

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 15 December 2021 at 5.30 pm in West Stand, AFC Telford United, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford, TF1 2TU

Present: Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, R Mehta, K Middleton, G L Offland (as substitute for J Loveridge), K S Sahota (as substitute for J Jones), P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair)

In Attendance: R Attwell, J Clarke (Democratic and Scrutiny Officer), A Howells, V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), I Lowe (Principal Planning Officer), I Ross (Legal Adviser), P Stephan (Principal Planning Officer) and M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East)

Apologies: Councillors J Jones and J Loveridge

PC223 Declarations of Interest

In respect of planning applications TWC/2021/0871 and TWC/2021/1043, Councillor I Fletcher advised that he was a member of St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions or voting on these applications.

PC224 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes - 17 November 2021

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 17 November 2021 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

(b) Minutes - 24 November 2021

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 24 November 2021 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC225 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC226 Site Visits

None.

PC227 Planning Applications for Determination

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary

information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2020/1056 and TWC2021/0684.

PC228 TWC/2020/1056 - Land North East of Stirchley Interchange, Nedge Hill, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for outline planning application for the erection of up to 350 new dwellings (Use Class C3) with all matters reserved on land North East of Stirchley Interchange, Nedge Hill, Telford, Shropshire

This application had been brought for determination by the Planning Committee as the Council was the landowner/applicant and it involved a S106 financial contribution.

An update report was tabled at the meeting which set out details with regard to education, play provision and street trees.

Councillor G Sinclair spoke against the application on behalf of the Parish Council who raised the overwhelming negativity that the development brought to the area. They raised concerns regarding overdevelopment, impact on wildlife, the lack of capacity on local services and schools, the impact on the Nedge Farm Riding Centre, congestion and highways and the lack of green measures such as solar panels or car charging points.

Councillor N England, Ward Member, spoke against the application on behalf of local residents and raised concerns regarding highway safety, safety of pedestrians and cyclists, the new island, the climate emergency, traffic generation and gridlock which would cause unnecessary pollution, flooding, loss of important hedgerows, archaeological work which needed to be undertaken prior to development and a secured phase of works.

K Curtis, a member of the public, spoke against the application due to the significant impact it would have on the Nedge Farm House and the Riding Centre, overdevelopment, significant historical value of the farmhouse, the lease for the farm, highway safety from farm and agricultural traffic. She asked Members to consider reducing the dwellings to 300 and leave the lane open in order for the riding centre and farm to continue and be a benefit to the community.

Mr D Stengel (Applicant's Agent) spoke in favour of the application which was outline permission for up to 350 quality houses. It met Local Plan Policy HO1 and was a vibrant and sustainable development with open space and off-street parking and an enhanced pedestrian facility. The masterplan responded to the topography and created woodland footpaths, it had suitable ecological mitigation measures, buffer zones and a woodland habitat with a green spine through the site. The biodiversity net gain was in excess of 10% and integrated a sense of character and promotion of healthy living. The road network would be improved with S106 contribution of £2.2m for the wider development, education, highways and was policy compliant with 25% affordable housing.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the application was based on the Local Plan site assessment and was for up to 350 dwellings but this would be confirmed at the reserved matters stage. Although there was an impact on the wildlife, there was a biodiversity net gain of 10% and was in excess of that required. It was acknowledged that the loss of riding centre was a concern, but the lease was a civil matter and they had been informed that the lease would not be renewed beyond 2023. Green measures included solar, wind sheltering and electric charging. Highway safety was through a four arm roundabout which would future proof the site. With regard to flood risks, it was felt that there would be a betterment on the site. This was only an illustrative masterplan and the veteran, trees, mature hedgerows and mature trees would be protected through appropriately worded informatives and conditions. With regard to archaeology, a written scheme of investigation had been submitted and Shropshire Council were happy subject to conditions.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the size of the development and the lack of facilities such as shops and a doctors surgery and it was felt it did not satisfy the Local Plan, the culverting of the brook and the impact on the Nedge Farm and the loss of the riding school. Other Members suggested the applicant reduce the number of houses in order to save the riding school, a request for electric charging points and to ensure that the 25% affordable housing not be reduced at a later stage. The archaeological survey be undertaken before the work commenced as well as discussions regarding a doctors surgery take place and the lack of local amenities for local people. It was felt that there needed to be an amendment to the condition at 4.13 of the report with financial contributions towards secondary education of £1,998.12 per dwelling. Further concerns regarding the NEAP provision and the off-site enhancement for the residents of the development who would not receive the benefit.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the application had gone through the Local Plan process, was an allocated site with extant approval under the Section 1 New Towns Act 1981. No watercourses should be culverted unless it was essential to the provision of access but that drainage officers were content that in this case it was essential. Further details would be submitted at reserved matters stage of a detailed drainage strategy. The Lease was outside of the planning process and not part of the application. Discussions had taken place on the site visit with regards to the doctors surgery but the CCG had not requested any funding and the allocation did not require such facilities to be provided on-site. The site was considered sustainable and in reach of local facilities. Highway access was considered appropriate at this stage and there were no safety issues and there were S106 contributions towards highways. Affordable Housing was secured at 25%. Electric charging points would be encouraged through any REM applications, but not adopted planning policy at this stage and this would come through in the Local Plan review and are also being fed into Building Regulations. It was confirmed that there would be a LEAP on site but that a NEAP may be on site or in the vicinity of the site, and any S106 covers this fallback position. With regard to a strain on services a consultation had taken place during the Local

Plan adoption, and it was considered acceptable and sustainable. It was suggested that the applicant's agent was in the room and he could take notes of Member concerns.

The Development Management Service Deliver Manager confirmed to Members that the site and its current use was not something in the Council's control and that Homes England had confirm that the lease for the land south of the Riding School would not be renewed beyond 2023. The land had been allocated as part of the housing strategy for some time and had been assessed and tested through public examination so the principle of development had already been accepted. The site was wholly compliant with the Local Plan and NPPF, also providing an array of planning obligations.

On the recommendations in the report and being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that the recommendation not be approved due to the concerns regarding lack of local amenities, sustainability, the impact on the riding school and highway impact.

A discussion took place in light of concerns of Members and it was asked that the application be deferred in order to give officers the opportunity to express the Members concerns to the applicant about the lack of facilities, impact on the riding school and access and for the applicant to come back to the Council with a revised plan.

Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that the application be deferred to give officers the opportunity to express the Members concerns to the applicant about the lack of facilities, impact on the riding school and access and for the applicant to come back to the Council with revised plans.

PC229 TWC/2021/0637 - Former Builders Yard, Barrack Lane, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of 3no. detached dwellings and communal building for shared plant room on the former Builders Yard, Barrack Lane, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire.

This application was before Planning Committee at the request of Councillor A Eade, Ward Member.

Councillor D Shaw, spoke on behalf of the Parish Council who raised concerns regarding the loss of a greenfield area, the outstanding enforcement notice, the strength of feeling of the local community, the need for recognition of the local Neighbourhood Plan during decision making, it went against policy as it was not an infill plot, did not contribute to the village or fit within the local character. Access was over private land with a farm track and there would be adverse impact on the neighbouring properties and the nearby farm. It was

also felt that largescale development works may destabilise neighbouring properties and there was a possibility of claims by landowners which was a key consideration of policy BE1. He urged Members to refuse the application to enable the enforcement notice to return the area to its former use as green space.

Councillor A Eade, Ward Member, gave a short history on the site relating to multiple attempts to build houses on the site being refused and endorsed by planning inspectors, together with the refusal of the land for storage and the ongoing enforcement action. He hoped that Members would not inflict this design on the Borough and he felt that Policy HO10 was being used to circumvent refusals. It was felt that design was subjective and he was of the opinion that this was not an exceptional design. There were 80 objections and he did not believe that this was an exception to Policy BE1 or HO10 on policy grounds as it did not enhance the local built area, natural environment or topography. He felt that if it went to appeal the Council would not lose or incur costs.

Mr S Locke, a member of the public, spoke against the application on behalf of local residents who felt that the land should be restored to its former green status, the land was situated in the countryside and was not well related to other dwellings as there would be 3 houses and the relevant access. It was not an infill plot as it was surrounded by woodland. Policy HO10 paragraph 80 referred to "exceptional" and "truly ground breaking" and he questioned whether it was unique and innovative and that it needed to have an independent impact land assessment. The Design Review Panel raised concerns regarding sustainability, costs, access and the living concept. The criteria had not been met and it did not positively enhance the skyline or village setting. It was not a secure environment and encouraged isolation and did not consider mine workings. He felt that there were inaccurate drawings a lack of acknowledgement of the footpath and would impact the nearby houses and the dairy farm.

Mr J Warrington, a member of the public, spoke in favour of the application. He lives in the parish and liked local features such as the 1844 hunting lodge, cobbled floors and wooden stalls but he felt that Lilleshall lent itself to be at the forefront of the Industrial Revolution and improvements to living standards. But with progress comes change and this conflicted with sentiment and people were attracted to Lilleshall for the Duke of Sutherland style buildings. This application was modern housing with modern materials and was progress for the next generation. The village had undergone much change with the shops now gone as well as two farms and a wine merchant and so too had the shearing shed. The junior school in the hunting lodge had been bulldozed for retirement flats. This did tug at the heart strings but it brought progress and prosperity. Historians will look back again and see that it was at the forefront of solving tomorrow's challenges and I see what is in the heart of this application.

Mr A Chetwynd, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and understood the concerns as he lived in a rural village. His client's intention

was not to upset the community but to contribute to the future of Lilleshall. The development had been through a rigorous procedure through the Design Panel who had deemed the proposal to be of exceptional quality and innovative design. It had met strict guidelines and passed the bar of requisite standing. It fitted into the unique rural landscape which had mixed heritage and it reflected the industrial archaeology and fitted the context with the emphasis on material which was robustly referenced within the report. The overriding policy is HO10 criterion 3 and was a proposed small micro development with three highly sustainable houses, set within re-wilded landscape with a green approach with sustainable homes for the future. There was methodology to tackle climate change due to the climate emergency and the application was in line with the Council's forward thinking green agenda.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this was an unusual site with a long planning history. It was a triangular site on Barrack Lane, an unadopted highway, near to fields, Old Coppice Lodge and adjacent to a Tree Preservation Order and was along the Hutchison Way near to New House Farm. Previous refusals were detailed in the report which set out reasons for refusal.

The Planning Officer pointed out that planning inspector's refusals set a benchmark against which to assess future applications. The application was in the rural area but had 'nil' use as a result of the certificate of lawfulness determination but was not a greenfield site due to previous usage. Since the Inspector decision in 2017 Lilleshall had now been identified as a rural settlement and although this was not an infill plot, it received the same services and transport as Fernlea so was not materially different in terms of sustainability and accessibility. In respect of Policy HO10 criterion 3 sought exceptional quality or innovative design and it was not felt that this opened the floodgates for further development as this was assessed on a case by case basis and this application had the support of the Design Review Panel and the design had been strongly influenced by the local lime kilns and landscape and this gave the development its distinctiveness. This was a small unique development which respected the setting in a bespoke way and would address the inspector's concerns. Noise, odour and pest reports were sufficient to overcome concerns. The Geotechnical Specialist and Environmental Health Specialists were satisfied subject to conditions.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the condition of Barrack Lane and asked if there were any plans to make improvements. Other members raised concerns regarding the design and it not being in keeping with its surroundings, the ongoing enforcement action, watercourse, pests and noise from the nearby farm and if this had been undertaken at different times of the year and the objections. It was also felt that the Neighbourhood Plan needed to be taken into consideration.

The Planning Officer confirmed that Barrack Lane was unadopted and improvements would need to be undertaken by private agreement. The design has been before the Design and Review Panel twice to ensure that it

achieved the policy in the Local Plan and its design took in environmental credentials such as lower carbon and had less energy consumption. There was also mechanical ventilation and solar gain and had a natural cowl shape that pulled up warm air to be reused inside the dwelling. The visual impact of the development was limited and it was enclosed between the trees. With regard to the enforcement notice, there were a number of parts to the notice and with the exception of two parts the rest had been complied and deferring determination of a planning application in such circumstances was common practice. The Panellists had made an error with regard to the watercourse who had been advised twice that there was not a watercourse. It was for Members to decide what weight was given to the material considerations within the application and the Neighbourhood Plan had not been disregarded. There had previously been commercial and residential use on this site and this was a material consideration. The noise monitoring had taken place and the consultant had confirmed that this was acceptable.

Upon being put to the vote it was a tied vote. Upon the Chair's casting vote it was:-

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions contained within the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC230 TWC/2021/0684 - 25 Pinewoods, Church Aston, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9LN

This application was for the erection of 1 no. outbuilding (Part-Retrospective) at 25 Pinewoods, Church Aston, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9LN

This application was before Planning Committee at the request of Councillor A Eade.

An update report was tabled at the meeting which presented details with regard to additional information received and a series of points raised by neighbours.

Councillor A Eade, Ward Member, spoke against this application due to the retrospective material changes that had taken place compared to the original planning application. It was not compliant with policy BE2 with regard to respecting the character and the adverse effect on the amenity of the neighbouring property. He raised concerns regarding light pollution, the grey soffit, the large triple opening doors, overlooking into kitchen and bedroom with obscuring glass ineffective and excess height of the development.

Mr S Wilmott, member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the contravention of Local Plan policy BE1 and BE2 in relation to the centralised bi-fold doors, the detrimental impact of overlooking, the facia and soffit which was overbearing, appearance, air conditioning unit,

the increased height, length and depth of the building which was built on blocks. There was light pollution which impacted the neighbouring property and there was a change from office use to an extended lounge and bar. It overlooked into the kitchen and bedrooms and could be seen from every aspect from the neighbouring garden and there was exaggerated light and noise pollution. It was felt that this was an unauthorised building subject to a contravention notice and should be refused.

Mrs A Fletcher spoke in favour of the application and following full planning permission being granted in 2020 without objection or concern the site was cleared. Due to a promotion it was felt that extras such as bi-fold doors could be achieved and there was a minor alteration to the window design. At this point they were advised that a new planning application was required and the scale and size was further tweaked at this stage. It was felt this was not dissimilar to the scale under permitted development rights and it was asked that Members grant full planning permission.

The Planning Officer confirmed there were no technical objections to the application. It was clad with feather edged board and was one open plan room with the front alteration with fully opening patio doors and on balance did not detract from the property. There was limited view from the street scene and in order to address concerns the application had agreed to mitigation measures such as obscure film to the bi-fold doors and the high level window and the removal of the downlight and fascia lights. It was recommended that members grant permission subject to the conditions contained in the report and the update report.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the retrospective application, the extension dominating the main building, its height and the noise from the air conditioning unit. Further concerns were raised regarding the extension remaining as part of the house and not for separate use and that it not be rented out for sleeping accommodation. Other Members felt that mitigation measure had now been put in place and once it was completed it would be acceptable.

The Planning Officer confirmed that each application was considered on its own merits and material consideration was given to the size, scale, nature and amenity on neighbouring properties. This was covered within Policy BE1 of the Local Plan. A noise assessment had been undertaken but this was not required as part of the planning permission. It was considered that the use would be incidental to the existing house and business use would need a separate permission. Home working was an acceptable but the renting out as a room would be conditioned.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission (with the authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

subject to the conditions contained within the report and the update report.

PC231 TWC/2021/0871 - Holy Trinity Academy, Teece Drive, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9SQ

This was an application for the erection of a standalone three storey teaching block with changing block, 3G Pitch with 6no 15m floodlights, two single storey in-fill extensions to the existing school, fencing to grass pitches outside school boundary, a new 5v5 mini soccer pitch, and associated landscape works at Holy Trinity Academy, Teece Drive, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9SQ.

This application was before the Committee as Telford and Wrekin Council was the applicant.

Councillor V Fletcher had also requested that the application be determined by Planning Committee.

The application was subject to a Memorandum of Understanding for a financial contribution towards potential traffic restriction orders in the vicinity of the school.

Councillor V Fletcher, Ward Member, said that, although school places were needed, she had concerns regarding the loss of green space regularly used by the public. She raised further concerns regarding the green guarantee, the 5x5 sports pitch and its upkeep, the highway impact in regards to excess traffic, the bus route and parking on grass verges despite the double yellow lines, the route being used as a rat run and road safety due to the lack of a school crossing. The impact of noise and light impact on the surrounding homes and on the classrooms during construction and the effect on health and wellbeing was also a concern. She felt it failed to meet policies and there was non-compliance with policy NE3. Councillor Fletcher was of the opinion that other potential solutions had not been considered and the pitches could be well maintained with or without a fence and it was asked that the School and the community worked together to find a solution.

Councillor R Cadman spoke against the application on behalf of St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council. Although they were not against the expansion of the school as there were not enough school places within the Borough, they raised concerns regarding the fencing off of valuable green space, the impact on the traffic on Teece Drive, the loss of access to green space which was important for mental and physical wellbeing and the use of the 3G pitch year round. They raised concerns regarding the impact of local residents and young children with regard to light and noise pollution and the increased traffic and impact on the nearby residential estate.

Mr L Coffey and Mr M Anderson spoke in favour of the application and confirmed that the construction of the new block and the playing pitch improvements were welcomed and that a need had been identified for

additional pupil places. The application would improve facilities including an artificial playing pitch and changing facilities and would give greater flexibility for pupils and local people and improve safety and security for students. The green space would remain accessible as part of the network and a community use agreement would bring a better balance. An updated travel plan was submitted as part of the application which would assist in reducing vehicular trips and 21 parking spaces would be made available for drop offs and pick-ups to help reduce the impact upon the highway network and was fully compliance with policy. The development would increase the access to teaching and reduce the pressure on school places and oversubscription. The School were happy to work with the local community in relation to the community use agreement, maintenance and management of the facilities in order that they were sustained long into the future.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the high number of objections to the enclosure of the existing pitches had been recognised but that this freedom of access when not in use by the school must be balanced against the needs and requirements of a safe school environment for students and teachers and a satisfactory level of outdoor sports facilities. There would be a better maintained sports pitch for local residents together with a community use agreement and was in line with policy NE3. The highways impact would be mitigated by students being encouraged to use sustainable transport modes and the school would be encouraged to use the Modeshift STARS programme supported by the Department of Transport and engaging with the Road Safety Team in order to bring forward sustainable modes of transport and a sustainable school travel plan. Traffic restriction orders/traffic management measures had been considered with a sum requested to mitigate local impact of the extension through traffic restriction orders and other measures. With regards to the impact of the new 3G pitch a noise and light assessment had been undertaken which satisfied concerns. Members were reminded that the 3G pitch replaced an existing grass pitch which could also be used outside of school hours.

The Legal Advisor addressed the Committee regarding the element of this proposal which included the enclosure of areas external playing pitches with fencing. He commented on that point raised that the land to be enclosed had been held by the Council as public open space since 1992 when it was acquired off Telford Development Corporation the assertion that enclosure of this public open space would be contrary to the Open Spaces legislation. He confirmed officers' understanding from information currently available, that, when the Council acquired the land off TDC in 1992 it was used as playing fields and so fitted the definition of open space and that this open space use appeared to have continued. He went on to say that public open space was held by the Council under a statutory trust for the benefit of the public, but that, subject to certain procedural requirements being followed, this did not prevent the Council from leasing or selling it. Further, he said that if it was leased to the Holy Trinity Academy the public open space status would fall away and that the Academy could enclose these areas and make them available under the terms of a Community Use Agreement as explained in the report. He added that the current uses and proposed new community

arrangements for use of these external areas were described in the Planning Officer's report and that, importantly, they were material planning considerations which needed to be weighed in the planning balance and given such weight as Members considered appropriate in the determination of this planning application.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the fencing in of the local playing fields on Teece Drive which had been used by residents of Priorslee for many years and which was a green guarantee site, the traffic impact and the use of the drop off and pick up point, the access to Teece Drive, the restrictions on access from the community use agreement and impact in the winter months, the number of objections received, the academy charging for the use of the once free open space and the detrimental affect on the residents of Priorslee. Other Members felt that the Council had to provide for the future education needs of the children and the application and asked if the removal of a green space had to be approved by Cabinet and if this was a planning consideration. Some Members asked if the fence was necessary and if there was a way of giving more access to the socially used space for public wellbeing. A further concern raised were the size of the dining room extension, road safety and students crossing the roads and anti-social behaviour.

The Legal Advisor confirmed that a Cabinet resolution would be required to lease this green guarantee site but that this Cabinet Process was not a planning consideration.

The Planning Officer confirmed that different options had been considered and that this option was the most appropriate to safeguard children and teachers and the community use agreement had been put in place. The drop off point was part of the travel plan conditions and further details would be requested on how this would be managed and this would be reviewed annually. In regard to the community use agreement conditions were provided by Sport England and the Council would need to work with them in relation to what forms part of the agreement ie school times, public use and booking arrangements. Policy NE3 with regard to recreation facilities took a balanced approach to each of the points raised and the wider benefits and advantages such as safeguarding. The existing sports facility as part of the open space still remained, the difference being that how it would be managed had changed. One Member questioned the size of the dining room extensions and the Officer advised that the use of the dining room and how this was managed was a matter for the school and not a planning consideration. Road safety relating to the existing school would have been picked up in the original application and was not for consideration within this application. Safeguarding was a wider issue although dog fouling and the risk of antisocial behaviour was part of this and this extra level of protection would lead to the children being in a safe and enclosed school environment.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority

RESOLVED – that that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to:

- i) The applicants/landowner entering into a memorandum agreement with the Local Planning Authority in order to secure a sum of £10,000 towards traffic restriction orders (TRO's) or Traffic Management Measures where appropriate.
- ii) a Memorandum Monitoring Fee of £200
- iii) The conditions contained in the report

PC232 **TWC/2021/1043 - Highgrove Meadows, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9RJ**

This application was for the erection of part single and part two storey rear extension at 32 Highgrove Meadows, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9RJ.

This application was before Planning Committee at the request of Councillor V Fletcher.

Councillor V Fletcher raised concerns regarding conditions, overlooking, amenity of the neighbouring property, loss of outdoor space and no eco gain, a construction management plan, access and highway impact.

Mr A Lane, Applicant's Agent, confirmed that this was an application for a small house extension to the ground floor area and complied with policy and a permitted development to the existing bedroom and bathroom on the first floor. This was of good design practice and met the characteristics of the street scene. He accepted any conditions with regard to limiting construction time, but felt that a traffic management plan and construction management plan went way above what was required.

The Planning Officer advised Members this application lay within the urban boundary and had no impact on residential amenity and design and was within the rear property of the garden. Separation distances were considered appropriate and there was no impact on the street scene. Although there would be some level of noise and dust during constructions, this would be limited and temporary. The grant of permission at the previous committee of 30 Highgrove Meadows was a material consideration and the application was compliant with Policy BE1 and BE2.

During the discussion some Members felt that there was a measure of overlooking to the bedroom window where the contour of the land dropped away, the construction management plan was required within the culdesac, the impact on access and egress and a limit to be put on the construction hours.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application was not dissimilar to the application at the previous Committee and the proposed working hours were consistent with the previously approved application.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

RESOLVED – delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions contained within the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

The meeting ended at 9.16 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday, 26 January 2022