

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd September, 2019 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room - Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**PRESENT:** Councillor C J Crofts (Chair)  
Councillors F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, G Hipperson, M Howland, C Hudson, C Joyce, J Kirk, B Lawton, C Manning, T Parish, S Patel, C Rose, S Sandell, S Squire, M Storey and D Tyler

PC25: **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence, although Councillor Joyce would be arriving later in the meeting.

PC26: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, Councillor Crofts.

Councillor Parish referred to PC22 (i) and stated that the numbers who voted for and against a resolution should have been included.

The Democratic Services Officer explained that it was not normal practice to record this in the minutes.

PC27: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest declared.

PC28: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no Urgent Business under Standing Order 7.

PC29: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended and addressed the Committee on the following items, pursuant to Standing Order 34:

M de Whalley	8/2(d) & 8/2(e)	Grimston
B Ayres	8/2(f)	Marshland St James

PC30: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chair, Councillor Crofts reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the appropriate officer.

PC31: **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.

PC32: **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) – (viii) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

- (i) **19/00597/FM**  
**Downham Market: Land to the south of Prince Henry Place: Proposed development of 19 no. 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings (including 4 no. affordable units) with associated garages/parking, access road, landscaping and open space: Mr Bob Fidock**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application had been deferred from the previous meeting held on 29 July 2019 for further negotiation with the applicant.

It was explained that the case officer had liaised with the agent to discuss the prospect of amending the scheme to reduce the number of dwellings as per the debate at the Committee meeting and Committee instruction. The agent confirmed that density had not previously been an issue when the appeal was determined and equated to that adjoining the site. The application was therefore to be determined as submitted.

The site (0.7 ha of former paddock land) was located within the development area of Downham Market at the head of Prince Henry Place. It was bounded by residential development to the north

(bungalows) and south (chalet and houses), with school playing fields to the west.

The application sought full permission for the construction of 19 dwellings (including 4 affordable units), with associated garages/parking, access road, landscaping and open space.

Some Members might recall a similar application for 19 dwellings which was sought under application reference: 17/00581/FM which was refused (contrary to officer recommendation) in November 2017 and subsequently dismissed on appeal.

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

- Previous appeal decision;
- Principle of development;
- The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- The effects from noise and disturbance from construction works and occupation;
- Highways issues;
- Affordable housing provision;
- Drainage; and
- Other material planning considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Lennie Haslam (objecting), Mrs Lusha (objecting), Elaine Oliver (objecting on behalf of the Town Council) and Ian Hale (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made regarding the highway improvement works, the Principal Planner explained that the improvements to the Church/London/Howdale Road junction would involve the realignment of the kerbline to improve visibility for vehicles along Church Road in both directions when exiting Howdale Road, which would be to the benefit of all road users, and highlighted this on the plans.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts reminded Councillors Bubb, Kirk and Sandell that because they had not been present at the last meeting and attended the site visit, they would not be able to take part in the debate and decision making today.

Councillor Parish proposed that the application be refused for the following reason:

This proposed development would have an adverse impact on the quality of life and the mental and physical health of vulnerable adults in the existing, adjacent, estate. This impact would be two-fold: traffic generated by the proposed development would pass the edge of the sole, front gardens of several of the existing properties which are used by residents, some in wheelchairs, as recreational areas; the existing

greenspace with associated wildlife is, as frequently stated by mental health experts, beneficial to people in a fragile state and/or suffering from the early stages of dementia.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Patel.

Councillor Hipperson asked for clarification in relation to density of the proposal. The Principal Planner advised that the issue of density was addressed on page 14 of the agenda.

Councillor Patel explained that he still had concerns in relation to the junction and that there had been accidents in the past.

The Principal Planner advised that she was not in possession of accident statistics for the area but the Local Highway Authority had not raised an objection to the application or the proposed highway improvement works.

The Assistant Director added that the proposed works to the highway junction would help to improve the situation and had been agreed with the Local Highways Authority, the technical experts.

Councillor Patel referred to the site layout and asked if ambulances would be able to manoeuvre on the development.

In response, the Principal Planner explained that the private driveways had been assessed by the Local Highways Authority who had raised no objection to the proposal.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts reminded the Committee that no statutory consultees had objected to the application.

Councillor Squire stated that the statutory consultees did not live there and the proposal was not acceptable to residents. She added that she still believed that the scheme was a cramped form of development, and therefore could not support the application.

Councillor Parish stated that the Local Highway Authority, were in an advisory role, and the Committee, on a few occasions, had not always accepted their advice.

Councillor Storey made a comment in relation to the non-attendance of officers from County Highways. The Assistant Director explained that when County Highways had not objected to an application, they would not attend.

Councillor Storey expressed concern that the access would be via the sheltered housing scheme and he had sympathy for the residents. He agreed with the recommendation to refuse.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts reminded the Committee that the site had been an allocation site a while ago. He added that sympathy was not a material planning consideration. He referred to the proposed reason for refusal and considered that it was not a strong enough reason for refusal and warned that the Council could be liable for costs again.

The Assistant Director referred to the reason for refusal and expressed caution as the Planning Inspector had already awarded costs against the Council for that reason. In relation to noise and disturbance, he cautioned the Committee against referring to that as there was no evidence. The County Highways Authority did not object to the application on highways grounds and he urged the Committee not to use that as a reason for refusal as the Planning Inspector had raised no issues in relation to highways.

Councillor Squire considered that the proposal would not enhance the form and character of the area and result in a cramped form of development. It was explained that the scheme would have the same density as the surrounding area.

The Principal Planner clarified that the density of the scheme would be 28 dwellings per hectare.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts, with the required number of supporters, asked that a recorded vote be taken on the proposal to refuse the application, as follows:

<b>For the motion</b>	<b>Against the motion</b>	<b>Abstentions</b>
F Bone	C Crofts	G Hipperson
B Lawton	C Bower	M Howland
T Parish		C Hudson
S Patel		C Manning
S Squire		C Rose
S Storey		D Tyler

The proposal to refuse the application was therefore carried.

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

*This proposed development would have an adverse impact on the quality of life and the mental and physical health of vulnerable adults in the existing, adjacent, estate. This impact would be two-fold: traffic generated by the proposed development would pass the edge of the sole, front gardens of several of the existing properties which are used by residents, some in wheelchairs, as recreational areas; and loss of the existing greenspace with associated wildlife which is, as frequently stated by mental health experts, beneficial to people in a fragile state and/or suffering from the early stages of dementia.*

Councillor Joyce joined the meeting.

**(ii) 19/00100/F**  
**Denver: Denver Store and Post Office, 9-11 Downham Road: Canopy/shutter (retrospective): Denver Post Office**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the existing shop/post office was located at 9-11 Downham Road, Denver, directly opposite the Grade II\* Listed Church.

The application sought retrospective consent for the construction of a canopy and metal security shutters on the front elevation of the existing building.

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 and impact on Listed Buildings;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material impacts.

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

**(iii) 19/01053/CU**  
**Downham Market: 6 and 7 Burdock Close, Retrospective change of use from open plan garden(s) to enclosed residential garden land: Mrs S Endresz & Mr A Travers**

The Graduate Planner introduced the report and explained that the proposed development was for the change of use from 'open plan gardens to enclosed residential garden land'. The change of use is facilitated by the erection of a 1.8m close boarded fence. The piece of land in question was located immediately to the south of the dwellings Nos. 6 and 7 of Burdock Close in Downham Market and was used as amenity land and as a landscape buffer associated with the original estate. The piece of land was adjacent to the highway verge of the A1122, and was located within the development boundary for Downham Market.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Context and character; and

- Public rights of way.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Elaine Oliver (objecting on behalf of the Town Council) and Sheila Endresz (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Graduate Planner explained to the Committee that the applicant had advised that they would be willing to leave a 1 m strip of land. The Principal Planner advised that the Committee needed to determine the application as presented to them today.

Councillor Bubb asked for the street view to be presented to the Committee which showed a pleasant belt of trees which would absorb the noise from the A1122. The proposal negated the effect of what had been proposed originally and could set a precedent.

Councillor Joyce pointed out that this was not a public right of way and queried whether the piece of land should have been sold in the first place. He added that he could see no reason to refuse the application.

The Principal Planner advised that the area of land was privately owned however it was open space not garden land.

Councillor Tyler explained that the site was in his Ward. He stated that he was unable to support the application as it was supposed to be open amenity land and was not appropriate for development, as it was a much used thoroughfare. The development was forcing the public to walk near to the bypass which was a severe hazard. The land had been set aside as a buffer for the A1122 and dwellings. The proposal also had a detrimental impact on wildlife. He supported the recommendation to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson added that the land belonged to the householders and if the Council wanted to use it as a footpath then the Council should buy the land from them.

Councillor Patel added that the land had always been used as public open space for many years.

Councillor Parish added that the land was amenity land and never garden land and was also a buffer. He stated that the Committee should always protect amenity land.

Councillor Joyce asked who the rightful owner was of the land and whether it had been sold legitimately.

Councillor Hipperson stated that there needed to be further information and proposed to defer the application. This was seconded by Councillor Joyce.

The Assistant Director advised that the Committee could make a decision on the application, as it was clearly a change of use from amenity land to garden land, and it was the officer's view that the application should be refused.

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

*The Committee then adjourned at 10.50 am and reconvened at 11.00 am*

**(iv) 19/01079/F**  
**Downham Market: 43 High Street: Conversion of ground floor commercial hall into 4 x self-contained studio apartments: Mr Reynolds**

The Principal Planner advised that the application site was that of the former cinema No.43 High Street, Downham Market. It had frontage onto High Street and rear facing onto Church Road.

The front part of the building contained two lock-up shops with a two bedroomed residential flat above the first, second and third floors; there was a central commercial hall used and a gym above.

This proposal sought to convert the commercial hall into four residential studio apartments/bedsits.

The building was not listed but considered to be an undesignated heritage asset and was located within the Conservation Area of the town.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon character of the building;
- Parking;
- Impact upon adjoining properties; and
- Other material considerations.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to add Condition 5, which was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved, as recommended subject to the imposition of an additional condition (5) as detailed in late correspondence.

(v) **19/01035/RM**  
**Grimston: Land north of 105 and immediately west of 101**  
**Leziate Drove, Pott Row: Mr J Sandle**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was part of a former grassed paddock north of 105 and west of 101 Leziate Drove, Pott Row. The site was bounded by a recently constructed detached dwelling to the south west, large barns to the north east, an area of open land to the rear and treed open land on the opposite side of Leziate Drove.

Outline planning permission was approved on this site in June 2016 for the construction of a single dwelling, with all matters reserved.

Members may recall a planning application for a single, detached two storey dwelling on this site, which was refused. However this single dwelling spanned both this site and adjoining land, where outline permission had been granted for two dwellings. The proposed single property was of significant size and was refused planning permission due to its design and large scale by the Planning Committee on 1 July 2019.

The application sought approval of the reserved matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

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

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character and amenity;
- Highways;
- Affordable housing; and
- Other considerations.

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

Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34, objecting to the application, as follows:

*Thank you for allowing me to speak today.*

*Leziate Drove is characterised by bungalows and dormer bungalows on one side interspersed by open space and facing either allotment land or open*

*countryside. The SSSI's of Sugar Fen and Derby Fen lie to either side of the road with Derby Fen behind the line of properties. The outline planning permission for this was granted on land outside the development boundaries when the council was unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply.*

*The recent neighbourhood plan survey expressed the importance of maintaining the rural character of the villages.*

*Please may I refer you to this committee's decision to refuse application 19/00418/F, made on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> July, on the grounds that the development failed to preserve the character of the street scene. My concern is simply that the proposed development of large and obtrusive houses of a mediocre design will have a similar or greater impact to the character of the very same street scene and for this reason I have asked for 19/01035/RM and 19/01038/RM to be brought before the planning committee for your determination.*

Councillor Storey stated that he considered that the proposed dwelling would enhance the form and character of the area. He added that there was no objection from the Parish Council or residents.

Councillor Hudson added that having seen the photographs of the existing dwelling, she did not think that the proposal fitted in with Leziate along a country road.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts reminded the Committee that outline consent had been granted when the Council did not have a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.

Councillor Manning, Ward Member, added that he supported the application.

Councillor Parish stated that he had sympathy with Cllr de Whalley, and that the outline consent had been granted when the Council did not have a 5 year land supply, and that when applications came in the countryside, the Committee should protect it.

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

**(vi) 19/1038/RM**  
**Grimston: Land north of 105 and immediately west of 101**  
**Leziate Drove, Pott Row: Mr John Sandle**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was part of a former grassed paddock north of 105 and west of 101 Leziate Drove, Pott Row. The site was bounded by a recently constructed detached dwelling to the south west, large barns to the north east, an area of open land to the rear and treed open land on the opposite side of Leziate Drove.

Outline planning permission was approved on the site in June 2016 for the construction of two new dwellings, one on this site and one on a

separate parcel of land to the south west. The outline permission was approved with all matters reserved.

This application therefore sought approval of all of the reserved matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

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

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

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

- Key issues;
- Principle of development;
- Form, character and amenity;
- Highways;
- Affordable housing; and
- Other considerations

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

**(vii) 18/01999/F**

**Marshland St James: Plot of land approximately 200m south of Willowdale Farm, east side of The Street, Moyes Bank: Mr & Mrs Askew**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application related to full planning permission for an agriculturally tied dwelling and agricultural building. The proposal was considered to be contrary to paragraph 79 of the NPPF and Policy DM6 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies plan as it represented development within the countryside without adequately fulfilling the functional need to live on-site. In addition, the road which served the application site was not considered adequate to cater for the proposed dwelling.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Design and scale;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Flood risk;

- Highways issues; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Ayres addressed the Committee in support of the application, as follows:

*Mr Askew and his family currently farm approximately 540 acres of land, most of which is cereal or sugar beet. Askew's generate employment in the local area, and are a major contributor to the local community and have been for many years.*

*This application has been submitted to allow the farm to develop a new grain storage and drying facility, near to a three phase power supply and away from residential properties.*

*The dryers are currently operated with calor gas and the fan is driven by a 120hp Diesel engine, which is obviously not the most environmentally friendly set up. The new facility would be driven using electricity from the source close to the proposed development.*

*Residents near to the existing dryers have written in support of this application as the driers are operating from 6 o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock in the evening during the harvest period.*

*Developing a new facility would remove the noise and pollution factor completely, replacing it with a more environmentally friendly electrically powered system.*

*During the times of the year when the dryers are being operated the humidity levels need to be constantly monitored, which requires a manager to be on site at all times. The new facility would also have a grain silo on site which would benefit from the presence of an on-site manager. The ultimate objective is to establish a completely new farm unit run by Mr Askews son, allowing the old, outdated facility to be closed down, and Mr Askew to take a well-deserved retirement.*

*This surely justifies the establishment of an agricultural dwelling to accommodate a manager whose duties would be Security, crop monitoring and the operation and monitoring of the grain dryers. I believe that the tests required by the NPPF are met in this case, as stated by the National Farmers Union who also hold that the conditions are met.*

*The second objection raised by Highways relating to the width of the road could no doubt be overcome by conditioning into the permission, a requirement for the addition of passing places by the applicant on the adjacent land. Visibility is good in both directions as the road is arrow straight and the distance from the proposed development to the School Road Junction is relevantly short. The reason for the choice of this location is that a concrete pad already exists, so could be defined as a brown field site. I must say I find it remarkable that this has been raised as an issue when the road has been used for the transportation of sugar beet by other farmers for many*

*years , I am surprised that this has not been an issue in the past. Planners suggest that the site would be better accessed from School Road as the highway is more suitable, however as the applicant has previously stated the site is near to a three phase power supply, which has obvious environmental benefits.*

*The final matter of the flood risk assessment, is in reality arbitrary, as the Environment agency raised no objection.*

*This application seeks to allow Askew's to grow and develop their business. A business which has grown and flourished in our community for over 40 years, they need the continuity to allow them to expand, as does any business in their position.*

In response to the comments raised, the Principal Planner advised that the policy issues were set out in the report. In relation to the provision of passing bays, it was explained that the Local Highway Authority had looked into this, as detailed on page 83 of the agenda, however there were ditches on either side of the road.

Councillor Joyce stated that the best security was to have someone living on the site. Subject to conditions, he could see no reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Kirk added that he also supported the application as it would secure local employment.

Councillor Sandell stated that due to Climate Change, the Committee should be seen to be going green and considered that this proposal was one way to reduce the carbon footprint.

The Principal Planner pointed out the application also proposed an agricultural building. It had not been demonstrated that there was a requirement for someone to live on the site during the day and night, which had been established by the fact that the business was currently operated at some distance from the existing farm yard.

Councillor Parish stated that this was a new dwelling in the countryside, and no justification had been given for it. This was an unnecessary dwelling in the countryside.

It had been proposed by Councillor Squire and seconded by Councillor Joyce that the application be approved on the grounds that there was a functional need for the dwelling.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve which was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to appropriate conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair for the following reasons:

*The dwelling is considered to serve a functional need and support the needs of the business, and is considered to be in accordance with para 9 of the NPPF and policy DM6 of the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies 2016.*

Councillor Bubb left the meeting at 11.55 am

**(viii) 19/01221/F**

**Walsoken: Land east of The Old Police House, S-Bend,  
Lynn Road: Proposed new dwelling: Mr & Mrs Dix**

The Graduate Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the erection of a two storey 4 bedroom detached dwelling. The site was located to the east of the property known as The Old Police House, on the south side of Lynn Road, Walsoken. The site was located outside the development boundary, so it was deemed as being in the countryside.

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;
- Character and appearance; and
- Other material impacts.

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

The Chair read out an email from Councillor Blunt supporting the application, who could not be present at the meeting, as follows:

*The Parish Council are in total support and I have had no objections from anyone.*

*The reasons for refusal states the site is outside the development boundary. When you look at the current sites document it shows the Walsoken boundary associated with the Wisbech Fringe area.*

*The map does not show the full parish of Walsoken and if it did it would show that this site is adjacent to house on both sides. This clearly is in fill.*

*The second reason refers to an important gap in the street scene, let's get real, it is a hedge along the roadside between two residences nothing more and I think the development of this site would enhance the street scene.*

*To quote a fellow Councillor we need to use a bit of common sense re this application.*

Councillor Kirk added that he also supported the application and pointed out that there was a community farm on the opposite side of the road, and no issues with the access.

The Principal Planner explained that the starting point for determining the application was the development plan. She added that the site was outside the development boundary and was therefore a new dwelling in the countryside. She explained that there had been an appeal decision for this site and for the adjacent site, which had been dismissed. She explained that the Local Plan was being reviewed and the boundary could be changed in the future.

Councillor Storey stated that he supported the application as he considered that the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area.

Councillor Parish disagreed with the comments made by Councillor Blunt as the application site was outside the development boundary, and there was no need put forward for an additional dwelling. He added that the Local Plan policies were carefully considered. He therefore supported the officer recommendation.

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that there needed to be consistency. The Committee could go against the recommendation but there had to be a good planning reason to do so. He could not see any reason to go against policy on this occasion. In addition, the Council had won two appeals, albeit some time ago, on the principle of development in this area.

Councillor Squire stated that this was within her County Division and she had not received any complaints. She could not see any issue with the application other than it was in the countryside.

Councillor Crofts added that he considered that the proposal would add to the street-scene and was infill.

Councillor Kirk pointed out that a few hundred yards along the road was Knowles Transport Yard.

The Committee then voted on the officer's recommendation to refuse the application, which was lost.

The Committee then voted to approve the application on the grounds that it was acceptable infill development which would enhance the street-scene.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, for the following reasons:

*The application was considered to be acceptable as it was infill development which would enhance the street-scene.*

PC33: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received Schedules relating to the above.

Councillor Hudson referred to page 109 – Landing Stage at Marriotts Warehouse, and pointed out that it was the Borough Council's own application.

The Assistant Director advised that the application had not been required to be determined by the Committee as there had been no objections to it.

**RESOLVED:** That, the reports be noted.

**The meeting closed at 12.15 pm**