

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 13th January 2016 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite at Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel), Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher,
N C Lowery, P J Scott, M J Smith and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors S Bentley (for Planning Applications
TWC/2015/0220, TWC/2015/0590 and TWC/2015/0888), Councillor S Reynolds (for
Planning Application TWC/2013/0861) and Councillor J Seymour (for Planning
Application TWC/2015/0888).

PC-072 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor J Loveridge

PC-073 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to planning applications TWC/2015/0694 Councillor C Turley
advised that he was a member of the Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Board and
Management Committee.

PC-074 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held
on 16 December 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-075 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager reported that there were
no deferred or withdrawn applications.

PC-076 SITE VISITS

There were no Officer recommendations for site visits.

PB-077 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

The Arboricultural Officer presented a report on the Tree Preservation Order (TPO)
at Stockton Close, Stirchley.

Members had undertaken a site visit regarding the TPO prior to the meeting.

A selection of photos were displayed at the Meeting which showed views from the
north, west, east and south, along the footpath and from Claverley Drive.

The tree was a prominent feature and formed part of the boundary and was of significant public amenity value worthy of Tree Preservation Order status.

With regards to the points raised by the objectors, the dead wood could be removed without delay and there was no objection to crown thinning and appropriate forms for consent had already been provided .

It was asked that Members approve the Tree Preservation in its current form.

During the discussion Members agreed that the tree was a prominent feature and of significant amenity value. The maintenance of the tree was highlighted but it was noted that the Tree Preservation Order would not restrict this work.

Following the discussion it was unanimously:

RESOLVED – that the Tree Preservation Order, Borough of Telford & Wrekin (Ash Tree within the boundary of 4 and 5 Stockton Close, Stirchley, Telford, TF3 1RR) Tree Preservation Order 2015 be confirmed.

PB-078 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding each planning application.

- (a) TWC/2013/0861 – Sutherland Business & Enterprise College, Gibbons Road, Trench, Telford, Shropshire TF2 7JR

This was an Outline application for the erection of up to 123 dwellings together with open space, sports pitches, landscaping and associated infrastructure, and the demolition of the existing school buildings with all matters reserved. The application site was formerly the Sutherland School/Academy, whose pupils had now moved to the newly opened Telford Priory School which had replaced both Sutherland and Wrockwardine Wood schools. The re-development of the Sutherland site formed part of the Council's overall 'Building Schools for the Future' programme, in terms of generating capital funding for the new School(s). An indicative layout had been submitted in support of the application, showing where vehicular access could be provided, and how the development (including open space and sports pitches) could fit on the site.

This application had been deferred from the previous meeting in order for a site visit. The site visit had taken place prior to this meeting.

An update report was tabled at the meeting.

Cllr Stephen Reynolds spoke on behalf of Cllr Shirley Reynolds, Ward Councillor for Wrockwardine Wood and Trench, who was unable to attend the meeting. As Members would have seen from their site visit, this proposed development was proposed in a settled part of the Borough and it was vital that any development was

sympathetic to the surrounding area and contained affordable housing and bungalows. This was an area of traditional community and housed a high proportion of elderly people. Concerns were raised regarding the positioning of the sports pitches and the lack of changing facilities, toilets and parking. Cllr Reynolds appreciated that this was an application for outline permission only, but asked that this development complemented and revitalised the local community. There was concern regarding 3 storey properties which would be out of character to the area and impact on the privacy on neighbouring properties. The trees at Gibbons Road and the hedge on the western boundary needed to be retained, as well as the buffer zone to protect the Grade II listed building. There needed to be an improved option for the siting of the entrance and the access needed to be looked at carefully due to the daily movement of traffic next to the children's nursery as toddlers and cars were not a good mix and consideration needed to be given to the community as a whole.

Cllr K Hanmer, Parish Councillor for Wrockwardine Wood & Trench, addressed the Members on behalf of Cllr C Smith who was unable to attend the meeting. The Parish Council were not opposed to any development on this site as long as it was in keeping and fit in with the current community. They had 2 objectives which were for the supply of social rented and affordable housing and bungalows which would be in keeping with the local area, and how the Government's affordable housing targets could be reached. Cllr Hanmer raised concerns regarding 3 storey buildings and the land levels on Gibbons Road and that the development must be sympathetic to the existing community and become part of the established settlement. The Parish Council requested that they be included in any consultation as the planning application unfolded.

Mrs L Madeley, Local Resident spoke on behalf of residents and Mrs L Hurcombe, Trench Tots Nursery, who was unable to attend the meeting. There was concern for the plan around the nursery area, the siting of the football pitches and anti-social behaviour. It was hoped that the open green space would be retained in order that the community could enjoy this healthy and peaceful area and the nursery could meet Ofsted recommendations. Safety concerns were raised regarding the proposed access. A more suitable access road would be on the northern edge of the site by the old garages, which would ease concerns raised with regard to the expansion of the nursery and parking issues on Gibbons Road. Residents remained concerned regarding senior football. Junior football was well managed and this gave no concern. They also felt that there was no need for further football pitches on this site.

Mr J Dunn, Applicant, gave a brief background on the application and the proposals. Detailed plans would come forward at a later stage. The red line boundary was drawn to include Trench Lane and Furnace Lane. Sport England had asked that this be included within the school site for development. Trench Lane and Furnace Lane playing fields would not be sold and would remain in the ownership of the Council. The grass playing pitches would replace the tennis courts with a mini pitch being sited at the Furnace Lane Youth Centre. Two further mini pitches had also been requested by Sport England and agreed by Parks and Open Spaces Officers. Discussions had been ongoing with Trench Tots regarding a larger site and the provision of further parking spaces and when the details were at a final stage the nursery could submit a separate planning application. With regard to Green Open

Space and the Green Guarantee, the south west corner of the development site would be delivered by the Developer and this would be maintained by Parks and Open Spaces.

The Planning Officer advised Members that this was an application for Outline Planning Permission with all Matters Reserved. Any reserved matters application would follow the same process as the outline application. The principle of the application was acceptable and was within a sustainable area with a bus services and local facilities. This area was also put forward for development within the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and was a mainly residential area. Sport England originally objected to the application but this objection was removed once agreement had been reached regarding the sports pitches. It was felt that there were exceptional circumstances and the re-development was negotiated through the BSF Programme which provided new education facilities for the area and the creation of additional mini pitches and open spaces under the Green Guarantee. Financial contributions had been secured for new play facilities. The application was not considered viable to provide affordable housing. An update report had been tabled that addressed some of the concerns. The ball court would not be sited next to the nursery. The design and appearance of the development was not for consideration at this meeting and would be considered as part of the next process.

A discussion took place and although members concurred this was a good site for development as it was on brownfield land they raised concerns regarding the access, the size of the dwellings and senior football. Further concerns were raised regarding the lack of affordable housing on the site and a discussion took place regarding the viability assessment. Members agreed that the site would be suitable for development but asked officers to take on board the concerns of the public when any reserved matters application came forward.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0861 that Delegated Authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to Grant Outline Planning Permission (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval) subject to the following:

A) The applicant submit a signed Memorandum of understanding relating to:

A financial contribution of £145,000 towards the maintenance of the proposed sports pitches, a financial contribution of £55,000 to ensure the provision of a new ball court, a financial contribution of £5,000 towards the costs associated with the existing Traffic Regulation Order and a financial contribution of £5,000 towards the monitoring of the Travel Plan

B) The conditions and information set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2015/0220 – Site of Roden Nurseries, Roden Lane, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought outline planning consent for the erection of 9 dwellings with all matters reserved on pasture land south of Roden Lane and on the western edge of Roden Village. The site fell within the existing boundary of Roden Nurseries.

This application had previously been before the Committee on 3rd June 2015 and officers had recommended that this application be refused. At that meeting a request to defer the application was proposed following a late proposal from the applicant to provide a supply of mains water to the village of Roden. It was agreed that this application would be deferred to allow an investigation into the provision of a new water supply for the wider community benefit for the village.

The Planning Officer had received information which set out the basis of the water mains and the costs involved, including those costs applicable to the wider community should they wish to benefit from mains water.

The site was within the rural area, where development was focused on three identified settlements, outside of those areas, limited development was permitted in line with Policy H9. Policy H9 allowed for smaller developments and if acceptable within this policy then the development would need to be considered with regard to Policy H10 which limited development to 1-2 infill plots that would not encroach into the open countryside. This development within Roden was identified for limited development by policy H9 but would result in a large development that would encroach into the rural area, and due to the presence of Tree Preservation Orders in place on the site any layout of 9 units would be hindered. Officers had therefore originally recommended refusal of this application.

The officer identified that Roden was the only village identified that did not benefit from mains water. Proposals had now come forward to install a water main through the village to serve this development and this would be available for the residents to tap into; although there would be a cost to the residents. The Planning Officer had interrogated these costs and these would be standard installation costs, whereby the maximum cost would be in the region of £2,000 per property.

It was considered that these were exceptional circumstances that would not occur within any other village and the Officers had now recommended the application for approval.

Cllr S Bentley, Ward Member for Edgmond and Ercall Magna, gave his support for this application. This settlement was ideally located and continued to offer employment opportunities taking account of its previous history within the economy of the area and was supported by the Parish Council and the community. This development would give the potential for further investment and opportunity within the village. This was a unique situation within the UK and he congratulated the officers for the work that had been undertaken on this application and noted that there was now unanimous support for this development.

Mr A Williams, Applicant's Agent, informed Members of the endorsement and support locally for this application and was grateful that the application had been deferred to consider the mains water supply for the community benefit which would come at a reasonable cost to existing residents. Following the discussions with Severn Trent Water Mr Williams confirmed that mains water could be supplied at a considerable cost to the developer and would be funded by the proposed development. The Applicant was happy for a condition that the water mains be installed prior to the units becoming occupied. There was an offer to local residents to install water mains at their properties for the normal instalment charge only and there would be no clawback or extra benefit to the developer. The outline planning application demonstrated an acceptable scheme of 9 dwellings which would protect the young trees in situ and there had been no technical objections. Officers now accepted the benefit to the community and the environment and Mr Williams urged the Members to accept the revised Officer recommendation.

The Planning Officer explained that previously the position had been that Core Strategy policy CS7 had focused development in rural areas to High Ercall, Waters Upton and Tibberton. Outside of this development was limited, and within the open countryside strictly controlled. The previous recommendation had been based on that principle as there was no justification or material consideration and the village would have been extended into open countryside. This development was now subject to a significant community benefit of the water mains supply, which would not anticipated to come forward unless on the back of significant major development; and approximately 74 properties would benefit at a limited affordable cost to themselves of approximately £2,000, if they wished to take up this opportunity. Other businesses in and around the Village ie Roden Nursing Home, Roden Nurseries and Coopers Sausage Rolls would also benefit from the water mains and this would enable them to continue investment into the area. The Oak Trees would be protected although it was to be noted that this was only an outline planning application with all matters reserved and there may need to be an amendment regarding the trees with suitable replacements when officers consider the most appropriate layout through the reserved matters application. Officers were now of the opinion that 9 houses on this site bringing forward an exceptional community benefit now weighted the planning balance, and was now acceptable. Members were asked to agree the revised recommendation to approve this application subject to water mains being installed prior to occupation.

A discussion took place regarding the significant wider community benefit that this application would bring to the village of Roden and Members welcomed the application. Whilst this material consideration may attract more investment, encroachment into green field land must be kept in mind.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0220 outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives contained within the report.

(c) TWC/2015/0590 Land Adjacent Bleak House, Rowton, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought full consent for the erection of one detached dwelling with double garage and associated landscaping and access on land adjacent to Bleak House in Rowton. The proposed dwelling comprised a two storey, 4 bedroom detached house with a gable roof design and a detached double garage to the front and sited to the west of Bleak House and on the western edge of the village.

The Planning Officer advised Members that this development was within the rural area where development is focused on the three identified settlements as defined by policy CS7, elsewhere development was limited in the rural area, and strictly controlled within the open countryside. Policy H9 identified suitable areas where development in the rural area was limited. Rowton was not identified as a suitable settlement and was contrary to the Development Plan.

Cllr S Bentley, Ward Councillor for Edmond and Ercall Magna addressed the Members on behalf of the Applicants. Bleak House was a 17th Century listed building. The applicants wished to remain in the village but were unable to buy an alternative suitable property. The owners struggled to cope with the demands needed to maintain and keep Bleak House and the Applicant's wife had health issues. There were several outbuildings on the site but none suitable for conversion. The benefit of this development would be the design and this would not detract from the paddock area. The construction material could complement that of Bleak House and neighbouring properties. There were no objections from neighbours, Ercall Magna Parish Council or Tree Officers. Cllr Bentley drew the Members' attention to an application at "The Firs", a neighbouring property which had previously been approved, and this was 1 property in isolation. Policy CS7 and NPPF guidance took into account the needs of the individual. In a key settlement the Policy CS1 did not apply to a single property. Cllr Bentley also referred to Paragraph 6.10, 6.13 and 6.15 of the NPPF which related to the needs of the individual, the property not being beyond the edge of the village and agricultural land.

The Planning Officer advised Members that this development sat on the edge of the village on an open paddock within the curtilage of the property. Development within this location was unacceptable in principle based on current policy and Members' attention was drawn to the Application at Baxter House which was dismissed in November 2015 due to no special circumstances and did not meet policy CS7 and Policy H9. There would be a loss of grade 3 agricultural land that was defined as good to moderate and officers had raised concerns on the adverse impact of this development. The planning officer acknowledged "The Firs" application, this was on enclosed garden land and was approved prior to the Council having a 5 year land supply when these villages were allowed some small scale development; limited to 1-2 dwellings to support the vitality and vibrancy of the area, but subject to not extending into the open countryside. Attention was drawn to the Baxter House

decision which identified Rowton as an isolated village with limited facilities ie a church and a limited bus service on week days only which would mean that residents would be reliant on a car to access services ie doctors, public house, shops and schools. The Conservation Officer had expressed concerns regarding the design, however officers considered this design was on balance acceptable, the decision however was not acceptable purely in principle. There was a Tree Preservation Order on site and amendments to visibility splays would be required. There were no concerns regarding ecology, drainage or land contamination. The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to Policy H9 which had been omitted from the recommendation, and requested this was added to the reason for refusal.

With regard to meeting the needs of the individual, no specific needs test or special circumstances had been given and no evidence to confirm that the buildings/outbuildings within the site were not capable of conversion had been submitted. Members were asked to refuse the application based on policies.

A discussion took place around the reasons for the approval of "The Firs" application and why the Bleak House differed as the scale and design was the same and was generally acceptable and the impact of the 5 year housing land supply, suggesting that policies did not change overnight. It was questioned whether there was an encroachment into open countryside and whether the NPPF applied to the paddock as this was grade 3 agricultural land and not rolling fields. Members suggested that a common sense approach was taken when interpreting policy. A question was raised as to whether a deferment should be agreed in order for the applicants to submit a medical report and information around exceptional circumstances.

The Planning Officer advised Members that as the 5 year housing land supply became apparent. It was from that precise moment that the local policies were considered up to date, as confirmed by the Barrister's opinion in March 2015; and that is why members had re-considered several applications, giving them opportunities to refuse previous resolutions of the committee to grant applications. The paddock was contained within the curtilage of the house. There was no defined village boundary. Officers had referred to recent appeal decisions in relation to this application, both Baxter House in November 2015, and that of Charlton dismissed that week, confirming the approach to development outside of those settlements identified in both policy CS7 and H9.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist informed Members that there were two important points to consider. This application was not recommended for refusal on a technicality, but on an important policy issue. The decision at "The Firs" did not set a precedent as the position of the Council had now changed following the decision in the High Court and Legal Advice that the Council's 5 year housing land supply had reached the right figure. This application was clearly contrary to national and local policy. The Council was facing a number of important appeals about development and needed to demonstrate that the Council and the Planning Committee had firmly set out and used these policies. The advice to Members was to stick to Policy and use this Policy as this would send a clear message regarding appeals and would strengthen the Council's position.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED – That with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0590, that Planning permission be refused on the following grounds:

- the Local Planning Authority considers the proposed dwelling to be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies relating to the location of the development within the rural area. The Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and as such there is no requirement for additional dwellings in this remote rural location. Furthermore the site would involve encroachment into open countryside and loss of good quality agricultural land and there are no special or exceptional circumstances to support this application. The application site is considered to be unsustainable and would cause harm to the landscape and setting of the open countryside. Accordingly the principle of the development is contrary to the NPPF, CS7 and CS15 of the Core Strategy and Policies H9 and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

d) TWC/2013/0694 Halfway House, The Wrekin, Telford

This application sought full planning permission for residential alterations to The Halfway House on The Wrekin. The development included the installation of new timber cladding to the first floor which replaced the existing white painted brickwork; the installation of two large dormer extensions to the front elevation which were located one above the other and two further large dormer extensions to the rear again one over the other. Four roof lights had also be installed, two to the front, one to the side and one to the rear. A new window had been installed on the ground floor rear elevation and two replacements to the side elevation. These works had already been carried out in full.

There was also a proposal for a detached car port located to the North of the house which would be of a timber construction and single storey. This would have a shallow pitched tile roof totalling 3.7m height. These works had not been completed.

A further proposal for a detached timber outbuilding measuring 1.3m x 1.1m and up to 2.7m high to house a vending machine had already been completed and currently installed under the canopy of a mature tree outside the boundary of the dwelling but within the ownership of the Halfway House on the access route past the Halfway House which led to the summit of The Wrekin.

Planning permission was required as the dwelling was located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In such areas permitted development rights are reduced and permission required for any extensions, cladding of walls and any addition or alteration of a roof.

Cllr J Seymour, Ward Councillor for Wrockwardine, addressed Members regarding the development at the Halfway House which was a welcome stop-off on the way up and on the way down the Wrekin. This had not been the case in recent years when the dwelling became empty and dilapidated and had become an ongoing eyesore and if left would probably have fallen into total disrepair. The recommendation to

refuse was overlooked as this development was not in a conservation area and there was no impact on surrounding properties. With regard to the impact on the long distance views, Cllr Seymour confirmed that she had never seen the house from afar. It was Cllr Seymour's view that this decision had been based on the Officer's own personal likes and dislikes. The Applicant was willing to change the application and withdraw the car port, but he could not afford to re-do all the work which had been carried out. If this was the case then he may have to cut his losses and abandon the project. Cllr Seymour did not usually approve of retrospective consent but in this case the development was having a real impact on those who passed the building and was open to provide services. It was suggested that Members see the work that has been carried out for themselves and take their personal view whether it visually acceptable or an eyesore and a site visit was requested.

Mr S Seward, Applicant, explained to Members the reasons why he was in his current position. Mr Seward grew up locally and had fond memories of the building from his childhood and although surprised at the state of the building when it came up for sale he decided to take on the challenge. The development provides facilities for thousands of people and upon successfully purchasing the house polled local walkers to see what they wanted. A developer was then appointed and work started on the house as it was not liveable due to falling walls and damp. As some of the work had been completed without planning permission, Mr Seward was now in limbo and the development on hold and the facilities of the shop, toilets and the vending machine closed to the public. New builders had now been appointed and it may be necessary to remove the vending machine and move the car port. There had been no negative input from the community and Mr Seward asked Members to attend a site visit.

The Planning Officer advised Members that the main issue was the design and this was an important feature visible from the pathway, together with longer distance views at the descent from Little Wenlock. This was an area visited by thousands of people and there were environmental, ecological and social issues with this site. Timber cladding had replaced the simple white paint which sat against the grey backdrop of the clouds. There were 4 larger dormer windows which were significant individually and had an impact on the dwelling ratio and were considered to be more dormer extensions than windows as the windows themselves were only small slits. Individually they were unacceptable, and in combination had a significant cumulative impact; these were wider than any protruding apex and monstrous when compared to the scale of the existing dormer windows. This arrangement had specifically been created to provide more floor space and head height. The officer confirmed that this development would have been restricted within the urban area let alone in an AONB and visited by thousands of people. The dormer windows did not comply with building regulations and without any information being submitted it was difficult to say what alternative would work; but as submitted and being considered by members amendments would need to come forward. The outbuilding feature on the footpath whilst beyond the built boundary of the dwelling was in the ownership of the applicant but was a poor form of development that was significantly prominent. Officers had asked that this was moved closer to the house in order that it was not so dominant but no amendments were forthcoming. There were no bins in this

location and rubbish had collected at this location. Further rubbish was likely to collect if no bin was provided.

With regard to the car port, no information had been received as to the impact on the stability of the hillside and levels and level changes; and a request had been made for a land stability declaration form to be carried out by a suitably qualified person. The Planning Officer currently had no idea as to what harm the car port would have on the stability of the dwellings curtilage or on the wider hillside that formed part of the Wrekin and AONB. With regard to the roof lights and windows, the Officers had no objections to these.

Development on this property was restricted and there were some significant issues. This development would set a standard for what is appropriate and developers needed to recognise what was acceptable and respect and reinforce the host dwelling. The suitability of this application was considered inadequate and contrary to the work of the Wrekin Special Partnership and the work of the AONB.

The Chair asked members to consider whether this application should be deferred for a site visit to take place. Following the discussion and upon being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0694 that this application be deferred to the next meeting in order that a site visit could take place.

(e) TWC/2015/0888 Dukes Meadow, Sleapford, Long Lane, Telford

This application sought consent for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension with accommodation within the roof space and the creation of a Juliet balcony to the rear at Dukes Meadow, Sleapford, Long Lane, Telford. The development would provide a garage and summer room and extensions to the existing rooms at ground floor level. An additional bedroom would be accommodated within the roof space.

An update report was tabled at the meeting detailing a further consultation response.

Cllr S Bentley, Ward Councillor for Edgmond and Ercall Magna, spoke on behalf of the closest neighbouring residents. Concerns continued to be around the hedgerow, the trees and the Juliet balcony. A large amount of work had been undertaken by the Officers in order to secure amendments to the plans but further work was needed. There were no comments from the Arboricultural Officer regarding the trees at the boundary but if this could be looked at again he was sure that the neighbouring residents could conclude the discussions.

Mr A Sanghera, Applicant, addressed the Members and confirmed that since the consultation period discussions had taken place with Officers to address the concerns raised. Mr Sanghera didn't wish to add anything further to the report but was willing to address the further concerns raised at the Committee.

The Planning Officer advised Members that this application was for the extension of a bungalow within a mix of properties. The property benefits from permitted development rights and principle of a side and rear extension could take place, but because of certain design aspects requires consent. This included the side extension that wrapped around to the rear extension and the balcony. Two versions of amended plans had been received since the registration of the application, as the officer sought to reduce the impact on the neighbouring property and improved the design; this included the removal of the projecting balcony which was reduced to a Juliette balcony. Issues raised regarding the development being out of character, disproportionate and overlooking neighbours were addressed in the update report tabled at the meeting. The Planning officer drew members attention to the Google Satellite image of the properties indicating the location of the trees; one tree would be removed to the side of the property but there would be no further impact on trees or the hedgerow; officers reminded members of the applicants rights to remove any overhanging tree branches and permitted development rights. Officers now considered the application acceptable and recommend approval with the condition that the side elevation plan received on 25th November 2015 be submitted with the application.

Members considered that officers had now done enough work to resolve all issues raised and that the development be approved.

Following the discussion it was unanimously:

RESOLVED - that with respect to Planning Application TWC/2015/0888 it was agreed Full Planning Consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report and an additional condition requesting an amended side elevation plan showing the amendment removing the balcony, reflecting the other approved plans.

The meeting ended at 7.44pm

Chairman:

Date: