

Public Document Pack

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 21 January 2016 at 6.01 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor F J W Scales

Councillors: B W Butcher
J S Back
S F Bannister
T J Bartlett
T A Bond
B Gardner
D P Murphy
A F Richardson
P M Wallace (Minute Nos 91 to 98 only)

Officers: Principal Planner
Principal Planner (Renewable Energy)
Principal Planner
Senior Planner
Planning Consultant
Planning Consultant
Planning Delivery Manager
Locum Planning Solicitor
Trainee Solicitor
Democratic Support Officer

The following persons were also present and spoke in connection with the applications indicated:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/15/00482	Mr Jeremy Abbott	Mrs Barbara Peel
DOV/15/00533	Mr Mike Simmonds	Mr John Heyworth Councillor Paul Watkins
DOV/15/00777	Mr Ian Williams	-----
DOV/15/00444	Mr John Butler	Councillor Linda Keen
DOV/15/00952	Mr John Butler	Mr Anthony Price Councillor Linda Keen

84 APOLOGIES

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

85 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that there were no substitute Members.

86 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A F Richardson made a Voluntary Announcement of Other Interests in respect of agenda items 6 (Application No DOV/15/00638 – Land at Upton House, 4 Mill Lane, Shepherdswell) and 11 (Application No DOV/15/00777 – Former Snowdown Colliery, Snowdown) by reason of his employment with the Canterbury

Archaeological Trust and the fact that archaeological conditions were attached to these applications.

87 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman advised that Application Nos DOV/15/00624 and 00625 (The Chequer Inn, Chequer Lane, Ash) had been withdrawn from the agenda due to the late submission of a large volume of information which Officers had not had time to assess adequately before the meeting. Given that the information could have had a bearing on the advice given to the Committee, the decision had been taken to withdraw the item. Councillor B Gardner expressed concern that this situation had arisen, and stressed that representations should have been lodged in a timely manner during the statutory consultation period.

88 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

89 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman advised that Application No DOV/15/00444 (Aylesham Village Expansion) was dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

90 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00638 - LAND AT UPTON HOUSE, 4 MILL LANE, SHEPHERDSWELL

The Committee viewed plans and photographs of the application site. The Consultant Planner advised the Committee that the application sought planning permission for the erection of three detached dwellings on a site designated for development in policy LA 32 of the Council's Land Allocations Local Plan (LALP). Located in a Conservation Area, any development would need to reflect the character and scale of adjacent development. Members were advised of a correction to the report which referred to Snowdown rather than Shepherdswell in the context of Policy CP1 of the Council's Core Strategy. It was clarified that Shepherdswell was a local centre which was a secondary focus for development in the rural area rather than a hamlet as stated in the report.

Officers had sought revisions to the original application to reduce the number of dwellings from four to three and to reduce their scale. All three dwellings would differ in form, varying from single to two storey and in the materials used. Their design was considered sympathetic to the street scene and Conservation Area. There would be no adverse impact on the privacy of surrounding dwellings, and parking provision met the required standards. Existing hedgerow would be retained as far as possible, with additional hedgerow planted to replace any losses. Overall, the proposed development would have no harmful impact on the significance of the Conservation Area, with the opportunity for improvement. It was in accordance with the LALP, the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and was therefore recommended for approval.

Several Members welcomed the reduction in the number of dwellings, and praised the design of the scheme which was in keeping with the surrounding area.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/15/00638 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Timescale for commencement of development;
 - (ii) List of approved plans;
 - (iii) Samples of materials to be used;
 - (iv) Details of hard and soft landscaping, including planting schedule and programme;
 - (v) Provision and retention of parking and accesses;
 - (vi) Provision and retention of cycle parking;
 - (vii) Provision and retention of pedestrian visibility splays;
 - (viii) Provision and retention of vehicle access visibility splays;
 - (ix) Details of surface water drainage;
 - (x) Driveway to be constructed of bound material;
 - (xi) No further windows in side elevations or roof slopes;
 - (xii) Restriction in hours of construction;
 - (xiii) Construction management plan;
 - (xiv) Protection of retained trees during construction;
 - (xv) Archaeological watching brief.
- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

91 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/01065 - LAND TO THE REAR OF 19 AND 21 BEWSBURY CRESCENT, WHITFIELD

Members were shown photographs and plans of the application site. The Principal Planner advised that the proposal was for the erection of two detached, 3-bedroomed bungalows. Vehicle access would be provided between nos 19 and 21 by demolishing half of the garage to no 19 and removing the hedge separating the two houses. A solid wall would be built against the existing conservatory of no 19 in order to screen vehicles using the access.

The Committee was advised that two previous planning applications for similar developments on the site had been refused by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The first, a full application for three dwellings, sought the demolition of the garage at

no 21 with new access provided between nos 21 and 23. Parking and bin storage would have been provided in the front garden. Two floors of accommodation were proposed, with three bedrooms and two bathrooms in the roof space. The second, an outline application, was the same but for two dwellings. The applicant had appealed against both refusals which had been heard at the same time.

The Planning Inspector's decision had reached three principal conclusions. Firstly, in paragraph 7, that the proposals would have little impact on the character of the area, would not be unacceptably intrusive and would be in keeping with the residential character of the area. Secondly, in paragraph 8, that the loss of the grassed front garden and part of the grass verge for parking, together with the bin storage hardstanding, would have a harsh appearance which would detract from the spacious and landscaped appearance of the area. Furthermore, that the proposals failed to integrate into the existing built environment, harming the quality of the area, and were therefore contrary to the NPPF. Thirdly, in paragraphs 9 and 10, the vehicle access was considered. This would be within 1 metre of no 23 which had glass doors and ground-floor bedroom windows facing onto the access road, as well as a patio area. Vehicle traffic would be in close proximity to the patio and bedrooms, and the increase in traffic would result in noise and disturbance and a poor level of amenity for no 23. It was therefore also contrary to the NPPF on these grounds and the appeals were dismissed.

The Committee was advised that the Inspector's decision was a significant material consideration. However, Officers were of the view that the Inspector's conclusions on the proposal's impact on the street scene and its impact on the residential amenity of no 23 had been overcome by the current application. The proposed vehicle access would not have the same impact on nos 19 and 21 as these buildings were configured differently to no 23. No 21 had one side-facing window which was fitted with obscure glass and served a bathroom. The impact on no 19 had been overcome by replacing the glazed side wall of the conservatory with a solid brick wall and the replacement of a privet hedge. Furthermore, car parking and bin storage would now be located to the rear of nos 19 and 21, thus preserving the front gardens of these dwellings.

Members were advised that the occupant of no 23 had sent an e-mail which he had asked to be relayed to the Committee. In summary, this pointed out that the plans had already been rejected twice and dismissed on appeal. Whilst the current plans proposed a change of access, the proposals were still cramped and not in keeping with the rest of the street. Alterations made to the latest application would place the houses two metres closer together. This would exacerbate the cramped appearance and was not reflected in the original plan.

Councillors B W Butcher and Gardner expressed concerns about access arrangements and their effect on no 21. In response to Councillor J S Back, the Principal Planner confirmed that she was satisfied that the amended application was in accordance with paragraphs 17, 61 and 64 of the NPPF, these having been factors behind the refusal of the previous two applications. Given that the proposed dwellings would have windows at first floor level only, and the separation distance between adjacent dwellings, she was also satisfied that there would be no overlooking onto properties in Castle Drive or elsewhere. This would be safeguarded by the removal of permitted development rights. Councillor T A Bond agreed with the concerns raised about access and also questioned the potential impact of two additional dwellings on flooding in the area.

Councillor Richardson stated that he was opposed to back garden development, but accepted that the principle of such development at this site had been established. However, whilst the access arrangements were an improvement on previous proposals, they were not substantially better and he was of the view that the detrimental impact had simply been transferred from nos 21 and 23 to nos 19 and 21.

Councillor S F Bannister commented that, although the proposal was an intensive use of the site, in his opinion they were not cramped. The access was already in place and the proposal would mean a few more cars using it each day. On drainage, he advised that every new house was required to have soakaways installed, and his understanding was that all driveways now had to be of a permeable material.

The Principal Planner advised that Southern Water had not been consulted on this application due to its size. However, the plans indicated that a sustainable drainage system would be used and details of this had been conditioned in order to alleviate residents' concerns. Back land development was not ruled out by the NPPF, but was now assessed on a site by site basis. In reaching his decision, the Inspector had done a thorough assessment of the site and concluded that the general principle of development there was acceptable. Members were reminded of a recent appeal decision relating to Nancowry in St Margaret's-at-Cliffe. That proposal had also sought to develop garden land and had been refused by the Committee. However, the appeal had been upheld and now gave a steer on the principle of back land development being decided on a site by site basis.

It was moved by Councillor B Gardner and duly seconded that the application should be refused on the grounds of the impact on the space and character of the area and access arrangements. However, at the request of Councillor A F Richardson, Councillor Gardner agreed to amend his motion in order that the application would be refused on access grounds only.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/15/01065 be REFUSED on the ground that, by reason of the intensification of the use of the access between nos 19 and 21, the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of both properties, through the introduction of vehicle movements along the side and rear of these properties and the associated activity and disturbance that would arise from these movements. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

92 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00482 - GUY'S CLIFF, CHALK HILL ROAD, KINGSDOWN

The Committee viewed photographs, plans and drawings of the site. The Senior Planner advised Members of the reasons for the application being before them. These were set out in detail in section a) of the report. In summary, Officers had incorrectly used delegated powers to grant planning permission when the application should have come to Committee for determination as 6 objections had been received. The Committee was requested to indicate whether it would have resolved to grant planning permission had it determined the application.

The Committee was advised that the proposal sought the demolition of an existing dwelling and its replacement with two two-storey dwellings. The site would be sub-

divided into two plots with access to each plot utilising the existing two access points. Members were informed that the plans for Plot 1 showed a garage which had not appeared in the planning application or been advertised, and this would therefore require the submission of another application should the Committee be minded to approve.

In response to concerns raised by the occupants of Little Stow regarding overshadowing, the applicant had submitted a shadowing study. Whilst the study indicated that there was a significant degree of overshadowing in January, this was reduced in March and considerably reduced in summer when the sun was overhead for much of the day. Given the added factor of the 15-metre distance between dwellings and the presence of an intervening garage, Officers were satisfied that there would be no significant overshadowing. In terms of overlooking, the site fell to the rear and overlooking could therefore potentially be a problem. However, the rear of the proposed dwellings would be between 55 and 56 metres distant from Alexandra Road and, together with the presence of shrubs, bushes, two pine trees and the removal of a Juliet balcony in Plot 2, overlooking was not a matter of concern.

Ringwould with Kingsdown Parish Council had raised objections on highway grounds, preferring the footpath to be extended along the front of the application site for pedestrian safety. However, such an arrangement would be too engineered for a location which was on the edge of the village and therefore considered transitional between countryside and built development. Kent County Council (KCC) Highways were content with the two access points which would be widened and visibility splays provided. It had also raised no objection to the retention of hedges at the access points which would be maintained at 1 metre or lower.

Councillors Butcher and T J Bartlett welcomed the design of the proposed dwellings which were in keeping with the area. Although there might be a small loss of amenity due to overshadowing, this would not be so significant to justify refusal of planning permission. Councillor Richardson agreed, adding that the dwellings would be on large plots and that KCC Highways had raised no objections on highways or access grounds. Councillor Gardner expressed concerns that if planning permission were granted this would be with conditions which referred to drawings that included the garage. The Senior Planner clarified that Drawing No 52A, received on 8 December 2015, had included the garage. However, the application itself had not described a garage and the applicant had therefore been invited to submit a separate application for the garage. The Chairman confirmed that the Committee, if minded to do so, would be granting planning permission for two dwellings only and not for the garage. Several Members pointed out that references to the garage within the report had led to confusion and were not helpful.

RESOLVED: That the Planning Committee indicates that it would have resolved to grant planning permission had it been requested to determine Application No DOV/15/00482, subject to the following conditions (reproduced in full in the Committee report):

- (i) Details in accordance with approved plans;
- (ii) Time limit 3 years;
- (iii) Samples of materials;

- (iv) Details of boundary treatment;
- (v) Hard and soft landscaping;
- (vi) Tree and hedgerow survey;
- (vii) Trees and hedgerows to be retained;
- (viii) Parking spaces;
- (ix) Construction of access;
- (x) Access bound surface;
- (xi) No discharge of surface water onto the highway;
- (xii) Details of cycle and bin storage;
- (xiii) Construction management plan;
- (xiv) Hedgerow site frontage no taller than 1 metre;
- (xv) Access gradient;
- (xvi) Plot 1 – North North West elevation: obscure glass and window openings 1700mm;
- (xvii) Plot 2 – South South East elevation: obscure glass, window openings 1700mm, living-room high-level windows fixed shut;
- (xviii) Permitted development restrictions - new openings North North West elevation Plot 1; South South East elevation Plot 2. New openings and alterations to first-floor windows.

93 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00533 - LAND FRONTING SEA VIEW ROAD AND REAR OF PALMERSTON, LIGHTHOUSE ROAD, ST MARGARET'S BAY

The Committee was shown photographs and plans of the site which had previously formed part of the garden of Palmerston. The Senior Planner advised Members that an application to build a dwelling on the site had been refused by the LPA in April 2014. A subsequent planning appeal had been allowed and permission granted in January 2015. However, a number of variations to the original planning permission were now sought under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act, albeit that construction was already significantly advanced. The Chairman clarified that the Committee's role was to consider the proposed amendments to assess what impact they would have on the original application and the planning permission granted by the Inspector. It was also clarified that the removal of permitted development rights did not mean that further development could not take place, but simply that planning permission must be sought from the LPA.

The variations sought to the original application included the construction of a basement (already completed) which would have bi-fold doors opening onto a patio. A window serving the en-suite bathroom of the second bedroom would now be moved to the front facing return wall on Sea View Road. A roof terrace had been removed and replaced by an extension incorporating a sea view lounge.

Councillor Butcher expressed concerns about the proposals which he did not think were in keeping with surrounding properties. Councillor Bannister raised concerns about the design, particularly the roof extension which was incongruous to the building and surrounding area. Councillor Richardson commented that he was concerned about overlooking from the bedrooms. The excavation of the basement without planning permission also vexed him, for archaeological reasons, although he had no objection in principle. Like other Members, he was in favour of a site visit to assess the impact of the roof extension. The Chairman commented that Members also needed to consider whether some of the proposed variations would bring benefits.

The Senior Planner clarified that, of the four conditions attached to the Inspector's grant of planning permission, condition 2 was relevant. It was confirmed that there was no archaeological interest in the development. The appeal decision had been issued in January 2015. An application for non-material amendments and an application for a variation (relating only to the roof extension) under Section 73 had been received in the summer. The former had been refused since Officers considered that some of the proposed amendments were material changes. The applicant had subsequently been advised to include the content of the non-material application as part of the application under Section 73 in order to cover all the proposed amendments. This was the application now before Committee. In response to a query from Councillor Gardner, the Senior Planner advised that the basement and glazing works had gone ahead without permission.

RESOLVED: That Application No DOV/15/00533 be DEFERRED for a site visit to be held on Tuesday, 23 February 2016 in order to assist Members in assessing the impact of the proposed variations to condition 2 (including on overlooking, overshadowing, the street scene and form and design), and whether the variations are likely to create any benefits or disadvantages, and Councillors S F Bannister, B Gardner, D P Murphy, A F Richardson and F J W Scales (reserve: Councillor B W Butcher) be appointed to visit the site.

94

APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00777 - FORMER SNOWDOWN COLLIERY, SNOWDOWN

Members viewed photographs and plans of the site which was 50 hectares in size and located immediately to the south of Snowdown. The Principal Planner (Renewable Energy) advised the Committee that the proposal was to develop the central part of the site as a solar farm. Routeing arrangements for construction traffic had initially been of concern but were now considered acceptable following changes made. KCC Highways was also satisfied with the construction traffic management plan, and parking and unloading arrangements. The Environment Agency had initially raised objections due to concerns about groundwater contamination. However, the applicant had made revisions to the scheme with which the Environment Agency was satisfied. Officers were content that there would be no detrimental impact on the colliery buildings which were Grade II-listed, and the proposals would not preclude their re-use.

Members welcomed the proposals which they considered a good use of the site, and advantageous in that they would not prejudice future re-use of the site. That said, it was disappointing that a solution for the re-use of the surrounding site was not in the offing.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/15/00777 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time limit;
 - (ii) Approved plans;
 - (iii) Development carried out in accordance with Construction Traffic Management Plan (as amended);
 - (iv) Details of Construction Management Plan to be submitted to include measures for parking, loading/unloading and health and safety strategy to protect construction workers;
 - (v) Details of ecological Enhancement Plan, including botanical survey, to be submitted;
 - (vi) Archaeological watching brief;
 - (vii) Works to stop in event of contamination being found;
 - (viii) Construction compound to be removed post completion;
 - (ix) Arrays to be removed after 30 years;
 - (x) Implementation of decommissioning plan;
 - (xi) No external lighting;
 - (xii) Improvement of visibility splays.
- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

95 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00444 - AYLESHAM VILLAGE EXPANSION

Members were shown photographs of the junction. The Consultant Planner reminded Members that the original condition for improvements to the A2/A260 junction had been imposed in 2009 on the direction of the Secretary of State for Transport. An application to remove this requirement had come before the Committee on 23 July 2015 when Members had deferred the application in order to allow discussions to take place to consider what measures could be taken to mitigate the increased use of the junction as a result of the Aylesham development.

Since that meeting, further objections on the proposal to remove the requirement had been received from Nonington Parish Council, the Leader of Shepway District Council and seven individuals.

Following several site meetings with Highways England, it was considered that the removal of much of the vegetation, particularly along the 'hard nose' of the junction, would greatly improve visibility and bring benefits for cyclists using the cycle path. If approved, the entire planning permission would need to be re-issued with amendments to condition 14, as laid out in the report at page 96.

Councillor Bannister stated his opposition to the proposals, arguing that the slip road was dangerous and improvements must be made, particularly if traffic lights were to be installed on the overhead bridge which was the subject of another application to be considered by Committee. Councillor Richardson agreed that it was a dangerous junction. However, the junction improvement originally conditioned was now considered sub-standard by Highways England. If the Committee were to go for one that complied with current standards, this would involve making the slip road much longer and require more landscaping. These measures would permanently reduce the main A2 carriageway to one lane at this point which, in his opinion, was not a viable option. Although he would prefer to enforce the original condition, any decision along those lines was likely to be appealed and probably upheld, resulting in no improvements whatsoever. It was therefore far better to try to achieve some kind of improvement, such as the removal of vegetation, rather than nothing at all. Councillor Bond concurred that the vegetation clearance measures were the best that the Committee could hope to achieve in the circumstances.

Councillor Gardner argued that the junction was already a dangerous one and would become more so when lorries from Salvatori and the 1,200 new homes at Aylesham were taken into account. Drivers unfamiliar with the area were particularly at risk. As well as the removal of vegetation, the Committee should request improvements to the signage which was inadequate.

The Consultant Planner emphasised that the applicant could not be expected to solve existing traffic problems. If the application were refused, it was likely to be upheld on appeal since the applicant had sought the advice of several traffic consultants.

The Chairman informed Members that a Highways England officer had advised him that every slip road on the A2 was sub-standard and some worse than the one under consideration. For this reason, even if Highways England funds were available, it was likely they would be used elsewhere. He suggested that the communication from the Leader of Shepway District Council relayed by Councillor Linda Keen to the Committee should be shared with the Leader of the Council in order to support a request for general highway improvements. He undertook to pursue this outside the Committee.

RESOLVED: (a) That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to Condition 14 being amended to read: 'No more than 25 residential units hereby permitted shall be occupied until and unless a scheme and programme to clear vegetation in the area between the northbound slip road and the main A2 northbound carriageway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with that programme, and the works to the A2/A260 junction shown on drawing number 1218/43/06C

(junction improvement 21) or such scheme of works to the same general effect which has first been approved in writing by the Secretary of State for Transport, in consultation with the Local Highway Authority and thereafter approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, have been completed and opened to traffic. Reason: To ensure that the A2 trunk road continues to be an effective part of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and to improve visibility in the interests of the reasonable requirements of road safety.'

(b) That, in order to address concerns raised by the Planning Committee, the quality and positioning of the 'merge' sign on the A2 be considered as part of negotiations.

(c) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle the detailed wording of all other conditions and informatives forming part of the Section 73 permission in accordance with the extant permission and in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.5, Councillors S F Bannister, B Gardner and P M Wallace requested that their votes against the application be recorded.)

96 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00952 - AYLESHAM VILLAGE EXPANSION

The Committee was shown photographs and plans of the application site which comprised the junction of the A260 with the bridge over the A2 at the Aylesham/Barham junction which also carried traffic from the B2046. The Consultant Planner advised Members that the application sought to vary Condition 14 of planning permission granted for application no DOV/14/1206 in order to change the junction design from a roundabout to traffic signals. This was due to land ownership and design effectiveness issues which were set out fully in Appendix 1 to the report. The Committee was advised that it would need to consider whether traffic signals were likely to achieve the same as a roundabout in terms of safety and the effective management of traffic.

The original roundabout configuration, if implemented, would encroach into an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) by 55 metres. Furthermore, in order to comply with current design guidance, additional land would be needed which was not within the ownership of KCC. Without the additional land, the design would be unacceptable by current standards, and the original proposal was therefore no longer viable in design terms. Highways England had advised that the signalised proposal had passed a safety audit, and it therefore raised no objections. KCC Highways had also given technical approval. However, strong objections had been raised by Aylesham and Nonington Parish Councils, the District Ward Member and 44 private individuals.

Councillor Gardner commented that, having visited the site, it was clear that two lanes, with a filter lane for traffic turning left, would be needed in order for traffic signals to be a safe and effective solution. This was because HGVs turning right currently blocked the lane. However, two lanes would require the widening of the bridge which was a very costly option. He could not support the application and called for the roundabout to be implemented.

Councillor Richardson stated that, whilst he was a big defender of the AONB, the benefits of installing a roundabout would more than compensate for the loss of AONB land. Like others familiar with the junction, he was firmly of the view that lights would not offer the same safety and capacity benefits as a roundabout and were likely to make the situation worse because of queueing traffic on the bridge. He believed that Highways England's and KCC Highways' advice was incorrect. He proposed, and it was duly seconded, that the application should be refused. Councillor Bond queried why the experts had not recommended traffic signals at the time of the original application if they were genuinely the best option. Clearly that was not the case and the roundabout solution should be implemented, even if it involved the acquisition of more land.

The Chairman advised the Committee that, if it were minded to refuse the application, it would need to do so on a sound, defensible basis. For that reason, he proposed that the Committee should defer the application in order to seek advice from an independent highways expert. However, he was not willing to defer the application for a site visit on safety grounds. Councillor Richardson agreed to withdraw his motion in order that this approach could be pursued.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/15/00952 be DEFERRED in order for the Planning Committee to receive independent advice from a highways expert, this to include an explanation as to why traffic signals were now considered an acceptable solution when a roundabout had been the preferred option when the original application was submitted.

97 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

The Committee was advised that 13 appeals had been determined between October and December 2015, with 11 LPA decisions upheld and the appeals dismissed. Of the 2 appeals upheld, one had been against a Planning Committee decision and the other against an Officer decision.

The Committee noted the report.

98 ACTION TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDINARY DECISIONS (COUNCIL BUSINESS) URGENCY PROCEDURE

The Committee noted that no action had been taken since the last meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.54 pm.