



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

18 February 2016

PRESENT:

J Illingworth (Chair), P Baguley,
G Botterill, P Chandler, P Cumbers, M Glancy,
E Holmes, J Wyatt

Solicitor to the Council (VW), Head of Regulatory Services (JWo),
Applications and Advice Manager (JW)
Planning Officer (LP), Administrative Assistants LR)

SUBSTITUTE:

L Higgins for Cllr J Simpson

OBSERVER:

J Orson

D71. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr J Simpson (Vice Chair), Cllr P Posnett

D72. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

D73. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting dated 28th January 2016

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes
and seconded by Cllr Higgins

The Committee voted in agreement. It was unanimously agreed that the Chair sign them as
a true record.

D74. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 14/00777/FUL
- Applicant:** Mr Jamie Gibbins - Barwood Homes Ltd
- Location:** Land Behind 38 – 48 High Street Waltham On The Wolds
- Proposal:** Residential development (amended plans: further revisions to site layout and plots 25 and 26 submitted on 8.1.2016)

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services provided an update on the application as follows:

Severn Trent register no objection but require details of drainage arrangements

The Parish Council – have elaborated on the points reported on pages 10/11 as follows:

- Impact on the Conservation Area and adjoining properties

Highlighting the references to “open countryside and paddocks beyond” the cottages and walls in High St.

The regimented urban form remains and is out of character its village surroundings despite the minor subsequent changes to the scheme.

The proposed amendments would still result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining properties’ adjacent to the access points, particularly Bryn Barn B&B, 38 High st.

- Safety

The revised design of the private drive is unworkable. Whilst we welcome the new proposed access to the east of the site, there is no logic in leaving the western access road in place with all problems that has created. Vehicles, cars and commercial vehicles, accessing the site at this point will be forced to reverse out

- Flooding

We support the scientific objections of Dr Jefferson regarding the high groundwater on the site, reinforced by the real experiences of local residents (see objection and photographs from Mr and Mrs Manchester). The applicant has produced no convincing proposals on how groundwater flooding is to be mitigated, especially as climate change increases the chances of prolonged rainfall.

- Sustainability

It is unlikely that all the new residents of working age will be employed in Waltham and will therefore commute, probably to Melton or Grantham. Public transport is poor (infrequent, limited hours and not synchronised with national transport) so cars will be the main mode of transport

- Density of Housing

The density of 42 dwellings per hectare (dph) is too great and again out of keeping. The acceptable maximum gross density for housing in a rural area is 30 dph.

Residents' cars (maybe 40-50), visitors' vehicles, service lorries and wheelie bins (3 per house) will create an unsightly appearance.

- Affordable Housing

affordable is only 27% compared to the Borough's target of 37% and believe that a consistent approach is essential for all development proposals.

2 additional objections have been received since the report was published:

- There are now two access points onto High Street, increasing the potential danger even more. Vehicles will still use the narrow and unacceptable access past Bryn Barn.
- The stone houses feature brick quoins. This is particularly upsetting on sites 25 & 26, within the Waltham conservation area. Brick quoins are not a feature of the local vernacular
- The Proposed Site Plan shows that sections of the old stone wall are to be removed adjacent to Bryn Barn. This must not be allowed. Natural stone walls are a features of High Street.
- This development will create more problems than the housing solutions it may bring. The impact to the congested High Street is clearly of grave concern given the independent highways report findings. The access and exit points will create an unsafe road. It could in simple terms become a rush hour log jam.
- School children using the bus service on this busy road which will be even busier.
- The ground of the site is waterlogged and no clear regard seems to have been placed in the plans to say how this is to be solved.
- The ecology report seems to have been done in the dormant months and will not have taken account of the wildlife post hibernation in line with policy in obtaining such report.

The Head of Regulatory Services then addressed the key issues raised by the application as follows:

Key issues are considered to be design (including conservation), access, drainage, amenity for existing houses and housing supply issues

Design

Design whilst subjective appears to have found some common ground, please note references in report page 13 and Conclusion. In short, the development does not replicate its surroundings. However the Committee needs to consider the impact of this as well as its incidence. It is located outside the Conservation Area and obscured from view in the most part, so is not viewed in the same experience as the CA (High St). Also is the issue of the gap site close to no 48 (show plans)

Access

Access has been reviewed by the HA as have the concerns about the additional traffic on High St and the PC's independent report. Some of the content of this report have been overtaken by events that have resolved them (e.g. sightlines at the access, parking within the site) but the points regarding additional traffic on High St remain, save for the difference of a reduction of the no. of houses by 2. Please note the advice that this is regarded as "insignificant" in terms of the overall use of High St (page 6) , and the calculation on page 5 for context – this concern is founded on an additional car every 3 minutes (less at other times). I have taken further advice on the sightlines at the access (parked cars) and am advised that Manual for Streets does not oppose this, High St have many access with similar obstructions and has no accident record associated with its many accesses, and travel speeds are low.

Drainage

I am a little surprised to receive comments claiming there is no detailed scheme because within the application is quite detailed approach occupying many pages, setting out a 3- pronged approach to drainage on the site : infiltration where ground tests have shown this to be possible, storage tanks where it is not permeable and a small proportion drained into the sewerage system.

Representations have stated that it will not work but unfortunately none have explained why. The designs include capacity for a 1:100 year event (the national standard), with 30% extra for climate change. This approach has been analysed and accepted by both the LLFA and Environment Agency and as stated at the beginning, Severn Trent

Of greater concern is the issue raised by Dr Jefferson regarding impact on the aquifer – i.e. that additional water being fed into it (or in this case being fed into it faster that it would naturally) may result in discharge from the aquifer, although he himself has readily accepted that this is a possibility not a certainty, and cannot comment on likelihood and risk.

I have presented these concerns to the applicants and their hydrologists have advised – in addition to the approval of LLFA and the EA – as follows:

groundwater monitoring work covered seasonal variation. Groundwater levels encountered on site, particularly in the location of the proposed soakaways, were not at a level to give rise to any concerns. The soakaways are designed to accommodate the 1 in 100 year plus climate change storm event and therefore

storage is built into the soakaway systems proposed. Infiltration is only possible in parts of the site and therefore a piped system will drain the parts of the site that do not soak (in the east) towards the areas where it is possible, and further storage is provided in these pipes as well as within the permeable paving system for the main access road. The north eastern part of the site drains to the existing sewer within High Street and is therefore separate. Groundwater was noted to be higher on the eastern part of the site based on the results of the monitoring undertaken as part of the Phase II Ground Investigation, however, this area of the site is not proposed as a location for soakaways.

The question of groundwater has also been addressed. Ground water (a high water table including water emerging on the surface) is a situation anticipated by the EA guidance on SUDS and is addressed by

- The specification of floor levels
- Land drainage
- Overland flow routes, i.e. highways gullies and drains
- 'resilient construction' of foundations

Amenity

Clearly the outlook for properties on High St will be altered but we consider they will be acceptable because it is in excess of distances we routinely judge to be acceptable. In most cases this is clear cut but care is needed in respect of nos 38 and 48. I have marked up the plan with some measurements to illustrate the separation distances but as Members will recall there are changes in levels involved (a little under a metre in respect of no 38 and 1.5 m in respect of no. 48). Therefore if Members consider these issues to be critical I would recommend conditions addressing window positions, window openings and finished floor levels.

One other point of clarification regarding no 42 – this has been checked and the proposals make provision for no 42's gate post in the plans and does not intrude.

Housing supply

All of the above of course needs to be balanced against positive aspects – provision of housing supply (our shortfall has now exceeded 1000) and affordable housing. On the latter, detailed viability work has been carried out and independently checked, and this tells us that the provision of 6 is 'fair' in financial terms. The NPPF makes provides advice specifically that viability should not be threatened by our planning obligation requirements, specifically citing affordable housing (para 173).

The Chair reported that he had received a request to allow a departure from procedures to allow more than one objector to speak. This was agreed unanimously and the Chair advised that the applicant would also be allowed 6 minutes to speak, in the interest of natural justice.

(b) Mr Lusty, on behalf of the Parish council addressed the Committee as follows:

- Density is out of keeping at 42 dph – 30 is the recognised norm.

- Road Safety: no sense in leaving the west access, vehicles will leave in reverse gear
- Independent report – additional hazards to pedestrians
- The applicants have put in no justification for affordable housing under provision
- Ground water – support the objections of Dr Jefferson, “ground water flooding is a risk in the area. Mitigation measures are discussed further in s5” – this could not be found.
- Ground water already a problem

Cllr Higgins sought clarification on affordable housing. Mr Lusty responded that the Parish Council are in the process of identifying the level of need.

(c) Mrs Rowlands, and objector, addressed the Committee and stated:

- Overdevelopment by any description
- Height will be increased by flood measures
- The rear of the site will be 3m higher than High St
- Detrimental impact on residential amenities
- Reduction of light and overshadowing
- Heritage walls adjacent to no 38
- Residents views should be considered

(d) Mr Mulcaly, and objector, addressed the Committee and stated:

- The report concludes that the impact would be less than substantial and limited impact
- The report declares that the impact on the Conservation Area does not matter, but it will be seen from both private and public views.
- New development should enhance the village
- Scheme largely unchanged for the July version, but changes to it are limited and it is now for recommended for approval
- It would have a destructive impact on the setting of the CA, similar to 1970's schemes – needs to be better integrated and less heavy handed
- NPPF does not require housing at any cost.

(e) Mr Malkin, representing the applicant, addressed the Committee and stated:

- Development will not harm the Conservation Area.
- It proposes a correct house mix for Waltham and the Borough.
- Waltham a sustainable location; facilities and transport are nearby and the Council has identified it as such in its Draft Local Plan.
- The application contains a link to footpath connection to Mowbray Way which will assist further with accessibility
- Land supply position provides presumption in favour of development within the NPPF.

Members debated at length the key issues regarding the application and sought clarification on several matters.

There was concern regarding site levels and the level of affordable housing provision but it was noted that demand is present but there is no supply and this development would at least make some provision.

Concerns were expressed that there was an insufficient mix of housing and that the layout too urban, and backland in nature. Farm traffic is a real problem and additional traffic from the development will make it worse. The use of High St for car parking was cited as a hazard, challenging the view that it has a role in reducing vehicle speeds.

Views were expressed that transport is not the defining factor and reference was made to a recent appeal at Queensway, Old Dalby in this connection where an Inspector had stated that high car usage is to be expected and is acceptable in villages.

Concerns were expressed regarding sewerage capacity appeal and the adequacy of the proposed drainage in view of the high water table and nearby springs that are present. Clarification was sought as the status of the road in terms of adoptable standards and its ability to allow access by refuse and emergency vehicles.

Cllr Holmes moved refusal of the application on the following grounds;

- Flooding because of the springs
- Too dense a development on a backland site
- Incorrect percentage of Affordable Housing
- High water table, danger to children
- Dangerous road for manoeuvres
- Low water pressure – will this be addressed

This was seconded by Cllr Baguley who also suggested, and Cllr Holmes accepted, and additional reason on the grounds of loss of amenity to nos 38 and 48 High St.

The Head of Regulatory Services was invited to comment on the proposed reasons for refusal and advised on each of them including those additional suggested by Cllr Baguley.

There was further debate on a range of issues that were comprised in Cllr Holmes' motion and further matters including the suitability of access for emergency vehicles and future maintenance of the highway were discussed.

Cllr Holmes adjusted her motion to just 3 reasons and **moved refusal** on the grounds of:

- Character of the area
- Impact on nos. 38 and 48
- Insufficient affordable housing

This was **seconded by Cllr Baguley**.

A vote was taken:

Votes in Favour of refusal: 4

Votes Against refusal: 5

A further motion was tabled by Cllr Wyatt that the application is approved in accordance with recommendation.

Cllr Clancy seconded and sought agreement for additional conditions, which Cllr Wyatt accepted. These related to:

- Finished floor levels throughout the site,
- Specification of the bollard at plot 1
- Relocation of plot 1's garage to the rear boundary of the plot, to mitigate the impact on no.38 High St.

A vote was taken:

Votes in Favour of approval of permission: 5

Votes Against : 4

DETERMINATION: Permit, subject to the completion of a s106 agreement and conditions in the terms set out in the Committee report and the following additional conditions:

- **Finished floor levels throughout the site,**
- **Specification of the bollard at plot 1**
- **Relocation of plot 1's garage to the rear boundary of the plot, to mitigate the impact on no.38 High St.**

For the following reasons:

It is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and affordable housing in particular. The balancing issues are considered to be development of a greenfield site and an under provision of affordable housing. The former is considered to be of limited harm, bearing in mind its location and the absence of any identification that it is of particular landscape value. The latter has been justified on the basis of viability (see above) and is considered to be acceptable because the shortfall is limited, and the scheme would still provide an important contribution. Applying the 'test' required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits; it is considered that permission can be granted

The meeting was adjourned at 7.45 to deal with a disturbance from the public gallery, and resumed at 7.52 pm.

- (3) Reference: 15/01014/FUL**
- Applicant: Knossington And Cold Overton- The Clerk**
- Location: Playing Fields Owston Road Knossington**
- Proposal: Amended Application Form - Relocation of village allotments**

(c) The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks to relocate the village allotments to the western end of the existing playing fields off Owston Road, Knossington.

Since publication of the report a further 5 objection letters from 3 households have been received and 6 letters of support.

The objections state;

- Planning committee at half term, no one is free to attend the committee meeting to represent objectors
- Consultation process was inappropriate
- Playing fields are to be enjoyed by the whole village, not sublet for benefit of a few
- The Parish Council have caused a deep rift with this application
- The development will encroach on other people's leisure activities
- Other sites are more suitable with source of water, list of other sites provided in objection letter
- A bat survey should be done as has had to be done for everyone who is doing building works near the fields
- Allotments would be detrimental to nesting birds and bat roots in adjoining hedgerows and trees.
- Playing field meant to be for children and not a select few allotment holders
- Allotments and children do not go together – fires, gardening equipment?
- Sense of freedom and independence for children will be lost if there are hazardous allotments there
- Over 30 children in the village and 10-20 at the preschool
- The present allotments are covered in rubbish and bonfire residue, tin cans, plastic sheeting and broken fences and are an eyesore and safety issue.

The supporter state;

- There is no constraint on the Parish Council's right to use the land as it sees fit subject to obtaining necessary consents. The site was not given to the village, it was purchased by the Parish Council with part financial support from a village resident. No conditions were attached to that support.
- Allotments are provided to meet demand from villages, at present demand exceeds the available plots.
- Allotments provide recreation for many in the village and there is a waiting list for them.
- The land suggested as being used for the allotments has NEVER been anything other than wasted land, covered in brambles thick that balls can be lost and never found again.
- The land at present is scruffy and a waste of space and has no use.
- Cultivation of the area by keen gardeners must surely represent an improvement.
- Children have never been able to use that part of the field; the allotments won't change that
- Allotments will look smarter and may encourage children to grow things themselves.
- It's a perfect way to use unused space
- Current allotments look untidy as the holders were given termination of their licenses and told to leave by the end of March 2016. Consequently, no winter digging was undertaken.
- There has not been any evidence of vermin at the existing allotments.
- Allotment licenses impose obligations on the holders and control matters such as prohibiting bonfires, maintaining tidy condition, erection of sheds etc.
- We grow our own produce in our garden, but we share it with other residents who use the allotments and see the benefit of having them in the village.
- Allotments have until recently been kept in very good order.

As stated in the report, the current allotments in the village have come to the end of their lease and the Parish Council have a duty to provide allotments where there is an identified demand. The site proposed is considered to be an underused part of the playing fields and the proposal would allow an alternative recreational use on the site.

The proposal is not considered to impact on highway safety, impact on residential amenity and subject to a condition to restrict the erection of any sheds, greenhouses etc the proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such the application is recommended for refusal as set out in the report.

- (d) Mr Cook, representing the Applicant, addressed the Committee and stated that:
- The Parish Council has control of this site and will not need to relocate it again
 - No sheds or greenhouses will be permitted

- The site will be appropriately fenced
- It is approx. 50m from the football field
- Ownership lies with the Parish Council
- A water supply will be provided
- The emerging Local Plan encourages the provision of allotments and satisfy waiting lists

Cllr Holmes enquired about the use of the footpath and Cllr Cumbers enquired about the maintenance of the footpath. Mr Cook advised that the footpath is a definitive right of way and is maintained by the County Council.

Cllr Higgins moved approval in accordance with recommendation and also asked if the Parish Council could write to concerned residents explaining their choice of site.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the proposal

Members debated the proposal and expressed concerns regarding the introduction of structures from a child protection point of view, and noted that allotments are encouraged by the NPPF.

A vote was taken:

Votes in Favour of approval of permission: 8

Votes Against : 0

There was one abstention

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, for the following reasons:

The Parish Council has a duty to provide allotments where it has identified a demand, and the existing allotment site has come to the end of its lease. The western end of the playing fields are under-utilised as a community facility, and it is considered that allowing an alternative recreational provision on the site is supported by the NPPF. The application is also considered to be supported by policies OS2 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan subject to satisfactory information being submitted prior to first use of the allotments detailing the fence and planting to be in place.

(4) Reference:	15/00826/FUL
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Jinks
Location:	The Hall 2 Main Street Gaddesby
Proposal:	One new dwelling

The Planning Officer stated that:

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single dwelling to the north-east of Gaddesby Hall. The dwelling would be accessed from North Hall Drive and would be located between two existing dwellings on a parcel of land which is currently a grassed area and tennis court. The site lies outside of the designated village envelope.

There are no updates to report.

Correction to page 13 of the report Condition 15 in second to last sentence should read "set a approximately 1 metre lower floor level than the current land level"

In terms of the application whilst the site lies in the designated open countryside it lies on the edge of a sustainable settlement on a parcel of land which forms a group of buildings. The site is not considered to be isolated and is adjacent to a sustainable village and is considered to comply with the requirements of the NPPF. The site is within the Conservation Area and there would be adjacent to two listed buildings. The dwelling is considered to be some distance from the boundary of Gaddesby Hall, a grade II listed building, and it is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Building. Separated from the Church by Paske Grove it is not considered that the proposal would impact on the setting of the Church. In respect of the Conservation Area it is considered that the dwelling would be seen as a group of buildings and with suitable landscaping would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

There has been concern expressed with regards to the levels on site and the impact on the adjoining property. The relationship has been assessed and sited set back in the site it would be adjacent to the side elevation of the adjoining property and on higher ground, it is acknowledged that the proposal would have some impact on neighbouring properties given the distances between the proposed and existing building and the angle it is considered that the relationship is acceptable. A condition is suggested that levels should be submitted and approved and set 1 metre lower than the current land level to ensure that this relationship is acceptable.

Therefore it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and is recommended for approval as set out in the report with the correction to condition 15.

Mr Bingham, representing the views of Gaddesby Parish Council, addressed the Committee and stated:

- The site is close to listed buildings and conservation area and intrudes on to protected open area
- The proposal conflicts with objectives of new local plan in terms
- The Parish Council not accept that the site is supported by NPPF
- They contend the safety issue sat the access
- Removal of Yew hedge

Mrs Grigalis, an objector, addressed the Committee and stated:

- Cars parked on Main Street and the visibility on to Main Street would be an issue

- Impact on the Conservation Area, loss of hedge
- Single track drive is dangerous
- Accident is inevitable
- Designated open space
- The property would be elevated and large scale not suitable for the area
- Height of the garage is intolerable
- The application should not be presented until archaeology/ecology issues investigated.

Mr Jinks, the applicant, addressed the Committee and stated:

- The dwelling would contribute to the neighbourhood
- Appreciate the support of the Planning Committee

Members debated the size and impact of the dwelling. Cllr Holmes expressed concern over the garage not being in the right place and would over shadow the adjacent house.

Cllr Holmes moved refusal of the application on the following grounds;

- Needs to be further back in the site
- House and garage not sympathetic
- Needs to be built in a less oppressive way and not overbearing on adjacent properties

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal to refuse

The Applications and Advice Manager sought clarification over whether it was the garage or the house that should be set back. She suggested a deferment to seek amended plans to set the proposal back into the site to lessen the impact would be an alternative approach.

Cllr Botterill stated that setting the dwelling to far back would impact on the Conservation Area.

Cllr Holmes withdrew her motion and **moved to defer** to enable Officers to seek amended plans to set the dwelling and garage further into the site.

Cllr Cumbers **seconded**

A vote was taken:

Favour: 7

Against: 0

Abstention: 2

DETERMINATION: DEFER, to seek amendments to the layout of the site in order to reduce the impact of the garage upon the adjacent residential property.

(4) Reference: 15/0924/VAC
Applicant: Mr R Whiting
Location: 91 Grantham Road, Bottesford
Proposal: Variation of condition 2 of 15/00604/REM

(e) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

Parish Council comments received – The Parish Council does not have an objection to reduction in the height of building plot no.1.

The application proposes 2 main changes from the existing proposal:

- Plot 2 (to the left) is a whole new house type differing considerably from that already granted permission although it is of similar size (extended in depth by bay windows). It is considered that whilst different in style, there is no strong architectural theme along Grantham Rd and amongst the diversity this house type can be accommodated. It is also notable that the previous house approved on this site was also unique in design.
- Plot 2 (the right) proposes a new house type in that it is a metre lower than the former approval – seeking to address concerns over levels that the enforcement activity on this site relates to. In appearance terms, this barely has an effect but in terms of levels we are happy it provides an adequate streetscene, again with reference to the diversity present.

He advised that the VAC in the reference no. was of little relevance This would be a permission in its own right and as such conditions are applied afresh , including the bat accommodation, pinpointing the levels as per the plans and treatment of windows (obscure glazing) etc.

Mrs Wollard, an objector, addressed the Committee and stated:

- There are rules which should be complied with and these developers are not
- The proposed bay window will impact on residential amenity and they should be flush at first floor level
- The finished floor levels have not been agreed but floor levels are in
- The height of plot 2 should be lowered
- The bat loft should still be accommodated
- The hedge has been removed and there has been flooding of the roadside verge
- The wall should be replaced with a hedge

- There has been non stop work at the site
- All previous conditions should be reaffirmed

The Head of Regulatory Services stated that the proposed amendments would not create overlooking. The committee were advised that the hours of working, road sweeping and parking within the site could be conditioned on this current application as the previous approval was. The bat roost provision and obscure glazed windows are included in the proposed conditions.

Cllr Chandler expressed her concern over the development and the condition on the site including bonfires, parking and hours of working stating they should be conditioned and these conditions enforced.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that the previous conditions can roll forward to this application.

Cllr Chandler **proposed** to approve the application with the additional condition as per the previous approval.

Seconded by Cllr Baguley.

Cllrs commented on the harm that has occurred during construction and how frustrating this must be and commented on the patience of the neighbour.

A vote was taken:

Favour: 9

Against: 0

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and additional conditions requiring:

- **Parking provision within the confines of the site**
- **Wheel washing facilities and their use for vehicles exiting the site**
- **A limitation on the hours of working to 8 am - 6pm Mondays - Fridays, 8am - 2pm Saturdays and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.**

For the following reasons:

The proposal relates to changes to the approved dwellings and includes the second access previously approved. The principle of development remains acceptable and the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity, highway safety and ecology. Conditions can be imposed to ensure the site is developed satisfactorily. The proposal complies with the above policies and NPPF.

D75. PLANING APPEAL

5. PLANNING APPEAL - APPLICATION 15/00082/OUT

The Head of Regulatory Services introduced a report to update Members on the appeal against the non-determination of planning application 15/00082/OUT.

Cllr Chandler moved that the report is approved in accordance with the recommendation. Cllr Wyatt seconded this.

A vote was taken and the motion was agreed unanimously.

DETERMINATION:

- (I) The Committee endorse the decision not to include landscape impact as part of the Authority's case at the forthcoming Public Inquiry.**
- (II) The Committee notes the progress of this case and associated new application.**

D76. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 9.00pm