

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 30 May 2018 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)
Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Hugo Marfleet
Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Robert Waller

In Attendance:
Martha Rees Legal Advisor
Oliver Fytche-Taylor Planning & Development Manager
Russell Clarkson Development Management Team Leader
Jonathan Cadd Principal Development Management Officer
Martin Evans Senior Development Management Officer
Diane Krochmal Housing Strategy & Supply Manager
Ele Durrant Democratic and Civic Officer

Apologies: Councillor Tom Smith

Also Present: 14 members of the public

5 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all those present and any who may be watching the live webcast. He explained the procedure for the meeting and informed all present of the relevant housekeeping details.

6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation at this point of the meeting.

7 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 2 MAY 2018

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 2 May 2018.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 2 May 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

8 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 14 MAY 2018 (AT THE CONCLUSION OF ANNUAL COUNCIL)

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 May 2018 at the conclusion of Annual Council.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 May 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Cotton commented that the applicant for planning application 137697 (agenda item 6(b)) was an elected Member of council and therefore, for transparency, this should be declared for all Members of the Planning Committee.

10 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

The Development Management Team Leader advised Committee that both the Great Limber and Osgodby Neighbourhood Plans had a majority vote in favour of their Plan at recent referendums held on Thursday 24th May. These neighbourhood plans would come into force as part of the statutory development plan once approved at Full Council.

The status of Neighbourhood Plans in the District may be found via this link:<https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/>

Great Limber NP: <https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/all-neighbourhood-plans-in-west-lindsey/great-limber-neighbourhood-plan/>

Osgodby NP: <https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/all-neighbourhood-plans-in-west-lindsey/osgodby-neighbourhood-plan/>

11 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

RESOLVED that the applications detailed in agenda item 6 be dealt with as follows:-

12 137531 - 40 LODGE LANE, NETTLEHAM

The Chairman introduced the first of the applications to be considered by Committee and stated there were two speakers registered. He explained the process for hearing the application and invited the Development Management Team Leader to present the item to Committee.

The Development Management Team Leader advised Committee that in relation to application 137381 (referenced in the report), this had been determined on 25 May 2018. He explained that the condition that had required a footway across the entire frontage of the allocated site had been removed and that condition 15 now only required that they provided a footpath north to the village. Consequently, they were no longer required to provide a footpath within Lodge Lane that would have connected to the application site at 40 Lodge Lane (application 137531).

He added that the applicant had written to advise that, 'whilst they were intending to market these properties to retirees / older persons from Nettleham Village, they realised that some of the properties would be suitable for wheelchair users. Therefore they would prefer not to have a planning obligation to market the properties solely to those over 55 however, if WLDC and/or the Planning Committee saw that an Over 55's development would be the difference between being exceptional and not, then they would be agreeable to secure by a planning obligation'.

It was also explained to Committee that 40% of the parish were over 60 years of age where the average across West Lindsey was 29.1% and that the Nettleham Local Plan had allowed for provision of older adult accommodation. He detailed other allocated sites in the neighbourhood area which would provide some, albeit not all, of the identified needed homes. This included a dedicated site (site CL4663/D) for older persons. He concluded with the addition to the Officer recommendation that "dedicated provision of higher accessible homes for older persons, for which there is an identified need, would be a benefit of development. However, releasing an unallocated site outside the development footprint (now without a footpath link) would undermine those accessibility credentials and would not result in "exceptional circumstances"."

The Chairman invited the first speaker to address Committee. He introduced himself as Mr Steve Gelder, speaking in favour of the application, as the applicant. He explained to Committee that he had been perplexed by the objections from the Parish Council as they had been consulted, their discussions had been minuted and he had understood they were remaining neutral. He had also thought they had the support of the Planning Officer and had been surprised to see the recommendation on the report. Mr Gelder stated that this was a planning application with integrity, that there was a distance of only 100m to the doctors' surgery and 200m to the local store. He stated this was an easily accessible site and they had received letters of support from neighbouring properties and the local rugby club. He further added that the under construction residential site was now almost completed and therefore the proposed development would now arguably constitute infill. Mr Gelder stated that they would be providing 100% higher accessible bungalows (above policy) as well as 100m of public footpath to connect the development with local amenities and social areas. He asked Committee to consider what be accepted as 'exceptional' and questioned what more they could do in order for the application to be granted.

The Committee were then addressed by the second speaker, Councillor John Evans of

Nettleham Parish Council. He explained he had been involved in the development of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan and that the Parish Council could not support the planned development as it was not an allocated plot in either the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan or the Lincolnshire Local Plan. He stated the site constituted build into the countryside and that it was questionable whether the development could be considered sustainable. Councillor Evans stated that there were three sites already agreed for development and as such, it was not possible to say that the additional seven home within this application were necessary. Councillor Evans concluded by highlighting that the proposed development contradicted the Neighbourhood Plan and so should not be agreed.

There were no further comments from the Development Management Team Leader and so the Chairman invited discussion from Committee Members. There was significant discussion regarding the lack of single storey accommodation in the district, the importance of providing easily accessible homes but also the relevance of Neighbourhood Plans.

Members gave consideration to the location of the site and whether it would be considered 'land adjacent to' or 'infill'. It was commented that by agreeing the application the footprint of the village could be fundamentally changed and Members questioned whether this could, or should, be done against the wishes of the village. Members also enquired of the Development Management Team Leader as to the nature of the letter of support Mr Gelder had mentioned in his address to Committee. It was confirmed that a letter from the rugby club had been included in the planning application, not representations received by the council directly.

It was highlighted that the development would be within walking distance of public transport therefore increased car use would not be an issue and a Member of Committee also noted that there was no provision in existing plans for housing as proposed in application 137531 and as such it should be considered exceptional. There was concern that to consider a development of bungalows exceptional enough as to override the Neighbourhood Plan would be to minimise the relevance of the Plan and set a precedence for any Neighbourhood Plan to be disregarded in the future.

It was highlighted by a Member of Committee that discussion appeared to be focussed on the provision of bungalows for the over 55's however the application as it stood was for the dwellings to be sold on the open market, that is to say, not specifically for the over 55's. This was in relation to the accessibility of the bungalows and so as not to discriminate against younger residents who may also need easy-access properties. It was felt that this would not be considered as exceptional and it was necessary to adhere to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The recommendation in the report to refuse the application was proposed, seconded and voted upon and it was therefore agreed that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The application seeks residential development on a non-allocated site outside of, but immediately adjacent to the developed footprint of Nettleham, a large village. Policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan seeks that most large village growth to be via sites allocated in the development plan, or appropriate infill, intensification or renewal within the existing developed footprint. It is only in exceptional circumstances that additional growth may be considered in such locations. It is considered that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated that may justify additional

growth outside of the developed footprint. Development is therefore contrary to the provisions of the development plan, in particular policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

13 137697 - IVY LODGE, MESSINGHAM ROAD, SCOTTER

The Chairman reiterated, for transparency, that all Committee Members knew the applicant. The Senior Development Management Officer advised Committee that there had been one further objection received. The objector felt the plans for the bungalow were unclear, the proposed dwelling would be overlooking the home and garden of the objector and stated that, with building work underway at another property, there would be a significant loss of open space. The Senior Development Management Officer also advised Committee that Lincolnshire County Councils Historic Environment Officer had noted that medieval and post medieval archaeology was revealed when land to the rear of the White Swan Inn, less than 50m to the east of the application site, was developed. It was therefore likely that similar remains may survive on the application site and it recommended a condition requiring the submission of a scheme of archaeological works. He added that if Committee were to grant planning permission, appropriate conditions would need to be added to the permission to secure this.

The Chairman informed Committee that there was one speaker registered to speak and he reiterated the time limit of five minutes and invited the speaker to take the microphone.

The speaker introduced himself as Mr James Mumby, agent for the applicant. He explained the application was for outline planning only for a three bedroomed bungalow in the grounds of the existing property. He stated that the applicant had been running a bed and breakfast although had now retired from this and wished to downsize into a more accessible home. With respect to the proposal to build in the grounds of the existing property, Mr Mumby highlighted that other sites in the area had done this and it was deemed acceptable in principle. He stated that this would be a single storey dwelling meaning there would be no overlooking windows. It would be accessed by the existing driveway and would not generate any more noise or access issues than the bed and breakfast business had done, he stated there was already sufficient parking on the site. Mr Mumby concluded by asking Committee to support the application.

The Chairman thanked Mr Mumby and enquired of the Senior Development Management Officer whether the application would have come before Committee if the applicant had not been an elected Member of council. The Senior Development Officer confirmed that it would have come to Committee as there were objections received. The Chairman then invited comments from Committee members.

A member of Committee enquired as to the future of the bed and breakfast business and the impact there would be on the area if it were to continue as a bed and breakfast. The Senior Development Management Officer stated that there was no condition as to the cessation of the bed and breakfast however it had been confirmed the business had ceased running.

A member of Committee noted there had been comments from a member of public to the effect that the application was likely to have been agreed already because of the connection with the applicant. It was stated that Committee does not pre-approve any application and

the nature of the application coming before Committee was to be as transparent in decision making as possible.

It was felt by Committee members that building a new dwelling in the grounds of an existing property was not necessarily the best option, for the risk of losing green space, open areas and disruption to surrounding residents. It was acknowledged, however, that there was no reason within planning policy on which to object. The Senior Development Management Officer stated that in relation to the protection of green space, residential gardens were not considered high value areas.

Committee discussed the options for adding conditions to restrict working hours and change the use of gravel for the driveway however it was highlighted that the application was for outline plans only and the details would be provided at a later date. The Senior Development Management Officer confirmed that these conditions could be looked at in subsequent plans.

After further discussion regarding the nature of outline planning applications and the practice of building second dwellings in large gardens, it was moved, seconded and voted upon that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with the conditions as set out in the report.

14 136604 - BRIGG ROAD, CAISTOR

The Chairman explained this was a resubmission application following refusal of a previous proposal for erection of 69 no. dwellings, access to be considered and not reserved for subsequent applications. The current application sought to address the previous reason for refusal, which was based on insufficient proposals for dealing with drainage of surface water and foul water from the development. The Chairman invited the Principal Development Management Officer to provide any additional information or amendments.

The Principal Development Management Officer explained there had been some revised details to the report and additional information. There had been a letter of support received, which stated the site was complex and the applicants had gone in to great detail to resolve the water issues. There had also been one letter of objection which re-iterated concerns about water drainage, increased traffic levels and increased pressure on the infrastructure. The Principal Development Management Officer added that the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust had made comments on the application and stated that the plans and reports indicated that their recommendations had been taken into account but that they strongly supported the need for an ecological management plan to be conditioned. They offered to act as a consultee throughout any future works. The Principal Development Management Officer also noted an amendment on page 63 of the report: 1.16 ha of open space should read 0.93ha.

The Chairman advised Committee there was one speaker registered and he invited Mr Mark Hodson to take the microphone.

Mr Hodson addressed Committee, explaining he was the agent for the application and therefore speaking in support of the plans. He thanked all involved with the application for their assistance and willingness to engage in a positive manner. He re-iterated why the application had been refused previously and explained they had been working closely with Anglian Water to put something in place. He added that Anglian Water were happy with, and

supportive of, the proposed plans. Mr Hodson stated that a viability test had demonstrated whilst the full affordable housing contribution could not be afforded there would be a 15% affordable housing contribution, a full primary school education contribution, as well a CIL contribution to reduce the pressures to the infrastructure that had been a concern of the objectors and that the ecological importance of the site had also been taken into consideration for all aspects of the proposal. Mr Hodson acknowledged that Lincolnshire Police had raised concerns regarding the use of car ports on the development however he assured Committee that similar structures had been used for several years on other developments without any adverse effect on crime rates. Mr Hodson brought the attention of Committee Members to photographs of such car ports which he had provided to Officers in order to demonstrate the appearance and construction. He highlighted that the development would help to provide a mix of houses to the area, that the density of houses was below the recommended density and there was also access to a children's play area, the nature area, the market place and such like. He explained there was also a suggestion to extend the speed reduction area.

Note: The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7.33pm owing to a technical issue with the microphones and projector system.

The meeting recommenced at 7.35pm on the resolution of the technical problems. The Chairman offered his apologies for the pause in proceedings and invited Mr Hodson to continue.

Mr Hodson concluded by extending his thanks once again and to reiterate that the plans in place for dealing with surface and foul water drainage had been developed with Anglian Water, who had also given their support to the proposals.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hodson and noted it had been useful to see examples of the proposed car ports in use on other sites. With no further comments from the Principal Development Management Officer, the Chairman invited discussion from Committee.

A Member of Committee indicated support for the application and the way in which it had been designed. He noted that there was sub-station situated next to the proposed development and enquired whether there was anything that could be done to make it more aesthetically pleasing in line with the new buildings. It was explained that, as neither the council nor the applicant had ownership of the sub-station or the land it sat on, there was nothing that could be enforced in terms of improving the appearance although it may be possible to use an advice note to suggest the developer work with the owner of the sub-station to have it re-clad. Any advice note could not be imposed but would reflect the thoughts of the Committee.

The Vice-Chairman noted that there had been a site visit undertaken in relation to the previously submitted application and that Members had found that very useful. He explained he had several concerns about developing on the site that reflected the concerns voiced in the community. He noted that the site was adjacent to a built up area but that the site had not been developed on over decades. He explained that the site was next to an area known locally as the Waterhills, the boundaries of which had not been defined, and that the long term goal had been to gain enhanced planning protection for the area, including the site of the proposed development. He welcomed the comments from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and the Lincolnshire Chalk Streams Project. There were ongoing concerns regarding the

allocation of housing to Caistor within the Central Lincolnshire Plan to be balanced against the importance of protecting ecological sites such as this. It was acknowledged that the applicant had gone into great detail in order to resolve the issues that had been identified previously although the concerns raised locally remained valid.

The Planning and Development Manager addressed some of these concerns by clarifying that the site was adopted in the local plan and was not protected from development. It had been identified as needed to reach housing levels and the development of the site had been positively encouraged in order to meet the evidenced housing need. The previous technical issues with regards to the water drainage had been resolved within the current application. The Principal Development Management Officer noted that the proposal was an outline application supported by an indicative waste water strategy and that Anglian Water were happy with the strategy. He noted that the actual detailed plans would need to be agreed with Anglian Water at a later date and that such works would need to be completed before occupation which would be controlled through a condition requested by Anglian Water. He also explained that there could be conditions regarding the management of flora and fauna on the site although that would be looked at through a reserved matters application.

Members discussed the allocation of the site within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and that some of the proposed development would be outside of the allocated site. This was confirmed by Officers however the proportion of houses outside the allocation was not contrary to policy LP2 within the Local Plan and that the topography of the site meant that only a small percentage of any housing would be developed on this part of the site. There were further concerns raised regarding the use of car ports however Officers again advised that as an outline planning application, the details relating to the car parking and therefore car ports could be considered at the reserved matters stage. There was further discussion in relation to traffic concerns and the impact on congestion in the area. The Principal Development Management Officer explained to Committee that the site had been looked at by the Highways Authority on three occasions and by a number of Officers. The required sight lines for a 40mph road could be achieved, it was judged that the road had capacity for increased use and that a junction in this location was safe. It was noted that the Highways Authority did not object to the application.

On the conclusion of discussions the recommendation by Officers was moved, seconded and voted upon. It was **AGREED** that the decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, to enable the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 (as amended) pertaining to:-

- The delivery of no less than 15% as affordable housing (70% rented – 30% shared ownership) or equivalent housing contribution if no registered provider can be identified;
- Measures to secure the delivery, and ongoing maintenance and management of public open space, drainage features and ecological areas;
- A capital contribution towards primary education (based on a set formula relating to housing size and numbers).

In addition to the s106 agreement the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), is in force and a contribution will be required in accordance with WLDC's regulation 123 list. The exact detail of the contribution will be determined at the reserved matters stage, when floor space can be accurately calculated.

In the event of the s106 not being completed and signed by all parties within 9 months from the date of this Committee, then the application be reported back to the next available Committee meeting following the expiration of the 9 months.

15 137532 - CHURCH LANE, SAXILBY

Note: The Chairman explained Councillor Cotton had offered his apologies for leaving Committee earlier and indicated he was feeling unwell.

The Chairman introduced planning application 137532 for the proposed replacement of the communal building approved under 134583 with the erection of two single storey bungalows and associated works. The Principal Development Management Officer notified Committee that there was an amendment to the report in that the recommendation stated it was subject to Section 106 arrangements however this should have read Section 1 which is also a legal agreement under the Localism Act 2011. The section 1 agreement would ensure affordable housing on the site. S106 agreements will remain the principle type of agreement for planning applications to secure affordable housing but in certain circumstances an s1 allows an applicant to gain funding for such accommodation as in this case.

The Chairman notified Committee there were two registered speakers and reiterated the order of appearance. He then invited the first speaker to the microphone.

Committee was addressed by Councillor Liz Hillman of Saxilby Parish Council who was speaking in opposition to the application. Councillor Hillman explained the impact the removal of the community hub would have on the proposed development and that it would drastically alter the original plans for the site. Councillor Hillman highlighted the risk of social isolation amongst older residents and informed Committee of the higher than average population of older people within the Saxilby area. She explained the percentage of older residents would only increase with time and it was necessary to provide suitable residential areas for this section of the community. She noted that the original plan would have provided not only suitable housing but also the necessary community support to ensure an integrated and prosperous retirement village which would have helped tackle the social issues faced by older generations. She considered that not all the alternative management methods for the facility had been considered which may have allowed the original hub to be retained. Councillor Hillman strongly recommended that the application be refused.

The second speaker, Andrea Brough, introduced herself to the Committee and explained she was representing Acis Group Ltd in support of the application. She explained that Acis had been brought into the scheme following the withdrawal of the original housing provider allowing the scheme to continue to provide the over 55's accommodation. With the involvement of Acis Group Ltd, the specification for the site had been amended due to their business model and that the homes would be provided not only for older people but with a greater affordable housing emphasis as well as open market properties. Ms Brough explained that the costs involved with running the community building, such as staff, utilities, entertainment licences and maintenance, would need to be absorbed by the residents by way of a service charge. On breaking down the average costs involved, and in consideration that the service charge would not be included in any financial assistance provided to those in identified affordable housing options, it was explained that Acis did not consider it was

sustainable to build and run the community hub building as residents would not be in a position to afford a significantly increased service charge. In addition to that, Ms Brough explained that the original plan for the building included two flats above the community hall however there was no lift in the building meaning occupants of the flats had to have certain levels of mobility. By contrast, the proposal was to replace the community building with two bungalows which meant there was no change to the number of homes provided but an increase in the number of accessible properties. Ms Brough concluded by highlighting that it was important for the development to be accessible to all and that people should not be excluded from living there because of associated costs.

The Chairman thanked both speakers and invited the Principal Development Management Officer to offer any further comments. He acknowledged that it was a difficult application for Members to consider. He explained that the original scheme was indicative of a development with facilities however that provider had parted company with the landowner. He highlighted that Acis Group Ltd had stepped in to provide the accommodation but was not in a position to provide the facilities and that without the involvement of Acis, the scheme could have stalled altogether and the over 55's accommodation lost.

Members of Committee engaged in significant discussion regarding the importance of a community hub in such a development. Some Members felt it was imperative to keep the community building within the plans however others felt there were sufficient community facilities within the village to provide the social element to the development. The Principal Development Management Officer highlighted that any determination had to be based on the planning merits of the case. It was significant that the Planning Inspector's Decision Notice made no specific reference to the community hub and neither did the conditions imposed by him. This was a significant consideration particularly as in contrast his conditions did require the provision of 60 over 55's units. There was no option to enforce the provision of the community building and that the recommendation was based on the planning facts of the case. He acknowledged again that it was not an easy situation.

Councillor G. McNeill stated for the record his thanks to Acis for taking on the development project. He further highlighted the importance of a community hub and felt it was important to try all options to manage the building rather than agree to replace it. There was further discussion regarding the importance of a community building to prevent social isolation amongst older residents and the impact the loss of this building would have.

The Legal Advisor reminded Committee that the reasons for objecting to a planning application were required to be based on planning policy and that, based on their discussions, they had not found a contradiction to any policy that would support the refusal of the application.

The Principal Development Management Officer requested that Di Krochmal, Housing Strategy and Supply Manager, be allowed to address Committee to provide context to the housing provision within the proposed development. She explained that under the previous company, the development would have been for 60 retirement dwellings with the community hub. Under the new tenure of Acis, the development would consist of a greater mix of properties either for sale on the open market, allocated as affordable housing or for shared ownership options. It would no longer be a market led scheme but one with greater tenure mix for the over 55 community which would meet a specific need within Central Lincolnshire. She reiterated the options for running a community building would include a service charge

for all residents which would not be realistic for those in affordable housing. It was acknowledged within the Committee that this was a difficult decision.

Councillor G. McNeill proposed and moved an alternative proposal that the application be refused on the basis that the development was contrary to policies: LP10, meeting accommodation needs, highlighting the final paragraph was particularly relevant; LP12, the infrastructure to support growth, which he felt had not been touched on in the officer's report but he felt was material; finally the Saxilby with Ingleby NP policies 1 and 3, with 3 being the specific policy related to the development site and specifying the need for ancillary and additional construction.

There was further discussion between Members as to alternative options for the community building to be constructed. The Principal Development Management Officer confirmed that the overall number of dwellings (individual residential units) on this phase nor overall development would not change, simply that two flats would instead be two bungalows. The overall level of development would still be up to 230 dwellings.

The Vice Chairman declared an interest as the WLDC representative for Age UK West Lindsey and stated that they did all they could to provide support for older citizens. He noted that several Members had focussed on the need for a social building in order to enable older residents to socialise together and commented that the greater benefit to a community is for inter-generational activity. He highlighted that there had to be sufficient scale for such a facility to be viable, regardless of who was to run it, and noted that several authorities had been caused by financial restraints to withdraw registered wardens from sheltered accommodation complexes. He acknowledged that although difficult, that was the current economic environment. He commented that the proposition by Acis appeared to bring many benefits to the local people and community, although it was not an easy option to go for.

At the conclusion of Committee discussions, the Chairman reiterated the moved proposal from Councillor G. McNeill to refuse the application. On being seconded, Committee voted against this proposal but was not agreed.

Having had the original recommendation moved and seconded, the Committee voted for a second time and it was subsequently **AGREED** that the decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, to enable the completion and signing of an agreement under section 1 of the Localism Act 2011) pertaining to:

- The delivery of two affordable rented bungalows.

In addition to the s1 agreement the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), is in force and a contribution will be required in accordance with WLDC's regulation 123 list. The exact detail of the contribution will be determined at the reserved matters stage, when floor space can be accurately calculated.

In the event of the s106 not being completed and signed by all parties within 6 months from the date of this Committee, then the application be reported back to the next available Committee meeting following the expiration of the 6 months.

16 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

Planning Committee – 30 May 2018

The Chairman highlighted there were two appeal decisions on this occasion. There were no comments or questions from the Committee.

RESOLVED that the determination of appeals be noted.

The meeting concluded at 9.05 pm.

Chairman