

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 6TH DECEMBER 2021, AT 6.03 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), S. J. Baxter (substituting for Councillor A. B. L. English), A. J. B. Beaumont, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, M. Glass (substituting for Councillor C. J. Spencer), J. E. King, A. D. Kriss, M. A. Sherrey (during Minute No's 50/21 to 54/21 and 56/21 to 59/21) and P.L. Thomas

Officers: Ms. C. Flanagan (via Microsoft Teams), Mr. D. Birch, Ms. K. Hanchett, Worcestershire County Highways, Mr. G. Nock, Jacobs (via Microsoft Teams), Mrs. S. Hazlewood, Mr. S Edden and Mrs. P. Ross

50/21

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR

The Chairman announced that, following on from a recent change to the membership of the Committee, a new Vice-Chairman needed to be elected for the remainder of the municipal year.

RESOLVED that Councillor A. D. Kriss be elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

51/21

TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A. B. L. English and C. J. Spencer, with Councillor S. Baxter and M. Glass in attendance, respectively as substitute Members.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor P. M. McDonald.

52/21

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor M. A. Sherrey declared in relation to Agenda Item No.5 – 19/00592/FUL and 20/01140/LBC – Blue Bird Confectionery Ltd, Blue Bird Park, Bromsgrove Road, Romsley, Halesowen, Worcestershire, (Minute No. 55/21), in that she would be addressing the Committee for this item as Ward Councillor under the Council's public speaking rules.

Following the conclusion of the public speaking, Councillor M. A. Sherrey left the meeting room.

53/21

MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021 were received.

It was noted that, on page 7, there was a typographical error, as the meeting actually stood adjourned from 19:49pm to 19:52pm.

RESOLVED that, subject to the correction as detailed in the preamble above, the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021, be approved as correct record.

54/21

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING

The Chairman announced that a Committee Update had been circulated to all Planning Committee Members and she asked if all Members had received and read the Committee Update.

In response to Councillor S. P. Douglas, the Chairman confirmed that a Committee Update had been emailed to all Planning Committee Members prior to the commencement of the meeting.

55/21

19/00592/FUL AND 20/01140/LBC - PART DEMOLITION AND SITE CLEARANCE OF THE FORMER BLUE BIRD FACTORY SITE FOR ITS REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 108 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3), CONSISTING OF BOTH NEW DWELLINGS AND CONVERSION OF THE WELFARE AND ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS, ALONG WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING; DRAINAGE; ENGINEERING; HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS WORKS - BLUE BIRD CONFECTIONARY LTD, BLUE BIRD PARK, BROMSGROVE ROAD, ROMSLEY, HALESOWEN, WORCESTERSHIRE - MR. J. RICHARDS

The Chairman announced that officers would be presenting a joint presentation for Planning Applications 19/00592/FUL and 20/01140/LBC, Blue Bird Factory, Blue Bird Park, Bromsgrove Road, Romsley, Halesowen, Worcestershire.

Officers reported that with regards to:-

Planning Application 19/00592/FUL – that a further 5 objections from 3 individuals had been received. The majority of issues raised had related to matters already reported. Those matters not previously listed related to:-

- The notification procedures for the Committee meeting.
- The conduct of the meeting on 1st November.
- Where the s.106 money was being directed to.
- The application of vacant building credit.

- An application for planning permission for a nearby development for 2 houses.

Planning Application – 20/01440/LBC – that a further 2 representations had been received from the same individual. The comments raised no material planning matters rather than issues associated with the listed building consent; as detailed in the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers highlighted that as Members would recall, during the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021, the Committee resolved to defer Planning Application 19/00592/Ful, pending confirmation on the vacant building credit, which removed the requirement for the proposed development to provide affordable housing.

Officers explained that further information had now been received and officers drew Members' attention to the 'Vacant Building Credit (VBC) – What is the vacant building credit?' detailed information on pages 11 and 12 of the main agenda report and Section 8 – Affordable Housing and Vacant building credit, as detailed on pages 35 to 36 of the main agenda report.

Officers continued and informed the Committee that the proposed development comprised of the demolition of the existing modern industrial buildings on the site and the conversion of the retained Welfare and Administration buildings, to provide a total of 108 residential units. 9 units were proposed in the Administration building, 13 units were proposed in the Welfare building with the remainder of the dwellings new build.

In 2019 the Welfare and Administration building and the boundary walls, railings and gates fronting the highway were listed at Grade II and would therefore be retained.

Officers further drew Members' attention to the following presentation slides:-

- Site Frontage - Administration and Welfare Buildings
- Proposed site layout plan
- Proposed house types
- Proposed street scenes
- Conversion of the Administration Building
- Conversion of the Welfare Building

Members were also reminded that during the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021, that some Members had raised some concern with regard to drainage and surface water flooding at the site.

Appendix 1 to the report provided the Drainage Note from Pegasus Group in respect of the proposed drainage and surface water flooding, as detailed on pages 45 to 51 of the main agenda report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs. L. Dowling (via Microsoft Teams) addressed the Committee in objection to Planning Application 19/00592/FUL.

Mr. K. Fenwick, the Applicant's agent addressed the Committee in respect of both planning applications. Mr. P. Smith, on behalf of Hunnington Parish Council, addressed the Committee in objection to both planning applications; and Councillor M. A. Sherrey, Ward Councillor also addressed the Committee with regard to both planning applications.

The Committee then considered Planning Application 19/00592/FUL, which Officers had recommended to approve.

Councillor S. P. Douglas acknowledged that having had some of the queries raised by the Committee, at the last meeting expanded on, had been most helpful, however, she was still hearing the distress of the local residents.

Councillor Douglas suggested a proposal to expand the Condition, as detailed on page 42 – Ecology, with regard to trees and landscaping, in order to reflect the comments received from the Urban Designer and the consultant Conservation and Landscape officer, with regard to tree planting on the public realm and the northern and north-eastern aspects of the site being screened.

In response officers stated that Councillor Douglas's suggestions with regard to additional street trees / hedging could be considered in the Landscape Environmental Plan. The developer was present and could consider the comments made by Councillor Douglas.

Members commented that whilst they recognised that more houses were needed and that the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply, however the development would change the dynamics of the community and it would have been a good opportunity to include some affordable housing on the site.

Officers confirmed that no further comments had been received from North Worcestershire Water Management.

Members thanked officers for the additional information on the Vacant Building Credit (VBC) and further commented that they would have liked to have seen some affordable housing on the site, however, the additional detailed information on VBC showed that this would not happen.

Members further referred to the Drainage Note and the updated information as provided.

It was acknowledged that officers had provided further information, as requested by the Committee at the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021.

Members raised further questions with regard to play provision/open space/parks being located at the community recreation ground at St. Kenelms Road.

Officers stated that St. Kenelms Road was agreed following consultation with the Council's Leisure officers and that the area was the nearest place suitable for offsite play equipment to be provided. Planning officers were not aware of any site within Hunnington and therefore Leisure officers had recommended St, Kenelms Road for the reasons as detailed on pages 23 and 24 of the main agenda report.

Officers informed the Committee that Members could include a Condition to the S106 contribution that discussions take place with the District Council, Hunnington Parish Council and the developer regarding the location of the offsite play provision; however, officers would also recommend that a time limit be included on such discussions taking place and an agreement being reached.

Members also raised a question in respect of the increased street lighting and bio-diversity.

In response officers referred Members to the Condition on page 42 of the main agenda report with regard to a lighting strategy, and the need to consider public safety as well as the wild life. Taking into account the concerns raised by Members, lighting pollution and an enhanced lighting strategy could be looked at.

Further debate followed on planning legislation, VBC and no affordable housing being provided on the proposed site and inclusivity .

Some Members stated that the questions raised and the reason why the planning application was deferred at the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021; had now been fully answered by officers.

Members referred to the comments received from Highways, as detailed on page 22 of the main agenda report.

Ms. K. Hanchett, Worcestershire Highways explained that the Highway Authority had recommended that the application be refused as the proposed site was in an unsustainable location as residents would be reliable on private cars. However, the Highway Authority had not recommended refusal on any highway grounds; and that there would be a contribution in respect of traffic calming.

Further discussions followed and it was mooted that the application be deferred again or refused as some Members were of the opinion that the development would not create a vibrant community and that there was no on-site play provision.

Officers highlighted that at the Planning Committee held on 1st November 2021, Members had the opportunity to discuss the proposed development in some detail; officers had worked with the developer over a two year period.

In response to the Committee, officers clarified that should Members be minded to approve the application, that following on from the earlier debate, Members had agreed that officers would:-

- look at the lighting strategy and enhance the Condition as detailed on page 42 of the main agenda report;
- change Condition (ix) to read - Look at the toddler junior play equipment at either / or Hunnington / St. Kenelms Road recreation ground, following discussions with the District Council, Hunnington Parish Council and the developer, no longer than 3 months, as detailed in the preamble above; and
- landscaping scheme to take into consideration Councillor Douglas's comments regards tree and hedgerow cover, within the proposed site, as detailed in the preamble above.

Councillor J. E. King proposed an alternative Recommendation that, the application be deferred to allow further discussions between the developer, the planning department, the Parish Council, and any other interested parties. She was also concerned about offsite play provision for younger children, children under eight and the lack of a meeting place for residents to meet; and the possibility to consider the inclusion of 5/10 affordable homes on the site.

Officers further reiterated that Members, should the application be approved, had tasked officers to look into play provision, as detailed in the preamble above. With regard to affordable housing provision, officers reminded Councillor King, that the Committee had been provided with detailed information on VBC. This was requested by the Committee at the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2021, when the planning application was deferred pending further information on VBC.

It was noted that there was no seconder for Councillor King's alternative Recommendation to defer the application.

Having been alerted by a member of the public that they could smell smoke, the meeting stood adjourned from 19:09pm to 19:14pm to enable officers to investigate.

Having reconvened it was

RESOLVED that with reference to application **19/00592/FUL** that full Planning Permission be granted, subject to:-

a) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure to determine the application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism in relation to the following matters:-

- (i) £400,000 towards improvements to bus services
- (ii) £15,000 towards community transport services
- (iii) £98, 511 towards school transport
- (iv) £23, 760 towards personal travel planning service (£220/dwelling)
- (v) £ 20, 519.78 towards NHS Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust
- (vi) £161, 280 towards Dudley Clinical Commissioning Group NHS for premises expansion
- (vii) £360, 469 towards primary phase education
- (viii) £470, 188 towards secondary phase education
- (ix) £77,050 towards improvements to toddler junior play equipment at St Kenelms Road recreation ground or £77,050 towards the provision of toddler junior play equipment at a suitable location in Hunnington. Discussions to take place with interested parties (Hunnington Parish Council/Bromsgrove District Council/the applicant) to explore and identify a suitable location in Hunnington over a maximum period of three months from the date of the Agreement. If a suitable location has not been identified and/or is not deliverable within the three months, the contribution will automatically revert to the provision at St Kenelm's recreation ground.
- (x) £5641.92 towards the provision of wheelie bins for the development
- (xi) A S106 Monitoring fee
- (xii) A flood response plan
- (xiii) A Boardwalk Specification
- (xiv) Various site restrictions in relation to drainage matters
- (xv) The management and maintenance of the on-site open space
- (xvi) The management and maintenance of the on-site SuDs facilities

b) that delegated powers be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of conditions.

and

c) that when determining conditions that the comments from Members with regard to a lighting strategy, toddler junior play equipment and landscaping, as detailed in the preamble above, be included.

RESOLVED that with reference to application **20/01440/LBC** that

a) Listed Building Consent be granted;

and

b) that delegated powers be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of conditions.

56/21

20/00458/FUL - SINGLE STOREY, FIRST FLOOR AND TWO STOREY EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING 20-BED RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME TO CREATE A 48-BED RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME; 3 NO. ADDITIONAL COMMUNAL LIVING/DINING ROOMS, A LAUNDRY ROOM, ENCLOSED LANDSCAPED GARDEN, CAR PARKING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS - RETIREMENT HOME, HOPWOOD COURT, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, HOPWOOD, WORCESTERSHIRE B48 7AQ - MRS. M. BIRCHILL

Officers clarified that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration because it was for a Major development.

Officers presented the report and in doing so informed the Committee that the application was for a single storey, first floor and two storey extensions to an existing 20-bed residential care home to create a 48-bed residential care home.

Officers referred to the Site Location presentation slide. The care home was located along a private driveway accessed off the eastern side of the Birmingham Road (A441). Officers drew Members' attention to the Access from Birmingham Road presentation slide, as detailed on page 87 of the main agenda report. There was a belt of trees to the right of the site, tree matters were covered on pages 75 and 76 of the main agenda report.

Officers further referred to the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 80 to 100 of the main agenda report, which included:-

- Front elevation from north west
- Access from Birmingham Road
- Existing and proposed site plan
- Proposed site plan
- Existing ground floor
- Proposed ground floor
- Existing first floor
- Proposed first floor
- Front elevation: existing and proposed
- Rear elevation: existing and proposed
- Existing and proposed: (NE facing) side elevation
- Existing and proposed: (NW facing) side elevation
- Proposed courtyard elevations

Currently the site had 10 car parking spaces, this would increase to 30 car parking spaces.

Officers continued and informed the Committee that there was clearly a need for this type of development in the district and that principle of the development was accepted. Policy BDP10 sets out that the Council would encourage the provision of housing for the elderly where appropriate whilst avoiding an undue concentration in any location. The applicant had commissioned an 'Assessment of Need' report, which concluded that there was a current shortfall of residential care closer to Bromsgrove and Alvechurch.

The site was located within the Green Belt and paragraph 149 (c) states that the 'extension or alteration of a building' was appropriate development provided that the development does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

Officers drew Members' attention to the front elevation from the north west presentation slide and in doing so further referred Members to the planning history of the care home. The existing floor space present within the care home equated to 660m². If permission were to be granted, the total floor space following the development would rise to 2400m², a total increase of 1740m². This would represent a non-proportionate (disproportionate) increase.

The applicant had raised a number of matters, as detailed on pages 72 and 73 of the main agenda report, referring to Very Special Circumstances (VSC). Whilst the matters raised by the applicant were material planning considerations in the determination of the application it was also necessary to examine whether there were genuine VSC, effectively unique to the site and development proposal. The applicant had commissioned a report by Christie & Co to undertake a review into the viability of Hopwood Court, to determine the need to extend the existing care home in order for it to remain economically viable.

This was independently assessed by Andrew Golland Associates, as detailed on pages 74 and 75 of the main agenda report.

Based on the evidence submitted, officers were not satisfied that the survival of the business was dependent of the proposed development. It was not considered that the reasons put forward by the applicant would amount to VSC that would outweigh the substantial harm arising to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs. M. Birchill, the applicant, addressed the Committee.

Members then considered the application, which officers had recommended be refused.

Members stated that whilst they understood the intrusion on the Green Belt, the area was screened by trees and the plans showed extensive replacement tree planting was proposed. Members referred to the comments made by the applicant with regard to the need for the care home to be brought up to date with new ensuite facilities. Whilst Members understood the information provided by Andrew Golland Associates in respect of the viability of the current business; Members emphasised that quality of life for elderly people in care homes was important.

Members were mindful of the information provided by both the applicant and officers with regard to VSC and the viability of the business.

Members agreed that it was a difficult application to consider. There was a need for care homes and specialist dementia care homes in the district.

Officers briefly responded to questions from the Committee with regard to the original footprint of the building.

Members also commented that there was a need for care homes to expand in order to provide better living accommodation, such as ensuite facilities, in order to meet the need of residents.

In response to Members, officers clarified that the applicant had seen the full contents of the report from Andrew Golland Associates.

Some Members commented that they would have liked to have seen more viability information provided.

Councillor A. J. B. Beaumont stated that in order to meet the Council's five year land supply that Green Belt land would be used, and that this proposed development was relatively small in size and was surrounded by trees and hedges and would not be seen from the road. There was not enough provision throughout the country for elderly people.

Officers reiterated that 'not seeing' a development did not amount to VSC.

Some Members further commented that looking after the elderly did amount to VSC and the need to provide suitable accommodation.

In response to questions from Members with regard to viability, officers drew Members' attention to page 76 of the main agenda report. The applicant had not demonstrated that the business would fail without the proposed extension. The proposed extension would still be inappropriate. However, if the applicant provided detailed information on the viability of the business, Members could then determine if this equated to VSC.

Some Members further agreed that more detailed information on the viability of the business was needed.

Whilst agreeing with this, Councillor G. Denaro referred to page 71 of the main agenda and that the Governments Planning Practice Guidance stresses 'that the need to provide housing for older people is critical. In this respect, it has to be concluded that the needs of BDC's ageing population are acute, and evidenced national, regional and local need is currently being unmet and forecasted to remain unmet in the foreseeable future. The principle of the proposed development is acceptable'.

Officers summarised the debate and acknowledged that Councillor Beaumont had proposed an alternative Recommendation that the application be approved. The VSC being that there was a need for this type of accommodation and that this need would outweigh the substantial harm arising to the Green Belt from the inappropriate development.

Members were therefore minded to approve the application and on being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to:-

a) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of conditions:-

- Time constraints, shorter time frame of 18 months delivery
- Plans listed
- External Materials
- Drainage
- Landscaping
- Lighting
- Car parking
- Accessible driveway
- Electric charging points that were able to charge lithium iron and lead acid batteries (used in mobility wheelchairs and scooters)
- Cycle storage provision
- Method statement
- Waste provision

and

b) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure to determine the full planning application following the satisfactory completion of a suitable Unilateral Undertaking to agree:-

- Highways contribution

57/21

21/00196/FUL - REDEVELOPMENT TO FORM 8NO. CLASS E(A) RETAIL UNITS AT GROUND FLOOR AND 9NO. 1 AND 2 BED APARTMENTS AT FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR - 113 HIGH STREET, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE, B61 8AE - MR. J. LAWSON

Officers clarified that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration because it was for a Major development.

Officers presented the report and in doing so informed the Committee that the application was for redevelopment to form 8no. Class E (a) retail units at ground floor and 9no. 1 and 2 bed apartments at first and second floor.

The site was located in the town centre, officers drew Members' attention to the Proposed Ground Floor Plan presentation slide. The application sought the redevelopment of the existing ground floor retail units, reducing them in size, but increasing to three units fronting the High Street. The formation of a pedestrian access from the High Street into a courtyard area behind, with five further Class E(a) retail units proposed on the ground floor. Across the first and second floors 9no. flats were proposed, 6 one bedroom and 3 two bedroom units.

The application had met with support from the Conservation Officer and all statutory consultees.

Members then considered the application, which officers had recommended be approved.

Councillor A. D. Kriss stated that he welcomed the proposal and that it brought life to the front and rear of the property.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted, subject to the Conditions as detailed on pages 105 and 106 of the main agenda report.

58/21

21/01046/FUL - FULL PLANNING FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND ACCESS FROM PERRYFIELDS ROAD - LAND TO THE NORTH OF, PERRYFIELDS ROAD, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE, B61 8TA - MS T. MCSMITH

Officers reported that they had received amended contaminated land comments from Worcestershire Regulatory Services. Mott McDonald (acting as Transport Planning Advisors to the Council) had reviewed the latest documents published on the planning portal site and had three main key points that the developer would need to consider, as follows:-

- Uncontrolled crossing of Perryfields Road
- Footpath / Cycleway connection from Perryfields
- Cumulative Assessments

Members' attention was also drawn to the amended Conditions, Condition 2 and Condition 10, as detailed in the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers presented the report and in doing so drew Members' attention to the Site Location presentation slide, as detailed on page 137 of the main agenda report.

Officers informed the Committee that the application proposed the erection of 60 dwellings on land to the north of Perryfields Road, Bromsgrove and formed part of the BROM2 allocation as a Bromsgrove Town Expansion Site.

Members were further informed that the proposal sought permission for a 100% affordable housing scheme. The proposed house types were detailed on page 143 of the main agenda report.

Members were asked to note that, the application proposed a new vehicular and pedestrian access off Perryfields Road further to the west than the existing farm gate access into the site.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. P. Rawle the Applicant's agent addressed the Committee.

The Committee then considered the Application, which officers had recommended for approval.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee with regard to the uncontrolled crossing of Perryfields Road, child safety when accessing the play area and safety around the balancing ponds.

In response to further questions from the Committee with regard to the comments received from Mott MacDonald, as detailed on pages 1 to 3 of the Committee Update.

Ms. K. Hanchett, Worcestershire Highways stated that they were aware of the comments received from Mott MacDonald and they were content, however she would ask Mr. G. Nock, Jacobs to respond further.

With the agreement of the Chairman, Mr. G. Nock, Jacobs, who had acted on behalf of WCC Highways Authority providing advice on this application addressed the Committee.

Mr. Nock informed Members that he had worked closely with Mott MacDonald and that there had been due diligence with regard to the three main key points raised:-

Uncontrolled crossing of Perryfields Road

Access and pedestrian consideration had been taken very seriously. There would be a number of pedestrian crossings throughout the site and a Road Safety Audit procedure had been undertaken twice in this case.

Footpath / Cycleway connection from Perryfields

This was achievable.

Cumulative Assessments

He would assure Members that the approach was to align with that transport strategy, which would be a very comprehensive strategy, in order to deliver today and to be delivered at a later stage.

In response to further questions from the Committee, Mr. Nock referred to the 'monitor and manage' strategy, as detailed on page 2 of the Committee Update and that s106 monies would contribute to such a strategy.

Members asked for it to be noted that, it would be useful if developers and officers could include in future reports to the Committee details on Climate Change Carbon Neutrality and homes for life initiatives for larger developments.

Members further commented that it was a good application, which would provide much needed housing.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- a) the Conditions and Informatives, as detailed on pages 127 to 134 of the main agenda report; and
- b) amended Conditions 2 and 10, as detailed on page 3 of the Committee Update.

59/21

21/01548/FUL - SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION - 40 PENSURST ROAD, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE, B60 2SN - MRS. R. WILKES

Officers clarified that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration as the applicant was an employee of Bromsgrove District Council.

Officers reported that the Tree Officer had no objections, as noted on page 3 of the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

The proposal involved the removal of an existing conservatory that would be replaced with a single storey extension to the rear of the property to provide a larger kitchen/dining/family area.

The Committee then considered the Application, which officers had recommended for approval.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to the Conditions as detailed on page 148 of the main agenda report.

The meeting closed at 8.25 p.m.

Chairman