



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 21 OCTOBER 2014**

Members Present: Councillors Harper (Chair), Serluca (Vice-Chair), Casey, Hiller, North, Stokes, Sylvester, Martin, Harrington and Ash.

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Head of Development and Construction
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highway Control)
Hannah Vincent, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Pippa Turvey, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

2. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor

No Member Declarations of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor were received.

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

4.1 14/00895/HHFUL – 80 Ledbury Road, Netherton, Peterborough, PE3 9PJ

The planning application was for a two storey side extension and first floor rear extension at 80 Ledbury Road, Netherton.

The main considerations were:

- The impact of the proposal on the character of the area
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings
- Objections

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- A previous scheme on the site had been approved in 2013, however the proceeding development was not in line with the approval.
- An error had been identified within the current on site construction as the roof trusses were of the incorrect size. This was in the process of being corrected.
- Issues had been raised in relation to the neighbouring garage and water pooling as a result of the extension. This was not a planning matter, but a private matter between parties.
- The method for drainage prior to previous garage extension was unclear.
- The overhanging nature of the eaves, on the neighbour's property was similarly a

private matter that could not be resolved by the Committee.

- Further objections had been received in the update report from Stewart Jackson MP, Councillor Arculus and a local resident.

Councillor Maqbool and Councillor Fitzgerald, Ward Councillors, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- A lot of time had been spent on this application, with reservations from neighbours and local residents associations.
- Normal protocol for planning permission had not been followed, as such this application was retrospective.
- Individuals living nearby were keen to have the development completed as soon as possible, if permission was granted.
- The proposal was considered to be oversized.
- The applicant had disregarded planning law.
- The construction site was an eyesore.
- The Committee had no power to force the applicant to finish work, even if permission was granted, and this could be a problem.
- It was questioned whether the Committee could approve an application which did not meet building control regulations.
- The Ward Councillors suggested that, once finished, the development would not be a problem but were concerned that work would not be completed or would not be completed in line with approved plans.

George Oommen and Bindu George addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Oommen and Ms George had moved into the property neighbouring the development site in late 2013.
- The previous joint garage had been knocked down to build an extension.
- The original plan indicated a gap between the two properties, however when built the two were joined together.
- While the applicant had offered to fix the drainage problem on the garage roof by installing a pipe this was not considered sufficient.
- Mr Oommen could not believe that the Council could not assist to rectify this problem, as it was the Council who permitted the application.
- Mr Oommen and Ms George were not aware of how the drainage from the garage was previously addressed, having only moved to the property recently.
- The Committee were urged to reject the application and maintain the gap between residences.

Phil Branston, Branston Associates, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The issues surrounding this development had been long running. After negotiation with planning officers an agreement had now been reached.
- The original plan was not adhered to however this was an issue that needed to be resolved. The applicant was keen to finish the development, which was shown by the work completed within the past week.
- Building Regulations had been approved on 8 August.
- The situation with the neighbouring property was unfortunate and would be resolved legally.
- Remedial work was being undertaken to the roof where incorrect trusses had been used.
- Mr Branston assured the Committee that the development would be built as per the submitted plans.

The Head of Development and Construction clarified that the developments adherence to Building Regulations was a separate legal process and could not be a ground for refusal. Issues relating to drainage on the neighbours property were a private law matter and could not be taken into account by members when determining the application, however the neighbour had been advised to seek specialist property advice. The fact the application was retrospective was not a reason for refusal. The Head of Development and Construction was satisfied with the design submitted.

The Committee discussed the application and several members commented that the size and massing of the proposal was significant. It was considered that in relation to the large plot size, the proposal would be acceptable on balance.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried eight voting in favour and two voting against.

RESOLVED: (eight voted in favour, two voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the reports.

Reasons for the decision

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically, the proposal would not unacceptably harm the character of the area or the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings; in accordance with policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) and policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

4.2 14/01033/FUL – 270 Eastfield Road, Eastfield, Peterborough, PE1 4BE

The planning application was for the change of use of an original building from office building to Elderly Care Home plus side and rear extensions to provide, overall, a 62 bedroom Elderly Care Home for the over 65's at 270 Eastfield Road, Eastfield.

The main considerations were:

- Principle of Development
- Recent Site History
- Design
- Amenity for future residents
- Access and Parking
- Impact on Neighbours
- Sustainability
- Drainage
- Impact on Locally Listed Building
- Landscape and Ecology
- Section 106

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The existing modern extensions to the building were proposed to be removed and access to the rear maintained.

- A previous scheme for the site was refused permission, in part, because of its proximity to nearby residential properties. The current scheme before Committee allowed for a greater separation distance from neighbouring properties.
- The design was in keeping with the host property.
- The windows on the upper floors were angled and recessed to avoid overlooking.
- The previous reasons for refusing development on this site had all been addressed within this revised scheme.
- A condition in order to restrict the use of the site to residential accommodation and care for adults in need of full-time care was included in the recommendation.

Councillor Shearman and Councillor Peach, Ward Councillors, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Residents welcomed the improvements made from the previous scheme submitted.
- The fact that it was no longer proposed to house student accommodation and that the original building and trees were to be protected was welcomed.
- The mass of the proposal was still too large.
- Parking was not assured and appeared to be dependent of staff travelling via mini-bus. This was not considered to be good enough.
- There was still a considerable amount of overlook on neighbouring properties.
- It was requested that the extra condition restricting use be altered to 'elderly care home' as per the application.
- Traffic is a concerning issue. The road was very busy and College Park Road was very narrow.
- It was requested that all trees be protected.

John Grimsey, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal was too big for the site.
- Residents were happy that the site would be used for elderly care and that the original building was to be retained.
- Previous reasons for refusal regarding design and mass of the buildings were still relevant.
- The proposal still presented a lack of privacy.
- The parking difficulties that would result from the development would add to those already existing. The footprint of the development should be decreased and parking provision increased.
- It was questioned whether conditions relating to enforcement, lighting and restriction of use were robust enough to implement.

The Senior Engineer (Development) explained that parking provision for elderly care homes varied for each development and that the Council's policy on parking provision provided a maximum standard for parking, not minimum.

The Planning and Highways Lawyer advised that the conditions relating to enforcement and lighting were considered sufficiently robust. Condition 16 may be strengthened by changing the wording to 'adults over 65'.

The Committee discussed the parking provision provided with the application, with several Members expression concern as to whether it would be sufficient. It was highlighted that the majority of care home residents would not themselves be driving, so parking would be used primarily by staff and visitors.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, with an amendment to condition 16 to read 'elderly persons'. The motion was carried nine voting in favour and one voting against.

RESOLVED: (nine voted in favour, one voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the reports and the amendment of condition 16 to read 'elderly persons'.

Reasons for the decision

- The site was in a residential area and was suitable for a residential use.
- The development could be carried out without harm to the existing locally listed building.
- The development would allow for the retention of protected trees.
- Adequate access and parking could be provided.
- The development would not lead to any unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours.

4.3 14/01060/R3FUL – Thorpe Primary School, Atherstone Avenue, Netherton, Peterborough

The planning application was for the partial infill of the existing courtyard at Thorpe Primary School, Artherstone Avenue and the single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey teaching block. Associated alterations to the car park at the front of the site were also applied for, with an extension of the car park to the rear.

The main considerations were:

- Principle of Development
- Highways Impacts and Car Parking
- Design and Layout
- Landscape Impacts
- Ecological Issues
- Construction Management
- Other Matters

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The application had been deferred from a previous meeting of the Committee in order to consider impact on parking and congestion.
- Four options had been outlined to mitigate any highways impact. Options C and D involved the loss of playing field areas and were not workable for the school. These options were unlikely to attract support from Sport England.
- Option A provided a layby on Atherstone Avenue with space for two vehicles. As this option was on street and would have only a small impact, it was considered unsuitable.
- Option B was recommended to the Committee. This provided a drop off area in the front car park with separate entryway and exitway.
- As the expansion of the school would be phased, it was proposed that the need for a drop of provision be monitored at each phase.
- A base line survey of traffic levels would be undertaken before and expansion occurred. After each expansion phase a further survey would take place to establish if any increase in traffic had resulted. Only if there was a significant increase, the drop off scheme would be implemented.

- If the entire expansion was completed without a significant increase in traffic, the drop off scheme would not be actioned.

Councillor Fitzgerald, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Councillor had met with school parties.
- The increase in pupil numbers would be phased over several years.
- The options put forward to Committee show that further thought had been given to the highways impact of the proposals.
- The options put forward represent a compromise.
- If the area at the front of the school was needed it could be used, if the survey highlighted a more significant increase in traffic than expected.
- Councillor Fitzgerald was reluctant to see the loss of a sporting site.

Peter Flowers addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Even if the increase in pupil numbers was phased, the traffic would still get worse.
- Options A and B would provide insufficient mitigation.
- If option D was not possible, option C would be preferable.
- Attention was drawn to a traffic incident which had occurred in the area which had resulted in a child being knocked down and suffering from permanent memory loss.
- Mr Flowers had consulted 40 people, all of which objected to the proposals on the grounds of safety, environment and community.
- Cars parking on roads and drives would break up communities.
- The construction traffic would cause a significant amount of congestion. The road proposed for construction traffic use was far too narrow.
- If the application was approved local residents would have a deep lack of faith in the Council, who had disregarded the safety of children.

The Senior Engineer (Development) clarified that although it was anticipated that an increase in traffic would occur with the proposal, it was not expected that this would result in an increase in accidents. Those travelling by car would spread out over the area and walk in. The suggested drop off area may increase traffic flow problems by attracting people to drive closer to the school. In response to a question from Committee the Senior Engineer (Development) assured Members that work would be undertaken with the school and Ward Councillor to provide a travel plan.

The Committee discussed the consideration that had now been given to the highway implications of the proposal. It was considered that option B would provide sufficient mitigation, although some Members suggested that traffic problems would still result.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in the report along with the inclusion of additional condition 18 allowing for the implementation of Option B should traffic monitoring establish a significant increase in congestion as a result of the expansion.

RESOLVED: (eight voted in favour, two voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the reports along with the inclusion of additional condition 18 allowing for the implementation of Option B should traffic monitoring establish a significant increase in congestion as a result of the expansion.

Reasons for the decision

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The development would help address the shortage of school places within the West Planning Area and the expansion of schools was supported by the National Planning Policy Framework. No objection to the proposal had been received from Sport England subject to the attached conditions. The principle of development was, therefore, considered to be acceptable.
- The development would result in additional traffic on the local highway network. This impact could be partly mitigated by a Parking Management Plan and Travel Plan in accordance with policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy. There would, however, be an impact on the local network. This impact had to be balanced with the need to provide additional school places in the local area, which in this instance was considered to outweigh the potential highway congestion particularly as there were no highway safety concerns. Additional car and cycle parking would be provided in accordance with policy PP13 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The design of the proposed extensions was considered to be acceptable, and there would not be any unacceptable adverse impact upon neighbour amenity. The proposal therefore accorded with policy CS16 of the adopted Core Strategy and policies PP2 and PP3 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The tree removals proposed by this application were considered to be acceptable in light of the condition of the trees and their limited amenity value. Neither would any significant ecological impacts result. Subject to conditions therefore, the proposal was, therefore, considered to comply with policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

4.4 14/01375/FUL – Land to the Rear of Barsby Cooked Meats, Northey Road, Peterborough

The planning application was a retrospective application for the retention of two touring caravans at the land to the rear of Barsby Cooked Meats, Northey Road and the siting of one new static caravan with facilities block and relocation of existing stables.

The main considerations were:

- Principle of development
- Access to services / facilities
- Archaeology
- Landscape character
- Access and highway implication
- Residential amenity
- Contamination
- Ecology
- Drainage and flood risk
- Minerals and waste safeguarding

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- A development similar to that proposed had been approved on the land adjacent

to the application site.

- Access to the site would be hardsurfaced and the remaining site would be laid with stone chippings.
- The stables currently on the site would be relocated to elsewhere on site.
- The Council had no allocation for permanent pitch sites. This absence of existing provision meant that it would be difficult to refuse this application.
- English Heritage had objected to the application because of the impact it would have on the flag fen monument. However, the adjacent site had been approved and a site existed immediately adjacent to the monument which had recently been upheld at appeal as not having an impact on the monument.

Councillor Sanders, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Thorney Parish Council had also objected the proposals.
- Concerns were raised in relation to flooding risks and the loss of possible archaeological findings.
- It was accepted that the site was in a low flood risk area and that no evidence of archaeological remains had been found.

Mr Barry Nicholls, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Parish Council's objection had been without grounds and it was not necessary for this application to be brought to Committee.
- The applicant had accepted all the proposed conditions, including those in relation to landscaping.
- The site present no real risk of flooding.
- The proposal would help the Council fulfil its five year supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- Seven letters of support had been received from local residents.

The Committee discussed the objection raised by the Minerals and Waste Officer. It was advised by the Head of Development and Construction that the proposal threaten reserves to such a small degree that it was not considered a reason to refuse the application.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the reports.

Reasons for the decision

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- the City Council could not demonstrate an available five-year land supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites and the proposals met an identified need for such sites within the locality, in accordance with Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012);
- the application site was located within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, in accordance with Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012) and Policy CS9 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);

- the proposal would not result in unacceptable impact upon the setting of designated heritage assets and adequate provision for the assessment of undesignated heritage assets can be achieved. Further, any harm that may result was considered to be outweighed by the public benefit of providing much needed Gypsy/Traveller accommodation, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the landscape character or visual amenity of the locality, in accordance with Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012), Policies CS9 and CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- adequate parking provision would be made within the curtilage of the site and the proposal would not result in unacceptable risk to the safety of the public highway, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- potential contamination risks could be adequately addressed so as to prevent any undue risk to human health, in accordance with Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- no unacceptable impact would result to nearby ecology or species of principal importance, in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP16 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- adequate provision could be made for surface and foul water drainage so as to prevent any unacceptable flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011); and
- owing to the presence of existing development within the site, there was no potential opportunity to extract any minerals contained therein, in accordance with Policy CS26 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (2011).

4.5 14/01509/FUL – 241 Park Road, Peterborough, PE1 2UT

The planning application was for an additional single storey building at 241 Park Road, Peterborough for childcare provision.

The main considerations were:

- Expansion of an existing education facility
- Parking and highway implications
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Neighbour amenity

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The site currently catered 52 child spaces. The proposals would increase this to 76. No additional staff would be required.
- The development would fill a grass play area between two existing buildings and would be 2.9 tall with a flat roof.
- The site currently provided eight parking spaces, however this was reduced to four when taking into account turning space. Discussions were being had with adjacent property owners to obtain an additional two spaces.
- Site visits had been undertaken by the planning officer where it was observed that cars were parking on the pavement or blocking the car park, which resulted in stacking.
- Refusal was recommended on the grounds of parking, overdevelopment, impact on neighbour amenity and noise and disturbance.
- An additional objection had been received from Stewart Jackson MP as well as two additional letters of support from Early Years staff.

Councillor Shearman, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that great weight needed to be placed upon the expansions of schools.
- There was a shortfall of places in the area, which had been increased by the Government initiative to provide places for more two year olds.
- Education standards needed to be raised in the area and could be done through more spaces in this outstanding nursery.
- There were challenges to meet regarding car parking, however teachers urge parents to be sensible.
- It was hoped that conditions could be suggested to deal with the parking arrangements, such as a staggered start or off-peak hours, and planning permission be granted.
- The nursery was in a residential street, however permission had been granted for nursery use.

Andrew Brown addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Brown lived in the property neighbouring the site and was Chair of Governors and Kings School, as such he had an interest in the safety of young people.
- If this proposal was approved, 50% of the site would be built on. Only a small section of the site would be left for play space for up to 76 children.
- The proposal represented overdevelopment which the street would be unable to accommodate.
- It was believed that the nursery did not currently operate at maximum capacity, so additional spaces were not required.
- The shortage of spaces was prevalent in other areas and would mean that parents would travel from further afield.
- The access was designed for a residential dwelling. As such, reversing out of the site caused significant problems. The traffic was more noticeable as the nursery increased in size.
- Funding on expansion would be better spent elsewhere.
- The proposal would constitute overdevelopment regardless of the traffic issues.

Robert Gooding, GOOD-DESIGN-ING LTD, and Pam Setterfield, Targeted Services and Sufficiency Team, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- 16,000 extra children were now eligible for child care.
- This need had been assessed on a local level and Park Ward had been identified as in need.
- Hours of child care would be delivered outside of peak hours or could be staggered.
- It was expected that up to 70% of parents would be local.
- The proposal would link up the existing buildings and would, in fact, help mitigate the noise levels.
- Access to the play area was staggered.
- The nursery was operating at full capacity.
- There were fire assembly points at the front and back of the site, with access along the side.

The Head of Development and Construction advised that conditions could not be imposed on pre-existing development. As such, any condition relating to the hours of use of the proposal would be unenforceable.

The Committee discussed the traffic problems presented by the proposals, such as exiting the site. The fact was highlighted that the proposal was a commercial operation within a residential area. The Committee recognised the importance of child care however considered the site to be an inappropriate location to expand. One Committee Member suggested that the proposal would not make the situation significantly worse than present.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried nine voting in favour and one voting against.

RESOLVED: (nine voted in favour, one voted against) that planning permission is **REFUSED**.

Reasons for the decision

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given in the report.

4.6 14/01416/HHFUL – 33 The Orchards, Orton Waterville, Peterborough, PE2 5LA

Councillor Serluca retired from the Committee.

The planning application was for a proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension at 33 The Orchards, Orton Waterville.

The main considerations were:

- The design of the extensions and their impact on the visual appearance and character of the area.
- The impact of the proposals upon the amenity of neighbouring / nearby residents.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The first floor extension was only above the garage and no further.
- It was not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the neighbours, nor would it be overbearing.
- The separation distance between the proposed development and the neighbouring property increased further into the site due to the layout of the plots. At its largest the distance between the two properties would be approximately three metres.

The Committee discussed the application and several Members commented that the proposals were too large and would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property. The possibility of ensuring the first floor window was obscure glazed and non-opening was discussed, to mitigate concerns regarding loss of privacy.

It was clarified that permitted development rights allowed extensions of up to four metres at ground floor level. The proposal for the most part projected 4.3 meters from the rear wall however did extent to 6.28 metres at its longest.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, contrary to officer recommendation because of the overbearing impact of the proposal and the loss of privacy. Four voted in favour, four voted against and two abstained from voting. The Chair used his casting vote against the motion, as such the motion fell.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, with the inclusion of a condition that the first floor rear window be obscure glazing and non-opening. The motion was carried six voting in favour, one voting against and two abstentions.

RESOLVED: (six voted in favour, one voted against, two abstained from voting) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the reports and an additional condition that the first floor rear window be obscure glazing and non-opening.

Reasons for the decision

The proposal had been considered against the relevant development plan policies namely policies PP2 and PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD. It was considered that these policies were in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and as such there were no other material considerations to take into account. The views of the neighbours had been taken into account. The original proposal had been amended and it was considered that the revised scheme would not have any significant impact upon any neighbouring or nearby resident. The proposal was also acceptable in terms of design. The application was accordingly recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Chairman
1.30pm – 5:09pm