

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING Committee held in the Remote Meeting using Microsoft Teams on TUESDAY, 9 March 2021

Present: Councillor N Smith (Chairman)

Councillors D Bigby, A J Bridgen, R Canny, D Everitt, S Gillard, J Hoult, J Legrys and R Ashman (Substitute for Councillor D Harrison)

In Attendance: Councillors R Boam

Officers: Mr C Elston, Mr J Mattley, Mrs C Hammond, Mrs S Grant, Mr T Delaney and Mrs H Exley

58. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors R Boam, D Harrison and M Wyatt.

Councillor R Boam attended the meeting as the Ward Member who had called in both applications.

59. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of the following applications but had come to the meeting with an open mind.

Item A1, application number 20/01823/FUL

Councillors R Ashman, A Bridgen, and S Gillard.

Item A2, application number 20/00689/FUL

Councillors R Ashman, A Bridgen, S Gillard and J Hoult

During the consideration of item A2, Councillor J Hoult confirmed that he only knew the applicant in their capacity as the landlord of the restaurant.

60. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2021.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor G Hoult and by affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2021 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

61. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

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

Chairman's initials

**62. A1
20/01823/FUL: ERECTION OF OFFICE DEVELOPMENT (CLASS E(G)) INCLUDING
NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS**

Land South Of A512 Between Loughborough Road And Moor Lane Coleorton LE67 8FQ
Officer's Recommendation: Permit

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to members.

Mr Golby, applicant, addressed the committee highlighting that the application would allow the business to expand whilst ensuring it remained local to key clients, and that there was a shortfall in office provision in the district. He noted that the landscape was central to the location and as such, 87% of the land under their control was being secured as landscape enhancement, adding that the application was to develop on the site what was needed, not what was the most profitable. He advised that there would be no large vehicles accessing the site and no vehicles, machinery or materials stored there. He noted that there were no technical objections and that they were happy to accept a cap on the size of the business in line with the business plan to ensure the vehicle movements did not exceed what had been assessed as acceptable.

Councillor R Boam, Ward Member, addressed the committee highlighting that the site was greenfield and was outside the Limits to Development, that there were other office sites within the area that would have been suitable for the applicants and that there were highway safety concerns, even though there was no objection from LCC. He questioned the number of vehicle movements to and from the site. He noted that both Parishes had objected to the application and the detrimental impact it would have on the visual amenities. He urged the committee to refuse the application.

In determining the application, many members raised concerns over issues relating to highway safety due to the single track road the site was accessed from and then on to the A512. They also raised concerns that the application was contrary to policy S3k, that it was outside Limits to Development and a development, such as the one in front of them, would have a detrimental impact on the local amenities. Some members acknowledged that there were no objections from statutory consultees including the highway authority and that the NPPF allowed for development on greenfield sites and consideration was given to the suitability of the design of the building within the rural context.

Members had regard to the fact that a condition could be included that would limit use to that of an office only, as the application was the first under the new class E use. It was also noted that the current guidance does show a shortfall in small office units, the application was being assessed under policy S3k rather than policy EC2 and that there was no definition as to what a small scale business was in the Local Plan.

A motion to refuse the application on the grounds that the application was contrary to S3k as it did not constitute small scale development was moved by Councillor D Bigby and seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

The Chairman put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being required, the voting was as detailed below.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused on the grounds that the application was contrary to policy S3k and authorisation to word the decision notice be delegated to the Head of Planning and Infrastructure.

Chairman's initials

Motion to refuse the application on the grounds the application was contrary to Policy S3k (Motion)	
Councillor Nigel Smith	Against
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Alexander Bridgen	Abstain
Councillor Rachel Canny	Against
Councillor David Everitt	For
Councillor Stuart Gillard	Against
Councillor Jim Hout	For
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Robert Ashman	Against
Councillor Gill Hout	For
Carried	

63.

A2**20/00689/FUL: FORMATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS (RETROSPECTIVE)**

Willow House Rempstone Road Griffydam Coalville LE67 8AP

Officer's Recommendation: Refuse

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

Mr A Dennison, agent, addressed the committee highlighting that no personal vehicle could arrive or leave the house without passing through the public house car park, which in turn had a severe impact on the amenities of the dwelling, and that the new access would be used by visitors to the house only. He noted that the access met the standards for visibility as set out by the local highways authority and the splays that had been established exceed the requirements. He added that the applicant was willing to accept a condition in relation to the width of the access, and the only reason for refusal was that the application was contrary to Network Access policy IN5. He urged the committee to disregard the highway's objection as the application complied with their standards and that the application site was located in an area where there were many other similar accesses.

Councillor R Boam, adjoining Ward Member, addressed the committee highlighting that the application met all highway standards and the access was a betterment to the occupiers, as it was much safer than the public house access, which was detrimental to the applicant's amenities. He noted that the applicant had addressed all the previous concerns, with the only issue outstanding being the highway authority's objection and that the agent had produced a very substantial report to support the application. He urged the committee to permit the application.

In determining the application, members had regard to the objection that had been raised by Leicestershire County Council Highways. It was noted by some members that the application would not generate any additional traffic and a separate access would be beneficial to the occupiers, however it was also noted that due to the conditions on the original permission for the dwelling, the applicant should have been aware that permission would have been needed for the access.

A motion to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure was moved by Councillor J Legrys and seconded by Councillor D Bigby.

The Chairman put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being required, the voting was as detailed below.

Chairman's initials

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be refused in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure.

Motion to refuse the application in accordance with the Head of Planning and Infrastructure (Motion)	
Councillor Nigel Smith	For
Councillor Dave Bigby	For
Councillor Alexander Bridgen	For
Councillor Rachel Canny	For
Councillor David Everitt	Abstain
Councillor Stuart Gillard	For
Councillor Jim Hout	Against
Councillor John Legrys	For
Councillor Robert Ashman	For
Councillor Gill Hout	Against
Carried	

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.30 pm

Chairman's initials