

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 9TH APRIL 2026, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), M. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), A. Bailes, S. J. Baxter, J. Clarke, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, R. E. Lambert, S. T. Nock (substituting for Councillor J. D. Stanley), S. R. Peters and J. Robinson

Officers: Mr. D. M. Birch, Mrs. S. Hazlewood, Mr. J. Pavey-Smith, Mrs. J. Chambers, Mrs. R. Paget, Miss E. Cox, Mr. M. Howarth (Of Anthony Collins Solicitors), Mr. B. Simms (Of Worcestershire County Council Highways) and Mr. G. Day

68/25

TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J. D. Stanley with Councillor S. T. Nock in attendance as substitute.

69/25

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J. Robinson declared in relation to agenda item 5 (Minute No72/25) - 17/01468/FUL - Stourbridge Road Car Park, Stourbridge Road, Bromsgrove in that he would be addressing the Committee as Ward Member and would therefore leave the room as the conclusion of the public speaking and will take no part in the debate or decision thereof.

Councillor M. Marshall declared in relation to agenda item 9 (Minute No76/25) - 25/00803/FUL - 7 Churchfields Road, Bromsgrove, B61 8EB in that he will be addressing the Committee as Ward Member and would therefore leave the room at the conclusion of the public speaking and would take no part in the debate or decision thereof.

Councillor A. Bailes declared in relation to agenda items 6 (Minute No73/25) - 19/00140/OUT - Land Between 47 And 53 Redditch Road, Alvechurch, B48 7RS in that he knows the applicant. However, it was only in a general capacity. Therefore, he did not believe it was a prejudicial interest and would retain an open mind and would not be leaving the room for the agenda item.

Councillor A. Bailes declared in relation to agenda items 8 (Minute No75/25) - 25/00749/FUL - Dominion Racing Stables, Seafeld Lane, Portway, B48 7HL in that he knows the applicant. However, it was only

in a general capacity. Therefore, he did not believe it was a prejudicial interest and would retain an open mind and would not be leaving the room for the agenda item.

Councillor A. Bailes declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda items 7 (Minute No74/25) - 25/00612/S73 - Attwell Farm Park, Seafield Lane, Portway, B98 9DB as the applicant previously made a complaint against him which was investigated and found to be unsubstantiated. However, he did not consider it to be a pecuniary interest and would remain impartial with an open mind and therefore would not be leaving the room for the agenda item.

70/25

TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 12TH FEBRUARY 2026

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12th February 2026 were submitted for Members' consideration.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12th February 2026, be approved as a true and accurate record.

71/25

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING (TO BE CIRCULATED PRIOR TO THE START OF THE MEETING)

The Chairman announced that a Committee Update was circulated to Members prior to the meeting commencing, with a paper copy also made available to Members at the meeting.

Members indicated that they had sufficient time to read the contents of the Committee Update and were happy to proceed.

72/25

17/01468/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF FREESTANDING RESTAURANT WITH ASSOCIATED DRIVE THRU, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS. ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS STOURBRIDGE ROAD CAR PARK, STOURBRIDGE ROAD, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE. MCDONALDS RESTAURANTS LTD AND CORDWELL LEISURE DEVELOPMENTS LTD

As detailed in the preamble above, Councillor J. Robinson left the room at the conclusion of the public speaking and took no part in the debate or decision thereof.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 41 to 48 of the Public Reports pack.

The application was for the Stourbridge Road car park, Stourbridge Road, Bromsgrove and sought the Construction of a freestanding restaurant with associated works.

The site's proximity to the Aldi supermarket, Bromsgrove District Council Offices and adjoining roads were highlighted and their locations identified on page 45 of the Public Reports pack. Landscaping around the site included a retaining red brick wall and railing and there was a proposed widening of the access point to accommodate two directions of traffic. The building would be predominantly constructed of red brick with grey brick infill panels and white canopy detailing, a CGI representation of which was shown on pages 67 and 68 of the Public Reports pack.

The main issues for consideration were detailed which included, the principle of development, public health, the design, Highways matters and Trees.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Gerner, on behalf of the Bromsgrove Society, Dr D Raven and Carol Bennett address the Committee in objection to the application. Mr P Isherwood, on Behalf of the applicant, spoke in support. Councillor J. Robinson also address the Committee as Ward Member.

After questions from Members the following was clarified by Officers.

- The site will have parking; however, this would only be for customers. The control of this was an operational issue for the restaurant.
- It would be outside of the remit of the planning Committee to impose litter picking via the Section 106 (S106) planning obligation nor Conditions. This would be an operational issue for the restaurant.
- There was no requirement for West Mercia Police to be consulted on the application. Furthermore, how the security was managed on the site would be an operational issue for the restaurant.

It was noted that Paragraph 97 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that Local Planning Authorities should refuse applications for hot food takeaways and fast-food outlets within walking distance of schools or other places where children and young people congregate, unless the location is within a designated town centre. However, Officers clarified that as the application was within the defined town centre the application complied with paragraph 97 of the NPPF.

It was noted that the application originally proposed a two-storey building with substantial internal seating. This would have generated a large number of vehicles and therefore, Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways) objected to the application due to the cumulative impact of the volume of vehicles on the road network. However, the application before Members was a much smaller building and with the proposed mitigating measures, was deemed acceptable by County Highways.

Mr B. Simms, of County Highways further clarified the following.

- The £10,000 provided as part of the S106 agreement would be used to upgrade the Mover traffic light system to optimise the signal change times to minimise traffic queues. This value also accounted for some money towards future calibration work on the junction.
- All current and known future developments were accounted for during the highways impact assessment modelling.
- Yellow box junctions could be utilised where two roads meet which was deemed to be the case with the development. Section 174 of the highways code forbids stopping in this area, this would be a matter for the police to enforce.
- There was currently a level of traffic which was being rerouted due to works in the area and that County Highways had to consider the baseline function of the road when determining an application, not necessarily the current situation.
- There was some professional disagreement between Jacobs, Mott MacDonald and County Highways as to if the modelling was accurate and if the proposed measures would be sufficient to mitigate the impact of the development. County Highways considered all the views and it was their conclusion that the severity test set out in Para 116 of the NPPF was not met, therefore, they did not raise an objection.

Members expressed strong support for the regeneration of the Town Centre and welcomed businesses to the area, however, there were concerns around if the location was suitable and if the traffic measures would be adequate to mitigate the impact on the highways. Members were also concerned that there were differing professional opinions supplied by the highway's experts.

In addressing Members concerns, officers drew their attention to page 31 Paragraph 6.11 of the Public Reports pack, noting that although Mott MacDonald expressed a difference of opinion, they had stated that "Overall, the development's traffic impact, particularly at the Parkside junction, remains "not proven" rather than demonstrably severe", it was highlighted by Officers that demonstrably severe was the threshold required to raise an objection to the application. Therefore, there was no evidence supplied to directly support an Alternative Recommendation that the cumulative highways impact was severe as to warrant refusal.

There would be a loss of 71 car parking spaces within the Town Centre of Bromsgrove due to the closing of the Stourbridge Road carpark. Parking reports indicated that there was very little capacity in some of the town centre car parks, However, School Drive and North Bromsgrove car parks had sufficient excess capacity to accommodate the 71 spaces lost by the development. It was further noted that Employees of Bromsgrove District Council would be asked to use these carparks and the recreation road carpark near Asda was often at 50% capacity so could also accommodate vehicles. Therefore, following enquiries from Members and in light of the above figures, Officers advised that it would be difficult to justify the imposition of a S106

Contribution from the developer to re-open the Churchfield Road carpark.

Councillor M. Marshall proposed an Alternative Recommendation to refuse the application as to the application was supported by transport modelling which contained limitations and deficiencies such that the degree of impact on the Parkside junction and neighbouring roads, including proposed mitigations, remained uncertain and that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the cumulative impact on the road network would not be severe. The Alternative Recommendation was Seconded by Councillor R. Lambert. However, following Legal advice and after a 10-minute adjournment from 19:31 hours to 19:41 hours to consider the advice, the Alternative Recommendation was withdrawn.

Councillor A. Bailes Proposed an Alternative Recommendation to defer the planning application with the view that Members did not have up-to-date base data, nor did they have enough evidence that the scheme had been tested under all reasonable future scenarios in order for members to make an informed decision. The Alternative Recommendation was Seconded by Councillor R. Lambert and on being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to a future meeting of the planning committee to allow Officers time to supply information as requested by Members detailed in the preamble above.

73/25

19/00140/OUT - OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 25 DWELLING. LAND BETWEEN 47 AND 53 REDDITCH ROAD, (ALVECHURCH FC SITE), ALVECHURCH, B48 7RS. CROSSLANDS DEVELOPMENTS LTD

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 71 to 79 of the Public Reports pack.

The application was for the land between 47 and 53 Redditch Road, Alvechurch, B48 7RS and sought outline planning permission for the construction of 25 dwellings and associated works.

The site of the application was Alvechurch Football Club, located just outside the development envelope of Alvechurch which was to the southeast and the site was situated within the greenbelt.

An indicative layout of the 1.71 Hectare site was shown in page 73 of the Public Reports pack, additionally, Images of the site indicated the current location of the pitch, clubhouse and access point. The access point for the proposed application would remain the same, via Redditch Road to the west of the site. The adjoining road had a speed limit of 40 miles per hour.

Officers highlighted the main issues for consideration which were the housing land supply, the grey belt policy, the sustainability of the development, the highways impact and the financial contributions.

Officers further detailed that as part of the Section 106 (S106) legal agreement, Sports England would receive 1.332M due to the loss of the sports provision. The site also had a requirement to provide a 50% on-site affordable housing contribution. Due to the Council being unable to demonstrate an adequate 5-year housing land supply, these factors were given significant weight and the application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chairman Mr Mark Fogarty, sporting director of Alvechurch football club and Mr Steve Clements, Academy Manager of Alvechurch football club Via Microsoft Teams, addressed the committee in support of the application. Councillor R. Clark of Alvechurch Parish Council also addressed the committee regarding the application.

After questions from Members the following was clarified by Officers.

- That the S106 financial contribution had been updated since 2019 when the application was originally submitted so included up to date figures.
- The 50% affordable housing contribution was required under the NPPF as a minimum requirement to permit development within grey belt areas.
- The additional waste food collection bin was not included as part of the waste collection S106 contribution. This was noted as an error by Officers.
- Page 52 of the Public Reports pack detailed that Severn Trent would require 24hour access for the treatment works which must be located within public open space. However, as the application was an outline application, a detailed site plan had not been submitted. It would form a part of the requirements to be considered as part of the final reserved matters application and how to achieve this would be determined at that stage.

Officers clarified that the school transport contribution of the S106 agreement was to enable children to attend a suitable school setting and was expected to generate a requirement for 4 pupils across all year groups.

Members had concern that the S106 Healthcare contribution would be supplied to the Kingfisher and Nightingale Primary Care Trusts, however, the GP surgeries in the village were not part of the trusts and would therefore, not receive any funding under the S106 agreement. This was discussed in length by Members who requested that Officers ensured that the contributions went to the local surgeries under the Delegated powers should Members approve the application.

The lack of contribution for Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways) was highlighted in that there was no request for a

cycle lane nor bus stops enhancements for the development. Members explored the possibility of requesting an additional contribution for a cycle lane, however, Officers advised that there was no evidence to suggest a lane would be necessary for the development and might not meet the CIL tests which were required. Members further requested that Officers contact County Highways and explore the matters raised which could be determined under delegated powers to the Assistant Director for Planning, Regeneration and Culture Services in conjunction with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

During the debate, a number of clarifications, additions and requests were noted by Members around the S106 contributions:

- (iii) stated “Middle school contributions”, however, was requested to be amended to “First and Middle School contributions”. Additionally, in light of the change, clarification was needed on the Four schools detailed.
- (iv) that Hopwood Community Centre was considered as a potential recipient of the contributions for “off-site teen and adult play and sports facilities”.
- (v) contributions be supplied to local surgeries, so transport could be arranged for residents to sustainably use surgeries out of area.
- (v) Officers explore altering the condition to include local surgeries as the recipient of the contributions.
- (vi) contributions to be updated to include waste food collection bins being provided.
- A contribution be added to facilitate a resident’s welcome pack and a reduction in service vehicle activities.
- It was also requested that concerns raised around cycle lanes, Bus stops and lighting be investigated with the relevant consultees.

Due to the proposed changes to the S106 planning obligation as detailed in the preamble above, Members were content that the decision was delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services. It was further stated that the delegation ensured that suitable changes would be made in conjunction with the Chairman of the Planning Committee.

On being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that outline planning permission be granted and that delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to:

- a) agree the final scope and detailed wording of the Section 106 planning obligation Outlined on pages 63 and 64 of the Public Reports pack, subject to the changes noted in the preamble above.
- b) agree the final scope and detailed wording of the Conditions as outlined on pages 64 to 68 of the public reports pack.

74/25

25/00612/S73 - VARIATION OF PLANNING PERMISSION 19/01544/FUL DATED 21/10/2020: CONDITIONS 2 (OVERSPILL PARKING AREA), 5 (EXTERNAL LIGHTING), 6 (BIODIVERSITY/ECOLOGY/OVERSPILL PARKING AREA), 8 (VARIATION OF OPENING HOURS TO VISITING MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC). ATTWELL FARM PARK, SEAFIELD LANE, PORTWAY, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 9DB. ATTWELL FARMS LTD

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 107 to 113 of the Public Reports pack.

The application was for Attwell Farm Park, Seafield Lane, Portway, Worcestershire, B98 9DB and sought the variation of four conditions that were attached to the existing planning permission on site. The conditions relate to the layout of the overspill parking area (Condition 2), external lighting (Condition 5), biodiversity/ecology/overspill parking (Condition 6) and the opening hours to visiting members of the public (Condition 8).

Officers drew Members attention to the update reports and detailed that comments had been received from the Tree Officer and Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) with further comments from the Resident's Association and Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways). However, Officers clarified that the submissions did not affect the Officers Recommendation.

The existing and proposed overspill parking areas as detailed on pages 109 of the Public Reports pack. The Application sought to amend the approved layout, including surfacing and marking there would also be an increase in the number of spaces, with some parking spaces under the tree canopies and positioned closer to both Seafield Land and Chery Pit Lane. Furthermore, the amendment to Conditions 2 and 6 sought to extend the acoustic fencing and it was noted that the overall number of trees provided remained the same.

There was no objection from the Tree Officer or WRS, conditions were recommended.

The main issues for Members to consider were shown on page 113 of the Public Reports pack.

At the invitation of the Chairman Roy Hoffmeister, on behalf of Health green Farm and Councillor James Urry, of Beoley Parish Council addressed the committee in opposition to the application. Mr A Murphy, Planning Agent spoke in support.

Officers commented that the proposed alteration to Condition 5 was to permit the applicant to submit details under a planning condition, as the current condition did not allow any lighting to be provided in connection with the development. Members noted the light up decorations observed during their site visit and questioned if details of these would be

submitted under a retrospective application. Officers advised that a lighting scheme had been requested but the request had been declined by the agent stating it would be a future management decision for the applicant whether to submit the details. Therefore, Officers clarified that no lighting scheme had been submitted as part of the application, nor was there any indication from the applicant to do so.

Members were given some assurance that WRS would be involved in consulting on any submitted lighting schemes (under a varied Condition 5) or assessing the impact to local residential amenity due to noise (from the variation of Condition 8). Members accepted that with current data, WRS had no objection to the application. There was still some concern that the alteration to those conditions could have a detrimental impact on local residents.

During the debate It was explored by Members if it was possible to require that the applicant consult with their neighbours before submitting any lighting plans. Officers advised that it was not reasonable to require the applicant to consult with residents and therefore it would not meet the "reasonable" test that a Condition needed to comply with. However, Members may consider the inclusion of an informative added which stated that it would like the applicant to discuss with residents. Officers further advised that the wording of the proposed condition on page 104 requires a Lighting Assessment to demonstrate suitability with regard to the impact on, amongst others, residential amenity of neighbouring properties and Heath Green Farm.

Members felt that the site did not necessarily need to open from 9am to 9pm each day and that to do so might affect the amenity of the local residents. Furthermore, permitting one of two days would still allow the business to accommodate SEN visitors and those wishing to visit during an evening. Officers advised that it was within the gift of Members to change the proposed opening times, however, they would need to provide sound planning reasons to do so.

In exploring the possibility of amended the opening hours Condition, it was noted that during the original application, opening hours were Conditioned as 9am to 5pm to safeguard the amenity of local residents. This was due to WRS raising an objection on noise grounds, primarily due to the lack of evidence that it would not affect the residents. However, with the current application a noise assessment has been carried out, and a noise management plan had been submitted, both of which were absent from the original application. These had been assessed by WRS who found it to be robust and therefore, no objection had been raised for the current application. Officers noted that this was a different situation as it was the lack of evidence which led to concerns regarding opening hours.

Councillor R. Lambert proposed an Amendment the substantive recommendation to amend Condition 8 for only one day a week and retain the 9am to 5pm for the other days. The reasons given were to

safeguard the amenity for local residents. The amendment was Seconded by Councillor A. Bailes.

However, on being put to the vote the amendment was not carried.

The Substantive Recommendation as detailed on page 81 of the public reports pack and was considered. On being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that Full planning permission be granted and that delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to agree the final scope and detailed wording of the Conditions as outlined on pages 104 to 105 of the Public Reports pack.

75/25

25/00749/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF AN ACCESS TRACK FROM BILLESLEY LANE TO DOMINION RACING STABLES. DOMINION RACING STABLES, SEAFIELD LANE, PORTWAY, WORCESTERSHIRE, B48 7HL. MR. I. WILLAMS

The application had been called to committee by councillor A. Bales as the ward member to be discussed at the planning committee rather than being delegated to officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 131 to 139 of the Public Reports pack.

The application was for Dominion Racing Stables, Seafield Lane, Portway, Worcestershire, B48 7HL and sought the Construction of an access track joining to Billesley Lane.

The proposed access plans were shown which included the new access and proposed position of the track. The first 12 meters of the access point would be tarmac with the remainder being considered under a Condition if members were minded to approve the application. Additionally, there would be wire fencing along the side of the track which would also follow a planted native hedgerow.

Officers detailed that the development was within the greenbelt and thus was regarded as inappropriate development, therefore, to be approved very special circumstances (VSC) would need to be present as to outweigh the harm which would be caused.

The site featured a gentle incline towards the brow of the hill; therefore it was officers' assessment that this would make the track highly visible and negatively impact on the rural character and openness of the greenbelt. A case for VSC was presented by the applicant and detailed on page 120 of the Public Reports pack. However, it was Officers assessment that VSC did not exist so as to outweigh the harm to the rural character and openness of the greenbelt and therefore, their recommended was for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr I. Williams, the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Members were in support of assisting the local business which had grown significantly since starting. This was also supported by Bromsgrove District Plan4 and the NPPF, however, Members had to balance that against the harm to the greenbelt and decide if they believed VSC existed.

On balance Members agreed that the new track could remove excess traffic from Seafield Lane. However, Conditions would not be able to be imposed as to require vehicles to only use the new access, therefore, it would not be enforceable and the overall reduction in traffic on Seafield Lane could not be determined.

Upon visiting the site, Members agreed with the Officer's assessment and stated that the incline was very pronounced. Therefore, any track would be visible and harmful to the openness of the greenbelt. It was also noted that the site already has a usable access point via Seafield Lane so not permitting the application would not significantly harm the business operation.

Councillor S. Peters proposed an Alternative Recommendation that Planning permission be approved as the VSC detailed on page 120 outweigh the harm to the green belt. The Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor S. Baxter. However, on being put to the vote it was not carried.

Members then considered the substantive Recommendation outlined on page 115 of the Public Reports pack and on being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be refused, for reasons as stated on pages 128 and 129 of the Public Reports pack.

76/25

25/00803/FUL - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS ON SITE AND DEVELOPMENT OF 3 NEW DWELLINGHOUSES. 7 CHURCHFIELDS ROAD, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE, B61 8EB. ELMSVYNE LTD

As detailed in the preamble above, Councillor M. Marshall left the room at the conclusion of the public speaking and took no part in the debate or decision thereof.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 157 to 166 of the Public Reports pack.

The application was for 7 Churchfields Road, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B61 8EB and sought the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 3 new two-bed dwellings.

The application was deferred during a previous Planning Committee meeting on 12th February 2026 due to a number of highway concerns raised by Members. Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways) had submitted further comments which were detailed on pages 140 to 141 of the Public Reports pack. The position of County Highways had not changed following the submission of the additional information and there remained no objection to the development on Highways grounds.

Officers further detailed that there were no objections from Historic England or the Conservation Officer regarding the loss of the bungalow and heritage impacts, nor from any other consultee. Therefore, the Officer Recommendation remained the same which was for approval.

At the invitation of the Chairman Mr S. Martin spoke in objection to the application. Councillor M. Marshall also addressed the Planning Committee as Ward Member.

It was confirmed that each dwelling had two parking spaces all of which were at least 2.4m x 4.8m in size with a total width of 14.4m for all 6 spaces. This met the requirements for the Worcestershire Streetscape Design Guide. It was noted that there was an error in the information supplied in the report, however, the County Highways Officer in attendance confirmed that there was enough space to accommodate the parking space with circulatory space around.

A telegraph pole shown on page 165 of the Public Reports pack was highlighted by Members. Officers detailed that it could be moved as part of the development and that should Members be minded to approve the application Condition 3 could be amended to include the relocation of the existing street furniture.

Members had concern with the last parking space in that it would be very difficult to access this spot, requiring repeated or complex manoeuvres with potentially limited visibility. County Highways clarified that their assessment showed sufficient tracking for the vehicles to access, although they appreciated that it might require several manoeuvres. It was further noted that tight manoeuvring and poor visibility was already present for a number of other properties on the road, which was a consideration from County highways during their assessment, as this might make it difficult to justify refusal on those grounds, however, it was a consideration for Members who might on balance take a different view.

Members expressed great concern regarding pedestrian safety especially when considering school children and the general public and that although they appreciated that some other properties had similar concerns they considered the cumulative impact on public safety to be important. It was noted by Officers that in terms of highways safety the development was compliant but that it was for Members to consider if

the development undermined the overall safety to meet the severity test under Para 116 or 117 of the NPPF.

Councillor E Gray proposed an Alternative Recommendation that planning permission be refused due to the impact on pedestrian safety, contrary to Paragraphs 115b, 116 and 117 of the NPPF. The Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor A. Bailes.

On being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be refused, for reasons as stated in the pre-amble above.

The meeting closed at 10.11 p.m.

Chairman