

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 5 AUGUST 2014

Present: Councillor J Bridges (in the Chair)

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

In Attendance: Councillors N Clarke, S Sheahan, L Spence and J Geary

Officers: Mr S Bambrick, Mr C Elston, Mrs V Blane, Mrs M Meredith, Ms S Worrall, Mr J Knightley and Mr R McKillop

#### **24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N Smith and D J Stevenson.

#### **25. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

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

Councillors R Adams, N Clarke, J Cotterill, J Legrys, T Neilson, M Specht and M B Wyatt declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A1, application number 14/00050/FULM.

Councillor M B Wyatt declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary interest in item A1, application number 14/00050/FULM, due to his association with the Save Our Green Wedges Action Group. He referred to another application in the area, regarding which he had made his intent clear. He clarified that he had not made up his mind regarding this application. In respect of the public meeting organised by Councillor N Clarke, he advised that he had not attended, and to his knowledge had not been invited to attend.

Councillor T Neilson declared that he had attended the meeting arranged by Councillor N Clarke regarding item A1, application number 14/00050/FULM, but he had not spoken at the meeting.

Councillor J Legrys declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A2, application number 13/00141/OUTM.

Councillor T Neilson declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of items A2, A3 and A4, application numbers 13/00141/OUTM, 13/00516/FULM AND 13/00969/FUL.

Councillors R Johnson and J Legrys declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary interest in item A6, application number 14/00450/FUL, as a Member of the Owen Street Recreation Ground Pavilion Management Committee and as a Member of the Coalville Special Expenses Working Party.

Councillor R Woodward declared that he had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A6, application number 14/00450/FUL.

Councillors M Specht and M B Wyatt declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary interest in item A6, application number 14/00450/FUL as a Member of the Coalville Special Expenses Working Party.

Chairman's initials

**26. MINUTES**

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

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

RESOLVED THAT:

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

**27. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Director of Services, as amended by the update sheet circulated at the meeting.

**28. 14/00050/FULM - ERECTION OF 79 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE**

Land North Of Greenhill Road And East Of Agar Nook Lane Coalville Leicestershire

The Planning and Development Team Manager presented the report to Members. Councillor N Clarke, Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He spoke in support of the officer's recommendation as this was an area of particularly attractive countryside and the development would encroach into the Charnwood Forest and a SSSI site. He referred to the document from the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust which supported the officer's recommendations and he thanked them for producing the document. He felt that there would be an effect in terms of highways, as the development would generate an increase in traffic which would impact upon Warren Hills Road. He added that the additional traffic had not been mitigated. He thanked the residents who had highlighted the flooding issues and pointed out that the report offered no conclusive solution to these issues. He encouraged all Members to support the officer's recommendation.

Mr T Sporne, objector, addressed the meeting on behalf of the Save Our Green Fields Action Group and neighbouring residents. He stated that the proposed development was outside the limits to development, in an area of particularly attractive open countryside, which should be protected. He added that the proposals were contrary to policy E22, would encroach into Charnwood Forest, and would set a dangerous precedent for similar sites. He pointed out that the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust had objected for a number of reasons. He stated that the ecological buffer and wildlife corridor should be retained in respect of the Holly Rock Fields SSSI. He made reference to the recent revisions to the methodology used to calculate the housing land supply and the current position that the Council was able to demonstrate a five year supply plus a twenty per cent buffer, which meant that it was no longer necessary to permit the application. He stated that residents had grave concerns regarding traffic and the environmental implications. He added that if the application was granted, an additional junction onto Broom Leys Road would be required.

Mr S Lewis-Roberts, agent, addressed the meeting. He stated that the application site was in a sustainable location, with good access to shops, schools and bus stops. He added that there were no technical objections from any of the statutory consultees. He made reference to the comprehensive S106 package. He stated that the development was of high quality, and was sensitive to local concepts following discussions with the Council's Urban designer. He added that the proposals would ensure that more than one third of the site would be protected and designated as a wildlife site. He acknowledged that the area was attractive countryside, however he felt that this should not prevent appropriate development taking place. He stated that the landscape strategy would reduce the visual impact of the proposals. He commented that the five year housing land

Chairman's initials

supply was a critical factor when considering this application. He stated that the argument to rely on the recent changes in methodology was flawed, as demonstrated by a recent decision at Blaby which had been overturned on appeal. He advised that calculations made by his organisation showed that the current position was in fact only 2.94 years. He added that policy S3 and E22 were out of date and concluded that permission should be granted.

Councillor R Adams commented that Councillor N Clarke and Mr T Sporne had said most of what he was intending to say and therefore he moved that the application be refused in accordance with the officer's recommendation. He expressed concerns regarding the report from the Highways Authority as he felt this was not correct in terms of the traffic situation on Greenhill Road and Warren Hills Road. He added that he was local to the area and was aware of the issues. He commented that he would like to see some reinvestigation of the highways situation and asked whether such a recommendation could be made.

The Director of Services clarified that if Members were minded to refuse the application, this could be included as an additional reason for refusal.

Councillor R Adams moved that the application be refused in accordance with the officer's recommendation, and that an additional reason for refusal be included on highways grounds due to local knowledge. This was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Chairman advised Members that firstly a vote would be taken on adding the additional reason for refusal. The motion was then put to the vote and declared a tie. The Chairman exercised his casting vote and the motion was declared LOST.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he supported the officer's recommendation to refuse the application. He added that the current position meant that the Committee would not be forced to approve applications due to the lack of a housing land supply. He made reference to the speed in which Pegasus had come to conclusions about the housing land supply issue and stated that he was happy to support the SHMA outcome and the officer's recommendation.

Councillor M B Wyatt stated that he agreed with the recommendation to refuse the application. He felt that it would have a detrimental and harmful effect, would destroy the local countryside and would cause congestion. He referred to the objection from Friends of Charnwood Forest, and felt there would be a detrimental impact upon the landscape. He stated that he would support the recommendation to refuse the application.

Councillor T Gillard made reference to various policy constraints including H4/1 and S3, which should apply when determining applications if there was no conclusive backup of delivered housing. He stated that on this basis, the application should be granted. He felt that this was a very good scheme and sought advice on planning grounds for permitting the application.

The Planning and Development Team Manager advised that there was substantial detailed evidence backing up how the figure of 7.4 years' housing land supply had been arrived at. In respect of the concerns raised by the applicant's agent, he advised that the latest figures were a good basis for the calculation and could be relied upon. He added that the deliverability figures had been assessed.

The Director of Services advised that, in terms of planning grounds, it was a matter for Members whether they regarded the proposals to represent sustainable development.

Councillor T Gillard moved that the application be permitted on the grounds that the proposals represented sustainable development. This was seconded by Councillor G Jones.

Councillor T Neilson raised a point of order in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.10, in that no further motions could be moved when a motion was under debate. He suggested that a vote be taken on the motion to refuse the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

The Chairman then put the motion to the vote and it was declared LOST.

Councillor G Jones stated that he had reservations about the density of the development site and sought assurance that the square footage of the properties was above average. He felt that the location was ideal.

The Planning and Development Team Manager advised that there were approximately 30 houses per hectare, which was deemed to be an appropriate density for a development of this size.

Councillor M B Wyatt sought advice from officers whether permitting this application would set a precedent, particularly in this area. He also referred to the uncertainty regarding the housing land supply figures and asked whether it was worthwhile deferring the application so that Members' concerns could be clarified.

This was seconded by Councillor R Adams.

The Chairman sought clarification from Councillor M B Wyatt on the grounds on which he wished to defer the application.

Councillor M B Wyatt commented that the officer's report had been questioned, especially regarding the housing land supply figures. On that basis he felt the application should be deferred until the September meeting as clarity was needed.

The Director of Services advised that the housing land supply would always be a fluid situation, and therefore if Members were minded to defer the application, it was unlikely that there would be a more definitive position when the application was reconsidered. He explained that officers were claiming a five year housing land supply currently existed, and the applicant did not agree. He added that the motion to approve the application was on the basis that the scheme was sustainable, and not the basis that Members did not agree with the officers' claim in respect of the housing land supply. He commented that the position regarding setting a precedent was difficult to answer, however clearly if this site was being reconsidered, a precedent would have been set. He added that sites nearby would need to be considered on their own merits. He stated that permitting this application may have implications for nearby sites, however a definitive answer could not be given as to whether a precedent would be set.

Councillor R Adams sought advice on whether the application could be deferred due to the fact that there were outstanding flooding issues.

The Chairman advised that the application could not be deferred on this basis as these issues would need to be dealt with in any case.

Councillor M Specht commented that it was a breath of fresh air to have a recommendation to refuse. He stated that he was not happy with the content of the report and felt that the application met two of the three key criteria. He referred to the housing land supply issue and commented that there had been a lot of figures bandied about, however he was not satisfied that the current presumption could be relied upon. He

Chairman's initials

added that many of the applications approved over the past 18 months were outline applications, and as such, the housing land supply figure could be minimised at appeal. On that basis he expressed support for the application.

Councillor J Legrys agreed that this application was close to call. He stated that the figures from G L Hearn were as good as it would get. He referred to the speech made by the applicant's agent regarding the application at Blaby, as his understanding was that this application was refused at appeal. He expressed concerns regarding flooding, traffic, and the fact that the application site was outside the limits to development. He commented that there had to be a line drawn in the sand between the urban and rural areas, and until today, Agar Nook Lane had been that line. He referred to Charnwood Forest which was currently earmarked in the Local Plan. He expressed concerns that applications may be received on the other side of Warren Hills Road, and that precedent was not a planning objection. He acknowledged that the line in the sand could not be held in perpetuity however he believed strongly that a 7 year housing land supply did exist and expressed support for the SHMA figures. He stated that he could not under any circumstances support the motion to permit the application. He requested a recorded vote.

Councillor A Bridges highlighted that there were no objections from the statutory consultees and added that she could find no reason to refuse the application.

Councillor D Everitt referred to the risk of flooding and stated that the application needed to be considered in the overall context as it would cause problems for the surrounding low lying areas.

Councillor R Johnson highlighted the reasons for refusal in respect of the application at Blaby which had been referred to. He stated that the proposals would be harmful to the area and commented that all we seemed to do was build on areas of natural beauty.

The Planning and Development Team Manager referred Members to the current motion to permit the application and advised that the developer contributions would need to be secured by means of a Section 106 Agreement. The mover and seconder agreed that they were happy to have this written in to the recommendation.

The Chairman then put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote having been requested, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors G A Allman, A Bridges, J Bridges, J Cotterill, J G Coxon, T Gillard, J Hoult, G Jones and M Specht (9).

Against the motion:

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

Abstentions:

None (0).

The motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted subject to conditions, and the wording of the decision notice be delegated to the Director of Services.

**29. 13/00141/OUTM - DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 450 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS AND REINSTATEMENT OF 1.1KM OF ASSOCIATED CANAL, PROVISION OF PUBLIC**

Chairman's initials

**OPEN SPACE AND VEHICULAR, EMERGENCY AND FOOTPATH ACCESS (OUTLINE APPLICATION - ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT ACCESS)**

Land At Measham Waterside Burton Road Measham Derby

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Dr O Mulka, supporter, addressed the meeting. He made reference to his long association with the village and the severe impact that the closure of the mine had had upon it. He stated that the best way to improve health and wellbeing was by improving the economy. He added that he had started the canal restoration group as this was the only project that could bring back the heart of Measham. He referred to previous the regeneration of the village which had done nothing for the high street. He stated that there would never be another opportunity to regenerate the canal and the high street and this was a unique opportunity to create a leisure attraction.

Mr B Wilson, applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He commented that he welcomed the opportunity to change the approach to the Section 106 Agreement. He referred to the June meeting of the Planning Committee where Members had expressed the need for the application to provide benefit locally, as well as restoring the canal. He reiterated the commitment to developing the canal and advised that an access road and bridge would be constructed, and the domestic waste would be removed from the bed of the canal. He made reference to the cost of protecting the route of the canal in addition to the Section 106 Agreement. He placed on record his thanks to the officers for allowing the application to be reconsidered.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he was extremely disappointed that after the June meeting, further talks were made with the applicant when no authority had been granted by the Planning Committee to do so. He stated that a decision had been made by the Committee and he found this to be extremely worrying. He added that if the officer in question was still in post, he would have taken this matter further. He raised a point of order relating to Council Procedure Rule 15.2, in that a motion in similar terms to one which has been rejected at a Council meeting within the past six months cannot be moved unless notice is given and signed by at least one third of the Members. He stated that nothing had been brought before Members to this effect and he sought advice on whether it was constitutional for Members to reconsider this item. He referred to the Money Hill application, in respect of which Members were required to take a vote to reconsider the application.

The Chairman proposed that the application be deferred to enable advice to be sought following the meeting. This was seconded by Councillor M Specht.

The Chairman then put the motion to the vote and it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be deferred to enable further legal advice to be sought.

**30. 13/00516/FULM - ERECTION OF 20 NO. DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, DRIVEWAYS AND PARKING**

Land Off New Street Measham Swadlincote Derby

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

Councillor S Sheahan, Ward Member, addressed the meeting. He stated that the initial concerns appeared to have been resolved, and therefore he supported the recommendation to permit the application.

Chairman's initials

Councillor T Neilson stated that he took issue with the fact that there was no affordable housing. He added that the development was not sustainable if there was no affordable housing. He commented that a motion to refuse the application would be voted down, however he could not support a scheme with no affordable housing.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Director of Services.

**31. 13/00969/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 7 NEW AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS, INCLUDING ACCESS AND PARKING ARRANGEMENTS AND PARKING FOR NO. 6 QUEEN'S STREET**

Land At 6 Queens Street Measham Swadlincote Derbys

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Councillor S Sheahan, Ward Member, addressed the meeting. He stated that he was generally in favour of affordable housing, however this development had been badly designed and did not satisfy policies E3 and E4. He added that there was an issue getting bin lorries into the site as it was too constrained. He questioned where a bin store might be located and expressed concerns that residents may end up paying twice for this service. He referred to the separation of 5.3m which was quite worrying and would cause Orchard House to be overshadowed. He added that officers felt this would not be significant, however the residents of Orchard House had had a professional study undertaken which indicated otherwise. He referred to the errors in the officer's report and plans. He concluded that the proposed development would be a blight upon neighbouring properties and a horribly cramped place to live. He urged Members to refuse the application on the grounds that it did not comply with policies E3 and E4.

Mrs P Wheatcroft, objector, addressed the meeting. She made reference to the site plan and the original outline application for 5 dwellings. She added that the whole point of good design was to offer imaginative solutions. She stated that the issues had not been addressed and planning officers had given inaccurate and inconsistent advice. She expressed concerns that the proposals would cause overshadowing and overlooking, and felt that they were demonstrably overbearing. She questioned whether permitting the application would set a precedent. She highlighted numerous errors in the report, in particular that the parking provision for plot 4 was located within her own garden. She stated that the plan was totally flawed.

Mr P Taylor, applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He stated that at the April meeting, the reasons for deferring the application were the access and overlooking. He added that there had been many changes to the scheme and the position of dwellings, and the issues in respect of the access had been addressed. He commented that the applicant had made a significant effort to address the concerns raised by residents. He stated that the parking arrangements were compliant with the design guide and there was no reason to refuse the application on highways grounds. He added that drainage would be a matter for building regulations. He acknowledged that there were unusual relationships between existing dwellings, and therefore there would be an impact, however he urged Members to make a subjective assessment of the impact upon neighbours. He stated that the applicants had worked hard to satisfy the technical requirements and address the concerns expressed by neighbours. He felt that there were no reasonable grounds to refuse the application.

Councillor G A Allman moved that the application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Director of Services. This was seconded by Councillor J G Coxon.

Councillor R Woodward stated that he supported social housing, however this was typical of outline applications where the number of dwellings was subsequently increased. He added that he had seen the site and could not support the proposals.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he could not support this plan as there were still too many problems, even after an extremely long negotiation process. He referred to the question he had raised at the previous meeting regarding the parking issues for the residents of 8 Queens Street. He added that after hearing the representations made, he felt this would be a time bomb if approved, and he would be voting against the recommendation.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he could not vote for the recommendation and had been struck by the resident's objection, particularly regarding the plans and the allocation of a parking space in their garden. He stated that this was poor planning and he was disappointed that there had not been an opportunity to check the plans. He added that he was aware there was an ongoing boundary dispute in respect of this application. He expressed disappointment that the RSL had not taken the opportunity to discuss and consider Queensway House as part of these proposals, as it was currently vacant and in the ownership of the Council. He stated that he was deeply concerned regarding social housing, as the number of dwellings per hectare was being increased, and the size of properties was reducing. He felt that on planning grounds, this application was wrong and he could not support it.

Councillor A Bridges stated that during the debate on the previous application, a comment had been made that Measham was incredibly short of affordable housing, and so she felt this was an ideal area. She added that boundary issues were between the applicant and the landowners.

Councillor T Neilson made a point of personal explanation, in that he had commented that the District was short of affordable housing and as such, this application would not have much impact on the shortfall. He added that these proposals should not be compared to the previous scheme.

Councillor M Specht felt that the proposals constituted overdevelopment of the site, which was a ludicrous parcel of land. He stated that he would not be supporting the proposals.

The Chairman then put the motion to permit the application to the vote and the motion was declared LOST.

Councillor T Neilson moved that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposals were not in accordance with policies E3 and E4, constituted overdevelopment of the site, had poor access and a poor relationship with surrounding properties. This was seconded by Councillor R Johnson.

The motion was then put to the vote and was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that the proposals were not in accordance with policies E3 and E4, constituted overdevelopment of the site, had poor access and a poor relationship with surrounding properties.

**32. 14/00509/FUL - CHANGE OF USE OF DWELLINGHOUSE TO A MIXED USE AS A DWELLINGHOUSE AND FOR THE KEEPING, FOR BREEDING AND SHOWING**

Chairman's initials



**PURPOSES, OF UP TO 15 DOGS TOGETHER WITH THE RETENTION OF KENNEL BUILDINGS, A STORAGE SHED AND OPEN AND CLOSED RUNS**

27 School Lane Newbold Coalville Leicestershire

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Mr I Hallam, objector, addressed the meeting on behalf of the residents of Newbold. He stated that the application was retrospective which showed a disregard for rules and procedures. He added that there were strong concerns that noise and dog odours would reach unacceptable levels as they had before. He sought clarification on whether there was the option to change the breed at the premises, and if so, there could be potentially worse issues with noise and odour. He made reference to the school opposite the premises and expressed concerns that visitors would add to the existing traffic problems. He highlighted that the stated number of dogs on site excluded puppies, which still produced odour and noise. He concluded that a business of this sort was not suitable for a quiet residential area.

Mr T Redfern, applicant's agent, addressed the meeting. He stated that he was pleased to note that the officer's recommendation was to permit the application. He made reference to the previous application and highlighted that the number of breeding dogs had been reduced to 15. He added that officers had not considered it feasible or necessary to require a restriction on the breed of dog. He stated that the applicant had a large garden and the sheds had been situated in the best location. He added that the dogs were virtually noise-free as the site had been sound proofed, the compound was fenced, the site was kept clean and there were no smells outside the fence. In terms of visitors he explained that multiple visits did not take place at the same time, and therefore there were 5 or 6 purchase visits per month. He added that the parking on site could accommodate 6 or 7 vehicles at a time and was never full. He stated that the objections to the application were as a result of a malicious complaint and the applicants had been the subject of racial abuse and vandalism since the previous application. He added that there were no reasons to refuse the application. He concluded that control would be reinforced by the breeder's licence and urged Members to grant the application.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he had spoken in favour of the previous application as no complaints had been received whilst the premises had been in operation. He moved that the application be permitted in accordance with the officer's recommendation. He added that as the District Council had yet to receive any complaints, public nuisance could not be evidenced, and the visit from the RSPCA had given the all clear.

The motion was seconded by Councillor D Everitt.

Councillor M Specht stated that there were no objections regarding noise and smell, and the outbuildings would appear to be permitted development and as such were no different from having a hobby room in your back garden. He expressed support for the application.

Councillor A Bridges stated that she would not be supporting the application and felt that the comment indicating that there had been no official complaints received was misleading and was the reason that this application had been called in previously. She added that this was an inconsiderate way of moving into a village and turning a lovely garden into a kennel. She stated that there had been complaints from neighbours, but these had not been made officially. She indicated that she would move that the application be refused on the grounds that it did not accord with policies E3 and E4 as it was significantly detrimental to neighbouring properties and subsequent purchasers.

The Chairman advised that a motion had already been moved and seconded, and this would be dealt with firstly.

Chairman's initials

Councillor R Woodward agreed that information on the number of complaints received could be misleading. He pointed out that the number of dogs on site would be significantly more than the 15 breeding dogs, irrespective of whether they were in the sheds or in the house. He felt that the application would be detrimental to the local area and stated that he would not buy a house next to the site. He concluded that the application did not accord with policy E3 and added that he could not support it.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he felt likewise and had objected to the previous application. He added that he could not see that a reduction of 5 dogs was any different. He stated that the dogs may or may not be loud, however they would cause a nuisance. He expressed a real concern that the buildings were permitted development, which could have been used for hobby purposes, however he felt that the Committee would take a dim view of them being used for business. He added that there were issues raised by the objector which could not be taken into account, such as property prices. He expressed concern that the objector referred to complaints which had been made, however the Environmental Health department had no record of them. He felt that the overlooking onto the site was unacceptable.

Councillor D Everitt stated that he could see no problem with the application, and the officer had recommended that it be permitted. He added that there had been a lot of assumptions, however the fact was that no complaints had been received, and the facts led him to believe that the officer's recommendation was correct.

Councillor J G Coxon referred to the report which stated that the applicant had a licence for 7 litters. He sought clarification on how many dogs would produce 7 litters.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the current number of animals was 12 breeding females and 3 males, and between them they produced 7 litters per year, with an average of 6 pups per litter.

The motion to permit the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation was then put to the vote and was declared LOST.

Councillor R Woodward moved that the application be refused on the grounds that it did not accord with policies E3 and E4.

The Director of Services advised that policy E4 related to design and that this reason for refusal could not be sustained on appeal.

Councillor R Woodward withdrew policy E4 as a reason for refusal.

The motion was seconded by Councillor A Bridges.

The Chairman then put the motion to the vote and it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that it did not accord with policy E3.

**33. 14/00450/FUL - PROPOSED NEW CLUBHOUSE AND CHANGING ROOM**  
Coalville Town FC Owen Street Coalville Leicestershire

The Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

The Chairman asked Councillor M B Wyatt to clarify why he had called in the application.

Councillor M B Wyatt explained that he had done so as he wanted to make sure that residents could see that the process was open and transparent, as a substantial sum of taxpayers' money was going in to the scheme.

Councillor J Geary, Ward Member, addressed the meeting. He explained that the Chairman of the football club had been invited to attend the last meeting of the Coalville Special Expenses Working Party and he had explained that their aspirations for future development depended upon the new changing rooms. He stated that the club had been very successful and referred to the match at Wembley which was a remarkable achievement. He added that the pavilion had been purpose built for the former cricket team and was not suitable for football. He reminded Members that the team had lost out on promotion in the playoffs, but they may have been denied in any case as they do not currently have the requisite facilities. He made reference to the significant improvements which had already been done at the team's expense and added that match funding had been arranged. He concluded that the football club were enhancing the Council's portfolio and this was a 'no-brainer'. He urged all Members to support the application.

Councillor J Legrys reiterated that the site belonged to the Council and the board of directors had invested a significant amount of their own money into improving the facilities on site. He added that any person who invested in their community deserved congratulating. He stated that the club needed the facilities to enable the name of Coalville to progress through the football league. He added that there would be a benefit not just for Coalville, but for the whole of North West Leicestershire and this would promote the district in the sporting media. He welcomed the initiative and significant investment in the community.

The Chairman asked Councillor J Geary to pass on his full support to the football club.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be permitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Director of Services.

Councillor S Sheahan entered the room at 5.45pm prior to the discussion and debate on item A3, application number 13/00516/FULM.

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 6.48 pm

Chairman's signature