

# **NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

At a meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held in the **Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth, NE61 2EF** on **Tuesday 4 September 2018** at **4.00 pm**.

### **PRESENT**

Councillor CW Horncastle  
(in the Chair)

### **MEMBERS**

Castle G	Renner-Thompson G
Flux B	Richards ME
Gibson RM	Robinson M
Gobin JJ	Stewart GM
Lang J	Thorne TN
Ledger D	Swithenbank ICF
Pidcock B	Wearmouth R

### **OFFICERS**

Bulman M	Solicitor
Fairs G	Highways Development Manager
Hitching J	Senior Sustainable Drainage Officer
Little L	Democratic Services Officer
Sinnamon E	Senior Planning Manager
Sittambalam R	Senior Planning Officer
Thompson C	Principal Highways Development Management Officer
Thompson M	Planning Officer
Wood J	Senior Planning Officer

### **ALSO PRESENT**

R Moore  
C Seymour  
G Hill  
Press/public: 42

#### **24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Reid.

## 25. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor R Wearmouth declared an interest in application 18/01658/REM as he was the Chair of the Development Company who had submitted the application. He advised that he would withdraw for this item. Councillor D Ledger also declared a personal non prejudicial interest in this application as he was the former Chair of the Development Company.

## 26. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The report requested the Committee to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. Members were reminded of the principles which should govern their consideration of the applications, the procedure for handling representations, the requirement of conditions and the need for justifiable reasons for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications. The procedure at Planning Committees was appended for information.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

## 27. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chair advised that item number 4 application 16/01458/CCM had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

## 28. 17/04143/FUL

### Hybrid Application

**Full planning permission: 81 Dwellings & Temporary Construction Access from Denwick Lane, Outline Permission with All Matters Reserved: 189 Dwellings - Amended 13/06/18, Land North East Of Windy Edge, Alnmouth Road, Alnwick, Northumberland**

R. Sittambalam, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. Updates to the report were provided as follows:-

- Northumberland County Council encountered issues with its Public Access system between the 24th and 30th of August during which the public were unable to access documents or submit representations. Members of the public were advised that representations could be emailed directly to the planning department as an alternative. All comments received prior to committee have been registered against the application.
- Following publication of the committee report, two further objections were received from a neighbour and from the Alnmouth and Allerburn Lea Residents Association (or AARA). The majority of issues raised were in line with those summarised within section 5 of the report. The response from AARA considered the contents of the report and has prompted the following points of clarification;

- At 2.3 Garden Cottage and Oaklands West have vehicular access onto Peters Mill Lane.
- The proposed access was located next to Metasequoia, a residential dwelling with an access onto Alnmouth Road. At 7.147 the report said;

*“It is understood that a proposal has been put to the owners of the property however this is a civil matter and not necessary to make the development acceptable, so has not been pursued further.”*

However a formal proposal has not been put forward and therefore should be modified to read;

*“A proposal has been discussed between the landowner and developer but has not progressed however this is a civil matter and is not necessary to make the development acceptable, so has not been pursued further.”*

- At 7.157 it was stated that there would be an upgraded 3m right of way spanning from Alnmouth Road to Fisher Lane however this would narrow to 2.5m toward the Alnmouth Road junction.
- Finally, in the preparation of the report Officers have had regard to Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and in concluding the transport section of the appraisal do not consider there to be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network to be severe.

The recommendation to the Committee was reported as follows:-

That Members authorise the Head of Service to GRANT permission subject a Legal Agreement pursuant to S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following contributions:

- Provision of 40 no. affordable dwellings to be provided on site;
- Coastal mitigation contribution of £162,000 total;
- Education contribution of £673,200;
- Health contribution of £186,300; and

The conditions as set out in the report.

Lesley Clark addressed the Committee speaking as the Vice Chair of the Alnmouth Road and Allerburn Lea Residents Association on behalf of the 53 residents who were objecting to the application. Her comments included the following information:-

- The proposed application site boundary was in direct contravention of the site boundary identified within the Alnwick and Denwick Neighbourhood Plan (ADNP) and residents were shocked that this had been ignored.

- The applicant had not demonstrated that a safe access to the site could be achieved from Alnmouth Road as required by the pre-application advice provided in 2016 which stated that the applicant would need to demonstrate that a safe junction could be created to the A1068 Alnmouth Road which did not prejudice the safety of road users at that location. Details had not been included or addressed as part of the revised Traffic Assessment with concern expressed that details of an original road safety audit had not been included, had not been made available to be viewed and had not been included as part of detailed evidence within the Traffic Assessment of the application.
- The applicant had not addressed the collision risk at the junction including the dangerous approach, visibility restrictions and the private accesses in close proximity. Risks had not been correctly assessed including the 8 Northumbrian Water Tankers which used the access road daily and the reducing width of the road and footpath for the final 100m to the junction. There were numerous errors in the Transport Assessment which should have been challenged and these were not reflected in the report or the recommendation.
- The proposed use of the access to the site from Denwick Road was confusing.
- The application was in direct contravention of the ADNP and the junction onto Alnmouth Road would not provide a safe access and therefore Members of the Committee were asked to consider that unreliable and incomplete information had provided and that the consultation process had been flawed.

Councillor Martin Swinbank addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of Alnwick Town Council. His comments included the following:-

- Whilst the Town Council supported the principle of development on the site it had a number of concerns/objections.
- The proposal included 25 houses outside the site boundary as detailed in policy H2 of the ADNP and therefore the well supported ADNP had not been respected.
- There were safety issues surrounding the junction with Alnmouth Road with the width of the last 100m of the road being reduced to only include a 2.5m footway with the road regularly used by Northumbrian Water Tankers, cyclists and walkers. This was less than the previous minimum width of 3m and the 2.5m would further be restricted by road signs.
- A large number of residents use this route to access the BMX track, High School etc and the proposals did not satisfy the requirements of Policies TR1 and TR2 of the ADNP.

- The use of the route by bikers, walkers, tankers, delivery and construction vehicles along with cars increased the potential for collisions. The route was below the specification for a housing estate without all the other issues being factored in. It would not be safe for young people or the wider community.

Councillor Robbie Moore, the Local Ward Member addressed the Committee and advised that he was putting forward the views of the local residents he represented. His comments included the following:-

- The application promised to deliver the houses as required by the ADNP, however 25 of the houses were outside the boundaries of the zoned site within the ADNP for residential development.
- The site visit undertaken by the Committee had shown how the proposal would encroach onto the green field space at the left of the site.
- 80% of the people of Alnwick had voted for the ADNP and he questioned whether it was right that the developer ignored the Neighbourhood Plan and brought this application forward with little mitigation.
- There was concern regarding the safety for pedestrians, cyclists and road users of the junction with Alnmouth Road and he questioned the visibility at the junction. He highlighted that a single lorry had problems during the site visit.
- With 270 houses and all vehicles using this route and only a 2.5m shared footway/cycle track this was less than policy stated.

Colin Barnes on behalf of Northumberland Estates addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- Whilst part of the proposal was outside the boundary indicated within the ADNP this allowed better planning and design for the site and therefore a better development with the number of houses provided to be maintained.
- The application better addressed the landscape and landfall of the site with no properties on the most elevated position and allowed a better quality of provision.
- Whilst the boundary had changed it still maintained suitable separation distances.
- Whilst the objectors raised issues regarding traffic, the site had been identified as suitable for development and accepted within the ADNP.
- The development would be undertaken by a the local developer Cussins and would provide employment for the people of Northumberland.

- The access from Alnmouth Road had been considered acceptable in the ADNP and all road safety and traffic assessments had been undertaken independently of the developer, Council and Northumberland Estates. The Highways Authority had meticulously scrutinised all information and nothing had been missed or overlooked and the junction met the required standard.
- They had listened to residents and had considered cyclists and pedestrians and made the route safe with upgraded connections.
- All statutory consultees were happy with the proposals and contributions would be made to affordable housing, education, healthcare and coastal mitigation. This was a strategically important site for the Town and he asked that the Committee support the recommendation to approve.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was provided by Officers:-

- Whilst it was the intention in the ADNP that separation distance between older development and the newer was larger than currently proposed it was the opinion of the Officer that the enhanced green space provision within the site, less development on the higher part of the site and the improved drainage provided for a better layout of development. The proposals allowed a good level of space and whilst there would be less of a buffer, a 25m corridor would still be achieved. It was considered on balance that the departure from the ADNP was not significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. It was considered that the landscape impact of the development would read as part of the town rather than a separate development.
- The Road Safety Audit submitted by professionals, who had an obligation to assess schemes in order to assured of their safety, had addressed concerns with all issues of visibility, geometry and private access all taken into account. The previously submitted scheme had highlighted some issues which was why the scheme had been amended. Details were given on the Road Safety Audit Team and the requirements they have to carry out such assessments.
- The cycleway/footpath had originally, at the Officer's request, been 3m, however due to the consideration of the impact on trees it had been required for the whole carriageway to be amended from 6.5m to 6.1m and moved away from the tree line to protect the roots of the trees. It was clarified that a 5.5m wide road was sufficient to serve 250 properties, with 2 tankers able to pass on a 5.5m wide road. The reduction in the width of the cycleway had been considered by the Council's Cycling Officer who had accepted a width of 2.5m, with cyclists being removed from the road and segregated from vehicular traffic. Signs would be positioned into the verge and not on the cycleway.
- The upgrade of the private accesses onto the upgraded road would be undertaken as part of the S.38 technical approval process overseen by the Development Management Team.

- The track marked on the map leading from Denwick Lane was a temporary construction access road and there would only be one vehicular access to the development.
- There would be some tree removal to allow the access to be delivered, however mitigation was to be provided including a landscape management plan over 10 years. Other trees were to be protected which was the reason for the change to the width of the road.
- The ADNP had been to referendum and it was set out in the allocation that the indicative access was from Alnmouth Road.
- Officers must weigh the benefit of the land being left as a buffer and the wider proposals including distances, changes in land levels with properties being built on the lower levels rather than high levels and more green space within the development.
- In respect of access to the BMX track, offsite highway works have been secured for the improvement of the Fisher Lane Public Right of Way route to provide a 2.5m shared cycleway/footway, including lighting. The route would also extend within the site to link with the BMX track facility, as well as widening of the existing route from Fisher Lane to 2.5m extending to the town centre for pedestrians/cyclists, which was the preferred route.
- The revised layout including more green space in the development was also to assist with drainage on the site and any future proposal for more than the accepted 270 properties would be a further departure from the ADNP.
- There was no evidence to require the developer to keep the temporary construction access to make the development acceptable.
- Traffic surveys had been undertaken at neutral times of the year as they were required to be with counters on the road for at least one week.
- Condition 34 stated that only construction traffic was able to use the temporary access.
- Accident history at the location of the access had been included in all traffic and road safety assessments and there had been none recorded within the last five years.
- Officers could only provide guidance and advice, and in this case it was that on balancing the whole application, the use of the white land outside the boundary identified within the ADNP was not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.
- The number of houses which the ADNP sought to deliver was based on evidence and this site had been identified as a preferred site.
- Suds basins were to be provided with the outflow restricted to greenfield rates. The site was on a slope and a filter drain would be provided at the bottom where houses were to be situated.
- The Officer clarified that the outline element of the application was likely to be reported back to Committee for agreement of the reserved matters.

Councillor Castle proposed acceptance of the recommendation as outlined by the Officer above which was seconded by Councillor Thorne.

Members commented that this was the site identified for the provision of houses within the ADNP and the issue was whether the departure from this was sufficient to warrant refusal. It was considered that the road safety assessments were

comprehensive and in the professional opinion of Officers satisfactory. Explanations provided by both the applicant and Officer had identified that the proposals allowed for a better development which avoided the use of the higher ground, provided more green space within the site and would have a better fit with the Town. It was not considered that the provision of 25 houses outside the boundary of the site as indicated within the ADNP was severe enough to warrant refusal.

A vote was taken as follows:- FOR 12; AGAINST 1, ABSTENTIONS 2.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee authorise the Head of Service to **GRANT** permission subject a Legal Agreement pursuant to S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following contributions:-

- Provision of 40 no. affordable dwellings to be provided on site;
- Coastal mitigation contribution of £162,000 total;
- Education contribution of £673,200;
- Health contribution of £186,300; and

Subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The Chair advised that a five minute comfort break would be held at this point. The meeting resumed at 5.20 pm.

**29. 18/01184/FUL**

**Retail Development; 5 no. retail (Use Class A1) units; 2 no. food & drink/drive-thru units (Use Class A1/A3/A5); Access, Parking, Servicing, Landscaping, Regrading & Associated Works amended 17/08/18, Land South West of Morrisons, Loaning Meadows, Berwick-Upon-Tweed, Northumberland, TD15 1UN**

An addendum report was circulated which would be filed with the signed minutes and uploaded to the Council's website. Sufficient time was allowed for Members to read the additional information.

R. Sittambalam, Senior Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. Updates were provided as follows:-

- Northumberland County Council encountered issues with its Public Access system between the 24th and 30th of August during which the public were unable to access documents or submit representations. Members of the public were advised that representations could be emailed directly to the planning department as an alternative. All comments received prior to committee have been registered against the application.
- Following the submission of additional information the County Archaeologist and County Ecologist had no outstanding issues relating to the application subject to conditions set out in their consultation responses.

- Prior to the Committee meeting and following publication of the Committee Report 14 further objections had been received. There were no new issues raised to those already set out in section 5 of the report. Berwick Town Council had also submitted a further representation, a full copy of this had been provided in the written addendum but in summary the view of the Town Council was that further consultation was required with elected members on the following three points;
  - A condition was sought on the Town Centre mitigation measures to ensure that work that had previously been undertaken was not duplicated.
  - The Town Council requested a contribution toward the maintenance of the bus stops proposed to be improved as part of the development.
  - In the absence of a clear proposal for sustainable transport within Berwick, further consultation was required with the Town Council to ascertain whether the bus facilities to be provided as part of the site were sustainable.
  
- In addition, a petition had been presented by Councillor Seymour with 120 signatures against the development.

The Officer advised in light of the responses from the County Archaeologist and County Ecologist the revised recommendation was as follows:-

*“That Members authorise the Head of Service to GRANT permission subject to the imposition of additional conditions deemed necessary and relating to;*

*Lead Local Flood Authority - Overland Surface Water Drainage;*

*A Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:*

*Place a use restriction on the existing retail unit occupied by Aldi on North Road for non-retail use (A1 use not allowed);*

*£40,000 Contribution toward the Town Centre Improvements;*

*A fifteen year Management Plan for the proposed landscaped area; and*

*The conditions as set out in the report as supplemented by the County Ecologist, County Archaeologist.”*

S Scott, Secretary of the Berwick Chamber of Trade and Commerce (BCTC) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. His comments included the following:-

- BCTC which represented 100 small traders objected to the application as it would have significant impact on Berwick town centre which already had 12 empty units.

- The proposed development did not provide for any new retail offer only allowing two existing retailers in the town to trade on a larger scale with the only new offer of KFC.
- There was concern from the retailers within the town centre that the incentive to come into the town would be reduced resulting in less footfall, increased pressures for small business and the possibility of store closures.
- The town was well served with supermarkets and the proposal could result in job losses within the town centre and could well be the final nail in the coffin for the town centre. He requested that the Committee reject the application.

M Noble also addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The drainage plan for the site was inadequate with a pond to be created at a higher level than existing properties and would therefore create more of a problem.
- The photographs were misleading it would essentially be a dry pond to collect rainwater to drain. There was nowhere for this to drain as it can't drain into the ground due to the soil conditions, the 750mm pipe did not exist and the sewer was at capacity. She questioned the run off rate and where the other water would go.
- The drainage would not be fit for purpose.
- Farmland would be dug up by large machinery which would cause noise, dust, air and light pollution to the surrounding residential areas for a considerable period of time.
- The wildlife of the area will be severely disadvantaged and the winter-feeding grounds of bird would be detrimentally affected, so much so that they might not return.
- There would be an increase in traffic which would back up and cause queuing on the A1 and be a danger for all road users including those accessing the first school. She highlighted that a fatal accident had occurred in the vicinity.
- She advised that the application should be refused as it was wrong for Berwick.

G. Davies, Town Clerk, Berwick upon Tweed Town Council (BTC) addressed the Committee. His comments included the following :-

- Asked that additional time be given to allow Town Councillors the opportunity to consider additional information provided and the final detail in the report before the application was decided
- Advised that whilst the Town Council did not object to the application, Town Councillors had not been given the opportunity to consider the proposed mitigation measures and it should be ensured that these did not duplicate work already undertaken by BTC and partners. He advised that this could be added as a condition.
- There had also been no detail provided regarding changes to the bus stops to bring up to DDA standards which Town Councillors should also have the right to decide.

Councillor C Seymour, the local Ward Member addressed the Committee. Her comments included the following:-

- Asked that the Committee reject the application.
- The scheme was for a large retail park on a green field close to houses, Morrisons supermarket and a Travel Lodge hotel.
- The application had received 84 objections and a 120 signature petition had been submitted.
- Objections included those related to issues with access, drainage and ecology which were important material considerations and should be taken into account.
- There were existing problems with drainage and flooding in the area.
- The application did not provide sufficient detail in relation to highways and the potential for adverse impacts in relation to the increase in traffic.
- The development would have an adverse impact on the town centre with a reduced footfall.

J Francis, the Director of DPP, Agent for the application addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- The development would deliver on a number of issues including £17m investment; £1m into the economy in salaries; business rates; new jobs; and provide a quality retail development.
- It accorded with the development plan and would complement the existing out of town offer. There was a lack of opportunity within the town centre with a number of retailers unable to find suitable premises within the town centre with Aldi requiring a larger store to be provided.
- The Retail Planning Consultant had advised that the impact on the town centre would not be significant and at an acceptable level.
- He was surprised by the responses from both the BCTC and BTC as the applicant had met /liaised with both and offered to work with them. He clarified that the brief had not been finalised.
- He highlighted commercially biased concerns.
- The application was in accordance with the Development Plan and would meet the future needs of Berwick following detailed consultations and he requested the Committee's support to approve the application.

At this point both Councillors Lang and Richards left the meeting (6.00 pm)

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was noted:-

- The Highways Authority and Highways England both required conditions related to traffic impacts. The level of separation between residential and commercial properties was significant and further details were required to be provided regarding operating hours, illumination and surface treatments. On balance the Officer did not consider that there would be an adverse impact on amenity.

- Iceland had a small supermarket in the town centre, but the proposed outlet was for a different model and there was no proposal to close the existing store. Home Bargains also required an out of town presence but were also proposing to stay within the town centre. It was not possible to ensure this with a condition. Aldi would relocate to the new development with a legal agreement placed on their existing premises that it's future use must be non retail.
- The proposal included the provision of 300 car parking spaces. A wider cycle and pedestrian access was to be provided along with a toucan crossing to keep pedestrians and vehicles separate. Highways England were satisfied with the proposals.
- It was confirmed that whilst the SuDS Officer was content with the principle of development, further details and calculations were required before planning permission was to be granted. Historical flooding had occurred and the principle was to provide a large attenuation basin on site and Northumbrian Water had confirmed that the system could accommodate a small distribution rate into their network to the west.
- The £40,000 contribution towards town centre improvements would be used to provide mitigation for the future. If there was an existing evidence base then money would be used to deliver improvements or if not then it would be used to deliver the evidence base.
- There was insufficient evidence provided to satisfy Northumbrian Water and therefore a condition would be included in any permission granted for this additional information to be provided.
- It was clarified that a previous historic application for the site had been allowed at Appeal but had not been developed. The land was not designated and was therefore considered as white land.
- Both Home Bargains and Iceland had been shown to be over-trading at the current sites. The Iceland proposal was for a different offer which could not be accommodated at their current premises. The framework for consideration was to look at the impact of the proposed development and whether the offer could be accommodated on a site within or on the edge of the Town Centre.
- The drainage on the site was currently split in two (east and west), the eastern part went towards Morrisons then to the cemetery which has caused issues with flooding on North Road in the past, the western half went towards Grange Road and had also caused flooding in some gardens. Mitigation would be provided to ensure the risk of flooding was no greater and further alleviation was sought to overcome the problems encountered at present.
- The applicant had undertaken a retail study to identify possible sites to accommodate the whole of the proposed development. There was a 10% vacancy rate within the town centre but no site capable of taking the proposed level of development had been identified other than the use of existing car parks which would only exacerbate the already difficult parking situation within the town centre. It was not possible to disaggregate the application.
- Neither business had stated it was their intention to vacate their town centre premises. The possibility of migration of the existing businesses from the

town centre to the proposed retail park would not be a valid reason for refusal as other retailers could take their place.

Councillor Thorne proposed acceptance of the Officer's revised recommendation for approval as outlined above which was seconded by Councillor Castle.

Members recognised that this was a difficult decision to make with town centres struggling, however it was considered that the offer within Berwick was poor and it was hoped this proposal would make the offer more attractive and would stop leakage both to Edinburgh and Alnwick. Investment and jobs were required in Berwick and it was commented that whilst it had beautiful architecture was described as having been neglected over the years. The retail park had the potential to draw people back to the town and the tourism offer of the town should be developed. The proposal was subject to drainage being agreed and Members considered that there were no planning grounds to refuse the application.

A vote was taken as follows:- FOR 11; AGAINST 2.

**RESOLVED** that the Head of Service be authorised to **GRANT** permission subject to the imposition of additional conditions deemed necessary and relating to;

- Lead Local Flood Authority - Overland Surface Water Drainage;
- A Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:
  - Place a use restriction on the existing retail unit occupied by Aldi on North Road for non-retail use (A1 use not allowed);
  - £40,000 Contribution toward the Town Centre Improvements;
  - A fifteen year Management Plan for the proposed landscaped area; and
- The conditions as set out in the report as supplemented by the County Ecologist, County Archaeologist."

Councillors Wearmouth and Renner-Thompson left the meeting at this point (6.30 pm)

**30. 18/01658/REM**  
**Reserved matters application for approval of details of Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale in respect of Phase B and the Infrastructure and Access Phase of the development as shown on the phasing plan, Car Park, Vulcan Place, Bedlington, Northumberland, NE22 5DN**

J Wood, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. An update was provided as follows:-

- A response had been received from the County Ecologist advising they were satisfied with the revised landscaping scheme and therefore raised no objections.
- It was also proposed to remove condition 14 from the recommendation as, if imposed, Officers would have concerns that this condition could potentially impact upon the viability of the scheme.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was noted:-

- 104 Car parking bays were to be provided in the middle car park. The outline application was for 250 spaces to be provided overall across the two phases. The additional spaces would be required as part of the next phase of the development.
- The required size of car parking spaces was 2.4m x 4.8m with mobility spaces 3.6m wide. There was no requirement to provide spaces at an increased size at the current time.

Councillor Robinson proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report with the removal of condition 14 which was seconded by Councillor Pidcock.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with conditions as outlined in the report and as amended above.

### 31. 18/01772/CCD

**Retrospective: Temporary siting of 2 no. steel storage containers for sports equipment, Ponteland High School, Callerton Lane, Ponteland, Northumberland, NE20 9EY**

M Thompson, Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

Councillor Flux proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Stewart.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

### 32. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chair introduced Flo Churchill, the new Interim Director of Planning to the Committee and welcomed her to the Council.

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE** \_\_\_\_\_