

**OSGATHORPE PARISH COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING  
HELD AT THE HARLEY HALL  
TUESDAY 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011**

<b>Present:</b>	Chairperson            Martin Buczkiewicz Vice Chairperson      Mike Inchley Councillor                Fiona Davidson Councillor                Simon Bishop Councillor                Penny Freeman
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	
	Clerk to the Council    Lisa Clarke 11 members of the public Mr Chris Elston (NWL Development Control Officer)
<b>01/2011</b>	<b>Introduction</b>
	<p>Cllr Buczkiewicz invited Mr Elston to this meeting to discuss planning issues that had been raised by both the Parish Council and Parishioners.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz thanked Mr Elston for agreeing to attend and answer questions.</p>
<b>02/2011</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>
	<p><b>It appears that some planning applications are rejected due to Osgathorpe being unsustainable but others are passed. What is the policy?</b></p> <p>Mr Elston – in terms of Government policy permission to build is directed towards larger settlements, with local services such as shops, schools and transport being taken into account. There is a list of villages where planning permission will be limited, Osgathorpe is on this list and is classed as ‘Unsustainable’ because of the lack of services.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz raised the issue of certain applications that had been passed over the last few years, why have these been allowed?</p> <p>Mr Elston – The Planning Officers will have recommended refusal of the plans, but the planning committee well have had a different view and decided that the applications were viable. The new policy framework is being developed but changes are unlikely and the future is uncertain. The localisation bill will be developed over the next 2 – 3 years.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz raised the example of 90 Main Street, rejected in 2005, but subsequently Meadow View Farm application for 3 large houses was passed. For the Armett Farm application NWL Planning provided a very detailed rejection proposal and yet it was passed? What is the process, how does this happen</p> <p>Mr Elston – Not all applications go through to the planning board members.</p>

If the Parish Council and the Planning Officer disagree these will go to the Planning Committee or, if an application is deemed contentious, then it will go to the Planning Committee. Meadow Farm was refused by the Planning Officer, but was called before the Committee by one of the members. A site visit followed and a decision was made based on the wider benefits. The site would be greatly improved, as it was derelict.

Cllr Buczkiewicz - it looked derelict but was lived in.

Cllr Buczkiewicz – 90 Main Street application has been rejected twice and there doesn't seem to be a valid reason, Mr Elston agreed to speak to Mr Thorpe outside of the meeting.

Mr Harrison raised a concern that the Meadow Farm application was based on reduction in farm traffic, but as a vehicle shed has now been erected this seems unlikely, does Mr Elston have any comments on this?

Mr Elston – The shed will fall under 'permitted development' and will not require planning permission. This is covered by the 106 agreement, the Planning Committee could be asked to review this if requested.

Mr Andrew Bates – raised the recent application on Main Street?

Cllr Buczkiewicz – 32 Main Street application was rejected at first, the Parish Council supported the plan because it was out of site and the man had lived in the village for a long time.

Mr Andrew Bates – the H41 Clause is open to interpretation and the reliance on a car in Osgathorpe is equal to that in Ashby, i.e. in order to visit Tesco.

Mr Elston – H41 relates to location and services. The policy is being reviewed and the Government may choose to change this. If 3 out of 5 services are available for example the plan will be passed.

Mr Phillipson commented that there appears to be conflict between the professional Planning Officers and the elected Committee.

Cllr Inchley – commented that the Farmstead was a good example of this as the Planning Officers report failed it on all counts.

Mr Phillipson commented that the next election was an opportunity to change the members of the Planning Committee.

Mr Elston commented that if the Planning Committee decision was contrary to that of the Planning Officer reasons had to be given. This procedure may not have been in place at the time of some of the planning applications that are being discussed tonight.

Mr Phillipson added that perhaps if the Planning Officers had used stronger language, such as 'Conflict' rather than 'Contravention' then the application would have to go to full Council.

Mr Elston – would have to check, this wasn't his understanding of the process.

Mr Andrew Bates – believes Mr Phillipson was referring to a 'Departure from plan'

**03/2011**

**Planning Statistics**

Mr Elston confirmed the statistics for planning applications were

- Plans approved with no PC objection = 14
- Plans approved with PC objections = 3
- Plans refused with no objections = 1

Mr Andrew Bates asked how many plans had not been responded to

	Cllr Buczkiewicz confirmed that all plans are responded to.
<b>04/2011</b>	<b>Enforcement Officer</b>
	<p>Ref 10/06692/AGP</p> <p>Mr Elston – believes the reason the Enforcement Officer has not acted is because of exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Mr Phillipson – TB checks require that the animals be not moved, they do not have to be kept inside.</p> <p>Mr Elston will continue to investigate and arrange another inspection.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz asked what powers the Officers had?</p> <p>Mr Elston – the Enforcement officer investigates and gathers evidence. They can give notice of restrictions or stop the owner from keeping animals. It has to be in the public interest to act. There are 3 Officers, Christine Jones is the Principle Officer and has offered to come along to a meeting to explain the role of the Enforcement Officer.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz – That would be very useful, we will provide dates of the next meeting to Ms Jones once the elections are over. <b>Mrs Clarke to action.</b></p> <p>Mr Elston noted that there was a restructure in progress and Enforcement Officers will be taken out of his team by May 2011.</p>
<b>05/2011</b>	<b>Surface Water Run Off</b>
	<p>Mrs Phillipson feels that the village should be reviewed as a whole and not by individually planning application.</p> <p>Mr Elston – This would be a building regulations matter and should be raised with the Building Control Manager. It may also require STW and the EA to be consulted. It is not, however, a reason for planning refusal.</p> <p>Mr Phillipson thought it should be inherent in planning applications.</p> <p>Mr Elston believes that all planning applications had to indicate where water run off would go.</p> <p>Mrs Phillipson commented that all parties involved had self-interest, Planning, STW, and Building Control. They were very efficient but operated separately.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz believes that too much run off water was running through the village already and drains were lifting during heavy rain.</p> <p>Mrs Phillipson raised a concern about buildings that didn't require planning permission, they all contribute to the problem even farms putting in land drains.</p> <p>Mr Elston commented that the rules about driveways etc had now changed to help with this problem.</p> <p>Mr Collin – raised a concern about the Jetty, no. 43,45, 47. A planning application has been submitted since 2000/01. The condition is that the entrance should be covered in tarmac before anyone moves in. The bond in place is not sufficient to cover the work and the driveway has not been tarmaced. When it rains silt from the drive washes into the gutters of Meadow Lane.</p> <p>Cllr Bishop suggested Mrs Clarke contact the Building Manager directly  <b>Mr Elston will send the contact information for David Darlington, Building Manager to Mr Clarke.</b></p> <p>Mrs Phillipson commented that at least 6 properties have had floodwater through them.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz commented that this had been such a long-standing issue</p>

	any investigation would be appreciated.
<b>06/2011</b>	<b>AOB</b>
	<p><b>Stockyard planning application.</b></p> <p><b>Cllr Buczkiewicz</b> asked members of the Exclusive Brethren go over some of the changes being proposed.</p> <p>The members responded that the plan is to convert the back of the building into a place of worship. The Brethren are a small group in Loughborough linked to other satellite churches who have been looking for a suitable location for 8 yrs and have looked at 40 sites before finding 'The Stockyard'. The highways are happy with the proposed new height of the fence and the new planning application is in.</p> <p>Mr Phillipson asked if the windows at the front of the building would be blocked up?</p> <p>The members present responded 'No, only the back of the building, the old nightclub would be blocked up. The front of the building will be kept as close to the original as possible'.</p> <p>Mr Phillipson – asked what the gates would look like?</p> <p>The members present responded that they will only fit what is required to ensure the security of the site.</p> <p>Mr Phillipson asked how high the gates would be?</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz confirmed from the plan that they would be 2 metres high.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz confirmed that the majority of the village welcomed the change of use.</p> <p>The members present said the Brethren would work with the village to come to an agreeable conclusion.</p> <p>Cllr Buczkiewicz thanked Mr Elston and the Brethren representatives for attending the meeting</p>