

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

10TH JULY 2019

Present:

Councillor Juliet Layton	-	Chair
Councillor Ray Brassington	-	Vice-Chair

Councillors -

Tony Berry	Sue Jepson
Claire Bloomer	Julia Judd
Patrick Coleman	Dilys Neill
Stephen Hirst	Gary Selwyn
Roly Hughes	Steve Trotter
Nikki Ind	Clive Webster

Substitutes:

Stephen Andrews

Observers:

Julian Beale (from 9.40 a.m. until 12.35 p.m.)	Mike Every (from 9.30 a.m. until 10.30 a.m.)
Jenny Forde (from 11.00 a.m. until 1.00 p.m.)	Joe Harris (from 1.40 p.m. until 1.55 p.m.)
Robin Hughes (from 9.30 a.m. until 11.00 a.m.)	

Apologies:

Richard Keeling

PL.16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Berry declared an interest in respect of application 18/02520/FUL, as he was a friend of the Objector. He left the room while the application was being determined.

Councillor Brassington declared an interest in respect of application 19/01178/FUL, as he was acquainted with the Agent as they were a former Officer of the Council and his wife also socialised with the Agent's wife. He left the room while the application was being determined.

Councillor Brassington declared an interest of application 19/01115/OUT, as he was acquainted with the Applicant as they were a former Officer of the Council. He left the room while the application was being determined.

Councillor Bloomer declared an interest in respect of application 19/00611/FUL, as she had undertaken some work for the Golf Club in a professional capacity. She left the room while the application was being determined.

(2) Officer Declarations

Mr. M Napper, Team Leader, Development Management, declared an interest in respect of application 19/01004/FUL, as he socialised with one of the Objectors. He left the room while the application was being determined.

PL.17 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Andrews substituted for Councillor Keeling.

PL.18 MINUTES

RESOLVED that:

(a) subject to the following amendments, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 12th June 2019 be approved as a correct record;

(i) deletion of the name 'Councillor Brassington' and its substitution by the name 'Councillor Berry' in regard to the second paragraph of Minute PL.5;

(ii) deletion of the word 'a' in the ninth line of the preamble in relation to Minute PL.12 application 18/02520/FUL, page 9, so as to read 'a condition would require details of structural works';

(iii) deletion of the application number '19/01288/FUL' and its substitution by the number '19/00996/FUL', page 11, in regard to Minute PL.12.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 2, absent 0.

PL.19 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair informed the Committee that, given a recent all-Member Sites Inspection Briefing and the number of absences at that Briefing, she wished the Committee to be mindful when requesting an all-Member visit and to determine if this was warranted over a panel visit.

The Chair reminded Members that the risk of appeal to the Council must be borne in mind when considering applications, but that this risk did extend to any Objectors and/or Applicants also and that ultimately, an appeal would always prove costly to at least one party involved in any application.

The Chair also announced that she had decided to exercise the discretion available to her under Council Procedure Rule 3.2 to vary the order of business at the Committee Meeting to allow application 18/02520/FUL to be presented and

debated earlier in the Meeting, particularly so as to minimise inconvenience to interested observers.

PL.20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No Public Questions had been submitted.

PL.21 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.22 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.23 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

It was noted that the details of the policies referred to in the compilation of the Schedule did not comprise a comprehensive list of the policies taken into account in the preparation of the reports.

RESOLVED that:

(a) where on this Schedule of Applications, development proposals in Conservation Areas and/or affecting Listed Buildings have been advertised - (in accordance with Section 73 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Regulations 1977) - but the period of the advertisement has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the advertisement, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;

(b) where on this Schedule of Applications, the consultation period in respect of any proposals has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the consultation period, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;

(c) the applications in the Schedule be dealt with in accordance with the following resolutions:-

18/02520/FUL

Erection of two dwellings at Land South of Wick House, East End, Fariford, GL7 4AP -

The Chair informed the Committee that whilst the application had been subject to a panel Site Inspection Briefing, she had been notified via Officers that additional information had now been requested by the County Council Highways Officer and Drainage Engineer and that the recommendation had been to defer a decision on this item to allow the Applicant time to respond.

A Proposition, that the application be deferred, was duly Seconded.

Following a request from a Member, the Chair confirmed that she would request those Members that had attended the Sites Inspection Briefing to record their views of the application site in preparation for the application being re-presented at the August 2019 Committee Meeting.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred, pending information in response to issues raised by the Highway Officers and Drainage Engineers.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 0.

19/01178/FUL

Alterations to and change of use of two buildings from agricultural use to Class B1 Use at Clay Meadow, Cirencester Road, South Cerney, Cirencester, GL7 6HU -

The Case Officer drew attention to an extra representation received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and displayed a site map and aerial photograph of the site, fenestrations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

A representative from the Parish Council and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that this application required the Committee to determine if there was a fundamental issue as to whether the application site presented a suitable location for Use Class B1 development and if the site was also outside of the settlement boundary of the village. In referring to the Council's Local Plan, the Ward Member explained that he did not consider the site to be suitable for development as he considered the fact that the Applicants had not submitted a business plan to indicate that there was a viable use. He continued that there were many other employment opportunities within the village and he could therefore not see why the application site had been chosen for the application, given its proximity to a main road and the lack of pedestrian access to the site. The Ward Member also informed the Committee that there were no cycling routes to the site and that, aside from driving, the only method of reaching the site would be via a bus journey. In concluding, the Ward Member stated that the proposed use, next to the existing equestrian use, did not, in his view, seem compatible with the proposed site layout and that reference to up to 50 workers entering and leaving the site would also not be suitable and he therefore urged the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that relevance made to the close proximity of the site to a military air base was in relation to the fact that there were no development rights for the change of use of buildings to employment use in close proximity to a military air base; there was no indication within the Council's Local Plan as to what constituted small-scale development, but that Policy EN6 related to the conversion of rural buildings, and that the re-use of rural buildings for employment purposes was a long-standing policy at national and local level; B1 Use could include 'B1(a) - Offices', 'B1(b) - research and development', 'B1(c) - light industry' and a general B1 Use had been applied

for; the proposals were for up to 40 full-time employees but a number of these were expected to be field based; there was currently one member of staff at the site and the buildings were used for storage; a personal travel plan had not been recommended but this could be conditioned if the Committee were minded to approve the application; Highways Officers had made no objection to the application; the travel plan would be in conjunction with County Council Officers and if the Applicant failed to meet the plan's requirements, this would be a breach of condition and could be the subject of enforcement action; despite nearby employment locations, relevant planning policy supported the re-use of rural buildings; the site totalled 50 acres and was currently used for equine and the keeping of alpacas; if Officers had considered the application to be unsustainable in regard to environmental matters, the application would have been recommended refusal and the road verge adjacent to the site was in the ownership of the Highways Authority, but that the walking distance from the site to the village was within the 800 metres considered reasonable.

In response to further Member questions, the Highways Officer present at the Meeting responded that all the surrounding road verges were in the ownership of the Highways Authority; if the Committee were minded to condition a personal travel plan, this would be considered fair in the view of Highway Officers and the plan would continue with any future owners of the site; there were no reported accidents from either pedestrians or cyclists using the nearby highway; and should a travel plan with condition be included, the addition of a travel watch and sufficient training for workers using the site could also be included.

A Member commented that, knowing the site well, she was concerned that the village already had a strategic employment site with a variety of workers and a fair amount of current empty space. She added that the site was located outside of the village boundary on the main road to Cirencester and that there was no industry in the surrounding area to the application site.

Another Member expressed his view that, as most of the operatives would be field based and if a travel plan was included with any permission, there were no reasons to refuse the application and therefore he was minded to vote in favour of the application.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, subject to additional conditions in regard to a Travel Plan and Footpath link, was duly Seconded.

In response to a specific Member's comment, the Development Manager responded that travel plans were considered by Officers to be fairly common on a number of applications and it was therefore not considered that the plan would need to be presented before any permission was granted.

Various Members expressed that they considered travel plans would become more common in future applications and highlighted that the site should also prepare for future energy efficiency measures including the installation of electric vehicle charging points.

The Development Manager explained that a travel plan could contain specific conditions and that the Committee were justified in specialising any of these conditions. He added that Officers would consider it beneficial, if the Committee were minded, to include the installation of a 'link' pavement from the site to the

village as a separate condition and that another condition be related to the facilities at the site.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained that he understood the Committee's concerns regarding travel to and from the site but stressed that he did not think the Committee should also be considering installing pavements on open countryside. He added that the site was located half a mile from the village and therefore he considered that an alternative site on the opposite side of the village would prove more beneficial. The Ward Member concluded by reiterating his request for the Committee to refuse the application.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to additional conditions in regard to (i) Travel Plan; (ii) Footpath link and (iii) Electric Vehicle Charging Points.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 3, abstentions 0, absent 1.

19/01595/FUL

Mobile home for temporary accommodation for rural worker (Retrospective) at Staple Farm, Withington, Cheltenham, GL54 4BH -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed a map and aerial photograph and photographs of the site from various vantage points and in relation to nearby listed buildings.

The Applicant was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that there had been a difference of opinion between those consulted on the application and that all the consultees except one in part had no objection. The Ward Member informed the Committee that there was an essential need for someone to be located on the site at all times with the Applicant, who leased the buildings and shooting licence on a short-term tenancy from the Colesbourne Estate. He added that the only property located nearby to the site was a farmhouse in which the Applicant lived and therefore the mobile home was required to be at the site until 2020. The Ward Member concluded by reiterating the comments made by the Council's Conservation Officer within the circulated report and highlighted to the Committee the benefit in regard to rural employment, should the application be approved.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the consultant employed by the Council accepted that there was a need for one worker to reside on site for 12 months of the year, but did not consider there a need for a second worker to also permanently reside on site; it was unlikely that permanent permission would eventually be applied for by the Applicant as the site was leased from the Colesbourne Estate on a short-term tenancy; in the view of Officers, it would difficult to enforce the removal of the caravan for the two months of the year that it was not required and it was unlikely, in the view of Officers, that the Applicant would consider converting the barn as this would prove costly and the barn was also a listed building.

A Member commented that the surrounding area to the application site was very sparsely populated and the skills required for undertaking the work required at the site were specialist and not easily available. He therefore commented that he did not consider any precedent would be set from approving the application and stated that he would vote accordingly.

Another Member commented that she considered a three year temporary permission would be the most sensible option for the site and explained that a condition should also be placed on any permission that the mobile home be removed within two months of the lease ceasing.

A Proposition, that the application be approved for a three year temporary period and subject to the mobile home being removed within two months of the lease ceasing, was duly Seconded.

The Locality Lead Officer informed the Committee that, following a request by a Member, an informative could be included regarding a permanent solution being sought for accommodation at the site.

Various Members commented that they considered approval of the application would also assist with potential rural crime, which the Applicant had referred to in his representation.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained he had no further comment to make other than agreeing with the view of the Committee that a three year temporary permission would be the best possible option.

RESOLVED that the application be approved for a temporary permission of three years and subject to an informative being included seeking a permanent solution for the site.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 2, absent 0.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation for the reasons outlined above.

19/01115/OUT

Erection of 2 no. dwellings and associated works (Outline application with all matters reserved except access) at Land to Rear of Ashlar, Coppers and Wyldlands, Broad Campden, Chipping Campden, GL55 6UR -

The Case Officer informed the Committee that since publication of the Schedule and other papers for the Meeting, he had received correspondence from Highway Officers stating that whilst they did not object to the application, they wished to be formally consulted on the application. The Case Officer reported that therefore the Officer recommendation was now delegated authority to permit the application, subject to no objection being received from the County Council Highway Officers.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed a map and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

An Objector and the Applicant were then invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Officer then read out comments submitted by one of the Ward Members. The Ward Member thanked those Members who had attended the Sites Inspection Briefing and commented that he now considered that the Members would understand why the application should be refused.

No comments had been received from the other Ward Member.

The Chair then invited those Members who had attended the Sites Inspection Briefing at the site to express their views. Those Members commented that the site was well screened owing to trees on the neighbouring land and that further screening would result in the application site being largely unseen from neighbouring buildings. Some Members also added that they were concerned that approval of the application would set a precedent for other back gardens in the vicinity being developed in the future.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that in the view of Officers, the proposed development was considered not to have a greater impact than the recently completed development neighbouring the application site; each application was required to be assessed on its merits and that the two potential neighbouring sites that could accommodate a similar type of development were more exposed and therefore would be viewed differently by Officers; Officers were satisfied that a loss of the garden space at the site would not be detrimental to the village; Highway Officers had given pre-application advice to the Applicant and that they had reported that the width of the road complied with the standard requirements, but further research was required in regard to waste vehicle access and Officers could request that, if the Committee was minded to approve the application, the Applicant research options in regard to single glazing and grey waste water.

A Member commented that with regard to the request by Officers for the Applicant to research options in regard to single glazing and grey waste water, that the application should be approved.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Another Member commented that he considered the application should be refused on grounds relating to Policy DS3 Paragraph 1A, 'does not enhance the local area', and that the application was also against Paragraph 1C, as he considered it did have a cumulative impact and would have an effect on the neighbouring six properties.

A Further Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

RESOLVED that the application be approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 9, against 4, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 0.

19/01706/FUL**Erection of a single dwelling and associated works (resubmission) at Land West of Brans Cottage, Brans Lane, Upper Oddington, GL56 0XQ -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and informed the Committee that the application had previously been refused at the April 2019 Committee Meeting and was now re-presented following a change in the proposed materials.

The Case Officer displayed a site map and aerial photograph of the site, proposed elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points, including from the Public Right of Way.

A representative from the Parish Council, a Supporter and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that he wished to endorse the view of the Parish Council in objecting to the application. He explained that whilst he recognised that the site would be suitable for some development and would help contribute to the housing stock of the village, he considered the proposals constituted a substantial change and that there were a number of difficulties surrounding access to the site. The Ward Member also commented that the design was contemporary and was therefore controversial and was one that, in his view, he felt was not well-suited to the village.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the principal glazed elevation of the building would face south into the urban area of the village; timber panels would be set inside the colonnade facing to the east, the main part of the dwelling would be 6 metres high with the living area element approximately 4.8 metres high; the Conservation Statement for the village dated 2004 should be considered though the Committee was informed that the boundary had changed since publication; an existing dwelling in the western part of the village was considered to be of a contemporary design; Highway Officers were satisfied with the proposed access and had raised no objection; the natural green infrastructure at the site would be required to be retained for five years and the overall height of the proposed plans would equate to six metres in comparison to a standard eight to nine metres for a two-storey property.

A Member commented that he considered approval of the application would result in the irreversible loss of open green space within the village and that he did not consider the proposals warranted construction within an open countryside space.

A Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

Another Member commented that he considered the application presented to be a rare opportunity to approve a non-traditional design with a historic area and that he considered the design warranted approval.

A Further Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Other Members expressed their support for approval of the application and commented that the site was not a public space and was also well screened alongside neighbouring properties having been built in various periods. Those Members also requested that a landscaping scheme be included, if the Committee were minded to approve the application.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained that the design body who had supported approval of the application was not an official body and that he was aware the Parish Council objected to the application as the benefits of the modern design would not be outweighed by the harm. He therefore reiterated his request that the Committee refuse the application.

On being put to the vote, the Proposition to refuse this application was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 5, against 10, abstentions 0, absent 0.

Approved, subject to an additional condition for a 10 year Landscape and EnvirEcological Management Plan.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 5, abstentions 0, absent 0.

19/00611/FUL

Temporary siting of mobile home for 10 years for rural worker at Cirencester Golf Club Ltd., Cheltenham Road, Bagendon, Cirencester, GL7 7BH -

The Case Officer read out to the Committee an email she had received from the agent and explained that the flat previously located within the Clubhouse was not relevant to the application, but that she considered it necessary to inform the Committee that there was previously staff accommodation on the site.

The Case Officer displayed a site map, elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Agent was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that recruiting for rural workers was an ever-increasing challenge and informed the Committee that the Golf Club had been seeking a highly-skilled and professional grounds person for some time, but to no avail. She added that the Golf Club was a community asset and run not-for-profit, and that it needed to compete alongside other golf clubs which were run as businesses. The Ward Member commented that any grounds person was responsible for ensuring the protection of a landscape within the AONB and in referring to the Council's Local Plan, quoted that rural accommodation should be provided where there was an essential need. The Ward Member explained that an essential need for accommodation could be demonstrated by the fact that in summer, grounds keepers commenced work at around 6 a.m. for often six or seven days a week owing to the fact that standards needed to be kept high. The Ward Member concluded that a new dwelling could not be created from the existing buildings on the site and owing to the fact there was no housing within the vicinity of the Club, urged the Committee to support the application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the request for a 10 year permission had been discussed with the Club and that the reasoning was that as the Club did not have sufficient funds to invest immediately in any property, the siting of a mobile home, if approved, would be undertaken for a trial period; three years was, in the view of Officers, considered to be a well-established temporary period; the Case Officer had not discovered any other golf clubs within the District which offer accommodation to workers; there had been five reported break-ins at the site over the past 10 years and it was understood these were in relation to trophies stored within the Clubhouse, but Officers confirmed the main reason for the accommodation was for a grounds person and the mobile home would be for accommodating one worker only as there was a requirement that need be demonstrated for any additional worker to reside at the site.

A Member commented that in his view, the Club had failed to demonstrate a need for the worker to reside on site and he therefore considered the application should be refused.

A Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

Various Members commented that the Club had demonstrated its difficulty in recruiting a skilled grounds person and that their expectation was that this could become easier should accommodation at the site be provided. Those Members also expressed their desire that the Club work with Officers to seek a permanent solution for the site, should a worker be recruited at the Club.

A Further Proposition, that the application be approved for a temporary period of three years and subject to the mobile home being removed within two months of any worker ceasing residing at the site, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was then invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained that through personal experiences, she was aware of how vital accommodation provision to ground persons was and highlighted to the Committee that the application had been brought about solely in an attempt by the Club to recruit a quality grounds person. The Ward Member concluded by reiterating her earlier comment that the Committee should therefore be minded to approve the application.

On being put to the vote, the Proposition to refuse this application was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 4, against 10, abstentions 0, interest declared 1, absent 0.

Approved, for a temporary period of three years and subject to the removal of the mobile home within two months.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 4, abstentions 0, interest declared 1, absent 0.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation for the reasons outlined above.

18/03102/FUL**Erection of an agricultural worker's dwelling and associated ancillary development. Retention of existing temporary static caravan to allow continued occupation whilst permanent dwelling is constructed at Korinn Farm, Cowley, GL53 9NJ -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and displayed a site map and aerial photograph of the site, proposed floor plans and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Applicant was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member apologised for the late circulation of the company accounts circulated to the Committee in relation to the application within confidential additional representations and explained that she considered these formed an integral part of her concern as Ward Member. The Ward Member informed the Committee that whilst she did not have strong views either way in regard to the application, she considered the proposals to be for a substantial construction within the AONB in relation to a company whose business kept changing methods and approaches. The Ward Member concluded that the site was located next to the River Churn and also had no electricity supply and therefore resulted in many questions in relation to the application remaining unanswered.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers were satisfied with the appearance of the proposed corrugated metal roof and that the roof specification would be dependent upon building regulations; the residential part of the site was of restricted use and therefore the buildings used for the care of the alpacas did not require residential justification; the current mobile home at the site was granted permission at appeal in 2015 for a period of three years; the Applicants who currently resided in the mobile home would move into the house once constructed, if permission was granted; the mobile home would remain on site until the construction of the property was complete, but would be required to be removed within two months and the proposals consisted of one single planning unit and any plans to develop the buildings in which the animals were kept would require a separate application.

A Member commented that she considered the application was warranted by the business use and indicated that she would support the application so as to enable a permanent solution to be found for the site.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Another Member commented that, with regard to the circulated business finances, he considered it concerning that a permanent structure could be built against a business which could not be considered to have to be permanently located at the site.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and explained that she appreciated the Committee's consideration of the item and that she had no further comment to make.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 4, abstentions 0, absent 0.

19/01004/FUL

Proposed dormers on the rear elevation (retrospective) at 54 Purley Road, Cirencester, GL7 1EP -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed a map and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member stated that he wished the Committee to take into account the personal circumstances of the Applicant and explained that the Council had received a number of objections from both local residents and the Town Council. He commented that, in his view, he did not consider the harm to have been caused by the application to be considerable and concluded that the Committee should consider if damage had been caused to the conservation area by the development.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that in the view of Officers, owing to the building's design, dormer windows were the only option to enable reasonable head height; objections raised by residents related primarily to the windows breaking the roof slope; the application was required owing to the property being located within a conservation area and the application was not considered by Officers to set a precedent as the design of the dormer windows was traditional.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

A Member commented that whilst the property was the only one within the Road to contain dormer windows; he considered that, as the design was both traditional and sympathetic, the application should be approved.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again but explained he had no further comment to make.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

Lists setting out details of additional representations received since the Schedule of planning applications had been prepared were considered in conjunction with the related planning applications.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

19/01178/FUL)	Mr. R Cowley (on behalf of the
)	Parish Council)
)	Mr. A Miles (Agent)
19/01595/FUL)	Mr. M Newell (Applicant)
19/01115/OUT)	Mr. D Hughes (Objector)
)	R Burrige (Agent)
19/01706/FUL)	Cllr. D Thorpe (on behalf of the
)	Parish Council)
)	K Adams (Supporter)
)	Mr. D Maguire (Agent)
19/00611/FUL)	Mr. I Stuart (Agent)
18/03102/FUL)	Mr. J Tibbs-Hamilton (Applicant)
19/01004/FUL)	U Corcoran (Applicant)

Copies of the representations by the public speakers would be made available on the Council's Website in those instances where copies had been made available to the Council.

PL.24 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 7th August 2019

It was noted that Councillors Patrick Coleman, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Clive Webster, together with the Chair, would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 7th August 2019.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefings had been notified.

PL.25 LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEES

1. Members for 17th July 2019

It was noted that Councillors Claire Bloomer, Stephen Hirst, Nikki Ind, Richard Keeling and Juliet Layton would represent the Committee at the Licensing Sub-Committee Meeting of 17th July 2019.

2. Members for 21st August 2019

It was noted that Councillors Ray Brassington, Sue Jepson, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill (substituting for Patrick Coleman) and Clive Webster would represent the Committee at the Licensing Sub-Committee Meeting of 21st August 2019, if required.

PL.26 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.00 a.m. and 11.15 a.m., and closed at 1.57 p.m.

Chair

(END)