

MINUTES of a meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 1 OCTOBER 2013

Present: Councillor D J Stevenson (Chairman).

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

In attendance: Councillors D De Lacy and L Spence.

Officers: Mr C Elston, Mr D Hughes, Mr A Mellor, Mrs M Meredith, Mr S Stanion and Ms S Worrall.

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Adams, J Hoult and G Jones.

20. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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

Councillor J Bridges declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A1, application number 13/00141/OUTM as a Member of Ashby Canal Trust.

Councillors J Geary, R Johnson, N Smith and M B Wyatt declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A2, application number 12/01094/FUL.

Councillors J Legrys and D J Stevenson declared that they had been lobbied without influence in respect of item A3, application number 13/00605/FUL.

21. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2013.

The Chairman advised that in respect of item A2, application number 13/00218/OUTM, Councillor T Neilson had moved that the application be refused and that there had been no objection from Highway Authority.

It was moved by Councillor D J Stevenson, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2013 be approved and signed as a correct record.

22. 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.

Chairman's initials

A1

13/00141/OUTM

Development of up to 450 residential dwellings and reinstatement of 1.1km of associated canal, provision of public open space and vehicular, emergency and footpath access (Outline application - All matters reserved except access)

Land at Measham Waterside, Burton Road, Measham, Derby

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

Mr P Leaver, agent, addressed the Committee. He stated that the site had been the subject of extensive discussion and public consultation over the past six years, and the suitability of the site for housing had been established in principle. He added that the proposals were contained and would not lead to pressure to release further land. He stated that the proposals were sustainable and would help the Council to fulfil its five year housing land supply requirement. He drew Members' attention to the significant benefits of the scheme, including the reinstatement of the canal, the rejuvenation of the town centre, improved connectivity with the wider area, enhanced landscaping and a solution to the River Mease phosphate issue. He endorsed the officer's recommendation to approve the application subject to discussions being held in respect of the Section 106 Agreement. He referred to the objections from the Parish Council in respect of the access and reminded Members that this view was not supported by the Highway Authority who had no objections to the scheme.

Mr P Oakden, supporter, addressed the Committee. He advised Members that he had lived in the area for forty years and was Chairman of the Canal Association. He expressed support for the restoration project and highlighted the proactivity of the Canal Association in respect of fundraising and providing volunteers. He stated that the aim of the association was to restore the canal from Snarstone to Moira, and this project had the full support of the Local Authority. He added that the restoration of the Measham section of the canal would enable further funding opportunities. He highlighted the social, economic and environmental benefits the restoration of the canal would bring to the area. He added that the canal would become a tourist and leisure destination in its own right.

Councillor N Smith moved that the application be approved, subject to discussions in respect of the Section 106 Agreement. He referred to the regeneration of Measham which had taken place in recent years. He stated that the canal would be a major asset to the whole of the District. He highlighted the importance of the tourism industry at present and added that the Council had no money to reinstate the canal and this provided an excellent opportunity to do so. He referred to the lack of objection from local residents and stated that to refuse the application would be absolute lunacy. He added that there was no objection from the Highway Authority and there was no one present speaking in objection to the application.

The motion was seconded by Councillor J Bridges.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he had no objection to the application which would be a very good development for Measham and would bring much-needed housing and investment. He referred to the access and the current issues regarding speeding on Burton Road, and added that installing a roundabout would improve this problem. He noted that the emergency access would be utilised in the preliminary construction phase, and following this, there would not be a significant increase in vehicle movements on High Street. He stated that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor J Geary stated that there was great potential in respect of this development,

Chairman's initials

as he had seen on the site visit and at the exhibition he had attended. He expressed support for the development and felt it would benefit Measham and the whole District. He stated that the whole scheme would be dependent upon the canal being reinstated. He stated emphatically that the reinstatement of the canal was imperative.

Councillor A Bridges reiterated the importance of the canal and stated that she would be disappointed if the development went ahead without the Section 106 contributions to support the reinstatement.

Councillor J Legrys expressed his support for the application. He stated that he was aware the application would be brought back before the Committee at a later date if the issues between the District Valuer and the developer could not be resolved. He referred to the fact that every £1 invested in heritage resulted in a £9 return, and stated that Measham and the rest of the District would benefit from the canal. He sought clarification on what would happen in the event that no agreement could be reached.

The Head of Regeneration and Planning stated that ultimately the matter in respect of the Section 106 Agreement was a decision for the District Council. He added that there was a clear steer that the application would be permitted on the basis that the canal was fundamental, and this would be reflected in the negotiations between the District Valuer and the developer. He added that if an impasse was reached, the matter would be brought before the Committee.

The Legal Advisor stated that if Members felt that the application was unacceptable without the reinstatement of the canal, this would ultimately need to be reflected in the later decision of the Committee.

Councillor J Bridges reiterated the importance of tourism to the present economic climate. He referred to the desperate need for housing, and added that a way of life was also needed. He felt that there would be cross-party support in the approach to the application and ensuring that there was a benefit to the District.

Councillor J G Coxon stated that the application could be the making of Measham. He added that the village had been much improved in recent years. He stated that the reinstatement of the canal was worthwhile for Measham and for the District, and was key to the success of Measham. He expressed support for the application.

Councillor D J Stevenson expressed his full support for the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

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

A2

12/01094/FUL

Erection of 4 no. two-storey (with habitable accommodation in the roof space) dwellings and associated garaging (revised scheme)

191 Loughborough Road, Whitwick, Coalville, Leicestershire

Councillor R Woodward moved that the application be deferred due to the issues which had been identified on the site visit in respect of the development being overbearing to neighbouring residents and loss of visual amenity. He expressed concerns that the applicant would not be able to dig the properties into the ground as suggested due to the solid granite below. He added that there were flooding problems, the distances

Chairman's initials

between the proposed and existing dwellings did not accord with the Council's policy and the Parish Council had suggested single storey properties if the site were to be developed.

The motion was seconded by Councillor D Howe.

RESOLVED THAT:

The application be deferred to enable further investigation of the issues raised.

A3

13/00605/FUL

Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension (Including Demolition of existing detached garage) to form integral garage, en suite bedroom (Enlarged) and new Kitchen/Dining Room
Woodlands, Main Street, Wilson, Melbourne

The Planning Officer presented the report to Members.

It was moved by Councillor T Gillard, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

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

The meeting commenced at 4.30pm and closed at 5.07pm.

Chairman's signature