HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 JANUARY 2007 AT 6.30 PM

PRESENT: MR R J FURNISS - CHAIRMAN MR D E HINTON - VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mrs M Aldridge, Mr D C Bill, Mr C W Boothby, Mr D R Bown, Mrs R Camamile, Mr W J Crooks, Mr B H Edwards, Mr R D Ellis, Mr M A Hall, Mr K A J Hunnybun, Mr C G Joyce, Ms J E Price and Mrs M L Sherwin.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.4 Mrs C M Claridge and Mrs R W Wright also attended the meeting.

Officers in attendance: Mr P F Cash, Mrs T Darke, Mr A Ghafoor, Ms T Miller, Miss R Owen, Mr R Palmer, Mr S Payne and Mr B Whirrity.

- APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Mrs M A Cook, Mrs D Finney, Mrs E A Spencer, Mr J E Stanley and Mr K Vessey and the substitutions of Mr Bill for Mrs Finney, Mrs Sherwin for Mrs Spencer and Mr Hunnybun for Mr Vessey were authorised in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.3.

- <u>MINUTES (P48)</u>

On the motion of Mr Ellis, seconded by Mr Crooks it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2006 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

- DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In response to a question by a Member, the Committee was advised that unless they had already formed an opinion on an application, they need not declare a prejudicial interest in the item.

Mrs Claridge arrived at 6.40pm.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - APPLICATIONS TO BE DETERMINED (P49)

The Committee considered a schedule of planning applications, together with a list of late items, and the recommendations of the Head of Culture and Development.

It was moved by Mr Ellis and seconded by Mrs Camamile that the recommendations of the Head of Culture and Development contained in the schedule submitted be approved.

(a) <u>06/01114/FUL – Land Adjacent 121 Station Road, Bagworth – Farland</u> <u>Trading Ltd</u>

Notwithstanding the officers' recommendation that the application be approved, Members felt that this would be over-development of the site due

to size and mass, was not in keeping with the character of the village, in particular the more modern design of the majority of properties now in Bagworth, and would lead to an intensified use of an existing access which was inadequate in terms of its design. The amendment was moved by Mr Crooks and seconded by Mr Bill.

At the request of the Head of Culture and Development, voting on this amendment was recorded as follows:

Mrs Aldridge, Mr Bill, Mr Boothby, Mrs Camamile, Mr Crooks, Mr Edwards, Mr Joyce, Ms Price and Mrs Sherwin voted FOR the amendment.

Messrs Furniss, D Bown and Ellis voted AGAINST the amendment.

Messrs Hinton and Hall abstained from voting.

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the use of the existing access could result in an unacceptable increase in traffic using an access, which lacks appropriate visibility for the speed of traffic on the main road which could lead to increased dangers for road users. Accordingly it is contrary to Policies BE1 and T5 of the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan.
- 2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development, by reason of its mass, design and appearance, would have a seriously detrimental effect on the character of the village and particularly the adjacent dwellings on Maynard Close and Station Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy BE1 of the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance on New Residential Development.
- 3. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the lack of any financial contribution to address the increase in pressure placed on play and open space facilities in the local area by the proposed development would not accord with Government guidance Circular 5/05 Strategy Policy 11 of the adopted Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan 1996-2016, Policies REC2, REC3 and IMP1 of the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance on Play and Open Space adopted 2002.

Mrs Claridge left the meeting at 7.49pm.

At this juncture, Ms Price and Mrs Sherwin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application 06/01201/FUL as the land owner was known to them. They left the Chamber at 7.50pm and returned at 8.10pm.

(b) <u>06/01274/CONDIT – Cottage Farm, 2 Cottage Lane, Norton Juxta Twycross –</u> <u>Mr D Corbett</u>

It was noted that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

Mr Hunnybun left the meeting at 8.11pm and returned at 8.16pm.

(c) <u>06/01356/FUL – Aldi Stores Ltd, Watling Street, Hinckley – Aldi Stores Ltd</u>

It was explained that the demolition of the building did not require permission, but that permission was required for the re-design of the car park. Mr Bill, seconded by Mr Crooks, moved an amendment that the application be refused due to the imbalance between expanding the supermarket and reducing the number of parking spaces.

Messrs Bill, Crooks, Ellis and Furniss requested that voting on the amendment be recorded. The vote was taken as follows:

Mrs Aldridge, Mr Bill, Mr Crooks, Mr Edwards, Mr Joyce and Ms Price voted FOR the amendment.

Mr Boothby, Mrs Camamile, Mr D Bown, Mr Ellis Mr Furniss, Mr Hall, Mr Hinton, Mr Hunnybun and Mrs Sherwin voted AGAINST the amendment.

The amendment was therefore LOST.

<u>RESOLVED</u> – The Head of Culture and Development be granted delegated powers to grant planning permission subject to no objection being received from the Highways Agency and subject to the conditions contained within the officer's report.

Mr D Bown left the meeting at 8.45pm, Mr Bill left at 8.47pm, Mr Edwards and Ms Price left at 8.48pm. Mr Bill and Ms Price returned at 8.50pm and Mr Bown returned at 8.51pm.

MOA ANNUAL ROLLOUT PLANS 2006-2007 (P50)

Members received a report that informed them of proposed telecommunications sites within the Borough. Concern was expressed with regard to the lack of evidence often presented by operators that mast sharing options have been explored. Officers assured Members that they would encourage mast sharing.

At this juncture Mrs Aldridge declared a non-prejudicial interest in paragraph 3.5 of the report – Mallory Park Circuit, Kirkby Mallory. On the motion of Mr Furniss, seconded by Mr Hunnybun, it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the report be noted.

- OMBUDSMAN CASES 2006 (P51)

The Committee received a report which indicated decisions of Ombudsman cases within the Borough. It was moved by Mr Furniss, seconded by Mrs Camamile and

RESOLVED - the report be noted.

- SECTION 106 OBLIGATIONS – CAR PARKING PROVISION (P52)

Members were provided with a progress report to identify developer contributions secured under Section 106 obligations that were specific to car park provision. On the motion of Mr Ellis, seconded by Mr Hunnybun, it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the report be noted.

- APPEALS LODGED AND DETERMINED (P53)

A summary was submitted of appeals lodged and determined since the last meeting. Concern was expressed with regard to planning policy which referred to 'open space required by children', as they felt that open space was required by everyone. On the motion of Mrs Camamile, seconded by Mr Furniss, it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the report be noted.

- <u>APPEALS – PROGRESS (P54)</u>

A schedule was submitted indicating the stages that various appeals against planning decisions had reached. On the motion of Mr Ellis, seconded by Mr Furniss, it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the report be noted.

- MATTERS FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC MAY BE EXCLUDED

On the motion of Mr Ellis, seconded by Mr Furniss, it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> - in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the undermentioned item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 2 and 10 of Part I of Schedule 12A of that Act.

Mr Stanley left the meeting at 8.35pm.

PLANNING ENFORCEMENT ACTION (P55)

Members were provided with a periodic report on planning enforcement actions taken. On the motion of Mrs Camamile, seconded by Mr Ellis, it was

<u>RESOLVED</u> – the report be noted.

(The meeting closed at 9.04pm.)