

Agenda Item 3.



PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE 11 JANUARY 2016

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors D McNally (Vice-Chairman), J W Beaver, D Brailsford, G J Ellis, D C Hoyes MBE, D M Hunter-Clarke, M S Jones, Mrs M J Overton MBE, N H Pepper, Mrs J M Renshaw, C L Strange and W S Webb

Councillor C J Davie attended the meeting as an observer

Officers in attendance:-

Steve Blagg (Democratic Services Officer), Neil McBride (Planning Manager) and Paul Rushworth (Solicitor)

62 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors T Keywood-Wainwright and T M Trollope-Bellew.

The Chief Executive reported that under the Local Government (Committee and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, he had appointed Councillor Mrs M J Overton MBE to the Committee, in place of Councillor Mrs H N J Powell, for this meeting only.

63 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No interests were declared at this stage of the meeting.

64 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 DECEMBER 2015

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Regulation Committee held on 7 December 2015, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
11 JANUARY 2016

65 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATION

66 TO CHANGE USE OF LAND AT THE BUNGALOW, OXCROFT BANK, MOULTON CHAPEL TO A SCRAP YARD COMPRISING PRINCIPALLY OF AN END OF LIFE VEHICLE DEPOLLUTION, DISMANTLING AND REUSE OPERATION. IT IS PROPOSED THAT AN OPEN SIDED SHEET METAL BUILDING WOULD BE ERECTED TO ALLOW WORK ON THE VEHICLES AND AN EXISTING STATIC CARAVAN WOULD BE USED AS A SITE OFFICE. H23/1042/15

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. The Highways Officer's comments in the report were misleading as the road to the applicant's site was used infrequently and vehicles only visited the applicant's site.
2. There was no sign of damage to the verge from vehicles visiting the applicant's site.
3. There were no adverse comments from local people.
4. The site was well screened and not overlooked.
5. There was another development close to the applicant's site which was in open countryside and visible from some distance away. (Note: This comment was subsequently withdrawn as it was not a material planning consideration to this application).
6. Was the road leading to the applicant's site a public highway or a By-Way?
7. There was a need for businesses like this one and this was a suitable location for this type of business.
8. The type of vehicle visiting the applicant's site would be small and not HGVs.
9. Noise was not an issue as the only resident was the owner of the bungalow adjacent to the site who proposed to lease the site to the applicant.
10. The County Council had fewer resources to repair roads and the applicant should be asked whether he was prepared to make a contribution towards the cost of repairs to the road leading to his site.
11. The business would provide extra employment.
12. The possibility of de-commissioning the road leading to the site by the highways authority should be examined.
13. Should the Environment Agency grant a licence for the site then it would be possible for the applicant to increase the number of vehicles he could handle. Was it possible for the planning authority to take enforcement action if the tonnage handled at the site got too high?
14. The road leading to the applicant's site was wider than it looked on the photograph because it was overgrown with grass.

The officer's responses included:-

1. The road leading to the applicant's site was highway maintainable at public expense.
2. By allowing the application would potentially cause further damage to Randall Bank with the responsibility and the cost of undertaking repairs to the highway having to be met by the County Council.

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
11 JANUARY 2016

3. Aware of any other developments in the area but each application had to be treated on its own merits.
4. He agreed that the vehicles carrying end of life vehicles to the site were small in size typical of a flat bed recovery truck.
5. The application site was owned by the adjacent owner of the bungalow and would be leased to the applicant.
6. The applicant could be asked if he was prepared to make a contribution towards the cost of maintenance of the local highway but this was likely to make his business unviable due to the costs involved.
7. The County Council would liaise with the Environment Agency in connection with any permit issued by the Agency to ensure that the local amenity was not affected by any increase in the tonnage handled at the site that the permit might allow.
8. Any proposal to extend the site or increase the tonnage would require further planning approval.
9. It was agreed that any decommissioning of the road leading to the applicant's site could be discussed with highways but a member stated that the road leading to the applicant's site was used by agricultural vehicles further down and that the road led eventually to another public highway.

On a motion by Councillor M S Jones, seconded by Councillor D Brailsford, it was –

RESOLVED (11 votes for, 0 votes against and 2 abstentions)

That consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit arranged for 10.00am on 2 February 2016 and that the opportunity also be taken to visit a similar site to the application site at the same time.

The meeting closed at 11.15 am

This page is intentionally left blank