

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Tuesday, 31 May 2016 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Councillor C Bowes	Mr J Newton
Mr R F W Brame	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)
Mr H E J Clarke	Mr P S Wilkinson
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mr W. R. J. Richmond (Substitute Member)
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr P R W Darby (Substitute Member)
Mr A.P. Joel	

Also Present

Mr P M M Dimoglou	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mrs S.M. Matthews	Mr M. A. Wassell
Mr J.D. Rogers	Mrs A M Webb

In Attendance

Steven Bell	Legal Advisor
Mike Brennan	Operations & Contract Manager
Hugh Coggles	Tree & Countryside Officer* (Agenda Item 10 only)
Chris Hobson	Principal Planning Officer*
Helen McAleer	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Nick Moys	Principal Planning Officer *
Cathey Rix	Planning Assistant*
Sarah Robertson	Planning Policy Officer* (Agenda Item 7 only)
James Tipping	Principal Planning Officer*
Sarah Wolstenholme-Smy	Interim Legal Services Manager
Simon Wood	Interim Business Manager*

* Capita for Breckland Council

62/16 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

Councillor Newton requested an amendment to page 10 to include the response of the Chairman to his suggestion that matters should be referred to the NCC Health Scrutiny Committee. However, as the exact wording could not be recalled it was agreed to make no change.

Councillor W Richmond noted for accuracy that the title of the Committee was the Norfolk Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Claussen requested that his additional comments be added to the fifth paragraph on Page 10 regarding cat predation. He had said that the Statutory Consultees and the Planning Inspector were wrong and he considered he was as much an expert as they were on the subject.

Subject to the amendments the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Action By

63/16 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Apologies were received from Councillors T Carter, Martin and Sharpe.
Councillors W Richmond and Darby were present as Substitutes.

64/16 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED (AGENDA ITEM 3)

Agenda Item 9: Schedule of Planning Applications

Item 6: DEREHAM – All Members had received direct correspondence.

Item 9: SWAFFHAM – Councillor Darby declared that as Mayor of Swaffham and a member of the Town Council he would not take part in the discussion or vote on this item.

Item 10: SAHAM TONEY: Councillor Bowes declared that she would not take part in the discussion and would abstain from voting as her family had a planning interest in a site in the vicinity.

Item 11: NORTH ELMHAM – All Members had received direct correspondence.

65/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

The Chairman confirmed that the briefing by Anglian Water had been postponed due to the number of items on the Agenda.

He informed those present that Schedule Items 3, 6, 7, 1, 2 and 13 would be heard during the morning. All other items would be heard from 2pm onwards.

He welcomed Councillor Wilkinson back to the Planning Committee.

66/16 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Agenda Item 9, Schedule Item 4 (Swaffham) had been deferred from the Agenda for further drainage information.

67/16 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

68/16 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Policy Officer presented the update at page 15 of the Agenda. The terminology contained in the Preferred Directions document and the weight that could be applied to emerging Local Plan policies was explained.

It was clarified that a site classified as unreasonable might receive planning permission as the application process provided far greater detail than was available in the Local Plan site assessment process.

Following changes to National Policy on 19 May regarding S106 obligations it was confirmed that Policy DC4 was no longer applicable. Contributions could not be sought on sites of less than 10 units or less than 1000 square metres.

Councillor Joel asked when the houses currently receiving planning permission would be included in the figures for calculating housing allocations and he was advised that they could only be included once the planning permission had been issued.

Councillor Claussen wanted assurance that the published timetable would be followed. He also wanted it spelt out clearly what a 'reasonable' site was. During the Gladman Appeal it had been said that Members had agreed to that terminology but they had not and the terminology was open to misinterpretation.

Councillor Clarke asked if the change in National Planning Policy would affect schemes already agreed but not delivered.

The Operations & Contract Manager advised that where a legal agreement was being drafted the permission had not been issued and could not now be issued, contrary to Policy. Members were asked if they would delegate authority to Officers to deal with those applications which had been approved subject to contributions which could no longer be required.

Councillor Claussen said that although he was happy to delegate authority to Officers to deal with such applications he felt they should come back to Committee so that it could be made clear that the new policy was contrary to what the Council wanted. All Members agreed with that suggestion.

69/16 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

There were no deferred items for consideration.

70/16 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows:

- a) Item 1: WATTON: Former RAF Radar Site: Modify S106 of 3PL/2007/0262/O: Applicant: Geradeve: Reference: 3PL/2015/0007/OB

Items 1 and 2 were discussed together as they were closely linked. The alternative Open Space land required under Item 1 was within the site area of Item 2. The developer was seeking to co-ordinate the two developments. Two separate decisions were required.

Comments re Item 1

Councillor Wassell (Ward Representative) asked Members to refuse the application. Watton residents had waited long enough and the proposal to link the two applications undermined the authority and decision making powers of the Committee. There was no Plan B if Item 2 was refused. He asked for the land to be transferred immediately.

Councillor Gilbert (Ward Representative) gave the Parish Council's representative's apologies. He said there had been years of stalemate and Watton had waited 16 years for the land. He asked Members to reject the proposal.

Mr Rogers (Ward Representative) agreed with the other Ward Representatives. Bennetts had owned the land for nine years. It was originally in good condition but was now badly overgrown. It should be returned to its original condition and provided now.

Mr Sampher (Carbrooke Parish Council) did not support the development and said the developers should keep their agreement.

Action By

It was confirmed that there had been no change in the size of land to be provided. No management plan had been specified. The land would initially be transferred to Breckland Council.

Councillor Darby suggested that if the land had come forward separately the development would be required to provide more affordable housing.

The Principal Planning Officer agreed that it did affect viability, as did the long stretches of access road without housing on either side.

Councillor Claussen asked why the developer required extra time to deliver the Open Space and he was advised that they wanted to have finalised plans for the access roads and housing to determine where services would be needed before the exact boundaries of the Open Space were determined.

Councillor Brame asked if the developer could be required to return the land to its original state. He was advised that the site had previously been a playing field and it could be ensured that it was a level surface.

Councillor Claussen asked how the split of land and money would be worked out.

That would be up to Breckland Council to determine, once the land was transferred.

Mr Sampher said it was the first Carbrooke Parish Council had heard about the split.

Comments re Item 2

Councillor Wassell (Ward Representative) was against the proposal. Watton was densely populated with limited infrastructure. He raised concerns about access; drainage; amenity; lack of up-to-date ecological information; and only 7% affordable housing.

Councillor Gilbert (Ward Representative) would not object to a small scale, high quality development on part of the site, but said that Trenchard Crescent and Portal Avenue were fine examples of architecture that warranted protection. He recommended a site visit.

Mrs Williams (Objector) raised concerns about development on Norwich Road; density; effect on architecture; the felling of 18 protected trees; no details of drainage scheme; lack of surveillance of parking areas; contamination; need for updated habitat survey and archaeological field evaluation; and requested restricted access to Portal Avenue.

It was understood that access to Portal Avenue could not be restricted due to private access rights, but the new road had been designed to discourage the use of the private sections of Portal Avenue. An updated ecological study had been provided and consultees were satisfied, subject to conditions.

With regard to the affordable housing provision it was explained that the original proposal had not included any, but the District Valuer had suggested that 7% was viable together with a financial contribution.

Action By

Councillor Bowes felt that at least one light-operated, pedestrian crossing was needed on the main road due to the increased traffic. She also supported Councillor Gilbert's views about the importance of protecting the historic value of the existing houses and felt that the proposed design did not compliment them. A site visit would highlight the contrast of what was there and what was proposed.

It was noted that the layout had been changed to retain the spacious feel. It was accepted that development would change the appearance of the site, but it was allocated for housing.

Councillor Wilkinson asked if materials could be conditioned to blend with existing and it was confirmed that high quality, matching materials would be expected.

The proposal for a site visit was supported.

Item 1 Decision: Deferred, for a decision on Item 2.

- b) Item 2: WATTON & CARBROOKE: Portal Avenue: Residential development for 80 dwellings with associated servicing and infrastructure: Applicant: Bennett Homes: Reference: 3PL/2014/1378/F

This item was discussed under Item 1. See Minute 70/16a above.

Item 2 Decision: Deferred, for a site visit.

- c) Item 3: ATTLEBOROUGH: Former Grampian Food Site, Buckenham Road: Demolish buildings and erect up to 165 homes, together with public open space and associated infrastructure (Outline): Applicant: Raemoir Properties Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2015/0546/O

This application had been discussed at the last Committee but was to be reconsidered due to the failure to notify all interested parties. The details of the application were reviewed.

Mr Aghabi (Objector) did not accept the traffic report. The access points were badly planned and the development would worsen existing traffic problems leading to accidents. Extra safety measures were needed.

Mrs Gray (Objector) noted that Whitehouse Lane had been flooded continuously for 16 weeks and in its current form could not support being a major access.

Mr Long (Agent) said that the issues had been addressed to the satisfaction of statutory consultees and officers. The development would provide over £1million in contributions to schools, health etc, and 25% affordable housing with a clawback clause if viability improved.

Councillor Stasiak (Ward Representative) supported the development of a site which had been vacant for many years. The proposed relief road would improve the traffic situation in future. He was just disappointed that the Town Council had not negotiated for more car parking for railway users.

Councillor Claussen asked for assurance that the drainage conditions addressed the concerns of the objectors. He was advised that the

Action By

scheme had been amended to ensure that increased volumes of surface water could be dealt with.

Councillor Joel was pleased that Whitehouse Lane was to be widened as it was used as a rat run.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions and a Section 278 agreement for off-site highway works, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- d) Item 4: SWAFFHAM: Land to the north of Norwich Road: Erect up to 165 dwellings, associated landscaping, open space, car parking and vehicular and pedestrian access: Applicant: Manor Oak Homes: Reference: 3PL/2015/0550/O

This item had been deferred. See Minute No 66/16

- e) Item 5: GREAT ELLINGHAM: Hollytree House, 80 Long Street: Proposed development of 5 No detached houses on land to the North of 80 Long Street: Applicant: Mr Tim Davidge: Reference: 3PL/2015/0899/F

The reason for refusal was set out in the Supplement to the Agenda. Highway concerns about visibility could also provide another reason for refusal.

Councillor Stasiak (adjacent Ward Representative) supported the proposal which would provide the right sort of housing to attract employers to the District. The site was an infill and the cul-de-sac was similar to others in the village. An adjacent piece of land had been gifted by the applicant and would be adopted by the Parish Council as amenity land.

Mr Betts (Chairman Great Ellingham Parish Council) supported the proposal which met their requirements for small scale development and would complement other development approved in the vicinity.

Mr Burbuk (Agent) thought the reasons for refusal illogical and unreasonable. The development was similar to an adjoining approved site and there were a wide range of types and styles of design on Long Street. The proposal was further enhanced by the planning gain of land gifted as public open space. He confirmed that the Applicant controlled all the land required for the visibility splay.

Councillor Smith (Ward Representative) pointed out approved developments on opposite and adjacent sites. The whole character of the area had already changed and the development would not be out of place.

The Interim Business Manager pointed out that the gifted land was not required to mitigate the development and carried no weight in planning terms. The visibility splay extended to the corner of 80 Long Street which was not included in the application. Other highway issues could be overcome, but Officers were concerned about the cumulative effect and incremental encroachment that the development represented.

Mr Burbuk (Agent) explained that 80 Long Street was in the ownership of the Applicant and they were willing to enter into a legal agreement to

provide and maintain the visibility splay in perpetuity.

The recommendation of refusal was not supported. Members believed that the proposal was sustainable, not out of character and would make a positive contribution to the Council's housing land supply.

Approved, subject to highways, landscaping and materials conditions.

- f) Item 6: DEREHAM: Land North of Norwich Road: Variation of conditions 12 and 13 on 3PL/2013/0976/F – Foul and waste water: Applicant: Taylor Wimpey East Anglia: Reference: 3PL/2015/0916/F

All Members had received direct correspondence.

Additional information had been included in the Supplement to the Agenda including comments from Anglian Water which were particularly relevant.

Councillor Webb (Ward Representative) showed examples of contaminated water she had collected on her way in, caused by the heavy rainfall. The original approval had required foul water to be removed by tanker but since then it had been connected to the Dereham Sewage Works, causing raw sewage to leak onto footpaths, etc. She asked Members to refuse to remove the condition.

Mr Needham (Clerk to Dereham Town Council) recalled that Anglian Water had originally advised that Dereham Sewage Works had no capacity. The connection had been made and a fix had been attempted, but now that it was raining it was clear there was a problem.

Mr Fenton (Technical Expert) said the only proper solution was to build the connection to the Mattishall scheme. Until then the foul water should be removed by tanker.

Mr Simpson and Ms Taylor (Anglian Water) were present to answer questions. Ms Taylor pointed out that Anglian Water could not refuse a connection to the network.

Mr Bruty (Applicant) was also present to answer questions.

Councillor Claussen suggested that Members could not make a decision without more information on how to resolve the problems. He proposed deferral and Councillor Duigan seconded that proposal.

Deferred, for further drainage information.

- g) Item 7: DEREHAM: Land West of Etling View: Outline application for up to 62 dwellings, provision of access, parking, public open space and associated infrastructure: Applicant: Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land: Reference: 3PL/2015/1045/O

This was an outline application with only access to be considered. It was proposed that additional conditions be required: the inclusion of a detailed drainage strategy at Reserved Matters stage; no occupation of dwellings before the foul water drainage system was completed and operational; details of surface water strategy; and drainage ditch management. Two

Action By

further objections had been received raising issues of amenity for dwellings to the south.

Councillor Webb (Ward Representative) had received a large number of representations from concerned residents. The land was not an approved, allocated site; the density was too high for an edge of settlement location; a veteran oak tree had been removed; and development would lead to a loss of ambience. She asked Members to carry out a site visit. Her main concern was sewage. There was no confirmation that the scheme to link to Mattishall would be delivered and 2018 was an unrealistic target.

Mr Needham (Clerk to Dereham Town Council) had a number of concerns: the veteran oak had been removed without addressing the loss of a hibernaculum; density too high; play area close to balancing lagoon; surface water discharge to non-existent ditches; surface water management scheme; and highway capacity issues.

Mr Myers (Objector) said the site was not identified for development and had received over 400 objections. The issues could not be satisfied by conditions. The Neatherd was a valuable nature asset. There was insufficient information on flood risk; the provision of sewage capacity was likely to take years and would take the development beyond the five year horizon.

Mr Coles (for Applicant) had worked to bring forward an acceptable development. Foul water could be dealt with by condition. The indicative plan had been amended to address concerns and the buffer with the County Wildlife Site had been increased. Mr Geddes (Drainage Consultant) was present to answer questions.

Mr Simpson and Ms Taylor (Anglian Water) were present to answer questions.

Councillor Clarke thought more weight should be given to protecting the tranquillity of the area. He endorsed the request for a site visit.

Councillor Claussen thought that the indicative layout plan was misleading. Members could not approve the application when the drainage details were unclear and the Anglian Water mitigation was not working.

Councillor W Richmond, also a Ward Representative, reiterated the comments made by Councillor Webb. He asked why the link to Mattishall which other developments were also meant to link to, had still not been provided.

Ms Taylor explained that part of the delay was due to a change in strategy. The scheme was moving forward and scheduled for delivery in 2018.

A site visit was proposed and seconded. Councillor Claussen asked that the areas suffering sewerage problems should also be visited.

Deferred, for a site visit.

h) Item 8: ATTLEBOROUGH: Land to the rear of The Bungalow, Leys Lane:

Action By

Proposed dwelling: Applicant: Mrs S Edwards: Reference: 3PL/2015/1056/F

Mr Cummings (Agent) was present to answer questions.

Councillor Stasiak (Ward Representative) supported the application. The site was in the area which would form the urban extension to Attleborough and he was pleased that some individual dwellings were being approved as it would provide a good mixture of house types.

Approved, as recommended.

- i) Item 9: SWAFFHAM: Land off Sporle Road: Outline planning application for residential development of up to 130 dwellings with access: Applicant: deMerke Estates: Reference: 3PL/2015/1155/O

Councillor Darby did not take part in the discussions and abstained from voting.

Only access was to be considered. Additional conditions were proposed regarding air quality, on-site mitigation and a noise impact assessment.

Mr Scott (Swaffham Town Council) said development would change the character of the area and obscure views of the church spire. The site could potentially contain the remains of an ancient chapel. Drainage lagoons would not be accepted as part of green space. Additional traffic would push the town over air pollution limits and traffic problems needed sorting out.

Mrs Bowler (Objector) raised concerns about flooding; impact on the rural location and road safety due to narrow lane width. Visibility was limited and the development would affect the historic character of the town.

Mr Cavalier (Applicant) was present to answer questions but pointed out there were a number of inaccuracies in the report. A reduction in the number of houses would affect viability and the number of affordable houses. He owned adjacent land which had received planning permission and Anglian Water and the Environment Agency were happy with those drainage proposals. If approved he would create a master plan to provide a consistent drainage strategy and design.

Councillor Matthews (Ward Representative) raised concerns about the number of applications; drainage problems; air quality and urbanisation. However, she acknowledged that if the town wanted to support its businesses it needed new development and the area to the north east of the town was preferred by the Town Council.

In response to a question about drainage by Councillor Wilkinson, Mr Cavalier explained that it was difficult to do precise calculations until the overall numbers were known, but he intended to comply with all requirements and provide a sustainable urban drainage system.

Councillor Bowes asked that Reserved Matters applications be brought to Committee and it was confirmed that they would be.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions and a Section 278 agreement for off-site highway works,

on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- j) Item 10: SAHAM TONEY: Land to rear of 84 Richmond Road: Erection of dwellinghouse with integral garage: Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Wright: Reference: 3PL/2015/1334/F

Councillor Bowes did not take part in the discussions and refrained from voting.

Councillor Darby thought the site looked like it could accommodate two dwellings.

Officers had requested a reduction in the red line area of the site as the curtilage had been considered to be excessive. With the access arrangements and layout it was not thought likely that another dwelling would be acceptable.

Approved as recommended.

- k) Item 11: NORTH ELMHAM: Mill House Farm, Billingford Road: Erection of dwelling and associated garage: Applicant: Mr & Mrs John Labouchere: Reference: 3PL/2015/1434/F

All Members had received direct representation on this item.

The report referred to two representations. Both had been made by the same person raising concerns about the relationship to the highway, visibility splays, drainage and the dwelling being out of keeping.

Mr Hobson (Objector) raised concerns about: the site entrance being directly opposite the junction causing danger; the visibility splay including part of the bank across the front of his property which he had maintained for years; potential problems if the adjacent water pumping station overflowed, as it had in the past; and the visual impact of the new dwelling on his property.

Mr Labouchere (Applicant) explained that the house was for his son who would be retiring from the army in two years. He understood the objection but there were not many new homes in North Elmham and it would contribute to the Council's housing land supply. The plot was hedged all round and had previously been used as a menage.

Approved, as recommended.

- l) Item 12: GREAT ELLINGHAM: Rear of 23 Long Street: Erection of dwelling and detached double garage/carport: Applicant: Mr Tim Davidge: Reference: 3PL/2016/0026/F

This was a finely balanced application with all matters acceptable except highways.

Mr Burbuk (Agent) pointed out that the proposal was for a single bungalow to use an existing driveway previously used by a garage business. Vehicle movements would be far less. An adjacent site for eight dwellings had been approved with a less suitable access.

Councillor Smith (Ward Representative) said the whole character of the

village had changed with 12 houses approved opposite and eight adjacent. He was happy with the access and the modest development which would have no impact on the area.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported. Members agreed that the existing access was acceptable.

Approved, contrary to the recommendation.

- m) Item 13: CARBROOKE: Land off Lancaster Avenue: Residential development of 106 dwellings and a community centre: Applicant: Westmere Homes: Reference: 3PL/2016/0084/F

It was noted that the Consultee responses had been missed from the Agenda and were provided in full on screen. The Lead Local Flood Authority had objected and the scheme had been amended to overcome their concerns. Confirmation of their satisfaction was awaited. The Ecological Consultant had required more information, which had been provided and again confirmation of their satisfaction with the details provided was awaited.

Mr Sampher (Carbrooke Parish Council) fully supported the updated plan which would enhance a current 'eyesore'. The site had suffered dumping, fires, anti-social behaviour and use by Travellers. The community centre was much needed and would bring the mixed community together.

Mr Wormall (Supporter) said residents wanted something done to improve the area and the residents' association had worked with the developers. Their current community centre was a shipping container with no facilities.

Mr Armstrong (Agent) said this was a brownfield site and its development would solve the current issues as well as providing community benefits including a commuted sum for management of the community centre.

Councillor Rogers (Ward Representative) fully supported the residential development which would make the estate a better place to live.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- n) Item 14: NORTH TUDDENHAM: Pound Farm, Pound Lane: On-farm anaerobic digestion facility: Applicant: F S Dann & Son Ltd / CE Norfolk 1 Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2016/0179/F

Attention was drawn to the Supplement to the Agenda in which the Agent addressed points raised by the Parish Council.

Mr Stapleton (Chairman North Tuddenham Parish Council) did not object to the proposal but it was very controversial. The site was visible from houses and roads and its proximity to houses was a concern. Screening, boundary hedging and the completion of the cow shed should be required before construction commenced. Health and wellbeing would be affected by gases and odour and the prevailing winds added to that problem. Traffic would increase to service the larger dairy herd. Use of the access away from the bend in the road would help to take noise and contamination away from the houses.

Action By

Mrs Baldwin (Objector) was not asking for refusal but sought mitigation of noise and odour from the uncovered digestate tank. Covering the tank would reduce odour and a bund would reduce visual impact. All should be in place at an early stage of development.

It was confirmed that no off-site crops would be used.

Approved, as recommended, subject to additional conditions requiring the tank to be covered, bunding, landscaping and the colour of the tank to be agreed.

- o) Item 15: MATTISHALL: Walnut Cottage, South Green: New dwelling and revision to existing car parking (revised scheme): Applicant: Mr & Mrs Lishmann: Reference: 3PL/2016/0247/O

Members were advised that a Appeal decision to refuse an application for eight dwellings, closer to the Settlement Boundary, on grounds of character and appearance and access to local facilities, was a material planning consideration. An additional reason for refusal was impact on the adjacent property.

Councillor Dimoglou (Ward Representative) asked Members to exercise their judgement. There had been no objections from the Parish Council or neighbours. The Applicants had lived in the property for many years. Car dependency to access services was an accepted fact for rural communities. The development would not harm the area.

Mrs Lishmann (Applicant) had lived in Walnut Cottage for 40 years. The garden was too big and they needed to downsize. The single storey proposal would be eco-friendly and future-proofed. A substantial amount of garden would remain with the original dwelling. Any trees removed would be replaced.

The reasons for refusal were not supported. Members felt the development would be sustainable and was not detrimental to the character or appearance of the area and would contribute to the Council's housing land supply.

Approved, contrary to the recommendation.

- p) Item 16: DEREHAM: 12 Market Place: Change of use from A1 retail to A5 hot food takeaway: Applicant: Mr G Pervaz: Reference: 3PL/2016/0411/CU

This proposal was in a Listed Building in a Conservation Area.

Councillor Clarke preferred to see the shop in use rather than boarded up.

Councillor Darby asked if there were any opening hours restrictions and it was agreed that they should be the same as for other take-away establishments in the vicinity.

Approved, as recommended, subject to a condition re hours of operation.

- q) Item 17: WELLINGHAM: Old Chapel, The Street: Single storey rear extension: Applicant: Mrs Gayle Curtis: Reference: 3PL/2016/0432/HOU

This proposal had been amended to have horizontal boarding to improve its appearance.

Approved, as recommended.

71/16 APPEAL AGAINST TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO) 2016 NO 1 BY CHILDERHOUSE LODGE FARM (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The Tree & Countryside Officer presented the report which sought confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order on a Beech tree, a group of trees and an area of woodland all thought to have amenity value and to be worthy of retention. The trees were located close to an area with outline permission for housing and there was concern about the potential future pressure to remove or cut them back.

Members were unanimous in their support of the Order.

RESOLVED that Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2016 No 1 be confirmed.

72/16 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLACE (AGENDA ITEM 11)

Noted.

73/16 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 12)

Noted.

74/16 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (AGENDA ITEM 13)

The resolution was not moved.

75/16 ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 14)

This item was deferred.

The meeting closed at 4.57 pm

CHAIRMAN