

Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Committee Minutes

Meeting date: 23 July 2026

Meeting time: 6.00 pm - 7.45 pm

In attendance:

Councillors:

Glenn Andrews, Adrian Bamford, Garth Barnes (Chair), Barbara Clark, Iain Dobie, Jan Foster, Richard Lawler, Tony Oliver (Vice-Chair), Arthur Snell, Dr Steve Steinhardt and Simon Wheeler

Also in attendance:

Chris Gomm (Head of Planning), Victoria Harris (Planning Officer), Michelle Payne (Development Management Manager), Simon Aley (Locum Senior Planning Solicitor), Peter Ashby (Senior Conservation Officer) and Ebba Carling (Acting Planning Officer), and Mark Sweet (Highway Planning Officer, Gloucestershire County Council)

1 Apologies

There were none.

The Chair offered his thanks to Councillor Suzanne Williams who had done sterling work on the Planning Committee for many years. He also welcomed Councillors Richard Lawler and Arthur Snell to the committee.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Tony Oliver declared that he is a member of the Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council but has not taken part in any conversations relating to the application at 6d.

Councillor Simon Wheeler declared, in relation to item 6b, that he is due to become a trustee of the Cheltenham Trust.

Neither was considered a prejudicial interest, and they were not required to withdraw from the debate.

3 Declarations of independent site visits

The following Councillors attended site 6d during Planning View:

- Councillor Garth Barnes
- Councillor Adrian Bamford
- Councillor Barbara Clark
- Councillor Iain Dobie
- Councillor Jan Foster
- Councillor Richard Lawler
- Councillor Steve Steinhardt
- Councillor Simon Wheeler

Councillor Tony Oliver had visited site 6d.

4 Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2026 were approved and signed as a correct record.

5 Public Questions

There was one public question, which was taken as read along with the response.

1. Question from Elliot Craddock to Chris Gomm (Head of Planning) and Chair of Planning – Councillor Garth Barnes

What aspect of the new-build flats on St Margaret's Road do you feel really fits in with the existing and famous regency architecture Cheltenham is so famous for?

Response from Chris Gomm (Head of Planning) and Chair of Planning – Councillor Garth Barnes

Thank you for your feedback.

The design approach at North Place was not one of replicating or imitating Cheltenham's Regency architecture; that would have been the wrong approach here. The site's context is eclectic in character with no prevailing style; the site's surroundings are characterised by a mix of Victorian and twentieth century buildings as well as a limited number of Regency-era buildings. The site's frontage to St Margaret's Road is particularly mixed with the substantial Brewery Quarter building, constructed in 2005/2006, situated opposite.

A pastiche design approach would have been inappropriate here, but so too would a highly contemporary approach given the nature of the buildings to the east (rear); the approach that has instead been taken is essentially a compromise between the two with a modern approach being taken to domestic vernacular architecture. The terraced buildings (to North Place) under construction are modern but take their cues from artisan terraces elsewhere in the town both in terms of their scale and simplicity. The apartment block to St Margaret's Road will be bolder but will be subservient to, and will not compete with, the adjacent listed

St Margaret's Terrace; it will infill what is currently a jarring and incongruous gap within the street scene.

Judgement should ultimately be reserved until the scheme is complete, occupied and landscaping/planting has become established; the council is satisfied that granting planning permission was the correct decision.

The questioner was not present to ask a supplementary question.

6 Planning Applications

7 26/00647/FUL - 3 Byron Road, Cheltenham, GL51 7HE

The Planning Officer introduced the report as published.

In response to Members' questions, officers confirmed that:

- It was confirmed that information was not available on whether this application was for all the council owned properties on Byron Road.
- Concern was raised about the importance of a precise join between old and new render. The officer confirmed that this was not a planning consideration but would possibly be dealt with under the Party Wall Act 1996. They also confirmed that the applicant had been made aware of the objector's views and concerns.
- The application does not confirm whether it will be a through-colour render or a painted cement render, but the officer thought it most likely this would be carried out through a through-colour render. The application does confirm that it will be an external wall insulation system with a smooth silicon render.

Councillor Oliver put forwards a motion to accept the officer's recommendation to permit. This was seconded by Councillor Andrews.

The matter then went to the vote on the motion to permit in line with the officer recommendation:

For: 11

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Voted UNANIMOUSLY for the motion to permit.

8 26/00754/LBC - The Wilson Art Gallery and Museum, Clarence Street, Cheltenham, GL50 3JT

The Senior Conservation Officer introduced the report as published.

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

- It was noted that this was a positive development.

Councillor Wheeler put forwards a motion to accept the officer's recommendation to grant. This was seconded by Councillor Andrews.

The matter then went to the vote on the motion to grant in line with the officer recommendation:

For: 11

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Voted UNANIMOUSLY for the motion to permit.

9 26/00763/FUL - 24 Alstone Avenue, Cheltenham, GL51 8EH

The Planning Officer introduced the report as published.

There was one public speaker on the item: the Ward Member.

Councillor Dearden, as Ward Member, addressed the committee and made the following points:

- She highlighted that she was grateful plans have been revised after concerns were raised by council officers, residents of Alstone Avenue, the Civic Society and herself. These revised plans no longer have external wall external wall insulation (EWI) on the front of the properties. While this change retains the Edwardian streetscape, she does not feel she can fully support the application as there are still some unresolved issues that need consideration.
- The first concern is why was the external cladding chosen in the first place? According to the Design and Access Statement, this external insulation will help Cheltenham achieve its net carbon zero targets by 2030. She is surprised that there has been no comparison made between the benefits of internal versus external insulation. There is no comparison provided between the installation costs, the improved energy efficiencies, as well as the lifespan of the different types of insulation. The main justification mentioned seems to be disruption to tenants.
- The officer's report also mentions that there have been similar upgrades to other properties. The Ward Member thinks it is important we know more about how successful these projects were before we proceed with this application. For instance, how many upgrades have been completed? Were these improvements to similar Edwardian properties? How improved was their energy efficiency? And were there any problems during these upgrades?
- The second concern is about the potential for damp as a result of either or any type of insulation that is used. Damp has been a major worry for neighbouring residents and it would be helpful if their concerns could be addressed in more detail. Can the contractors guarantee that the external insulation chosen is the very best option when trying to mitigate damp, not only to the upgraded properties themselves, but to the neighbouring properties as well.
- The Design and Access Statement states that the external system significantly reduces the risk of creating consequential damp and mould problems. Is this when compared to all of the alternatives that could be used?
- The officer's report states that any dampness is technically not a planning consideration and any issues created would be settled as a civil matter under provisions such as the Party Wall Act. While this legal position is truthful and any

potential damp problems between neighbours is a civil matter. The council have an obligation to go further in protecting not only the properties that the council owns, but the nearby homes and communities they serve. Any work done to properties should not mean neighbours need to engage solicitors or surveyors to rectify damp problems and other damage caused. The council, as the applicant, should do everything it can to mitigate this possibility by investigating which insulation type is best from the outset.

- The final concern relates to the streetscape and visual impact of the external cladding. Part 6.13 of the officer's report mentions that as properties are already rendered or painted at the side and rear, any changes would be in keeping with the appearance of the area. With this in mind, she would like the committee to take this opportunity, using the new voting procedures, to ask that measures be put in place to prohibit the installation of any front-facing cladding of any kind to protect this streetscape for the future.
- She would wholeheartedly support the use of EWI if it is known for sure, based on data and evidence, that it is the most energy efficient and longest lasting insulation option to achieve the council's net zero targets. And if it were known it was the option that is least likely to cause damp to council owned and neighbouring properties. However, if the council cannot answer yes to these questions, then she believes the application should be rejected or revised and brought back to committee with any necessary changes.
- Finally, as Alstone Avenue is not in a conservation area, she would ask that measures are put in place to ensure that cladding of any kind cannot be put on the front of these properties in the future. This will ensure that the streetscape of this lovely Edwardian Avenue is protected.

In response to Members' questions, officers confirmed that:

- Originally the application had proposed render to the front of the properties but as these are red brick properties in a terrace it was felt that rendering the front of the properties would have an impact on the character of the street scene. The officer had explained to the agent that the council would not be able to support this scheme, and the applicant decided to revise it to remove that part of the proposal and just retain the rendering of the front and the sides.
- Officers were unable to confirm whether technology and the materials proposed are the same or essentially the same as what has been successfully and widely used across CBC housing stock.
- Officer's were not able to confirm what the impact of the front of the property not being rendered would have on the efficacy of the insulation. However, they noted that the applicant would still have the option of installing internal insulation, which would not require planning permission.
- The officer did not have the technical details of the render carried out by neighbouring properties in terms of damping. Any issues with damp would be a civil matter between landowners under the Party Wall Act.

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

- A considerable number of properties in a Member's ward have had similar external insulation installed and have found significant difference with this form of insulation. In contrast cavity wall insulation in the area has led to properties experiencing significant damp problems and a number of complaints. It would be nice to see the front-face insulated, potentially internally, as the insulation itself is of enormous benefit.

- Another Member lives in a terrace street which is predominantly rendered but has some brick houses and does not feel it ruins the streetscape. They have no concern about the rear of the building being rendered.
- A Member noted that the council have carried out a programme of installing EWI in council-owned properties, which has been successful. It is disappointing that the committee have not been given assurance that it will be the same successful rendering techniques and technology that has been applied elsewhere in the town, and also that the knowledge of whether it would be effective if it was only partially rendered was not available. He suspects that any insulation will still have a positive effect and will make these properties cheaper to heat.

Councillor Wheeler put forwards a motion to accept the officer's recommendation to permit. This was seconded by Councillor Dobie.

The matter then went to the vote on the motion to permit in line with the officer recommendation:

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Voted for the motion to permit.

10 25/01073/FUL - Land 1 Off Kidnappers Lane, Cheltenham

The Interim Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report as published.

There were three public speakers on the item: the Ward Member, an objector, and the applicant's representative.

Councillor Horwood, as Ward Member, addressed the committee and made the following points:

- He is sad to be opposing this application as he has supported previous Newland Homes developments in this location, which has helped make houses reliant on solar panels and air-source heat pumps the norm in Leckhampton. Even the large new Miller development the planning committee reviewed has followed suit.
- This is an inexplicably bad application, overwhelmingly opposed by local residents and the parish council.
- There are a number of reasons for the committee to review it – a quite unnecessarily dangerous double road exit, a huge loss of habitat biodiversity, the gratuitous removal of a whole line of mature trees, and a clear breach of the brand-new neighbourhood plan.
- There is an unnecessary double road exit for just 21 houses, with the two exits just a few yards apart, across a busy walking and cycling route to the nearby secondary school. A route packed with kids at peak times. Whilst Highways have withdrawn their objection, they do not address a central issue – there is no reason for the roads to exist. If the gardens were put at the front and the access road to the back of the eight southern houses, the two roads would meet on site. Highways are ignoring their

own guidance. The manual for Gloucestershire streets says that where schools are nearby "priority should be given to pedestrian and cycle movements".

- The impressive biodiversity gain figure quoted in the report sounds great but that only refers to hedges, which represent only two out of the 13 units worth of natural value on this site. The other 11 units are for habitats, and these have a staggering -66.58% biodiversity loss. In plain English, the proposal trashes the vast majority of on-site biodiversity. To compensate they have promised to buy 8.45 units elsewhere, but these could be in Cumbria or Scotland. This would break the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policy SD9 which clearly states that harm to the biodiversity of a site should be avoided where possible, and that where there is harm, this should be mitigated by enhancements on site, and that only "exceptionally, compensatory enhancements may be acceptable". So the committee does not have to accept such an enormous loss of habitat on site.
- Part of the damage is the proposed cutting down of 50 mature trees, in the tree officer's words, almost all the trees on site. Worst of all, a whole familiar avenue of trees along the corner of Kidnappers Lane. These aren't in the way of any houses and are to be replaced with a small hedge, he assumes for marketing visibility. The applicants claim they are of limited value but the tree officer addresses this point. He says that whilst the trees themselves may have limited amenity value, their value for habitat should not be underestimated. He has recommended a smaller development. It is wrong to gratuitously kill mature trees which are part of the Kidnappers Lane streetscape, familiar to adults and children alike. The council have fought hard with other applicants, like Miller, to retain familiar green boundaries and at least some of the rural feel of the area.
- The report acknowledges that the new Neighbourhood Plan policy LWH1 is breached by this application. It says, "developments of more than one hectare, more than 800 meters, from other grocery facilities should not be permitted unless suitable local grocery shop provision exists or is to be provided". Over the years roughly a thousand houses have been built between the Shurdington Road and Church Road by a number of developers, plus a new 900 student secondary school. Not so much as a corner shop has been provided. So, everybody hops in their cars, adding to congestion, particulate pollution, and carbon emissions. The policy allows a viability argument. No doubt the applicant will make it, despite the fact that two of their other developments here have been smaller. This is in reality phase four of a 64 house development that has come to the committee in parts. This is a robust reasonable local policy that has got through three public consultations, survived legal challenge and independent examination, and finally a referendum with overwhelming local support. It would be very sad if, after all that effort, the committee chooses not to enforce it.
- He asked the committee to support the neighbourhood plan, the JCS biodiversity policy, the tree officer and the manual for Gloucestershire streets and reject the application.

The objector addressed the committee and made the following points:

- He is an adjoining property owner speaking on behalf of fellow residents living in Pear Tree Close. While he is an architect by profession, he stressed that he was not acting in that capacity.
- He made it clear that residents are not objecting to the principle of appropriate development. While they recognise that the land in question has the potential to support modest low-density development, they strongly believe and request that such

proposals should align with the local green infrastructure objectives and overall spirit of the approved Leckhampton & Warden Hill Neighbourhood Plan.

- In harmony with that expectation, their objection is to the amount and density of development; it's appropriateness in the setting and its means of access. They are especially concerned about the consequential damaging impacts the proposals would have on biodiversity, traffic generation and road safety.
- By way of context, Kidnappers Lane and the land in question have recognised established character and value – which means that, at present, they form part of a distinctive balanced mosaic of mature landscape assets interspersed with pockets of smaller-scale development. This pattern is very evident at ground level within and around the lane, and when viewed from Leckhampton Hill.
- The proposed new development would, unfortunately, constitute another big step towards the total loss of this balanced pattern in a location that is already saturated with other recent housing schemes. Another large area of established greenspace would be obliterated and the rich and vibrant biodiversity that it supports would suffer an astonishing net loss of -65%, meaning that the many species of wildlife the site currently teems with will simply disappear.
- As far as traffic is concerned, Kidnappers Lane is already too narrow for large vehicles to pass without mounting the pavement. This is seen almost every day. He also noted that the road safety audit was undertaken at lunchtime in January – nowhere near representative of the true heavily congested conditions during the peak periods (including school runs) in the morning and afternoon. To add two new vehicle junctions will make the lane more congested and unsafe.
- Importantly, while residents fully recognise the need for more housing, they seriously question how appropriate its provision is in the complete absence of local community and retail facilities. How much more unsustainable car use will be generated and how, in turn, will meaningful net-zero carbon targets be achieved?
- Ideally, the residents would ask that the land in question be left and nurtured as the valuable natural asset it already is. Alternatively, if development is to be permitted, then a fresh and scaled back approach be taken with fewer dwellings, working along with the existing landscape and ecology, as opposed to against it.

The applicant's representative addressed the committee and made the following points:

- He is the senior project manager for Newland Homes for the site being discussed. Rather than reiterating the robust planning committee report, which recommends approval, he wanted to introduce Newland Homes to those unfamiliar with the company and address some of the comments that the application has received.
- Newland Homes are a privately owned regional house builder based in Gloucester and specialising in bespoke residential developments with sites in and around the southwest of England. They have a successful history of developments in Cheltenham, with recently completed and ongoing developments near this site.
- Importantly between these sites they have delivered 14 affordable zero-carbon homes in partnership with the council which have been well received following a recent visit by the Leader of the council.
- With all their developments, Newland Homes aim is to respond appropriately to the site and its surroundings, and to create homes that people wish to live in now and for future generations. This site is no exception to this approach.
- In addition to the high quality and sustainable materials that form part of this proposal, they have committed to delivering 100% of the homes as zero carbon. To help give this commitment perspective, at present, the highest energy performance certificate rating for a residential property is A. Only 2% of homes built in 2025

achieve this rating. this development in energy terms alone will therefore outperform even the top 2% of homes nationally. The proposals are therefore years ahead of the government targets to be zero carbon by 2050 and go far beyond obligations required by policy regulations and what other developers are building locally. So much so that Newland Homes sites have been used to benchmark others, something the company are extremely proud of.

- The existing trees on site are self-seeded low value specimens in a varying state of decline, or non-native trees that remain present from former land use which have become wild and unwieldy due to the lack of a management regime. These are proposed for removal to facilitate the development and enable future enhanced measures. Higher quality trees on site are predominantly located on the site perimeter and these are to be retained. Failing hedging along the site perimeter will be enhanced to increase ecology diversity, in addition to providing over 130 new native and diverse tree specimens which will be managed in perpetuity. This is in line with the tree officer's recommendations.
- Achieving biodiversity net gain gains on small sites is difficult. However, where possible, they have delivered an uplift. This is evidenced by the 100% net gain in hedgerow habitats. The remaining habitat found on site cannot wholly be offset following development. It will therefore be provided offsite and secured via legal S106 agreement. This ensures that proposals deliver an overall biodiversity net gain of 10% as required. This solution is in compliance with legislation and supported by Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC).
- On the matter of highways, an independent higher road safety audit was undertaken in January 2026. The findings evidence that the proposals are safe and do not conflict with any of the existing footway, cycle way or vehicle movements along Kidnappers Lane. Despite this, they have agreed to additional highway and pedestrian enhancements, including cycling widening, traffic calming, and to further enhance existing arrangements. This is supported by the Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Highways team.
- It has also been suggested that each of Newland Homes developments along Kidnappers Lane have artificially been separated to avoid provision of a local shop. In fact, they have come forward for independent landowners at separate times over a 5-year period. On the subject of a local shop, if there is strong demand locally, one would expect the market to respond and provide one in a suitable location. However, if a 350-home development located north of this proposal were unable to accommodate one, missed opportunity should not be forced upon a developer proposing a minor 21 home development. Officers have concluded that existing facilities nearby are wholly accessible.
- Finally, following detailed conversations with CBC and GCC, there have been inconsistencies with comments received. This has led to significant delays during the course of the application. They are however pleased these have now been addressed and officers unanimously have offered their support.

In response to Members' questions, officers confirmed that:

- The committee is considering the scheme that is in front of them, so it would not be possible to change access to the site to a single entrance through the introduction of a condition as it would have significant impact on the scheme.
- There is a footpath link at the moment along the sides of the road, but these will be altered as part of the highway improvement works.
- The Gloucestershire Highways officer confirmed that the secondary access is to serve a small number of dwellings at one end of the site. It may have been provided

that way due to the layout of the site making that the most beneficial approach. This would have been part of the applicant's design process. In terms of the principle that there is nothing preventing a developer providing one access to the site, sometimes less is better because it reduces conflict points where a site's traffic users come out onto a road. In this case, Highways assessment is that the two accesses are both visible and provide suitable spacing according to minimum standards for the speed of traffic on the road to allow someone to stop or give way as they approach access. They also consider the interaction and proximity between one access and another, to assess whether large vehicles might have issues with manoeuvring which could create a conflict point or insufficient reaction time between users. In this case they consider that it was sufficiently spaced to have two accesses.

- The Highways officer confirmed that Kidnappers Lane would be considered a minimum width lane. Whilst it can probably cope with two cars passing on a two-way basis, this will be difficult for larger vehicles, but there are points along the lane where people can pull in. Whilst its location may lead to it being something of a rat run, in terms of considering the application and its impact, the proportionality in terms of the traffic generated needs to be considered. The officer believes that the traffic report for this application provided the potential peak hour movements in the morning and afternoon and their assessment was that this application would equal approximately one additional movement down the lane for each of those peaks. It was not considered that this impact was significant enough to warrant refusal.
- The Highways officer noted that elements of the application, such as urbanising the lane, and the cycle and pedestrian improvements, may provide some traffic calming. With the junctions as potential additional passing points for traffic.
- The traffic survey was taken on a single day and was taken as part of looking at the site access arrangements to consider the direct access arrangements for visibility and spacing and the points for the junction itself. Highways do internally have traffic data, and traffic counting takes place for other purposes to monitor roads from time to time.
- A crossing point at pavement height is part of the application being considered.
- There is a school positioned a street away from the location so there is potential that people may use the new accesses as dropping off points. The Highways Officer did not believe that the creation of these accesses creating a safety issue in relation to drop off.
- The parking provided will be proportionate to the size of the houses. If the streets within the development are of sufficient width that it will offer an additional opportunity for people to park, as they do on existing residential roads.
- The cumulative impact of a development of this scale would not normally bring with it a need to provide a GP surgery or facility.
- It is not possible to condition that the biodiversity being purchased offsite is bought in Gloucestershire.
- In terms of the local green space, this does wrap around the rest of the site, so this is the last site for development which is not designated as local green space.

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

- A Member highlighted that he lives on a similarly sized cul-de-sac in an estate that exits onto a road of a similar width to Kidnappers Lane, with a pavement about half the width of the one proposed in the application. Vehicle movements in and out of the estate are quite minimal and without problem. The Members anticipates the situation being the same in this case. He noted that having two exits may also make the situation marginally better. Also need to balance the concerns around highways with

the benefits brought by the solar panels and 40% affordable housing, which makes it difficult to argue against this development. However, he is not happy with the loss of the trees, whether they are self-seeded or ancient trees, and feels that at least some of these could be retained.

- A Member commented that they have lived in the area for their entire adult life and do feel regret at every development, as it is such a lovely space to walk in. However, considering this application in planning terms requires the committee to constantly work out the balance between benefits and harms. In Cheltenham there is a tilted balance as the town does not have a 5-year housing supply. This means that other things that might be considered as valid objections carry less weight than the impetus towards development.
- A Member highlighted that even if we set aside the problems with the trees and the lack of biodiversity net gains, this was a clear breach of the neighbourhood plan, which was recently established at great pains. He felt that there has been a large number of small developments that has left the local infrastructure massively overloaded, which has left him unable to support this scheme.
- A Member commented that we are in a climate crisis and are losing our insects and biodiversity, so they are not happy with the loss of mature trees proposed. They also felt unable to support the application due to the lack of available infrastructure.
- A Member noted that Newland Homes builds exemplary houses in respect of the fight against climate change. Including the use of air-source heat pumps which provide cooling in the summer, as well as heating. He thinks it is very important to encourage a local builder from Gloucestershire and there is an imperative to build more housing for the local population, particularly as the Golden Valley is developed. Recognised that it is painful, particularly having grown up in the area and having wandered through these fields. He is pleased that many of the green spaces have been preserved as green space, including space on the other side of the road. On balance feel that we have to look at the future of Cheltenham's communities, for young people, and approve exemplary developments like this one.
- A Member commented that there is good and bad to this application. It is great to see Newland Homes committing to 40% affordable housing, the majority of which is social housing. The big problem is the loss of the biodiversity, particularly the number of trees that will be lost. He highlighted that he would have preferred to see grass planting rather than hard standing in front of these properties, to address some of this loss. He also agreed that it was important that any offsetting be done within the town, rather than further away. He was not concerned about the two entrances as he didn't feel the number of properties would make a significant difference to Shurdington Road or Kidnappers Lane. In terms of local amenities, he noted that there are shops nearby and that a bus route is offered down Bath Road. On balance he felt that he would support the application due to the need for social housing.
- A Member noted that whilst the committee may feel like they have allowed a constant drip-drip of developments over the years due to the low impact of smaller numbers of houses, the cumulative impact can not be considered in this case. The only consideration that can be given is to the specific impact of the proposed 21 houses.
- A Member commented that they were conflicted due to the loss of biodiversity, the lack of amenities, and the highways issue. However, the tilted balance over housing is in place, so despite these conflicts they felt they would probably support the application.
- A new Member commented that on the basis of the very excellent training provided and his understanding of what the law says, it seems clear that this is a lawful application. If it were rejected by the committee it would probably succeed on appeal.

It is disappointing that some of the unsatisfactory elements, such as the two entrances and loss of biodiversity, seem unnecessary. The affordable housing is also all grouped in one area rather than spread throughout the development. Whilst these elements seem unnecessary they are not strong enough reasons to reject the application. He had also grown up in the area but is acutely aware that people all over Cheltenham are desperate for housing and, if small developments like this are rejected, that problem carries on for years and years.

- A Member asked whether through the S106 negotiations officers could push for the biodiversity offsetting to take place locally. The officer noted that this could not be a condition, but the applicant has expressed a desire to purchase local units and there are plenty available for what is needed. However, it could be included within the S106 agreement to ensure that the units are serving the local community. This request could also be included as an informative to encourage the purchase of local units.

Councillor Oliver put forwards a motion to accept the officer's recommendation to approve subject to a S106 agreement and with the addition of an informative to request that biodiversity net gain units are bought locally. This was seconded by Councillor Wheeler.

The matter then went to the vote on the motion to approve subject to a S106 agreement and with the addition of an informative to request that biodiversity net gain units are bought locally in line with the officer recommendation:

For: 7

Against: 3

Abstain: 1

Voted for the motion to approve subject to a S106 agreement and with the addition of an informative to request that biodiversity net gain units are bought locally.

11 Appeal Update

The appeal updates were noted.

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

There were none.