

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 20 April 2017 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor F J W Scales

Councillors: B W Butcher  
J S Back  
T J Bartlett  
T A Bond  
D G Cronk  
B Gardner  
D P Murphy  
G Rapley  
P M Wallace (Minute No 163 only)

Officers: Team Leader (Development Management)  
Principal Planner  
Planning Officer  
Planning Officer  
Planning Consultant  
Planning Consultant  
Planning Delivery Manager  
Planning Solicitor (Locum)  
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/17/00288	Mr Neil McCollum	Mrs Helen Williams
DOV/17/00028	Mrs Tracie Bates	Mrs Joanna Thomson
DOV/16/01328	Mr Adam Rabone	Mr Jeff Goodsell
DOV/16/00973	Mr John Collins	-----
DOV/16/01467	Mr Harry Kenton	-----
DOV/17/00194	Mr Nigel Brown	-----

157 APOLOGIES

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

158 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that there were no substitute members.

159 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor F J W Scales declared an Other Significant Interest in respect of Agenda Item 11 (Application No DOV/17/00103 – Land at Greenacres, Roman Road, Shatterling) by reason that the applicant was a work colleague.

Councillor G Rapley declared an Other Significant Interest in respect of Agenda Item 6 (Application No DOV/17/00288 – Land opposite Walmer Castle, Kingsdown Road, Walmer) by reason that she did voluntary work for English Heritage.

160 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

161 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman advised that the first deferred item listed was dealt with elsewhere on the agenda. The second item (Application No DOV/16/00530 – Site adjacent to 5 Friends Close, Deal) remained deferred.

162 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00288 - LAND OPPOSITE WALMER CASTLE, KINGSDOWN ROAD, WALMER

The Committee was shown drawings, a plan and photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant reminded Members that a previous application had been refused by the Committee in January on the grounds that the proposed charging machine would affect the amenity of the area. However, the location of the machine had been changed and it would now be situated in a less exposed area in a copse of trees, adjacent to a display board and the public footpath. An additional letter of objection had been received since the report was written, arguing that English Heritage should provide free disabled parking. However, the Committee was reminded that the issue of car park charges was not a material consideration in determining the application.

Councillor D P Murphy welcomed the fact that the machine had now been moved, and recognised that car park charging was not relevant to the Committee's consideration of the application. He also welcomed the public speaker's statement that disabled parking would be free for a number of hours. He accepted that there were no Planning grounds on which he could object to the proposal, but he requested that the machine should be sited at least 2 metres from the footpath.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor B Gardner regarding signage and resurfacing, the Chairman reminded the Committee that its role was only to consider the siting of the machine, not how the car park was operated. Whilst resurfacing could be a Planning gain, it was not a material consideration. Councillors B W Butcher and T J Bartlett proposed that the application should be approved, given that English Heritage had moved the machine to a more acceptable location. Following clarification from the Planning Consultant that Kent County Council's (KCC) Public Rights of Way (PROW) Officer had already stipulated that the machine should not interfere with the footpath, it was agreed that the machine's precise location should be delegated to officers, taking account of Members' comments about its proximity to the footpath.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/17/00288 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time;
- (ii) Compliance with plans.

- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary issues (including the precise location of the charging machine in relation to the public footpath) in line with the matters set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(Councillor G Rapley withdrew from the Chamber during consideration of the application.)

163 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00028 - 5 LIVERPOOL ROAD (APRIL COTTAGE), WALMER

Members viewed a map, plans and photographs of the application site which comprised a semi-detached chalet bungalow occupying the junction of Liverpool Road and Clarence Road, in the south-east corner of Archery Square. The Planning Officer advised that the proposal was for a side extension to the property which would provide a single garage with ancillary accommodation above for a dependent relative. The extension would be the same height as the host property, finished in matching materials. The reflex curve in the boundary wall on Clarence Road – a significant feature in the street scene - would remain unchanged. Whilst the Liverpool Road boundary wall would be raised to form the front wall of the garage, the curved step-down in the wall would be reinstated to the south of the garage door.

It was considered that there would be no harmful impact to the street scene or the Conservation Area as a result of the removal of three birch trees on the site. However, they contributed to the greenery of the local area, and the suitable replanting of trees or vegetation would mitigate their loss. KCC Highways had raised no objections to the proposal following the removal of double-width garage doors. The new roof extension would mitigate existing overlooking by blocking views from the existing roof terrace which had been there for a number of years. The extension met the requirements of Policy DM9 of the Council's Core Strategy, and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Murphy stated that the proposal would be detrimental to the street scene, and the location of the proposed garage dangerous given its proximity to the junction and the layout of the area. The Planning Officer clarified that the kitchen of the house had originally been a garage and could be reconverted without planning permission. The double garage doors had been removed due to highway safety concerns. Moreover, visibility was now no worse than it had been when the garage was set back further from the road. KCC Highways had raised no objections due to the fact that the (amended) proposal would not materially worsen highway safety. It was also clarified that, if permission were granted, the applicant would have to arrange for the removal of the lamp-post at their own expense.

In response to Councillor P M Wallace, the Planning Officer advised that the boundary wall could be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset but, as such, its weight was diminished. The Council's Principal Heritage Officer had expressed no concerns about the proposal at a time when it had been proposed to have a double garage which would have resulted in greater intervention to the boundary wall.

It was moved by Councillor D P Murphy and duly seconded that a site visit be held. On there being an equality of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote and the motion was LOST.

It was moved by Councillor T J Bartlett and duly seconded and

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/17/00028 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) 3-year commencement;
  - (ii) Built in accordance with approved drawings;
  - (iii) Finishes to match existing;
  - (iv) Permitted development rights removed for new openings in north-facing roof slope of permitted extension;
  - (v) Samples of bricks for boundary wall if not reclaimed fully from site;
  - (vi) Permitted development rights removed for alterations/extensions to permitted extension and other alterations at roof level of permitted extension;
  - (vii) Landscaping scheme.
- (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.

164 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/01328 - LAND REAR OF ARCHERS COURT ROAD, WHITFIELD

The Committee viewed maps, plans and photographs of the application site. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought outline permission with all matters reserved, except for vehicular access which would be through the site currently occupied by 14 Archers Court Road. The site itself was outside the Whitfield Urban Expansion development area, but within the urban settlement confines of Dover. It was proposed to erect up to 28 dwellings which would give a density of around 16 dwellings per hectare; this was slightly lower than the density of dwellings in the surrounding area.

A PROW ran along the southern part of the site, and concerns had been raised by KCC that the proposed development would interfere with the PROW. Whilst matters relating to the PROW would be the subject of a separate legal process, the route of the PROW would be confirmed prior to development on site. In relation to a number of trees on site that had been the subject of a 1981 Tree Preservation Order (TPO), the Council's Tree Officer had advised that many were no longer in existence or were diseased. The details of tree retention, etc would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

Members were reminded that a previous application (DOV/13/00360) had been refused on the grounds that the local highway infrastructure did not have the capacity to absorb the additional traffic movements generated by the development. The subsequent planning history was set out at paragraphs 2.1 to 2.7 of the report, concluding with the Planning Inspector dismissing the appeal on the sole ground that the proposed development would fail to protect local biodiversity. Ecological surveys had since been submitted and found to be acceptable by the Council's Ecology Officer.

The Committee was advised that there were no details of drainage network capacity. However, this matter would be resolved as part of the greater Whitfield development. It was recommended that a proportionate approach be taken by requiring that a drainage strategy be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in consultation with Southern Water, prior to the reserved matters stage.

Whilst the development would lead to the loss of protected open space, this would be countered by the provision of new open space, including an equipped play area. This area of open space would be subject to a legally binding management scheme which would be agreed prior to the occupation of the units. Furthermore, the enhancement of the public footpath would increase the opportunities for informal surveillance and provide safe pedestrian access to local amenities. Taking these factors into account, and when assessed against Policy DM25 of the Core Strategy, the development was considered acceptable.

In respect of air quality, Environmental Health had raised no concerns. An up-to-date acoustic report had been submitted, and matters relating to noise would be mitigated by the installation of an acoustic fence along the A2 boundary. Finally, it was confirmed that Highways England (HE) had no plans to widen the A2 in the foreseeable future.

Councillor J S Back referred to Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which stated that developments could be refused on highway grounds if it was considered that the cumulative impact would be severe. Whitfield Parish Council had recently carried out a speed monitoring exercise at the Archers Court Road/Sandwich Road junction and had recorded 2,000 one-way traffic movements in a 24-hour period. The junction would never be able to cope with the increased traffic movements generated by the development, particularly when another planning application for over 40 units was in the pipeline. In respect of drainage, Southern Water had already confirmed that the drainage network would not be upgraded until 2020. The site was not suitable for development, and the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and an adverse effect on local residents.

Councillor T A Bond questioned whether Southern Water had been specifically asked if the proposed development would affect flood risk in the area. In addition, he sought clarification as to whether KCC Drainage had been asked about surface water going into the sewage or highways drainage systems. He also queried whether conditions could be attached to ensure that the access road was built to an acceptable standard.

The Planning Officer clarified that KCC Highways and HE would not normally undertake their own surveys but use highways information submitted by the applicant. Traffic movements around the junction had been considered intensively and the Planning Inspector had recently taken a view on this matter. Furthermore, it

was important for Members to consider advice received from KCC Highways which had raised no objections. Road widening, if it went ahead, would take place to the south of the site. However, he stressed that HE had indicated that it no longer needed the land for road widening and had raised no objections to the scheme.

He went on to advise that details of the access road were not available and would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. This was also the case with matters such as overlooking. With regards to drainage, he recognised that there would be no major upgrade to the network until 2020. The plans submitted by the applicant would be a temporary solution until a permanent solution for the wider Whitfield development was in place. The Chairman pointed out that members of the Committee were particularly concerned about drainage as a result of problems arising from recent developments.

Councillor Back argued that local residents knew the junction better than KCC Highways. The Planning Inspector had spent 5 minutes at the top of Archers Court Road during his visit so his knowledge of the traffic issues affecting the area should also be questioned. Councillor Bond proposed that the application should be deferred in order to receive more information which would allow the Committee to make an informed and fair judgement. Given that KCC Highways and the Planning Inspector had deemed the application acceptable in highways terms, the Chairman suggested that a traffic survey should be commissioned to provide the Committee with independent advice. Members agreed that when the application came back to Committee, Southern Water should be invited to attend the meeting to answer questions on the detailed proposals.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/16/01328 be DEFERRED for:

- (a) Further information from the applicant relating to: (i) arrangements for the disposal of foul and surface water, and the overall impact of the proposed development on flood risk in the area; and (ii) the location and width of the access road.
- (b) The commissioning of an independent traffic survey, the scope of which to be delegated to Officers in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee.

165 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/00973 - CASTLE MOUNT LODGE, TASWELL STREET, DOVER

The Committee was shown plans and photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised that the application sought planning permission to vary a condition on an existing permission granted in 2005 which limited the occupation of the residential care home to children with learning difficulties. The proposal sought to vary the condition to allow adults with learning difficulties to occupy the building. Members were required to determine whether it was appropriate for a change from nine children with learning difficulties occupying the premises to eight adults with learning difficulties. The Committee was not required to consider whether a care home was appropriate in this location.

The application property had been in institutional use since 1988 when permission was first granted for a nursing home. Since the application was first submitted, it had been amended and further information submitted regarding the operation of the home and the number of adults to be accommodated. It was proposed to

accommodate eight adults in accordance with the floor plans submitted. The applicant had stressed that the accommodation would be available to occupiers with learning difficulties or wider mental health conditions, the former being generally permanent and the latter often for temporary periods only. Some occupiers would be rehabilitated to enable them to live independently in the community, but others would always require support. The suitability of potential occupiers would be assessed by KCC and the operator.

A number of letters had been received in response to the consultation and these were summarised in the report. Since the report was written, four further letters had been received. These raised an objection about the impact on parking and requested that determination be delayed until May to enable more people to attend the Committee meeting. The Dover Society supported the continued use of the building as a care facility, but requested conditions on monitoring and mitigation measures to ensure that staff and deliveries accessed the rear of the building and to enable local residents to raise concerns when necessary. The final letter contested that the proposals lacked transparency and detail and claimed that the building had not been a residential institution for 25 years.

With regard to monitoring and mitigation measures, the applicant had submitted a draft management plan by e-mail a few days previously, setting out how local residents could be engaged with the operators. A copy had been circulated to Members and posted on the Council's website.

Members' attention was drawn to the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, and Officers' view that the recommendation was not considered to disproportionately affect any particular group.

Finally, the Planning Consultant suggested a change to condition v) so as to limit the use of the building to a care home for up to eight adults. He also asked Members to raise any particular concerns they had as these could potentially be addressed through the Management Plan and included in the wording of condition vi).

Councillor Butcher supported the provision of such accommodation for those with mental health problems. There was no evidence that the potential occupants would cause more problems than the children who had previously resided here. However, if things did go wrong, appropriate action could be taken.

In response to Councillor G Rapley, the Planning Consultant confirmed that his understanding was that there would be 24-hour on-site supervision by staff. However, to allay any concerns, a clause could be included in the Management Plan to this effect. The Chairman requested that the wording of the condition be strengthened to compel the applicant to adhere to the Management Plan on an ongoing basis.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/16/00973 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Commencement within 3 years;
- (ii) Carried out in accordance with the approved drawings;
- (iii) Visiting hours to be restricted to 8.00am to 8.00pm;

- (iv) All staff parking and deliveries to take place to the rear of the property;
  - (v) Use of building to be limited to a care home for up to 8 adults;
  - (vi) A Management Plan to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, setting out measures to mitigate harm and address complaints from local residents: the Management Plan shall include having 24-hour on-site supervision by a member of staff; holding regular meetings with local residents; monitoring how the use adapts to the local environment; directing staff, visitors and deliveries to park within the car parking area to the rear of the property. Once approved, the Management Plan should be implemented in full on a continuous basis and any changes to the Management Plan shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the changes being undertaken.
- (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.

166 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/01467 - SITE AT STATENBOROUGH FARM COTTAGE, FELDERLAND LANE, WORTH

Members were shown a plan and photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised Members that the application sought planning permission to erect a 2-bedroom detached house within the garden of Statenborough Farm Cottage. The Committee was advised that permission had been granted in 2016 for a dwelling on an adjacent plot under delegated powers as a departure from the locational policies of the Local Plan, whilst this application was recommended for refusal on the grounds of conflict with those same policies. It had therefore been considered appropriate for the decision to be taken by the Committee.

Since the granting of permission for the adjacent plot, the Council had been able to demonstrate that it had a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This meant that the housing policies of the Council's Local Plan were consistent with Government Policy Guidance in the NPPF, and full weight should therefore be given to those policies when determining the application.

The application site lay outside the built confines of any village or other settlement. Policies DM1 and CP1 of the Core Strategy set out the over-arching spatial strategy of the Local Plan. These sought to resist new general housing development in the countryside and to focus development within the settlement boundaries. Members were advised that the starting point in determining the application was that the proposal was contrary to the Council's policies and, unless there were other material considerations that weighed in favour of the application, it should be refused.

The report assessed whether there were other adverse impacts arising from the development. Officers had concluded that there would be modest but not significant harm to the rural character of the area. However, no exceptional circumstances had been submitted with the application which might weigh in its favour, and refusal was therefore recommended.

The Chairman commented that the applicant had been disadvantaged by the delay in bringing the application before Committee. If the application had been determined in February as originally scheduled, the Committee would have been determining the application on the basis that the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. He referred to other applications being caught out by the change, of which there had been no notice.

Councillor Bond raised concerns that applications for nearby developments outside the village confines had been granted permission by Officers in December 2016 using delegated powers. That aside, he agreed with the report recommendation. In response to Councillor Rapley, the Planning Consultant advised that a recent High Court decision had ruled that garden land situated outside the built confines could be regarded as brownfield land. In clarification for Councillor D G Cronk, the Chairman advised that approval would still be a departure from the Local Plan, regardless of whether the site was classified as brownfield land. Councillor Gardner spoke against the application, arguing that the rules had changed and the application should be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The Planning Consultant advised that there had been a delay in bringing the application to Committee for procedural reasons. Whilst the Council's policies had always been in place, Members were now able to give them full weight. This had not been the case with the development site opposite. The granting of planning permission was not necessarily the correct decision simply because the site was regarded as brownfield land since there would be a significant change to the rural character of the countryside if planning permission were granted for all rural brownfield sites. Whilst its classification as a brownfield site was a factor in determination, the view of Officers was that this did not override the Council's policies to protect the countryside and direct new housing developments to existing settlement confines and urban areas.

RESOLVED: That Application No DOV/16/01467 be REFUSED on the grounds that the site is located outside of any urban boundaries or rural settlement confines. Therefore, the proposal, if permitted, would result in the consolidation of residential development within the rural area and would result in a wholly unsustainable form of development that would be contrary to Policies CP1, DM1, DM11 and DM15 of the Dover District Core Strategy and to paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

167 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00103 - LAND AT GREENACRES, ROMAN ROAD, SHATTERLING

The Committee viewed plans and photographs of the application site. The application sought outline planning permission for the erection of two detached dwellings, with all matters reserved. The Principal Planner reminded Members that the application had been deferred at the last meeting for a site visit to allow Members to assess the visual impact of the proposal and highways and access issues, and to enable the applicant to submit further information regarding their needs and justification for two dwellings. In respect of the latter, a doctor's letter

had been circulated to Members. However, no substantive case had been made or further evidence provided that there was a compelling need for two dwellings.

The relevant issues for the Committee to consider were that Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF sought to avoid isolated dwellings in the countryside. Approval of the application would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Local Plan which could be afforded full weight now that the Council was able to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. Shatterling was a significant distance from Wingham. It could be regarded as a hamlet but, as such, would be unsuitable for development. Furthermore, KCC Highways had advised that the 160-metre visibility required for a 50mph road could not be achieved.

Councillor Gardner reported the outcome of the site visit held on 18 April. In terms of visual impact, Members had concluded that the proposal would be acceptable, provided the dwellings were bungalows or one storey buildings and set as far back from the road as possible. The site visit panel had been advised by the agent during the site visit that a new access was proposed 60 metres from the existing access. Members had looked at this but had concluded that it would be more dangerous than the existing access given its proximity to a hump in the road and speed of traffic. He proposed that the application should be refused only on the grounds that it was outside any settlement confines, on the basis that the existing access had been in use for over 20 years, apparently without incident. He was in favour of adding an informative that the Committee might consider one single storey dwelling on the site due to the exceptional circumstances of the applicant.

Councillor Butcher spoke in favour of the proposal as it would improve security at the site, provide two dwellings in a rural area, support local services and potentially result in fewer car journeys. Councillors Bartlett, Back and Rapley agreed with these comments. However, Councillor Bond stated that robust reasons were needed if the Committee was to depart from the Local Plan. No additional information had been submitted and, whilst he had sympathy for the applicant, this was not sufficient to justify approval. He added that there was a need for consistent and evidence-based decision-making by the Committee. The Principal Planner clarified that Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy supported extensions to existing properties, rather than the erection of new dwellings, for the purpose of accommodating dependent relatives.

**RESOLVED:** That Application No DOV/17/00103 be REFUSED on the grounds that the proposed development, by virtue of its location outside of any settlement confines, in a rural location, would result in an undesirable intensification of development in the countryside, detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the street scene and detrimental to the objectives of sustainable development, contrary to Policies DM1, DM11, DM15 and DM16 of the Dover District Local Plan and paragraphs 17, 61, 69 and 109 in particular of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Councillor F J W Scales withdrew from the Chamber during consideration of the application. Councillor B W Butcher assumed the chairmanship of the meeting for this item.)

168 APPLICATION NO DOV/17/00194 - 43 DOLA AVENUE, DEAL

Members were shown a plan, drawings and photographs of the application site. The Principal Planner advised that the application was a Section 73 application for a

variation of Condition 2 of planning permission DOV/15/00327, and followed a similar application that had been considered and refused by the Committee in January. That application had been refused on the grounds that the alterations to the dormer windows would be harmful to the character of the street scene, and have an overbearing effect on the residents of Foster Way. The current proposal was the same as the previously refused scheme, save for the amended window design which would see the window cill heights lowered. Whilst this improved the appearance of the dormers, Officers considered that the reason for refusal of the previous application had not been overcome. Furthermore, the new design would, in fact, increase overlooking to neighbouring properties in Foster Way. It was confirmed that the condition relating to the boundary wall between Dola Avenue and Foster Way had been discharged, in that a brick wall had now been constructed.

Councillor Gardner advised that he and Councillor Cronk had visited the dwellings at the invitation of the applicant. He confirmed that his previous concerns about overlooking had been assuaged by seeing the windows in situ. Moreover, the design of the dormers was very similar to other dormers in Deal. He proposed that approval of the original design of the dormers and windows, as refused by the Committee in January, should be delegated to Officers, subject to the receipt of amended plans.

Councillor Bond commented that he had been concerned about overlooking onto Foster Way when the original application had come to Committee. The Committee had subsequently been presented with the application to vary Condition 2 as a result of an error by the builder which he found incredulous. The application now before Committee proposed no reduction in the size of dormers and larger windows which, in his view, made matters worse.

The Chairman advised Members that they could only consider the application before them. The Principal Planner added that a new application would need to be submitted, advertised and considered without prejudice. Delegating approval to Officers was not advisable as this could cause difficulties if contrary representations were received.

**RESOLVED:** That Application No DOV/17/00194 be REFUSED on the following grounds:

- (i) The proposed dormer roof extensions to the rear (north-west) roof slopes of the dwellings, by virtue of their size, location and proximity of neighbouring properties, would cause an unacceptable sense of enclosure to, and overbearing impact on, neighbouring properties (Nos 25 and 27 Foster Way and No 41a Dola Avenue in particular), significantly harming the residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties, contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 17, 56, 63 and 64.
- (ii) The proposed dormer extensions to the rear (north-west) roof slopes of the dwellings, by virtue of their size, flat-roofed design and prominent location, would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 58, 59, 60, 61 and 64.

- (iii) The proposed windows within the dormer roof extensions at first floor level to the rear (north-west) roof slopes of the dwellings, by virtue of their size, the height of their cills above floor level, location and relationship with adjoining properties, would cause an unacceptable perception of overlooking to neighbouring properties (Nos 25 and 27 Foster Way and No 41a Dola Avenue in particular), significantly harming the residential amenities of those properties, contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 17, 56, 63 and 64.

169 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

The Planning Delivery Manager presented the report, advising that two appeals had been upheld between January and March 2017. When assessed against the Government's criteria, which was based on the number of decisions being overturned against the overall number of applications determined, the Council was doing well at 2% - significantly below the Government's target of 10%. He advised that the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Waste and Planning had requested that the existing performance indicators relating to appeals be retained for information purposes.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

170 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 9.16 pm.