A Greenwood, applicant, addressed the meeting outlining his personal reasons for the proposals.

In response to a question from Councillor J Legrys, the Head of Planning and Regeneration advised that the issue of conflicting vehicles on a private drive could be a planning matter. He added that the Highways Authority had taken into consideration the access arrangements as a whole and had raised no objections.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he supported the application and felt the proposals were ideal for the site.

Councillor M Specht expressed concerns regarding the number of windows in the gable end of the existing property abutting the development site. It was agreed that the first floor bedroom window on the side elevation of the existing dwelling, Mount Pleasant should be changed to obscure glazing prior to any occupation of the proposed dwelling and that this be dealt with by way of a condition.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration, subject to an additional condition to secure obscure glazing to first floor bedroom window in the northern facing side elevation of Mount Pleasant.

100.

**A5****16/01127/VCU: VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF 14/00925/FUL TO PROVIDE SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION DETACHED GARAGE**

5 Melbourne Lane Breedon On The Hill Derby DE73 8AT

Officer's Recommendation: PERMIT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to members.

Mr J Morrison, representing Breedon on the Hill Parish Council, addressed the meeting. He stated that the Parish Council supported applications which enhanced the village. He expressed concerns that the proposals represent a significant expansion in the Conservation Area and would result in a significant loss of amenity for the neighbouring property. He submitted that the officers were inconsistent in recommending approval of this larger scheme having refused the original application. He disagreed with the officer's opinion that the location within 2m of the common boundary was not a material consideration. He added that the apple tree provided screening to the neighbouring property. He urged members to refuse the application on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site, scale, massing and loss of neighbour amenity.

Chairman's initials

Mr D Dore, objector, addressed the meeting. He stated that the amenity of the neighbouring property would be adversely affected, the site was very small and narrow and the access through the pub car park could potentially cause problems. He felt that it was misleading to suggest that there was sufficient space to provide 2 parking spaces on the site and expressed concerns in respect of cars backing into the traffic flow from the pub. He asked members to refuse the application.

Members expressed concerns in respect of the proposals and sought advice from the Head of Planning and Regeneration on the reasons for refusal.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that owing to the scale and mass of the proposals, which constituted overdevelopment of the site over and above that of the dwelling previously approved, the proposals were not in keeping with the conservation area or surrounding area.

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5.49 pm