

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Monday, 4th February, 2019 at 10.00 am in the Assembly Room - Town Hall,
Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)
Councillors Mrs C Bower, 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 and Mrs S Young

PC91: **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

PC92: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 January 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC93: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

PC94: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

The Assistant Director informed the Panel that items 8/3(a) – Docking and 8/3 – Little Massingham had been withdrawn from the agenda.

PC95: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillor attended pursuant to Standing Order 34:

A Lawrence	8/2(a), 8/2(b) & 8/2(c)	Methwold
------------	-------------------------	----------

PC96: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the relevant officer.

PC97: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

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

PC98: **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) – (xii) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **18/01864/FM**
King's Lynn: Land N of Outfall S off Transmission Cables, W off Road, Cross Bank Road: Erection of anaerobic digestion facility to process biomass including reception/office building and workshop, digesters, storage tanks, combined heat and power plant, energy crop storage area and ancillary plant: Mr Michael Stollery

The Committee had visited the site prior to the meeting.

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought consent for an Anaerobic Digestion plant that would process up to 42,350 tonnes of biomass / slurry per annum (38,500 + 10 per cent allowance). There were two extant permissions granted under applications 16/01145/CM and 17/02338/F for similar projects (ie. anaerobic digester plants). Both previous approvals were on a slightly smaller site.

The 2016 application was a County Matters Application (CM) and was refused by County in April 2017. However it was approved by the Planning Inspectorate at appeal in November 2017. It was for a 14,000 tonne facility processing biomass and slurry.

The 2017 application removed slurry from the feedstock and was therefore dealt with by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as it was no longer classed as a waste proposal. It was for 19,500 tonnes of biomass.

The facility proposed under the current application would comprise three digesters, a feeder unit, two day tanks, a process building (containing the feeder unit and day tanks), a storage area, gas upgrade unit, CHPs and compressor, fire water store, administration building, car parking, screen bank (made from soil taken to lower the site), an access road, and a contamination bund wall.

All HGV's serving the development would enter the site from a new access track provided from Estuary Road. The road benefitted from planning permission granted under application 17/02338/F.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Assistant Director.

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

- Principle of development; and
- Differences and impacts between permitted and proposed schemes.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr T Pither (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised by the objector, the Senior Planner explained that in relation to the end user, the same condition used by the Planning Inspector had been imposed. With regards to visual impact, this had been covered during the presentation and in relation to the impact on the landscape, Natural England had raised no objection.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings queried what the CSNN conditions related to. In response the Senior Planner advised that these were on the previous approval and related to:

- Hours of operation;
- Lighting;
- Noise assessment;
- Structural Management Plan; and
- Foul and surface water.

In relation to the height of the dome, the Senior Planner displayed a plan showing the cross section and explained that the domes would be 3 m above the acoustic fence. The domes would be visible in the wider landscape but this needed to be considered in relation to the taller structures in the immediate vicinity and against the backdrop of the industrial area.

With regards to whether there would be an impact on the flood defence, the Senior Planner advised the Committee that she had gone back to the Environment Agency over this issue but they still raised no objection to the application. The proposal would require a Flood Risk

Activity Permit from the Environment Agency and issues relating to flood risk would be primarily be dealt with via this permit.

In relation to traffic using the BOAT, it was explained that, with the exception of traffic connected with the site clearance works, all traffic would use the new farm track and element of unadopted road that linked with Estuary Road and ultimately Edward Benefer Way. It was also explained that NCC were responsible for making sure that the BOAT remained open.

Councillor Bubb expressed concern regarding digging into the ground by 6m. The Senior Planner reiterated that there had been no objection from the relevant statutory body (the Environment Agency).

Councillor Parish expressed concern in relation to the application. He advised the Committee that he had written to the relevant Government Department and read out an extract from the response he had received. He considered that this type of anaerobic digester was the worst kind and should not be supported. He added that there should be a supporting case from the applicant and evidence from an independent consultant as to whether this should be supported or not.

Reference was made as to why the Borough Council was determining the application as opposed to the County Council. The Senior Planner explained that she had on a number of occasions queried whether NCC should be determining the application, as the current application increased the scale of the proposal and included some slurry. However NCC had confirmed that the primary role of the facility was energy production rather than energy from waste and therefore should be determined by the Borough Council.

With regards to the technology to be used, the Senior Planner advised that the application had to be considered on its own merits. Any pollution issues had been addressed by the Environment Agency.

Councillor Storey made reference to food production and land being taken out and added that there had never been a shortage of food in this country. He added that he had sympathy with the residents who had concerns in relation to the application and referred to page 17, paragraph 5 of the report where it stated that 'many of the concerns of third parties would now be covered by specific permit requirements and therefore greater controls would be in place'.

Councillor Parish referred to comments made by the National Farmers Union in relation to applications of this nature. He added that the country imported a lot of its food and needed to be self-reliant. A digester was not a good initiative if it used crops specifically grown for them.

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

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

(ii) 18/01729/CU

Methwold: Cherry Tree Farm, Thornham Road: Change of use of land from agricultural to leisure (D2): Tracy Peckham

The Principal Planner presented the report and advised the Committee that the application was seeking consent for the change of use of an area of agricultural land to leisure (D2). The applicant was intending to use the site for a maximum of 6 log cabins, a camp site for up to 12 pitches, petting farm and 2 fishing lakes, however the detail did not form part of the application.

The site was located outside the development boundary for the village of Methwold, which was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre (with Northwold) in the adopted Local Plan (specifically the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP).

The application sat alongside application 18/01730/F for the retention of caravan for temporary residential use, and application 18/01791/F for retention of access track and entrance walls.

The application had been referred to the Committee as it was deferred from the previous meeting and at the request of Councillor Lawrence.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Highways / access; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner drew the Committee's attention to the need to impose an additional condition as outlined in the schedule of late correspondence.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Tracy Peckham (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Lawrence addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Lawrence explained that this was an unusual application and explained how the idea had come about. A financial plan had been completed and confirmed that this was a viable business opportunity. The small holding had been registered with DEFRA. He understood the concerns raised by the Local Highway Authority that the road was single width but informed the Committee that there were informal passing places

and gateways or field entrances which provided passing provision. He added that this was a quiet and tranquil area and would be a much needed addition to the Borough.

The Chairman then invited the County Highways representative to comment on the application. It was explained that the concerns related to the road network as Thornham Road was single track width and did not have formal passing provision for the majority of its length. It was also of poor construction with narrow verges and ditches to its sides.

Councillor Storey explained that the application was within his ward and he understood the position of County Highways on this particular application. The road was not heavily used. He made reference to the third paragraph on page 43 of the report and added that the provision of such a facility of this nature would be a wonderful addition.

Councillor Parish added that there were facilities of this nature available elsewhere, and the concerns of County Highways should not be dismissed. He asked how the application could be restricted in terms of its use.

The Principal Planner explained that condition 3 allowed the Authority to retain control over the development and, as it stood, the development would generate limited traffic.

Councillor Peake commended the application and added that the only concern related to highways. He suggested that the applicant could encourage visitors to access the site from Methwold Hythe.

The County Highways representative explained that even with the suggestion of using Methwold Hythe there was not any formal passing provision. He expressed concern that if the current business was unsuccessful then another business could come forward which generated more traffic.

The Principal Planner advised that condition 3 limited the number of cabins, etc on the site and covered this issue. The Principal Planner also highlighted where the cabins would be sited and the location of the fishing ponds and camping area.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings explained that she had visited the site and taken notice of the road. She added that this was a unique opportunity and was a much needed facility. She respected the view of County Highways but on balance felt that the benefits of the proposal outweighed the concerns of County Highways. She supported the suggestion of the applicant adding an informative note to any booking encouraging visitors to access the site via Methwold Hythe. She commended the applicant for the proposal.

The Committee then voted on the additional condition 7, as outlined in late correspondence, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended, subject to the imposition of condition 7, as outlined in late correspondence.

**(iii) 18/01730/F
Methwold: Cherry Tree Farm, Thornham Road: Retention
of caravan for temporary residential use: Tracy Peckham**

In presenting the report, the Principal Planner explained to the Committee that this was a retrospective application to gain temporary planning consent for the siting of a caravan for residential use on agricultural land.

The site was location outside the development boundary for the village of Methwold, which was categorised as a joint Key Rural Service Centre (with Northwold) in the adopted Local Plan (specifically the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP).

This application sat alongside application 18/001729/CU for the change of use of land from agricultural to leisure (D2), and application 18/01791/F for retention of access track.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had been deferred from the previous meeting and at the request of Councillor Lawrence.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Highways / access; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner drew the Committee's attention to the need to impose an additional condition as outlined in the schedule of late correspondence.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Tracy Peckham (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor A Lawrence addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Lawrence explained that the applicant needed to be on site to care for the animals and also offer a form of security. In addition, by virtue of the applicant being on site this would reduce the amount of traffic movements.

The County Highways representative advised the Committee that he had no objection to this application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then drew the Committee's attention to the need to add an additional condition, as outlined in late correspondence, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of the additional condition, as outlined in late correspondence.

(iv) 18/01791/F
Methwold: Cherry Tree Farm, Thornham Road: Retention of access track and entrance walls: Tracy Peckham

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that retrospective permission was sought for the creation of an access track and entrance walls at agricultural land to the north of Thornham Road. The application had been submitted alongside applications ref: 18/01729/CU and 18/01730/F, which sought to change the use of the land to leisure and for the retention of a caravan for temporary residential use and had been called in to the Committee for determination by Councillor Lawrence.

The site was located outside the development boundary for the village of Methwold, which was categorised as a joint Key Rural Service Centre (with Northwold) in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the application should be considered in conjunction with applications 18/01792/CU and 18/01730/F, which had been called in by Councillor Lawrence.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Tracy Peckham (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Lawrence addressed the Committee in support of the application. He stated that this was the third part of the scheme. He had looked at some old maps for the area which demonstrated that a track had been on the site. In relation

to the pillars, he informed the Committee that these would be just under 2m in height and, once completed, would enhance the area.

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

- (v) **18/01714/F**
Docking: Docking Rural Workshops, Station Road: Change of use of garage to 1 bed dwelling: Mrs Claudia Starr

RESOLVED: That the application be withdrawn at the applicant's request.

- (vi) **17/02194/F**
Holme next the Sea: The Poplars, 42 Main Road: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two storey dwelling and detached garage, plus the creation of a new access: A R & V Investments

In presenting the report, the Senior Planner informed the Committee that the application site was located on the southern side of Main Road, Holme next the Sea and comprised a single storey detached dwelling.

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of a dwelling following demolition of the existing dwelling, construction of a detached garage and creation of a new access.

Holme was classified as a Smaller Village / Hamlet within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Planning history;
- Impact on form and character;
- Impact on non-designated heritage asset;
- Impact on neighbour amenities;
- Impact on highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Patricia Jackson (objecting) and Margaret Easton (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and John Putman (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Wareham expressed concern regarding the access track being at the side of the property and taking away amenity space for the dwelling. He therefore proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring property. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Watson.

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that there was an existing access on the site and the proposal was to move the dwelling to one side of the plot. It was considered that the visual impact of the new access and the impact on the neighbours was acceptable and condition 15 limited the use of the access to serve the agricultural land. Taking those issues into account, it was considered that the application was acceptable.

Councillor Mrs Watson expressed concern in relation to the application. She made reference to the character of the area and stated that this was another very large residence, which would dominate the street-scene particularly with the garage at the front. She considered that the proposal would change the character of Holme.

The Assistant Director explained that design, bulk, scale and mass were all issues that the Committee needed to take a view as to whether they were acceptable or not.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked whether the application was an extension into the countryside.

The Senior Planner explained that it was very hard to see where any rear curtilage boundary was. Old maps had been checked and it was explained that old boundary lines had evolved over time and needed to be considered. In this case, it was considered that the proposed modest extension of residential curtilage into the countryside would be acceptable and would not result in any significant harm to the character of the area or AONB.

Councillor Morrison stated that he agreed with the comments made by Councillors Wareham and Mrs Watson that the proposal would dominate the street-scene. He also considered that the garage at the front was out of character and detracted from the street-scene.

The Senior Planner highlighted other dwellings where the garages were at the front of the plot.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to the fact that the dwelling was classed as a non-designated heritage asset and that a Building Preservation Notice had not been served.

The Senior Planner explained that the site was not in the Conservation Area and the Conservation Areas Advisory Panel had raised no objection to the proposal.

Councillor Hipperson queried whether the site area included the access or not.

The Assistant Director advised that the application should be deferred so that the issue raised by Councillor Hipperson could be clarified.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred for one cycle to allow for clarification over the site area.

The Committee then adjourned at 11.35 am and reconvened at 11.45 am.

(vii) 18/02054/F
Little Massingham: Manor Lodge, Station Road: Proposed replacement dwelling: Buck Estates

RESOLVED: That the application be withdrawn at the applicant's request.

(viii) 18/01842/O
Old Hunstanton: The Chalet, 19 Golf Course Road: Outline application: Construction of two dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and garage: Mrs Fowler & Mrs Howell

In presenting the application, the Senior Planner explained that outline permission with all matters except access for two dwellings following demolition of the existing dwelling and garage was sought.

The site was located wholly within the development boundary of Old Hunstanton, a rural village.

The site was also located within the buffer zone of an SSSI.

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;
- Highway safety;
- Form and character;
- Residential amenity;
- Protected sites;
- Crime and Disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

The Senior Planner drew the Committee's attention to the need to add an additional condition 8, as outlined in late correspondence.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings outlined her concerns in relation to the application. She explained that she felt the proposal was overdevelopment of the site and referred to other dwellings in the vicinity Nos. 9, 11, 15, 17 and 21, which all had large plots. She considered that one dwelling would be acceptable but two would change the character of the area. She therefore proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and parking. This was seconded by Councillor Wareham.

Councillor Wareham added that he had concerns relating to the parking layout.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that the proposal was overdevelopment of the site which detracted from the form and character of the area and the parking layout was also unduly crowded, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, contrary to recommendation for the following reasons:

The area is characterised by large plots with space around dwellings; to replace the existing dwelling with two properties would result in a cramped form of development at odds with and of detriment to the form and character of the locality. The crowded parking arrangement would also add to this cramped appearance. The proposed development would not therefore add to the overall quality of the area and represents poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF, 2018 and Development Plan Policies CS08 and DM15.

(ix) 18/02145/RM

**Sedgeford: Land adjacent The Chimneys, Docking Road:
Reserved matters application: Construction of three
dwellings (amended design): Casini Systems**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site related to land adjacent to The Chimneys, Docking Road, Sedgeford. The site was adjacent to the Sedgeford Conservation Area.

The proposal was a revised reserved matters application for three new dwellings.

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;
- Form, character and amenity;
- Highways; and
- Other considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Clarke (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Parish advised the Committee that Sedgeford Parish Council had an emerging Neighbourhood Plan and that it was a shame that it could not be taken into account. He also asked if there was an opportunity to remove permitted development rights.

The Senior Planner advised that it would be difficult to remove permitted development rights as the application proposed minor changes to the design of the dwellings but the proportions and layout remained unchanged from the previous approval.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the Neighbourhood Plan was at a relatively early stage and no weight could be afforded to it at this stage, however she was pleased that they were in the process of producing one.

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

- (x) **18/02167/F**
Terrington St John: Woodstock, 22 School Road: Remove existing garage and conservatory and install new double storey side and rear extension complete with single storey porch to front and garden room to the rear: Mr & Mrs Darren & Stephanie Carter

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located opposite Burman House on the west side of Terrington St John. The site was located within the development boundary for Terrington St John, not within any conservation area, and not close to any listed buildings.

The application was for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, a single storey front lean-to porch (to match what the neighbour to the south had), and a single storey rear flat roofed sun room. It was a revised design of a dismissed appeal, which proposed the two storey element to the side and front, instead of the side and rear in this case.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the application was similar to a previously dismissed appeal.

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

- Design and impact on the character and appearance of the street scene;
- Impact on neighbour amenity;
- Any other matters requiring consideration prior to the determination of the application.

The Principal Planner drew the Committee's attention to the need to add an additional condition 3, as outlined in late correspondence, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended subject to the imposition of an addition condition 3, as outlined in late correspondence.

(xi) 18/01876/F
Walpole Cross Keys: Old Farm, Market Lane, Walpole St Andrew: Change of use of agricultural land to residential garden and proposed new access to agricultural land: Mr Ben Human

In presenting the report, the Principal Planner informed the Committee that the application site was located on the northern side of Market Lane, in the Parish of Walpole Cross Keys between the A17 and Walpole St Andrew. It was located approximately 70 m west of 'Samuels Farm Shop'. It involved a parcel of land to the immediate west of the extended barn conversion known as 'Old Farm' and up to the bungalow 'Milagrita' further west. The land was bounded by a row of Poplar trees and hedgerow to the south adjoining a wide grassed verge to Market Lane.

The application site was located on land designated as countryside by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) (2016) and also in the Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan (October 2017).

The application sought the continued use of a 7m wide strip of land to the west of 'Old Farm' as extended garden, plus the creation of a new vehicular access to serve the remainder of the land which was not laid to an orchard.

Members might be aware that this land had been the subject of previous enforcement and planning appeals which had been dismissed.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of the Planning Sifting Panel given the planning history relating to the site/proposal.

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

- Policy context and planning history;
- Effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the countryside;
- Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land;
- Highway implications; and
- Other material considerations

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

(xii) 18/00860/O

West Walton: Willowvista, 232 Salts Road: Outline application with some matters reserved: Construction of 2 x 2 bedroom chalet bungalows: c/o Agent

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for outline planning permission for the construction of 2 no. two-bed chalet bungalows located to the rear of the donor dwelling. The site (except the access) was located outside the development boundary of West Walton with no rural justification but also represented a tandem form of development which was not characteristic of the locality and might also give rise to amenity issues.

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;
- Form and character;
- Amenity issues;
- Flood risk;
- Highways;
- Crime and Disorder Act; and
- Other material considerations

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

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that having been on site she considered that the recommendation was correct as the access proposed on the left-hand side would cause dis-amenity to the neighbouring property. She added that the access could be altered and the bungalows re-sited to overcome overlooking issues. She acknowledged that the flooding issues still needed to be addressed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

PC99: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

PC100: **PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee received a report which gave an update on service performance for planning enforcement during the fourth quarter of 2018.

It was reported that the total number of live cases was 272 with 163 cases having been closed. In addition, 16 formal notices had been served.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

PC101: **PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT APPEALS - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee was provided with the quarterly report update covering performance for the period 1 October 2018 – 31 December 2018.

It was noted that for the fourth quarter of 2018, 20% of all appeals were allowed. For the 12 month period to 31 December 2019 an average of 38% of all appeals were allowed. This was above the 2017/18 national average figure of around 32% of all appeals allowed.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 12.25 pm