

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 5th February, 2018 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)
Councillors A Bubb, C J Crofts, Mrs S Fraser, G Hipperson, A Morrison, T Parish,
M Peake, Miss S Sandell, M Storey, D Tyler, G Wareham, Mrs E Watson,
A White, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

PC81: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs Buck.

PC82: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PC83: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

PC84: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to the late correspondence and that the appeal decision reference 2/98/1197/F should refer to 8/3(e) rather than 8/3(b).

PC85: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

There were no Members present pursuant to Standing Order 34.

PC86: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chairman reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the relevant officers.

PC87: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the summary of late correspondence received since the publication of the agenda, which had been previously circulated, was tabled. A copy of the summary would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC88: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

(a) **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director for Planning & Environment (copies of the schedules are published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules are recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That, the applications be determined as set out at (i) – (xiii) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

(i) **17/01981/F
Holme next the Sea: Hope Cottage, Busseys Lane:
Erection of a single storey side extension: Ocean Breaks**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred from the January Committee to allow discussions to take place about redesigning the balcony so that it had less of an impact on the neighbouring property. A revised scheme had now come forward to be considered by the Committee.

The application site was located within the Conservation Area of Holme next the Sea, which was classified as a Smaller Village or Hamlet according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The property had been the subject of a recently refused application to extend the building to the west (16/00196/F) and subsequently dismissed at appeal.

The proposal sought consent for a single storey side extension, which incorporated a new balcony.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;

- Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and other design considerations;
- Impact on the AONB;
- Nature conservation;
- Highway safety;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Other material considerations.

Reference was made to the late correspondence where it explained that the objector had confirmed that the plans had been amended to suit both parties.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(ii) 17/01951/RM

**Stoke Ferry: Land between 11 and 12 Buckenham Drive:
Reserved matters application: Construction of two dwellings: BCKLWN**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the Committee would recall that this application was considered by them at the January meeting but was deferred to enable the submission of amended plans to provide for a wider footpath. Amended plans had been received that demonstrated a 1.8 m wide footpath.

The submitted reserved matters application reflected the indicative plan that was submitted under the outline application and showed a pair of semi-detached properties with shared access and parking to the rear. An existing footpath was relocated around the southern and eastern edges of the site and access for the garage of No.11 (the existing neighbouring property to the east) was retained via the shared access.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was a Borough Council application which had attracted objections.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

Councillor White expressed concern that the area was currently used for car parking.

Councillor White asked for his vote to be recorded against the following resolution.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

**(iii) 17/00025/FM
Hunstanton: Whitleys Stationers Press, 19-21 Church Street: Demolition of old print works and the construction of 15 number 2 bed flats and 1 number 1 bed flat with associated car parking: Waterfield Dudley Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was on the western side of Church Street, Hunstanton and measured 0.185ha and contained workshops and stores including hardstanding. The site was occupied by Whitleys Stationers Press.

The site was located within Hunstanton Conservation Area.

The proposal sought full planning permission for the erection of 15 x 2 bed flats and 1 x 1 bed flat following the demolition of the structures on the site.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of Hunstanton Town Council.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Loss of employment land and premises;
- Impact upon designated heritage assets;
- Impact upon residential amenity;
- Affordable housing;
- Highways;
- Drainage and flood risk;
- Contamination; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner advised that an additional piece of correspondence had been received from a surveyor employed by a local resident regarding the impact on daylight and sunlight. The correspondence requested that no decision be made until the applicant undertook to carry out a daylight/sunlight study.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Angela Read (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to an article she had read in the newspaper about a Council being sued in relation to the right of light. The complainant had won the case against the Council.

The Assistant Director explained that he was not aware of that particular case but the Committee would need to take into account whether the proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenity of the neighbours opposite the site.

In relation to whether the applicant had carried out a light survey, the Assistant Director explained that they were not required to produce one. The Committee would need to take a judgement on the impact of the development on residents.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings advised that the Committee could carry out a site visit first and may request a light survey if they felt that it was necessary.

Councillor Mrs Wright expressed concern in relation to the design of the building, in particular the street frontage, which she considered was faceless and out of character with the cottages on the opposite side of the road. She also considered that the proposed trees would be better placed on the frontage. She asked how the proposal compared in size with the McCarthy and Stone building in Hunstanton.

The Assistant Director advised that the proposal may be of a similar size to the McCarthy & Stone building. He further explained that the revised scheme had taken into account comments from Historic England.

Councillor Mrs Wright proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of principle of development and impact on residential amenity. This was seconded by Councillor Morrison.

Councillor Crofts stated that he would like to visit the site before he made any decision as the site was within the Conservation Area and he was not sure if the proposal would enhance or preserve it. This was seconded by Councillor Bubb and, after having been put to the vote was carried.

RESOLVED: That, determination of the application be adjourned, the site visited and the application determined at the reconvened meeting of the Committee.

(iv) 17/0268/F
Burnham Market: Spinneys End, 1 Woodside: Change of use to garden land (retrospective): Mr Jeremy Neville-Eliot

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the development boundary of Burnham Market. Burnham Market was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The proposal sought change of use of land to garden land. The change of use had already occurred.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of the change of use;
- Amenity issues; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Gleave (objecting) and Mr Jeremy Neville-Eliot (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Executive Director advised that the applicant owned the land in question although it was detached from his property.

The Principal Planner used google earth to highlight the site before the changes had taken place.

Councillor Storey made reference to a document from 1992 referred to by the objector and asked what relevance did that have today. In response, the Assistant Director explained that the document was around 25 years old and it appeared that the condition had not been discharged at the time. He added that planning policy did change over time, however the application had been considered on its own merits.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(v) 17/01735/F

Burnham Thorpe: The Lord Nelson, Walsingham Road: Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and two single storey side extensions with installation of new kitchen, internal alterations, improvements to car park and installation of replacement LPG tank, following demolition of two storage sheds: Greene King

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the southern side of Walsingham Road, Burnham Thorpe and consisted of a two storey, Grade II listed public house with associated pub garden and parking areas.

The site was flanked by residential properties to the east, a residential property and farm buildings to the west and the village green was on the opposite side of Walsingham Road to the north.

As well as being a listed building, the site was within Burnham Thorpe's Conservation Area. The site, and the whole village of Burnham Thorpe, was within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

During the course of the application amended plans had been submitted in response to third party comments received.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Burnham Thorpe Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact on AONB;
- Design character and appearance and impact on heritage assets;
- Impact upon residential amenity;
- Highway issues;
- Arboriculture implications; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mima Garland (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Simon Millett (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Sandell stated that she was disappointed that the Parish Council had objected to the plans as the public house had been closed since 2016 and needed re-opening. She supported the recommendation to approve the application.

In response to comments regarding using the upper floor of the existing building for staff accommodation, the Assistant Director explained that the applicant had look at this however due to building regulations purposes, this was discounted.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she would be pleased to see the public house re-open. It would offer employment and attract visitors to the area.

Councillor Mrs Watson stated that she would be delighted to see the public house re-open as it would attract a lot of visitors and had historic features within it. She informed the Committee that she had people approaching her who could not wait for it to re-open again. She added that the applicant had done their best to bring the roof height down.

Councillor Morrison agreed that it was important to save the public house and to give it a long term future. He reminded the Committee that they had heard from the Parish Council who thought that it was over-powering at the rear of the building. He suggested that the applicant could look again at a hipped roof for the extension and at the possibility of providing accommodation in the second floor.

He therefore proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would spoil the form and character of the building, however there was no seconder for the proposal.

Councillor Mrs Wright agreed that moving forward the public house would need to provide accommodation. She added that she would like to have seen the Historic Building report contained within the agenda. She considered that the proposed extension might be a step too far.

Councillor Storey added that the applicant had carried out their research and would be bringing a public house back into use at a time when many were closing across the country.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(vi) 17/01754/LB

**Burnham Thorpe: The Lord Nelson, Walsingham Road:
Listed building application: Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and two single storey side extensions with installation of new kitchen, internal alterations, improvements to car park and installation of replacement LPG tank, following demolition of two storage sheds:
Greene King**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was situated on the southern side of Walsingham Road, Burnham Thorpe and consisted of a two storey, Grade II listed public house with associated pub garden and parking areas.

The application sought listed building consent for the erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension and two single storey extensions with installation of new kitchen and internal alterations.

During the course of the application amended plans had been submitted in response to third party comments received.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development and impact on the designated heritage asset;
- Design, character and appearance; and
- Other material considerations.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

The Committee adjourned at 10.40 am and reconvened at 10.50 am.

(vii) 17/02168/F

Castle Acre: The Water Tower, Peddars Way: Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 16/00034/F: Re-use and develop existing water tower structure to a two bedroom residential dwelling: Mr Dennis Pederson

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site related to a former water tower located on Peddars Way in Castle Acre.

Planning permission was granted in 2016 for the re-use and development of the existing water tower structure to a two bedroom residential dwelling.

The proposal was a variation of the approved plans condition which comprised the re-positioning of the roof access hatch and ladder, adding twelve solar panels to the shipping containers already approved, and removal of timber fence and replacement with a hedgerow.

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy 2011 and the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Development Management Policies Plan 2016 were relevant to the application.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Planning history;
- Principle of development;
- Form and character and amenity; and
- Other considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr D Pederson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(viii) 17/02049/F

Docking: Chalfont, High Street: Proposed 1 and a half storey dwelling and cart shed: Mr Nick Johnson

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a rectangular shaped parcel of land measuring approximately 1995 m² and was situated on the northern

side of High Street, Docking. The site was currently garden land associated with Chalfront House which sits to the north of the plot.

Docking was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre as identified within the Core Strategy's Settlement Hierarchy.

The application sought planning permission for the construction of a one and a half storey detached dwelling and cart shed.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Morrison, and the view of Docking Parish Council was at variance with the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact on form and character;
- Impact on neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Marian Mardell (objecting) and Mr N Johnson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Morrison explained that he had called-in the application because he found it very finely balanced.

In response to a comment from Councillor Mrs Wright, the Assistant Director explained the stance taken by County Highways in this instance.

Councillor Watson explained that she knew the site well but the layout was confusing. She added that she had concerns about the cars coming out of Chalfont House and the application site.

Councillor Storey expressed concern that the comments made by County Highways were confusing to the Committee and members of the public.

The Executive Director explained that County Highways had made an assessment that the access was acceptable.

Councillor Mrs Wright proposed that a site visit be carried out, which was seconded by Councillor Crofts and, after having been put to the vote, was carried.

RESOLVED: That, determination of the application be adjourned, the site visited and the application determined at the reconvened meeting of the Committee.

**(ix) 17/02259/F
Docking: Greensleeves, Sandy Lane: Variation of
condition 2 of planning permission 17/01043/F: Demolition
of existing bungalow and erection of two semi-detached
dwellings: MEB Investments Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the development boundary and Conservation Area of Docking. Docking was classified a Key Rural Service Centre according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The proposal sought a variation of condition 2 of planning permission 17/01043/F "Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two semi-detached dwellings". Condition 2 related to the approved plans and the applicant sought: creation of a second floor within the roof of house no.1 to form a fourth bedroom with en-suite bathroom; extension of the proposed staircase to form access to the proposed second floor of house no.1; and the insertion of three high level roof lights on the rear (east) elevation of no.1 and one high level roof light to the front (west) elevation of no.1 to serve the proposed en-suite bathroom.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Design and amenity issues and the impact on the conservation area; and
- Other material considerations.

Councillor Morrison made reference to the comments from the Parish Council. He proposed that a site visit be carried out. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright, however after having been put to the vote was lost.

Councillor Mrs Wright stated that she considered that the proposal was poor design. The Executive Director advised that the scale of development had already been approved, and the applicant could convert the roof space under permitted development rights, however they had chosen to include it as part of the construction of the dwellings.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

**(x) 17/01843/F
Ingoldisthorpe: Coaly Lane: Construction of a place of
worship with car parking and landscaped grounds:
Watchtower Bible and Tract Society**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised an irregular shaped parcel of land, measuring 1385 m² and was situated on the southern side of Coaly Lane, off the western side of Lynn Road, Ingoldisthorpe.

The site was currently part of a container storage yard and was located just outside of the development boundary within the countryside. The site benefitted from planning permission for a new storage building and siting of storage containers, granted in late 2015.

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of a place of worship and associated car parking and landscaping.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was at variance with the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenities;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Andy Griffin (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Wright explained that the application was within her ward. She explained that the lane was regularly used by dog walkers, and there was hardly any traffic using the lane. The proposal would create a lot more traffic than what was currently experienced. She asked whether there was any way to make it safer for people walking along the lane whilst keeping the rural feel of it.

Councillor Mrs Watson asked why it would be acceptable for a place of worship to be located in the countryside.

The Assistant Director referred the Committee to pages 95 and 96 of the agenda which set out the policy which specifically related to community facilities.

The Principal Planner explained that it was not known who owned the road.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked whether the applicant could give help towards to the maintenance of the road. The Assistant Director explained that heavy goods vehicles also used the road through the present use, and it would not be fair or proportionate to the applicant for them to be solely responsible for the maintenance.

Councillor Bubb referred to the line of poplar trees to the west of the properties, and asked if any protection could be given to them? In response, the Principal Planner explained that there were no proposals to protect the trees as part of this application, however, a condition could be imposed to ensure the trees were protected. This was proposed by Councillor Bubb and agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Wareham proposed that a condition regarding a lighting scheme be imposed, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Watson and agreed by the Committee.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late correspondence and the need to amend Condition 5 to allow for evening services on Bank Holidays, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended, subject to:

- Condition 5 being amended to allow for evening services on Bank Holidays, as outlined in late correspondence.;
- An additional condition to ensure that the line of Poplar trees were protected; and
- An additional condition to secure a lighting scheme.

(xi) 17/02342/F

Snettisham: 36a Common Road: Construction of two dwellings: G H Owen Property Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site related to an undeveloped portion of land situated on the eastern side of Common Road in Snettisham.

The proposal was to construction two new dwelling houses that would utilise the existing access serving No.36 Common Road.

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy 2011, the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 were relevant to this application.

The site bordered the Area of Outstanding National Beauty boundary.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- The principle of development;
- Form and character and amenity;
- Highways;
- Trees; and
- Other considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Wendy Wall (objecting) and Gerry Byrne (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made by the public speakers, the Principal Planner referred the Committee to the late correspondence where an additional condition regarding landscaping had been proposed. The Principal Planner also referred to the comments in late correspondence from the Assistant Director regarding the comments from the Parish Council.

The Principal Planner confirmed that the height of the proposed houses would be the same as those in Golden Pheasant Drive.

Councillor Mrs Wright stated that the Parish Council were very concerned about this application particularly with regards to drainage, overlooking and overdevelopment and she proposed that a site visit be carried out. This was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings, who also had concerns with the application. The Committee then voted on the proposal for a site visit, which was carried.

RESOLVED: That, determination of the application be adjourned, the site visited and the application determined at the reconvened meeting of the Committee.

(xii) 1700027/O

**Tilney All Saints: Land to the west of Medina, Lynn Road:
Outline application: Construction of 5 dwellings and
associated external works: Mr & Mrs Goldsmith**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was deferred from the meeting held in May 2017 to enable further work in relation to drainage.

The application was in outline with all matters reserved for residential development on a site measuring approximately 0.26ha on the corner of School Road and Lynn Road, Tilney All Saints. The site represented the housing allocation in the Site Allocations and Development

Management Policies DPD, 2016 (SADMP) and Policy G97.1 related specifically to development of the application.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Highway safety;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Flood risk;
- Ecology; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Gareth Mower (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Executive Director reminded the Committee that the application was in outline form, therefore the layout could change.

With regards to the comments from the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board, the Principal Planner advised that Condition 10 related to drainage matters. As the application was in outline form, the applicant only had to demonstrate at this stage that a suitable drainage system could work in principle. The detail of the scheme would be considered at the reserved matters stage. In addition, the applicant had carried out a lot of work since the application had been deferred in May 2017.

Councillor Mrs Young expressed concern in relation to the drainage and explained that the problem with the culvert still existed and needed a lot more investigation. She also had concerns in relation to the proposed layout. She added that she was very uneasy with the application and supported the Parish Council objections.

The Executive Director reminded the Committee that the site was an allocated site, and any issues relating to the principle of drainage should have been raised at the allocation stage. He added that lots of villages had issues in relation to drainage but the Local Plan Task Group took the view to include them. He explained that the main issue related to whether or not five dwellings could be accommodated on the site. Details of the drainage would come forward at reserved matters stage. The applicant had provided the Council with further information from drainage consultants which included discussions with the Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to page 113 of the agenda where it referred to a third party asset (culvert) and asked who was responsible for it.

The Principal Planner advised that it was not clear if the applicant owned that or not. She drew the Committee's attention to Condition 10 parts v and vi.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(xiii) 2/TPO/00569

King's Lynn: 4 & 5 Cedar Row, Wootton Road: To consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00569 should be confirmed, modified or not confirmed in the light of objections

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report which related to two Copper Beech trees (T1 & T2) and were growing in the front gardens of numbers 4 & 5 Cedar Row, Wootton Road, King's Lynn. Both trees were highly visible from both north and south along Wootton Road.

The report outlined:

- The reason for making the Tree Preservation Order;
- Outline of the objections and representations;
- Response to objections and representations.

Councillor White asked for his vote to be recorded against the following resolution.

RESOLVED: That, the Order be confirmed without modification.

PC89: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

PC90: **PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT SERVICE - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee received a report which gave an update on service performance during the fourth quarter of 2017.

Attached to the report was a list of live cases to 23 January 2018.

It was noted that the total number of live cases was 213 with 85 cases being closed. In addition, 22 formal notices had been served.

The Committee also noted that a Temporary Stop Notice was served by the Council on land in Outwell due to the unauthorised stationing of

residential caravans and the laying of hardcore/aggregate on land in the countryside. This was subsequently supported by the granting of a High Court Injunction prohibiting this activity from taking place without the benefit planning permission.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

PC91: **PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT APPEALS - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee was provided with the quarterly update covering performance for the period 1 October 2017 – 31 December 2017.

It was noted that for the final quarter of 2017, 39% of all appeals were allowed. For the 12 month period to 31 December 2017 an average of 23% of all appeals were allowed, which was below the post National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) national average figure of around 36% of all appeals allowed.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 12.47 pm