

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 1st April, 2019 at 10.15 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, M Storey, D Tyler, G Wareham, Mrs E Watson, J Westrop (sub), A White and Mrs S Young

PC119: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Buck and Miss S Sandell.

PC120: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 4 March 2019 and of the Special Meeting held on 13 March 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC121: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There was no declaration of interests declared.

PC122: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that there was no need to determine 8/1(a) – Feltwell as the Section 106 Agreement had been completed and signed.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings also reminded the Committee that an additional Planning Committee meeting had been arranged for Monday, 29 April 2019 at 9.00 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall.

PC123: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended pursuant to Standing Order 34:

Councillor P Gidney 8/2(d) North Runcton

PC124: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC125: **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.

(a) **Index of Applications**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

PC126: **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) – (ix) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **18/01320/OM**
Feltwell: Long Lane Farm, 30 Long Lane: Outline application: Residential development for a maximum of 19 dwellings following demolition of existing: Mrs Christine Barrett

The application did not need to be considered as the Section 106 had been completed and signed within the originally approved timescale.

- (ii) **18/02200/RMM**
Ingoldisthorpe: Land around pond and west of 30 Hill Road, Lynn Road: Reserved major application: Residential development and new public amenity area: Mr Ben Marten

The Committee had visited the site prior to the meeting.

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the south-west edge of the village of Ingoldisthorpe, at the crossroads of the main Lynn Road (B1440) running north south and Hill Road running east west. Hill Road ran

along the northern boundary of the site whilst the main B1440 defined the western boundary.

To the east of the site boundary were existing detached residential properties and to the north, on the opposite side of the road, was a series of two storey, predominately terraced properties.

To the west, on the opposite side of the road was walled, formal recreational land with marked pitches and to the south were grass fields with a tree-lined boundary. An existing naturally-occurring pond was located in the north-west corner of the site.

Currently the site was grassed, open land used for grazing. A low post and wire fence defined the north and west boundaries.

Outline planning permission was approved on appeal in 2016 for residential development on the site (reference 15/00854/OM). Access was the only matter for consideration at that stage with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale being matters reserved for future consideration. The reserved matters application therefore sought consent for those outstanding matters.

Whilst the application was for 12 dwellings on the site it was of particular note that the proposal was for a Custom Self-Build development. 10 of the homes would be self or custom build homes and the remaining 2 plots would be affordable housing.

The key issues with the self-build scheme were that the site would be constructed in phases and that each plot would ultimately be designed by the plot owner. The application therefore sought a degree of flexibility in the final detailed design of the external appearance of each self-build dwelling.

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;
- Design, character and appearance;
- Impact upon residential amenity;
- Affordable housing;
- Access issues;
- Landscaping;
- Drainage;
- Ecology and open space; and
- Archaeology.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Katherine Wallace (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council), Mr Vawser (objecting), Mr B Marten (supporting) and Mr T Howard (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a comment from Councillor Crofts the Assistant Director explained that format of plots had been set because of the nature of the site but a choice remained including materials and fenestration. The options to choose from were set out in the design code.

Councillor Crofts asked for assurances regarding the Management Company, which was proposed to be set up to maintain the private roads and associated sustainable drainage systems, as well as the new areas of public open space including the pond.

The Assistant Director explained that until Government changed the requirements to require all roads to be adopted by the County Council, then there was very little that the LPA could do.

The Assistant Director further advised that a condition could be imposed to ensure that the Management Company was set up to the satisfaction of the LPA.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she would prefer the road to be adopted by Norfolk County Council and considered the proposed approach by the applicant to be the cheaper option.

Councillor Crofts then proposed an additional condition to ensure that full details of the long term management arrangements were submitted to the LPA, which included the access road and open space, and was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

Councillor Bubb added that he was very familiar with the site and when he first heard about the scheme he had concerns. However on balance he felt that it was not offensive and would not harm the area. He did have concerns in relation to the patches of carrstone and felt that the materials should all be carrstone or none at all. He also considered that the cladding was not suitable.

The Assistant Director advised that the homeowner would have the choice over the materials and would know the implications of their choice, particularly in terms of maintenance.

In response to a comment from Councillor Wareham, the Assistant Director explained that no street lights would be provided on a smaller scheme such as this.

The Senior Planner pointed out the two affordable housing units on the plans. Councillor Wareham stated that he considered that the affordable housing units stood out to him. He also asked at which stage of the development the affordable housing would be built.

The Housing Development Officer explained to the Committee how the affordable housing units would be delivered. He explained that the land owner would not build the plots and these would be sold to a Housing Association who would build out the units. A clause would be contained within the Section 106 Agreement requiring the affordable housing to be built after completion of the 6th house.

Councillor Wareham referred to the tree within the pond and proposed that this should remain. This was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

Councillor Parish informed the Committee that no CIL levy was paid on self-build houses, therefore the village would end up with houses that they didn't want and no CIL contributions.

Councillor White stated that the roadway should be constructed to adoptable standards.

The Assistant Director advised that County Highways had no objection to the proposed roadway surface.

Councillor Morrison stated that the Inspector had, when allowing the appeal, made sure that 50% of the site would be allocated to open space. He also referred to the pond and asked who would monitor the improvements and who would they be for.

The Assistant Director referred to Condition 6 of the Inspector's appeal decision which made reference to the area of open space, relating specifically to the amount of open space, matters of ecology and management and maintenance of the public open space.

The Senior Planner also referred to page 20 of the report where it made reference to the removal of weeds from the pond and specific habitat creation measures for Oystercatchers.

Councillor Morrison expressed concern in relation to the proposed materials, particularly the small squares of carrstone and explained that these were too fussy and was not part of the vernacular of West Norfolk.

Councillor Mrs Watson added that she felt that carrstone should be the dominant feature. She also referred to the fencing around the pond and queried the safety aspect of this.

The Assistant Director explained that the scheme had outline planning permission granted at appeal and the Inspector would have taken this into account at the time.

In response to a query, the Housing Development Officer explained to the Committee the trigger mechanism for the affordable housing units to be developed.

Councillor Storey expressed concern that you would not be able to see the final design until the units had been built. He also considered that the affordable housing had not been pepper-potted. He considered that custom and self-build was ahead of its time and that other developers had to give full details of what was proposed.

The Assistant Director reminded the Committee that a training session had been held on custom build. The Government were pushing this, and it had its own Act, which had come into force in 2015. This was the first application that the Council had received.

Councillor Mrs Fraser informed the Committee that she sat on the Custom and Self-Build Task Group. She had sympathy with the views expressed but felt that it was a pleasant development in a lovely area.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that it was difficult for the Committee as each plot would have their own palette of materials. She added that she agreed with the principle of custom and self-build but she also would prefer to see the finished product for each plot. She also referred to the use of natural larch and suggested that better wood could be used such as cedar or oak.

In response to a comment regarding the footpath, the Senior Planner explained that a footpath would be provided along Hill Road by the developer as part of the off-site improvement works, as this was covered by condition 11.

With regards to the comment regarding pepper-potting, the Assistant Director explained that it had been provided in accordance with the Council's adopted policy.

The Committee then voted on the proposed conditions regarding the full details of the long term maintenance arrangements to be provided including the access roads and open space and retention of the tree in the pond, which were agreed.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to remove condition 7 and renumber conditions 7-13, which was agreed.

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

- the imposition of a condition to retain the tree in the pond
- the imposition of a condition requiring full details of the maintenance arrangements to be submitted to the LPA.

- the removal of condition 7 and then conditions 7-13 to be renumbered as outlined in late correspondence.

The Committee then adjourned at 11.45 am and reconvened at 11.50 am.

Councillor Storey left the meeting at 11.45 am.

**(iii) 18/02218/F
Burnham Thorpe: Land east of Blacksmiths Lane and west of Garners Row and south of Walsingham Road: Construction of four dwellings: Holkham Estate**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located in the village of Burnham Thorpe and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Burnham Thorpe was designated a 'Smaller Village and Hamlet'.

The site was a level, grassed open space on the southern side of Walsingham Road and faced open land on the northern side of the road. The site had historically been used as garden land in connection with Nos. 2-5 Creake Road to the south.

To the east of the site were houses fronting Walsingham Road and to the west was an area of open space. The River Burn flowed through the land on the northern side of Walsingham Road, opposite the site.

Full planning permission was sought for four dwellings fronting Walsingham Road. Two were detached dwellings, and two formed a pair of semi-detached properties. Parking facilities for all units were accessed via a private drive leading to open and covered parking spaces.

There was an extant planning permission for six houses on the site and the adjoining open land to the west.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of the Sifting Panel.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- Form and character;
- Heritage assets;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Flood risk;
- Highway safety;
- Drainage;
- Ecology; and

- Other material considerations.

Councillor Wareham queried whether the chalk wall was to be retained. The Senior Planner advised that it was to be retained but would be lowered to be able to achieve the required visibility splays.

Councillor Wareham expressed concern in relation to this as this was an historic wall and part of the village.

The Assistant Director explained that there was a previous consent on the site which included lowering of the wall. The previous application was for six dwellings and had been dealt with under the Planning Scheme of Delegation.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings expressed concern in relation to the spatial relationship of the plots on the site. She explained that it appeared that the buildings were squeezed on the left when there would be ample room on the site for all plots if No.4 was moved over. She referred to the previous design, which she considered was an improvement on this one as every plot got a fair share of land.

The Assistant Director advised that the design had been carried out in consultation with the Parish Council and residents who wanted to keep some open space.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the residents of No.2 would have the disadvantage of traffic going past them.

Councillor Bubb added that each property should have its own access. The Assistant Director explained that purchasers of the properties would be aware of what they were buying.

Councillor Wareham then proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the wall should not be lowered and left intact. This was seconded by Councillor White.

The Assistant Director explained that consent had already been granted which included the lowering of the wall, which was a significant material consideration.

The Executive Director advised the Committee that it was important to recognise that the site had consent for six dwellings but this had attracted concerns from the Parish Council. The applicant agreed to modify the scheme and came back with 4 units and the support from the Parish Council.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that a further scheme could come forward which would be better for everyone and have a better spatial relationship.

The Committee then voted on the proposal by Councillor Wareham, seconded by Councillor White to refuse the application, which was lost.

With regards to the comments raised by Emergency Planning, the Assistant Director advised that this would be dealt with via an informative note on the decision notice.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings and Councillor White asked for their vote to be recorded against the following resolution.

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

(iv) 19/00232/F
Docking: Bernaleen, Station Road: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 3 dwellings: New World Timber Frame

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planner permission was sought for the erection of a terrace of three, 2.5 storey dwellings with shared access and parking provision to the front following demolition of an existing bungalow on the site.

The site was located within Docking's Conservation Area.

The application followed refusal of a similar application that was refused and dismissed at appeal (17/02118/F; APP/V2635/W/18/3208288). This application sought to address the reasons for refusal.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Morrison and the officer recommendation was contrary to views of the Parish Council.

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

- Principle of development;
- History / impact on Conservation Area;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

Councillor Mrs Watson asked whether the middle cottage had its own rear access. The Senior Planner advised that it did not appear to have any however the scheme was the same as what the Inspector had made comment on. The Inspector considered that the car port was not appropriate. No comments had been made on the access to the middle cottage.

The Assistant Director explained that the application had been a delegated refusal relating to the impact on residents but not on the form and character.

It was explained that there was an extant permission to demolish the bungalow.

Councillor Morrison explained the reasons why he had called-in the application. He stated that Docking had enough houses to be going on with at current time. He considered that the new houses were at odd angles at the front. He also considered that the proposal was overdevelopment and was concerned that there was no rear access for the middle cottage.

Councillor White proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that there was no rear access to the middle cottage, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Watson.

The Assistant Director reminded the Committee that there was a risk of costs against the Council if the applicant went to appeal. The Inspector had looked at the site previously and considered that the form was acceptable.

The Senior Planner advised that the Inspector did not agree that the site was overdevelopment.

Councillor Bubb stated that he had driven past the site and considered that it was cramped and overdeveloped.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that there was no rear access to the middle cottage, which was carried.

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

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

The proposed development, by virtue of the lack of a separate access to the rear amenity space of the mid-terrace dwelling, would not provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants of this dwelling and is therefore considered to represent poor design. The proposal was therefore contrary to the NPPF in general and specifically to paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF 2019, policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.

(v) **19/00139/F**
Heacham: Heacham Holidays Ltd, Long Acres Holiday Home Park, South Beach Road: Change of use of land to

allow the residential use of the warden's caravan for 12 months each year: Heacham Holidays Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site related to the Long Acres Holiday Home Park located on South Beach Road in Heacham.

The proposal was a change of use to allow 12 month occupancy of the warden's caravan situated at the entrance to the park. The overall site currently had an 11 month occupancy granted as part of application 2/95/1076/F.

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

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

- Planning history;
- Flooding; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings read out a letter from Mr Reader (objecting on behalf of Heacham Parish Council) who was ill and could not attend the meeting today.

Councillor Parish stated that the application sounded simple but had wider concerns. He referred to 'Other considerations' on page 53 of the agenda in particular to the concerns raised about the Fenway access, which was a restricted byway. He added that the quality of life for residents living along Fenway had suffered and felt that people could use it as an accessway. If asked if a condition could be imposed to ensure that Fenway was not used as an accessway.

The Assistant Director explained that the application was to allow the residential use of the warden's caravan an extra month each year. He considered that the route of Folgate Road and then South Beach Road would be used and the condition suggested by Councillor Parish would not be appropriate or necessary. The Senior Planner added that the additional month would be when the holiday park was closed.

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

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

The Committee adjourned at 12.40 pm and reconvened at 1.10 pm

(vi) 19/00250/O
North Runcton: Friars Bungalow, 32 West Winch Road:
Outline application: proposed new bungalow: Mr J Wood

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located within the development boundary for West Winch, a settlement adjacent to King's Lynn and designated as a Growth Area in the adopted Local Plan.

The application was for outline permission, with appearance, landscaping and scale reserved, for the construction of one dwelling behind an existing dwelling in West Winch. Access and layout were being considered within the application.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Gidney.

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

- Principle of development;
- Highway safety; and
- Form and character

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor P Gidney addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Gidney explained that he considered that the application site was in a sustainable location as it was close to a bus-stop and the garage in West Winch. There were already two dwellings along the track which used the access. Space along the access was already used by a self-employed builder which created vehicle movements in and out of the access, often with trailers.

He added that when you entered the A10 from that point, there was slow traffic in the morning and the same at the end of the day. The garage was also in the vicinity which slowed the traffic down. He added that it was easy to get out of Rectory Road and Common Lane. He suggested that a condition could be imposed to any permission to make the entrance wide enough for two vehicles.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then invited the County Highways Officers to outline their objection to the application. The County Highways Officer explained that when he had visited the site he had great difficulty getting out of the access. In relation to the proposal to widen the access, he explained that he had not been aware of this until the meeting today. He reminded the Committee that they had refused a similar application, which had been dismissed at appeal. He did not consider that widening the access would not be of any merit.

Councillor Parish stated that the Committee had been informed that the site was currently being used as a builders' yard, however there was no site history.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that was no premium on neglect.

Councillor Parish further added that with a condition to improve the access a modest bungalow in a sustainable location would be acceptable.

With regards to the site being used as a builders' yard, the Executive Director advised that this could be investigated by Planning Enforcement. The applicant could submit a planning application to seek to regularise this if considered appropriate.

Councillor Wareham stated that as a regular user of the A10, he made reference to the Chinese restaurant with people coming and going from and also asked why people were allowed to speed along the A10.

The Assistant Director explained that when he had visited the site, he had found it very uncomfortable exiting the site. He also reminded the Committee that they had refused an application a little further along from the site, and needed to be consistent in their decision making.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked for clarification as to who owned the access. It was confirmed that the land was outside the applicant's ownership.

The Executive Director explained that the principle of development was not an issue however the access was. He added that when visiting the site with the gradient, visibility and speed of traffic it was not easy to exit the site. He also referred to the application, approximately 50m along the road, which was refused by the Committee and went to appeal, and which was dismissed by the Planning Inspector.

Councillor White stated that the two properties which currently used the access did not have any issues with it. Also it was used by heavy vehicles.

The Principal Planner advised that there was no planning history for the site for use as a builders' yard. She added that the proposal put forward did not solve the issue of people having to pull out and interrupted the free flow of traffic.

Councillor Peake agreed that the incline on the access was very dangerous.

RESOLVED: That, the application be refused.

(vii) 18/02195/F

Runcton Holme: The Red Barn, 12 College Lane, South Runcton: Extension to rear of existing barn to provide permanent function space and kitchens following removal of existing marquee: Rockcliffe

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that College Farm was located on the western side of the A10 at South Runcton. The farm complex was situated to the south of the farmhouse and was accessed from College Lane. To the south of this complex of more contemporary agricultural buildings was Red Barn, which was a Grade 2* listed building which had been renovated and used as a venue for weddings, parties, etc.

The application sought full planning permission for an extension to the rear/north of the existing barn, to provide permanent function space and kitchens following removal of the existing temporary marquee.

The application was accompanied by an additional application for listed building consent (18/02196/LB) which was also on the agenda.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination due to concerns expressed by Historic England.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the heritage asset.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(viii) 18/02196/LB

Runcton Holme: The Red Barn, 12 College Lane, South Runcton: Listed building application: Extension to rear of existing barn to provide permanent function space and kitchens following removal of existing marquee: Rockcliffe

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that College Farm was located on the western side of the A10 at South Runcton. The farm complex was situated on the south of the farmhouse and was accessed for College Lane. To the south of the complex was Red Barn which was a Grade 2* listed building which had been renovated and used for functions (weddings, etc).

The application sought listed building consent to build an extension to the rear of the existing barn to provide permanent function space and kitchens following removal of the existing marquee.

The application was accompanied by an additional application for planning permission 18/02195/F which was also on the agenda.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of the Sifting Panel.

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

- Location of the new extension and relationship with existing historic barn; and
- Appearance and materials of doors linking the existing historic with the proposed extension.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(ix) 18/01008/F

Wormegay: Alfred G Pearce Ltd, Castle Road: Retention and extension of effluent treatment plant, including the erection of a new DAF/control room building and the installation of new tanks and associated plant and equipment: Alfred G Pearce Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the retention of and alterations to an effluent treatment plant, including the erection of a new DAF (Dissolved Air Flootation system), control room building and the installation of new tanks and associated plant and equipment at AG Pearce in Wormegay.

The site was located outside of the development boundary for Wormegay (a rural village).

The site was located within the buffer zone of the River Nar SSSI in a medium groundwater risk area.

Approximately 100m to the northwest of the site were the remains of Wormegay motte and bailey castle, a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Highway safety;
- Environmental Impacts;

- Neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings informed the Committee that Suzi Pimlott from the Council's Community Safety & Neighbourhood Nuisance department was present to answer any questions that the Committee might have.

Councillor Mrs Watson asked to see the photograph showing the ancient monument in relation to the site.

In response to a query, the Principal Planner advised that significant conditions had been imposed relating to the discharging of the Environmental Permit for the site. Conditions had also been imposed regarding noise, smell and landscaping.

Councillor Mrs Bower made reference to page 90 of the report, regarding planting on the bund. The Principal Planner advised that conditions 12, 13 and 14 were in place to ensure that it was completed.

Councillor Parish stated that there was no guarantee that the operation of this site would be better than the existing.

The Principal Planner advised that the Environmental Permit would be dealt with through the Environment Agency legislation.

The CSNN Officer advised that the proposed conditions were sufficient to have a degree of control over the operations.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that with the conditions in place this would be an improvement for the local residents.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

PC127: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That, the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.50 pm