

Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Committee Minutes

Meeting date: 18 April 2024

Meeting time: 6.00 pm - 9.00 pm

In attendance:

Councillors:

Paul Baker (Chair), Garth Barnes (Vice-Chair), Glenn Andrews, Adrian Bamford, Bernard Fisher, Paul McCloskey, Emma Nelson, Tony Oliver, Diggory Seacome, Simon Wheeler and Barbara Clark

Also in attendance:

Michael Ronan, Ben Warren (Planning Officer), Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance), Lucy White (Principal Planning Officer) and Sam Reader (Assistant Trees Officer, Place & Growth)

1 Apologies

There were none.

However, under this item the Chair thanked the retiring Members for all their work on the committee and in the community.

The Vice-Chair thanked the Chair and wished him well as being Mayor and thanked the democracy officer for supporting the committee.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Oliver declared that although he was the ward councillor he has specifically not been involved the planning application for the Belmont School.

3 Declarations of independent site visits

There were none.

Some Members visited sites as part of Planning View.

Councillor Clark clarified that they did not visit the tree as part of Planning View.

4 Minutes of the last meeting

There were amendments to the minutes which were agreed and signed.

The legal officer read out the following statement in relation to the minutes. Members will note that in the minutes in respect of 456 High Street towards the end of that minute that the vote on officers recommendation to permit was not carried. There were discussions in respect of reasons for refusal, these were acknowledged and there was no noted dissent. However, there was no final resolution in respect of that item recorded. Legal advice since that meeting has been that it cannot be said that the final resolution on the application by the council clearly providing its decision and reasons occurred at the planning committee in March, this needs to be reflected in the minutes which are to provide an accurate summary record of the meeting. Further there will be a need to return the application to the planning committee, the application due to timing and fairness to all is not on the agenda this evening but will be on the agenda for full reconsideration at the planning committee in May.

5 Public Questions

Two Member questions had been received, as follows:

1. Question from Councillor David Willingham to Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance) and Chair of Planning – Councillor Paul Baker

It is evident from Planning Committee reports the Council recognises the necessity of compliance with its s149 Equality Act 2010 Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as part of the planning process. Could the Chairman please confirm whether officers and committee members are aware of the principles established in Brown [2008] EWHC 3158 (Admin) <https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2008/3158.html> and Bracking [2013] EWCA Civ 1345 <https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2013/1345.html> which suggest to comply with the PSED, << *There is a need for a "conscious approach" and the duty must be exercised "in substance, with rigour and with an open mind"*>> , does the Chairman share my concerns using the same boilerplate text in multiple different planning reports may be non-compliant these principles, and can he assure me advice will be sought and followed to ameliorate the situation?

Response from Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance) and Chair of Planning – Councillor Paul Baker

Planning Officers have due regard to the Equality Act 2020, and its stipulations, when assessing the implications of all development proposals. Members are also reminded of this duty, and their obligations under the Act, within committee reports. It is important that committee reports are proportionate in their detail to each issue that is addressed and as such reference (in committee reports) to the public sector equality duty is necessarily light in many cases. Going forward, the planning team can look at whether this is something that needs to be refined.

Supplementary question

In the current agenda, three of the applications contain the same error relating to the public sector equality duty, calling the legislation Equalities Act 2010 rather than the Equality Act 2010. In the minutes of the last meeting, which are the official record of the meeting, the only reference to equalities in one of the applications says “with the gradient at 1:12 it is accepted that people will have to be pushed in a wheelchair”, but provides no reasons why this is acceptable. I am genuinely concerned that this council could be successfully judicially reviewed because the PSED is boilerplate in the report. In light of this being the final session before the election, can I get an assurance that officers will discuss this issue with One Legal and the Monitoring Officer to ensure performing the PSED is incorporated into new member training on planning?

Chair response

Would like to give reassurance and requested a copy of the question in writing to fully consider all aspects of it.

2. Question from Councillor David Willingham to Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance) and Chair of Planning – Councillor Paul Baker

At paragraph 9.2.1 of Part 5D Planning Protocol of Cheltenham Borough Council's Constitution, it is clear planning applications submitted by the Council itself must be determined at Planning Committee. Could the Chairman please advise how this should work when Cheltenham Borough Council is a potential financial beneficiary outside of the planning process, such as being a land-owner willing to conditionally dispose of assets to the applicant, but is not the applicant; and in the interests of openness, transparency, and compliance with the Nolan Principles would he consider how such situations should be best dealt with in future by the Planning Team and Planning Committee?

Response from Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance) and Chair of Planning – Councillor Paul Baker

Land and property ownership is not a material planning consideration; members of the planning committee are provided with training that, amongst other things, makes this very clear. Members of the committee are therefore unable to take into account council ownership, and any associated financial benefit, when they consider and vote on any application. Such situations are very common and it is not considered that there is any need to change current practices. We will however look to reference council ownership in committee reports in future, for information purposes only.

Supplementary question

This isn't a question about planning, but about probity. Is it not the case that situations where the council stands to benefit financially outside of planning legislation, not section 106 and not Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but where we are a landowner where we would gain from the approval of a planning application

is it not in the public interest of open public decision making, that those applications should come to committee and that interest be declared. Would the chair consider joining me in asking the Monitoring Officer to look at reviewing the constitution to cover those kinds of cases so that they come to committee and the council is open and transparent that it is a potential financial beneficiary?

Chair response

Happy to do that and in the answer did state that we would look to reference council ownership in individual reports in the future for that transparency point. Happy to do that and take that on board.

6a 24/00812/TREEPO Tree, Spring Acre, Spring Lane, Cheltenham, GL52 3BW

The tree officer introduced the report as published.

The following responses were provided to member questions:

- The tree has been historically maintained in order to prune the branches away from the neighbours property. By law if a tree grows over the boundary into a neighbouring property they have the right to prune back to boundary edge as long as reasonable care is taken of the tree.
- The application to prune the tree has not been actioned currently as working at two month lead in period.
- The objector to the TPO mentioned amenity of the tree as they considered the tree to be unattractive which is subjective. By the criteria used to judge amenity it fulfils it as it has good form, in good condition, has good life expectancy and is visible.
- The objection was also to with nuisance elements and the burden of tree works applications.
- Amenity is not further defined in town and country act and is open to interpretation but we need to set some criteria.

There was no Member debate.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to grant TPO:

For: Unanimous

6b 24/00389/FUL Land and Springfield Close, The Reddings, Cheltenham GL51

The Planning officer introduced the report as published.

There were 3 speakers on the item: an objector, the applicant and the Ward Councillor.

The objector addressed the committee and made the following points:

- The representative for the residents of Springfield Close who object to this application to build on our green open space.
- Not afforded the same considerations as new developments where a green space is a feature.
- The green space is an integral part of the Close and before any planning application was made the residents had applied for village green status.
- If the building is allowed the valuable amenity will be lost that we have benefited from for over 60 years. It has been used to hold parties, sports days, picnics and celebrations such as Queens Jubilee.
- It is only safe green space in the Reddings and is a haven for local families and residents it is of public interest to the whole community. It is a peaceful retreat that shouldn't be taken from the residents and used as profit.
- If permission is granted would want the removal of permitted development rights, as there would be nothing to stop the owner from applying to extend the property or add an external garage.
- If planning is granted the lack of street parking will be further strained, as it is emergency vehicles have struggled to get through the Close as well as refuse lorries.
- The green has alleyways on both sides, which are frequently used. The building will create a blind spot to oncoming traffic and would be a safety hazard. In January the Highways commission rejected the proposal, why is has it now been accepted when only minimal changes have been made.
- This application plan does not fit in with the layout of the Close as they are semi-detached and terraced houses.

The agent on behalf of the applicant then addressed the committee and made the following points:

- Have been working with the planning officer and the scheme has been through many changes to meet the councils requirements including change in position, reduction in scale and amendments to the design.
- The proposed building is set behind building lines of the terraced houses, the height, width and depth of the house is similar to the neighbouring properties. The design of the windows and doors are also similar to neighbouring properties.
- The footprint of the house will take 15% of the green. It is noted that there has been concerns about loss open green space. Most of the green space will remain undeveloped to protect the character and views of the local area. The existing site pass will be retained.
- There is already a detached house in the area which had planning permission approved in 2008.
- The proposal has been reduced in number and scale and would be set away from adjoining properties. The proposed windows on the first floor will be obscured glazed, therefore there will be limited impact to neighbours amenity.
- There will be two parking spaces and dropped kerb at the proposed building, which was accepted by the highways officer.
- Would enter a section 106 to make a financial contribution to protect Beechwood a special area of conservation.
- The scheme would contribute an additional dwelling to Cheltenham's housing needs, overall the scheme will respect the existing character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be acceptable in terms of principal,

location, massing, design and amenity. The scheme is in line with the relevant policies.

Councillor Collins as local ward member then addressed the committee and made the following points:

- If this is allowed it will deprive the local community of the only piece of green open space for some distance.
- It goes against the councils own policy BG1 on the Cotswold Beechwood and also against Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), and the councils SPD.
- The Councils policy on new developments is to create vibrant open green spaces, why deprive this community of theirs.
- The community has enjoyed this open space for decades, and is well used. It is also subject to an application for Village Green Status that has been in place for almost a year now.
- The design itself is awful and is completely different to the surrounding buildings and therefore does not comply with section 12 of the NPPF or planning policy D1 as it does not respect the existing neighbouring properties.
- Highways strongly objected to an earlier version of this application but now see this one as acceptable. Refuse and emergency vehicles already struggle to access the Close. There has been damage to vehicles without introducing more cars and a significant blind spot.
- The application should be refused on policies BG1, SD8, SD9 and SD14.

The matter then went to Member questions, the responses were as follows:

- Planning officer aware of the application for Village Green Status which is with Gloucestershire County Council it is a lengthy process and has been with them for a year and CBC has had no notification of it. The planning application is in now and needs to be determined as it has been submitted. The land isn't protected currently and a pending application for Village Green Status is not sufficient to protect the land and it is not protected in any other way. There is no policy in the local plan or in the JCS specifically about Village Green Status.
- The legal officer confirmed that the village green process is separate from the planning process and through a different body in Gloucestershire County Council and though CBC may be a consultee for that. It has no material consideration today it is the planning application that is before you.
- The legal officer confirmed that the land ownership of the remaining green space is a private law matter and outside the scope of planning.
- Permitted development rights have been removed for only the parts that were considered harmful to the site, such as erection of a fence, removal of permitted rights for a dormer window and restrictions on further windows. Would be unable to do a side extension as the regulations would not allow it.
- The footprint of building is reasonably modest for built development but would need to take into account that there would be a garden to the rear and parking at the front. Have attached a condition regarding further landscaping. Officers have tried to retain the openness of the site, however can't confirm that residents would be able to use the remaining green space as this would still be in private ownership.
- The scheme has changed significantly, the objection from highways was when the scheme was previously for two dwellings, both with access and

parking which would have been closer to the bend in the road. This scheme was withdrawn for number of reasons and now with this scheme which is acceptable to highways.

- The legal officer explained that deferral of the planning application would need to be within a reasonable amount of time as the applicant have appeal rights and we have no indication of when the village green status will be decided. It is not fair on the applicant and it is not a relevant planning matter before the committee.
- Even if the green space was adopted as a village green there is no planning policy to take this into consideration and therefore no planning policy reasons to refuse the application based on these grounds.
- There may have been some confusion on the ownership of the land as it seems the council have been maintaining the green from the representations of the local residents. It is ultimately private land if the council still cuts grass it seems unlikely they would object however, maintenance is the responsibility of the land owner.
- Planning officer confirmed that they would not recommend to permit a planning application if they thought the scheme wasn't acceptable in policy. Obviously some areas are subjective, people can disagree over design but in terms of planning policy as set out in the report it cannot be refused.
- The biodiversity net gain requirement came in after this application was submitted and therefore cannot be imposed.
- The relevant planning policies that would be relevant to this application are set out in section 3 of the officer report and is discussed and referred to throughout. SD8 would not be applicable to this application as it relates to heritage assets and conservation.
- The legal officer explained that there are tests as to what is a valid planning condition which is to make the application acceptable on planning terms. To demolish a building if the green it was built on gained village green status is a private matter and would not satisfy the test for a planning condition.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were raised:

- It is a fundamental loss of amenity as it is used by the whole neighbourhood and it is the only green space in the area.
- It may have been used as a green but is now in private ownership and we have a planning application that needs to be decided on which has an expiry of 26th May this year, if not decided the applicant could use non determination which would mean the planning inspectorate would decide.
- Builders are encouraged by councils and government to buy land and build houses as they are needed. We are dreadfully short of housing in this town.
- The parking issues are not the landowners fault, as parking on the bend is responsibility of the car owner and the property will have two parking spaces.
- The green may get village green status but that is in the future at this current time it does not and we need to make a decision on this application. It is difficult to find any planning policy reason to refuse this application.
- The policies are very clear and the officer recommendation is to permit. We don't have a five year land supply in this town and we know that at appeal inspectors regard this as an important factor.

- There will still be a green space there and conditions to protect that from being hidden by walls or fences. The planning officers have done everything possible to mitigate that and there is no good planning reasons for refusing.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit.

For: 9

Abstain: 2

6c 24/00318/FUL 2 Walnut Close, Cheltenham, GL52 3AG

The planning officer introduced the report as published.

There were 2 speakers on the item: an objector and the applicant.

The objector addressed the committee and made the following points:

- We have objections to two different parts of the proposed plans, the rear upper storey extension and the side upper storey extension.
- The rear upper storey extension would damage the aspect from all of the rear rooms and reduce light in parts of our garden.
- It may be 14 metres from our rear elevation, but its bulk and gable roof would loom over the objectors house adding considerably to the impact already felt from an extension at number 4. It would make their house and garden feel hemmed in on two sides and would also impact the attractiveness to future potential purchasers.
- The proposed side upper storey extension would bring number 2 within about 9 metres of the rear of the objectors house and about 10 metres from the rear of the neighbouring property at number 1. The usual required is a minimum distance of 12 metres. This does not appear to have been addressed in the officer report.
- The objector further understood that when discussing initial plans with officers, the applicants agent was advised that a full width extension at the front above the garage, which was preferred option was told it would be unacceptable and unlikely to be supported as the distance between it and the rear of number 1 The Gardens would be less than the minimum distance of 12 metres usually required. That potential front extension would have come to exactly the same line on the boundary between the properties as the side extension. This seems odd and inconsistent that officers should now approve the side extension even though it would be within 9 metres of our house.
- The objector proposed to the committee that they ask officers to reconsider their original advice about a potential full width extension across the front of the property with a view to allowing it if the applicant were to put in such a proposal. The objector would be prepared to compromise by withdrawing their objection to the side upper extension, despite its proximity and harmful impact on them as it is less unacceptable to us than the rear first storey extension.

The applicant the addressed the committee and made the following points:

- The applicant had lived in Pittville in Cheltenham for 6 years, during this time in the area we have seen recent expansions of existing detached properties mostly by building developers due to the desirability of the area.

- A lot of consideration was made when designing the work that has been submitted in this application. The architect we chose designed the adjacent property next door and ensured that the application was kept in line with the feel of the Close, as highlighted in the officer report.
- The sides of the plot, the location to others and the threshold for any potential expansion were always kept in mind when putting forward our designs. This is apparent in the front and rear extensions ensuring these have been kept as far away from neighbouring facing gardens as possible whilst aligning to an already expanding neighbourhood property at number 4.
- A single storey extension has also been used to minimise impact on others whilst keeping our own family needs in mind.
- The distances kept between the extensions and neighbouring properties also meet the requirements provided as part of the planning application and in the officer report. It is significantly smaller than other recent developments which have happened on the Close.
- The property adjacent at number 4 had significant two storey extensions wrapped around the property, the applicant felt that any views by ourselves or those neighbouring properties have long been obstructed since this construction.
- The three metres the applicant wishes to extend by will leave a considerable garden for the family and minimise any potential impact to surrounding properties. Where a potential privacy impact was highlighted by the planning officer during the review of the request to the garden south of the property the applicant listened and adhered to all requested amendments.
- The applicant felt that they were asking for the appropriate volume in relation to the size of the plot.
- In the sustainability report are plans which aim to make the best and lightest footprint possible from reclaiming materials, adding renewable energy sources, improving insulation and carefully selecting eco-friendly fittings.

The matter then went to Member questions, the responses were as follows:

- During the course of the application officers raised concerns with the new first floor rear elevation windows within the new wing not achieving the distance to the rear boundary for privacy reasons. The applicant and agent had sight of concerns with regards to loss of light and outlook. The agent asked if officers would be supportive of moving the first floor extension from the rear to the front. Two potential issues there, design implications as you wouldn't usually expect to see full width two storey front extension in that location as context of street scene is generally projected wings to the front. The other part is the distances, officers are required to consider the relationship of the application site to the neighbours and it is broadly positioned where it straddles the boundary between number 1 and 2, its side elevation is heading towards the gap between those two properties. That is where officers feel that the first floor rear extension is acceptable as it achieves 14 metres from the rear elevation of number 2 to the side wall, if you move that extension to the front and put it up to the boundary it moves in front of the rear elevation of number 1 and would be short of that distance. We accept that the two storey side extension is closer as stated by the objector but we have to consider context, outlook and position of gardens, number 2 garden is largely unaffected as it is

south of the plot and number 1 their garden wraps around the rear and side of their property.

- The legal officer explained that it is the planning application before the committee and there is no power for the planning authority to act as a mediator between applicant and objectors as it is a private law matter. The planning officer added that outside of the application it's not their role to be involved but they are there to negotiate a scheme if it is unacceptable. As in this application with the rear windows, had the applicant not been willing to accept change to the rear windows the officer recommendation would be different or refused without coming to committee.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were raised:

- Would support this application as people buy the location not the house as it is and along this Close all the properties have changed. Design is always subjective and in general see nothing wrong with the application.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit.

For: 10

Abstain: 1

6d 23/00117?FUL Belmont School, Warden Hill Road, Cheltenham, GL51 3AT

The planning officer introduced the report as published.

There were 4 speakers on the item: an objector, the applicant and 2 Ward Councillors.

The objector, who was speaking on behalf of the residents in the area, addressed the committee and made the following points:

- They are in support of the application with regard to SEN children however there are concerns that the development will be made available for private hire.
- They have not been able to confirm with the applicant that the development will only be for SEN children, and that causes concern for the residents.
- There are some operational issues at the moment that cause problems for the residents such as the alarm going off at various times and that has not been fixed, also the security lighting is very bright and sometimes left on all night.
- There has been an email sent to residents by a well meaning councillor that suggests that residents should be notified in advance if there will be an event held that will have 100 plus children at, this make it clear that this is not just a development for SEN children.
- During a meeting with the Headmaster that Councillors and the objectors attended the Headmaster failed to confirm that there would not be an application for floodlighting in the future and this is a real concern for residents in the area.
- If there are problems with the development then the enforcement team at the Council will be responsible for dealing with them.

- The noise report states that the highest level of noise that is expected will be 1 decibel lower than the WHO threshold for the onset of moderate community annoyance.
- The noise report also does not appear to assess the use of the athletics track or the bleacher seating.
- The objector asked for the application to be deferred as even some of the supporters appeared to be objecting to the proposed hours of use.
- There should be no need for lighting if there is a genuine intention to restrict use of the development.
- It is critical for residents and for the wildlife in the area that the playing field should be pitch black at night.

The applicant then addressed the committee and made the following points:

- The school needs better facilities for the SEN children that use the facility.
- The application is needed to support the disabled children.
- The inclusivity of the school has been acknowledged by Ofsted.
- The application fits with CBC's physical education strategy.
- There has been 2 years of work on the project and felt let down by the 16 late conditions imposed by the planning officer.
- The suggested conditions may not be allowed under the Equality Act.
- The vast majority of users are not only physically disabled but are also autistic and are not able to visit other facilities.

Cllr Harman in his capacity as County Councillor addressed the committee and made the following points:

- He thanked the community and the committee for their time in visiting both the application site and the neighbouring properties.
- This application is not about the residents versus the school as the residents understand the significance of the school and the work that it does.
- The neighbours that are closely affected are worried about the long term impact in terms of the hours that the proposal will wish to operate. Some believe that it may be used for commercial gain.
- There was a public meeting that was attended by both parties, but that did seem to raise more concerns particularly round the issue of noise. It will not be easy to limit attendance to things, and the amount of people using the facility would impact the noise level.

Councillor Beale as Ward Councillor addressed the committee and made the following points:

- The application has been subject to a number of changes but the purpose of the application is clear, it is to be all inclusive for SEN.
- Sports England are fully onboard with the application.
- As the applicant stated the application fits with the CBC sports strategy.
- There has been a challenge in communication with the school and the neighbours, however the school hosted a meeting and responded to most of the questions that were causing worry to the residents.

- The concerns about the alarms going off at the school at different times has not helped the situation with the neighbours.
- The Goals Beyond Grass group that meets at the school is run by volunteers and they have directly influenced the design of the application. They are an organisation that provides social connections for the SEN community and is very valuable to the children and adults that come to their sessions. The passing noise of cars and lawnmowers is far greater than the noise caused by this group.
- The conditions to the application should control the use of the site and encourage the community to work together closely.

The matter then went to Member questions. The responses are as follows:

- It would be unreasonable to condition no further lighting such as security and incidental lighting at the site. Additional lighting is not being applied for on this application. The restricted times that are proposed will prevent the need for further lighting.
- Bleacher seating is a stepped construction built into the land, it is permanent and not retractable.
- The noise report assessed the cumulative impact of the noise. The athletics track is a quieter activity.
- The noise assessment does not differentiate between users.
- The primary use of the proposed development will be for Belmont school pupils but Betteridge school and other special schools and SEN organisations across Gloucestershire will have access. If the school do want to hire out the facilities to other organisations the restricted time conditions will manage the times that they can use it.
- If the times are amended and restricted to SEN users only this could create equality issues.
- Once the acoustic fence is built and in use there could be feedback given by both the residents and the school via the environmental health forum.
- The Legal Officer reminded Members that they could only consider the application before them and cannot compare this application to any others that have been considered.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were raised:

- Members were minded to extend the time at weekends to 4pm or 5pm, there would be an issue if the application was only for commercial use and the SEN individuals were prevented from using the site. Would be happy to propose a new time of 10-5pm on Saturdays.
- There are some advantages of the application being used for commercial use as long as that is not the main use.
- There was general support for the proposed new times and also stated that there is no evidence to support the residents' fears.
- Other schools in residential areas let outsiders use their facilities.
- There has been no evidence that there will be excessive noise and the concerns about the noise of the alarm from the residents are not relevant.

- Members were happy to agree an extension to 5pm on Saturday for those with SEN and to support the use by the cycle group on Sunday for limited hours as stated. Cllr Wheeler suggested 10-5pm on Sunday as we live in a 7 day a week economy, this was seconded by Cllr Fisher.
- If the noise does have an impact on the neighbours then the school will be made aware by the residents and Environmental Health will be involved.
- There was a belief that the commercial fears were misplaced as there is not much scope for outside use.
- The facility won't be open until 5pm in the winter as it gets dark earlier.
- The school and the residents should keep talking and the school should be a good neighbour and the arrangements should work for everyone.
- A lot of SEN have severe reaction to noise and won't be able to tolerate any noise.

The planning officer then addressed the committee and stated that the cycling group can still continue to run their club on a Sunday. Their current use of the site is unaffected by the proposed development. However, the suggested condition would allow their use of the proposed cycle track on a Sunday. It will not be for residents to propose revised hours to the committee. The Member proposed extended hours on Saturdays would be going against the advice and recommendation of the Council's Environmental Health team. Environmental Health are concerned about noise complaints which is why there is the suggested condition.

The Legal Officer reminded Members that the committee could only look at one motion at a time and they need to be looked at in order. He also stated that the application had to be approved first before the condition was voted on.

The application then went to the vote:

For – 11 UNANIMOUS

The committee went to the vote to approve the amended condition for 10am-5pm on Saturday:

For – 11 - UNANIMOUS

Against – 0

The second condition for operating hours on a Sunday to be restricted to SEN from 10am-5pm went to the vote

For – 2

Against – 9

The vote to approve with the amended condition was then voted on

For – 11 – UNANIMOUS

It was also a UNANIMOUS decision to delegate the re wording of the condition to the officer.

7 Appeal Update

Appeal details were noted for information.

8 Any other items the Chairman determines urgent and requires a decision

There were none.