

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON TUESDAY 16 JUNE 2015, COMMENCING AT 6.00 P.M.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chairman – L Bentley
Vice Chairman – D Gamble

Councillors: G S Atwal; G A Boulter; B Dave; R Eaton; J Kaufman; T K Khong; Mrs H E Loydall; R E R Morris; Mrs S B Morris

Officers in attendance: Ms A Court, C Forrett, Miss G Ghuman

Others in attendance: Mr Dan Hicks

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
9.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>The Chair stated that the meeting was not called by him, but by the Monitoring Officer who confirmed that this was the case.</p> <p>Apologies receive from Councillors Mrs L Broadley, F Broadley, E Barr and Mrs S Haq.</p>	
10.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS</p> <p>It was declared that Councillor Mrs S Morris was substituting for Councillor Mrs S Haq.</p> <p>D Gamble proposed by Mrs H Loydall, and seconded by Mrs S Morris, to substitute as Vice Chairman for the duration of this meeting alone in the absence of Mrs L Broadley.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>1. Councillor D Gamble substitutes as Vice Chairman for this duration of this meeting.</p>	
11.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>Councillor G Boulter declared he was an Associate Governor of Guxlaxton College.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs S Morris declared she was a Director of the Multi-Academy Trust incorporating Guxlaxton College. The Member stated that she was not involved in the applications' consultation process and confirmed she was attending with an open mind.</p> <p>The Monitoring Officer advised that Councillor Mrs S Morris may</p>	

	remain at the meeting.	
12.	<p>REPORT OF THE PLANNING CONTROL MANAGER</p> <p>1. WIGSTON SWIMMING POOL - APPLICATION 15/00098/VAC 2. GUXLAXTON COLLEGE – APPLICATION 15/00139/FUL</p> <p>The Planning Control Manager summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 4 (pages 2 - 17) and the agenda update (page 1) which was circulated at the meeting. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>Mr Hicks acknowledged the issues raised at the last meeting in terms of the changes submitted since the tender. He summarised that the issues were identified as: to make the most efficient use of space; improvement(s) to design in respect of the inclusion of a sauna facility; to keep within budgetary constraints subsequent to an increase in material costs in the preceding 18 months; and the technical design in respect of the underground results which were not carried out until the results of the survey were known.</p> <p>Mr Hicks submitted that the cut and fill exercise was necessary to raise ground levels. He acknowledged there was a 935mm increase in the building height from the original application; notwithstanding this, he noted the original building demolished was 1845mm higher. Mr Hicks stated that the trees located on-site would be re-located and, or, replaced where necessary and that the trees affected were either of a poor positioning or quality. It was stated there was a good relationship with the Technical Manager at Guxlaxton College who has been supportive of the amendments.</p> <p>Mr Hicks submitted that the buff-brick was the preferred design conception for which obtaining colour palettes where developed and noted that the old demolished building was of a similar buff-brick colour. It was stated that the roofing materials would weather over-time, dulling in its appearance, and that there would be little visual impact due to restricted sight. It was confirmed that the top-front and side-elevations has not changed in terms of the proposed metal-cladding.</p> <p>Mr Hicks cited that investigations into the acoustics impact proved more than satisfactory and the data sheets had highlighted a normal passage of sound, and that a direct comparison of cladding <i>vis-a-vis</i> brickwork was not possible due to qualitative differences in measurements. He further advised that any potential acoustic concerns were to be addressed by soft-landscaping and that any noise generated would be comparatively insignificant to that ordinarily generated by the traffic on the surrounding highways and the neighbouring railway line. It was reported that past-use of the said panelling materials presented no acoustic issues.</p> <p>Mr Hicks stated that the site entrance would be made good with grass-seed laid. An upgrade to the tarmac would be implemented to ensure complaint heavy-goods vehicle access, to which professional</p>	

teams had applied their technical expertise and experience.

Mr Hicks confirmed that all other conditions had been met.

The Chair made reference to the availability of the proposed materials, alongside visual representations, for inspection by Members during the Planning Control Manager's report.

The Planning Control Manager stated that the agenda item was deferred from the previous meeting for want of further information. It was confirmed that the acoustic concerns had been addressed by Mr Hicks and that, although he was not in receipt of any information on the same, to his knowledge there was no reason to dispute the details reported. The key issues before Members were summarised as minor material amendments to all four elevations, namely in respect of: the side-elevation facing the railway line, the use of metal-cladding in lieu of brickwork; the side-elevation facing Guxlaxton College, of the same above in entire metal-cladding (as per the samples) with an insignificant change to window fenestration levels; the front-elevation facing Station Road, of the same brickwork and timber-cladding with a grey-in-colour rendering finish (as per the samples) with the colour to be agreed.

He advised that the differences in building height were acceptable and within the parameters of planning merits.

It was reported that there was a firm view of a red-brick character area and that the development ought to reflect this and so to accentuate design features, as included in the recommendation. The heavy-goods vehicle materials were approved as suitable for access purposes, addressing its initially problematic light-weight construction. The car parking space were given as a block-paved system, comprising of plastic and loose gravel with a recommendation of a grass-turfed substitute exterior to provide a sustainable drainage solution. A drainage scheme had been submitted and a consultation was to be held.

In respect of the second off-site application, the Planning Control Manager re-affirmed that the trees affected would be replaced and, or, replanted as necessary as an expectation to complete off-site works and noted previous references made by Members about the trees' poor quality, positioning and angle.

The Chair reiterated that the agenda item before Members was a minor amendment to materials within the acceptable remit of planning terms and not a planning issue *per se*.

A Member enquired as to whether the metal-cladding was of a special finish to prevent vandalism. The Planning Control Manager advised that it was a standard metal-cladding product similarly used on retail parks.

A Member questioned the lack of availability of common red-brick versus buff-brick.

A Member stated that a number of concerns had been allayed having inspected the illustrations for a second-time. It was reiterated that the trees affected were not significant and ought to be removed due to their 45 degree angling and welcomed the advantages of a replanting scheme to better provide for tree positioning and longevity.

The Member opined that the buff-brick exterior presented as a better-blend in relation to remainder of the building although had no objection to the recommendation. The Member requested more information regarding the effectiveness of the acoustic barrier provided by the metal-cladding and whether the use of such a material would be equally suitable for a swimming pool and the noises generated therein.

The Planning Control Manager stated that he was not in receipt of any further information, in addition to that presented by Mr Hicks, in terms of the acoustics investigations. He noted that from anecdotal-experience, no such aforesaid difference was evident. The Monitoring Officer confirmed the contents of the investigative report, citing it acoustically met the sought-after recommendations in terms of sound transfer and that a direct comparison could not be made. It was noted that brickwork or metal-cladding were equal in sufficiency.

A Member sought reassurance that any financial burden arising from any necessary remedial action to counter potential acoustic implications in the future would not be borne by the Council whilst acknowledging the appropriate remit of the same request. The Monitoring Officer advised that any such financial burden would be inherited by the contractor.

A Member enquired as to whether there was suitable boundary treatment through the planting of trees to visibly obscure the metal-cladding facade from the view of Guxlaxton College. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that no such treatment alongside the site boundary was permissible with reference to the site plan. The Member expressed that an agreement ought to be negotiated with the neighbouring college and a note be served on the applicant.

The Member raised a concern as to the availability of the information to Members contained in the acoustic report. Reassurances were sought from the contractor in respect to if the materials proposed for use were suitable for a residential-area and notably the need for appropriate insulation to mitigate any potential drumming-effects emanating from the metal roof.

The Chair enquired as to whether a condition was suitable to address the aforementioned matter.

The Planning Control Manager advised that a condition may be imposed stating that any noise originating from the building should not exceed the site boundary. It was further advised that a pre-

coloured, power-coated matt finish to materials proposed for use should be considered to remain in-keeping with the residential area and that the oxidising effects in respect of the roof will minimise long-term visual impact.

The Member stated that the brick colour was a subjective subject-matter and would prompt greater contention if the proportion of brickwork grossly exceeded that of windowed exterior. As this was not the case, the Member did not express a preference as to the colour of the brickwork yet acknowledged that it was an immediate red-brick area. A concern was raised with the Chair as to the colour of the mortar to be used in terms of its appropriate shading.

The Chair instructed Officers to make further enquires be made into the colour of the mortar. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that if they considered the colour of the mortar to be an important issue, then a condition may be imposed accordingly as a planning issue.

A Member enquired as to whether any special finish could be applied to the metal-cladding to pro-actively pre-empt any attempt at vandalism (i.e. graffiti) or whether this potential issue could be re-actively managed by on-site means of security and CCTV. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that any surface was susceptible to vandalism and that the concern was more appropriately addressed as a management issue, whilst acknowledging the advantage of taking a pro-active approach.

A Member enquired as to whether the metal roof would present any fire hazards due to light being reflected. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that if a power-coated matt finish was to be used, it would not be predisposed to any such risk in terms light reflection nor adverse visual impact.

The Chair recommended that the issues pertaining to the colour of the mortar and roofing materials to be used should be delegated to Officers to determine a suitable solution.

A Member enquired as to the conditions attached to the choice of finishing colours. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that if there was a preference as to colour, that Members can be further advised on the same.

The agenda items were respectively moved and seconded for approval in respect of the minor amendments to materials proposed for use, subject to conditions that: the proper assurances be given in terms of satisfactory acoustic levels at the site boundary; a note be served on the applicant to liaise with Guxlaxton College regarding any potential boundary treatment; and the colour of the mortar, roofing materials and exact finish to be used be delegated to the Officers to determine a suitable solution.

RESOLVED THAT:

	<p>The application in respect of Wigston Swimming Pool (Application 15/00098/VAC) be permitted subject to conditions.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>The application in respect of Guxlaxton College (Application 15/00139/FUL) be permitted subject to conditions by ten votes in favour and one abstention from Councillor Mrs S Morris.</p>	
<p>13.</p>	<p>TREE PRESERVATION ORDER TPO/0307 – LAND AT THE REAR OF PROPERTIES 11-37 MARSTOWN AVENUE, WIGSTON</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>The agenda item be deferred until the ordinary meeting of the Committee in June 2015 by unanimous agreement.</p>	

The Meeting Closed at 6.50pm