

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 20 JULY 2022

Present: Cllrs Toni Coombs (Chairman), Shane Bartlett (Vice-Chairman), Alex Brenton, Robin Cook, David Tooke and John Worth

Apologies: Cllrs Mike Barron, Mike Dyer, Barry Goringe, David Morgan, Julie Robinson and Bill Trite

Also present: Cllr David Walsh – Portfolio Holder for Planning
Simon Crosby, Applicant's architects – minute 275
Giles Moir, agent – minute 277
Clive Bailey, neighbour – minute 279

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting): Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager East), Naomi Shinkins (Lead Project Officer), Huw Williams (Lead Project Officer – Corporate Projects), Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Claire Hicks (Planning Officer), Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer – Regulatory), Hayley Caves (Member Development & Support Officer) and David Northover (Democratic Services Officer).

270. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barron, Dyer, Goringe, Morgan, Robinson and Trite.

271. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

272. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2022 were confirmed and signed.

273. Public Participation

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

274. Planning Applications

275. **P/VOC/2022/03461 - Demolition of existing three storey plus plant room building and erection of new three storey plus plant room building for Dorset Police Force Headquarters with associated parking without compliance with/variation of condition 10 of planning permission P/FUL/2021/04422 - The development shall be constructed to a minimum BREEAM standard rating of 'Very Good' instead of 'Excellent' - Force Headquarters, Dorset Innovation Park Access Road, Winfrith Newburgh, Dorset, DT2 8DZ.**

The Committee considered application P/VOC/2022/03461 for the demolition of an existing three storey plus plant room building and erection of new three storey plus plant room building for Dorset Police Force Headquarters with associated parking without compliance with/variation of condition 10 of planning permission P/FUL/2021/04422 - The development shall be constructed to a minimum BREEAM standard rating of 'Very Good' instead of 'Excellent' - Force Headquarters, Dorset Innovation Park Access Road, Winfrith Newburgh, Dorset, DT2 8DZ.

Officers explained BREEAM stood for 'Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology' and comprised a science-based suite of validation and certification systems for a sustainable built environment. The assessment methodology took account of a range of factors that were measured against pre-determined targets that reward performance which delivered social, economic or environmental benefit.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context for the reason why the variation was deemed necessary: in that it was now evident to the applicant from their assessments made that the practicalities of achieving the necessary credits meant that achieving an excellent status was not now necessarily readily achievable, without significant additional investment which would not prove value for money. No change was proposed to the architectural or landscape design proposals previously considered in the determination of application P/FUL/2021/04422; with energy, waste and ecology considerations all still being able to be delivered in the development.

However, BREEAM 'Very Good' was still a high sustainability rating well above that likely to be achieved by the existing building. Information submitted in support of the application identified several site constraints limiting the number of achievable and available credits for the proposed development and further indicated that the uplift required to achieve a rating of 'Excellent' would, if achievable, have an obvious and clear impact on other force initiatives.

Indeed, replacement of the existing building would better suit the operational requirements of Dorset Police, would perform to higher level of sustainability and would be the benefit of the local economy.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, dimensions – form, bulk, size and mass - and appearance of the development; how the demolition and replacement would be achieved; why

the variation was necessary; access and highway considerations; environmental and biodiversity considerations and obligations; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping and screening and its setting within that part of the Dorset heathland in the vicinity of Wool.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent development and how the buildings were designed to achieve optimum efficiency and effectiveness for the purposes it served. The characteristics and topography of the site was shown and its relationship with the highway network. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered the acceptability of the proposed variation: confirming it was the case that some credits were unobtainable. Achievement of any BREEAM rating was purposefully challenging and the predetermined targets had been raised over time so as to push performance beyond best practice, drive innovation, create positive impact and showcase success. This formed the basis of the recommendation being made and that - following the satisfactory conclusion of a habitats regulations assessment undertaken in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the execution of a planning obligation securing payment of financial compensation in accordance with the certified Biodiversity Plan submitted in support of planning application P/FUL/2021/04422 - permission should be granted.

Simon Crosby, of the architects, considered the building would still deliver all that was necessary to a very high standard, describing what sustainable features would be built in, but stressed that it had become apparent that the opportunity was just not there to achieve the excellent status envisaged given the credits unavailable to them. He assured members that very good was still a high standard.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised were and which they considered still required clarification were :-

- what was the differentiation between the status of "excellent" and "very good" and what this would mean for the standard of the building
- why this reduction in standard had not been envisaged
- what would it take to achieve "excellent"
- how environmental and ecological considerations would be taken in account.
- what assessments had been made in coming to the recommendation now being considered

Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable. Officers confirmed that condition 4 could be amended in the terms the Committee had

asked for. They also confirmed an Informative could satisfactorily cover the issue of cladding.

Wool Parish Council raised no objection to the variation, but remained concerned that the appearance of the building could potentially lead to bird strikes. However, the appearance had already received permission.

From debate, the Committee understood the reasoning for why the standard was being modified as it was and considered this to be acceptable – in the circumstances, whilst it was incumbent on the Committee to ensure the best possible standard was still achieved. Members understood that there was no opportunity for this to be readily realised.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Robin Cook, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed – unanimously, to grant permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Resolved

That following the satisfactory conclusion of a habitats regulations assessment undertaken in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the execution of a planning obligation securing payment of financial compensation in accordance with the certified Biodiversity Plan submitted in support of planning application P/FUL/2021/04422, the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 16.1 of the report or conditions to similar effect.

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>for</u>	<u>Decision</u>
----------------	------------	-----------------

1) Planning permission has previously been granted for the proposed replacement police force headquarters building but that permission is subject to a requirement that the replacement building shall be constructed to a minimum BREEAM standard rating of 'Excellent'. The replacement headquarters building is expected to achieve a BREEAM rating of 'Very Good' rather than a rating of 'Excellent' as favoured in Policy D of the Adopted Purbeck Local Plan for a nondomestic building of this size.		
2) BREEAM 'Very Good' is a high sustainability rating well above that likely to be achieved by the existing building. Information submitted in support of the application identifies several site constraints limiting the number of achievable and available credits for the proposed development and further indicates that the uplift required to achieve a rating of 'Excellent' would, if achievable, have an obvious and clear impact on other force initiatives.		
3) Replacement of the existing building would better suit the operational		

requirements of Dorset Police, would perform to higher level of sustainability and would be the benefit of the local economy. The architectural and landscapedesign proposals would:

- (i) enhance the character and appearance of the locality;
- (ii) provide for safe and convenient access;
- (iii) make appropriate provision for the conservation of heritage assets; and
- (iv) would contribute to biodiversity enhancement,

and use of the proposed development by Dorset Police would be to the benefit of communities across Dorset.

4) Having regard to the particular circumstances of the application site, the details of the development proposal and taking account of the public benefits that would accrue from the proposed development, it is considered that construction to a minimum BREEAM rating of 'Very Good' rather than 'Excellent' has been justified adequately in accordance with policy requirements.

5) Consideration of the potential for adverse effect on European sites is ongoing. On account of the location and nature of the proposed development, planning permission cannot be granted without the satisfactory completion of a habitats regulations assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

6) Subject to the satisfactory completion of a habitats regulations assessment, a planning obligation to secure mitigatory payment in accordance with an approved Biodiversity Plan and with the imposition of planning conditions necessary to secure an adequate level of compliance with the development plan, it is considered that the application proposal is in accordance with the development plan and that there are no economic, environmental or social considerations either warranting or necessitating determination of the application other than in accordance with development plan.

276. **P/VOC/2022/01598 - Vary condition 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 19 of PA 3/21/1556/FUL (Redevelopment of Wimborne Market to continuing care community comprising of 67 age restricted apartments, 26 age restricted bungalows, 6 age restricted chalet bungalows, one wellness centre, 9 open market houses, parking , highway improvements and pedestrian link (description amended 24.09.2021 as agreed to include dwelling numbers)) to allow for: amend incorrect plans - include phasing plan - rewording of pre-commencement conditions to refer to phasing - WIMBORNE MARKET, STATION TERRACE, WIMBORNE MINSTER**

The Committee considered application P/VOC/2022/01598; to vary condition 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 19 of PA 3/21/1556/FUL (Redevelopment of Wimborne Market to continuing care community comprising of 67 age restricted apartments, 26 age restricted bungalows, 6 age restricted chalet bungalows, one wellness centre, 9 open market houses, parking , highway improvements and pedestrian link (description amended 24.09.2021 as agreed to include dwelling numbers)) to allow for: amend incorrect plans - include phasing plan - rewording of pre-commencement conditions to refer to phasing at Wimborne Market, Station Terrace, Wimborne Minster.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were. The planning history of the site was detailed too.

Officers provided an illustrative summary of the location and appearance of the development and what it would entail in terms of its characteristics; access and highway considerations; environmental considerations; drainage and water management considerations and its setting within that part of Wimborne Minster and the wider landscape. Viability, flooding, heathland mitigation and affordable housing issues were all given particular consideration. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary. What contributions were to be secured through Section 106 legal agreement were also detailed.

The proposal was to vary conditions:-

- 2 (approved plans plans),
- 3 (access construction),
- 4 (turning and parking),
- 6 (biodiversity mitigation),
- 9 (landscaping),
- 19 (acoustic fence).

The reasoning for why this had been assessed to be necessary was explained: in how it was to be delivered - to only provide for the development to be built and occupied in phases, which did not materially change the approved design of the scheme.

The assessment had considered the acceptability of the proposal in relation to the Development Plan, taken as a whole, and all other material considerations, with all of the foregoing factors being considered in relation to the social, economic, and environmental benefits to be provided by the proposal. It is considered the proposed is acceptable in relation to material planning considerations.

Wimborne Minster Town Council had objected to the application considering that the original requirements made were for a reason and should remain valid. They saw no reason why this should not be the case. However, they recognised that DC planning officers were best placed to judge this.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision. Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-,

- what access arrangements had been made and what guarantees were in place in use of the industrial estate access given the limitations of Granville Road and Station Road within a densely built residential area
- the reasoning for how the construction was to be phased and the sequencing of this, including the timescales involved

- how the current building regulations - and those proposed for 2025 - would be factored in and what assessment had been made of how this scheme aligned with what was to be enacted.

Officers addressed the questions raised – and provided what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable. Confirmation was given that there would have to be compliance with a construction management plan; HSE guidance; and design and construction regulations - all of which officers were confident would satisfy those concerns raised.

One of the two Local Ward members, Councillor Shane Bartlett, had reservations how access to the site by construction traffic would work in practice, given the limitations of the road network. He considered there should be more assessment of the logistics of how this might be achieved given the access and routing constraints around that part of Wimborne. He provided his own thoughts on how this might be best achieved and, particularly, that Granville Road should only be used in the final phasing. Other members had concerns about the phasing aspect of the development and the practicalities of this being achieved satisfactorily.

Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

From debate, the Committee considered the permission granted in respect of PA 3/21/1556/FUL to still be acceptable, but that the application needed more assessment as to how the construction management plan – which was yet to be finalised – would provide for access for construction traffic and how the development's phasing and sequencing would be achieved in practical terms and that these matters should be addressed before they were able to reach a decision. On that basis in being proposed by Councillor Toni Coombs and seconded by Councillor Shane Bartlett, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed, unanimously, to defer further consideration of the application until those matters were addressed.

Resolved

That application P/VOC/2022/01598 be deferred so as more assessment as to how the construction management plan would provide for access for construction traffic and how the development's phasing and sequencing could be achieved in practical terms.

Reason for decision

To ensure the development could be delivered successfully.

277. **3/21/1471/FUL - Demolish existing flats and dwelling and erect 12, 3 bedroom, houses arranged as 6 pairs of semi-detached properties, together with associated parking and access - 442 Ringwood Road,**

Ferndown, Dorset, BH22 9AY

The Committee considered application 3/21/1471/FUL for the demolition of existing flats and dwelling and the erection of 12 x 3 bedroom houses, arranged as 6 pairs of semi-detached properties, together with associated parking and access at 442 Ringwood Road, Ferndown, Dorset, BH22 9AY

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; how the development would contribute to meeting housing needs; and what this entailed. The presentation took into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, dimensions and appearance of the development and of the individual properties, with examples being given of how typical properties would be designed, along with their ground floor plans; the materials to be used; access and highway considerations; environmental considerations; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping and its setting within that part of Ferndown.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development and how the buildings were designed to be in keeping with the characteristics of the established local environment. The characteristics and topography of the site was shown and its relationship with the highway network. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

How a Section 106 agreement would be enacted and what this entailed was explained to members: in that the construction was not necessarily required to commence until 2025, but this could be brought forward to within 18 months so as to demonstrate the commitment to build out, therefore not requiring a viability assessment. Officers explained the implications of these options. The applicant's viability appraisal was that the proposal could not support any affordable housing or other financial contributions, apart from CIL. This was the view of the District Valuer Service too, whose option of an earlier start to the scheme had been accepted by the applicant; this being reflected in condition 1. However, the Dorset Council Housing Officer still raised an objection to the lack of affordable housing on that basis.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered the acceptability of the proposal in relation to the Development Plan and this formed the basis of the recommendation being made.

Giles Moir, agent, considered the application would make a positive contribution to the housing stock in Ferndown, having taken into account local issues raised and addressed these as best the applicant might. He hoped there would not be a need to enter into a S106 - for a viability study - and that work could progress at the earliest opportunity.

Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

Formal consultation had seen Ferndown Town Council object to the scheme on the grounds of overdevelopment and access issues.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised were and which they considered still required clarification were:-

- what the options were as a consequence of Condition 1 being reduced from 3 years to 18 months and what this entailed in practice
- on that basis, what proportion of the overall scheme would need to be built to avoid a viability assessment
- how the District Valuer's assessment and calculations had been made
- how the buildings would be orientated so as to ensure sufficient privacy
- what the access arrangements were for waste collection and the assessment made of this being able to be achieved satisfactory
- what was the prospect of having a communal bin area
- what prospect there was for an affordable housing element in the scheme
- was sufficient parking available and could on street parking be regulated so as to ensure waste collection vehicles could readily manoeuvre
- drainage and tree issues

Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable. In particular they confirmed that the proportion of build to be achieved so as to not trigger a S106 would be assessed and determined by the Council's legal section. The management of on-street parking could be accounted for in the Management Plan and enacted by the management company.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable - understanding the fundamental issue of housing land supply, the need for accommodation of this sort and in making the best use of the land available. However, some uncertainty remained over :-

- the enactment of a S106 agreement,
- traffic management and on-street parking and
- waste collection logistics and how bins could be best stored.

On that basis it was agreed that these issues should be delegated to officers – after consultation with the Chairman - with a view to them needing to be finalised and formalised so as to complement any permission and fulfil the necessary obligations. Officer's view was that the on-street parking management element could be best addressed by an Informative Note.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an

understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Robin Cook, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - by 3:1, with one abstention by Councillor Alex Brenton - to grant permission, subject to the conditions and informative set out in the officer's report and the in the need for a S106, traffic management arrangements and waste collection and storage being readily pursued by the means set out above.

Resolved

That application 3/21/1471/FUL be granted permission subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report and in taking into consideration what need there was for a S106 agreement, traffic management arrangements and waste collection and storage being readily pursued by the means set out above.

Reasons for Decision

- The location is considered to be sustainable, and the proposal is acceptable in its scale, design, materials and visual impact.
- The proposal has an appropriate layout and design and would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or the landscape
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity and the occupants of the proposed dwellings would enjoy an acceptable standard of amenity.
- The proposal would not have an adverse impact on road safety and the access proposed and on-site parking provision are acceptable
- The proposal would provide appropriate mitigation for its impact on biodiversity and biodiversity enhancement would be provided
- Other issues raised by consultees have been assessed and there are not any which would warrant refusal of the application.

278. 3/20/1725/LB - Replacement of four windows - PAMPHILL VC CE FIRST SCHOOL, PAMPHILL, WIMBORNE, BH21 4EE

The Committee considered application 3/20/1725/LB for the replacement of four windows at Pamphill First School, Pamphill Wimborne, BH21 4EE with the application being considered as the Council's Assets and Property section was the applicant.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, dimensions and appearance of the school and its windows; how these would be replaced and by what means - given that the building was Grade II listed; the materials to be used; environmental, sustainability and built heritage considerations -

given the status of the building - and that it was within the Pamphill Conservation Area.

The characteristics and topography of the school site was shown and views into the site and around it, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

Officers explained there was a need for the replacement windows as those currently there were in a poor state of repair – having become unfit for purpose - and did not meet sustainability standards which might be expected.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered the acceptability of the proposal which would not result in any harm to the designated Heritage Asset and this formed the basis of the recommendation being made.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision. Some important points raised were and which they considered still required clarification were:-

- what the windows would be constructed of; what the quality of the materials to be used were and of what composition and; where these would be located on the building
- that local craftsman and firms might be engaged, if at all practical and possible within the terms of any contract or tender exercise

Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers – in being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application - which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable.

From debate, the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable - understanding the need for new windows to maintain the fabric of the building and which were in keeping with their surroundings.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Robin Cook, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - unanimously - to grant permission, subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

Resolved

That application 3/20/1725/LB be granted permission, subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>for</u>	<u>Decision</u>
The proposal would not harm the character, appearance and historic interest of the designated heritage asset that it affected being the Grade II listed building and there were no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.		

279. **P/HOU/2022/01307 - Square off front of property, erect rear extension, with addition of new first floor accommodation to converted roof space with new dormer to side elevation. - 54 Sandy Lane, Upton, Poole, BH16 5LX**

The Committee considered application P/HOU/2022/01307 to square off front of property, erect rear extension, with addition of new first floor accommodation to converted roof space with new dormer to side elevation at 54 Sandy Lane, Upton, Poole, BH16 5LX

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of what was being proposed and how it would be achieved, showing the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development and what this entailed. It was pointed out that, the architecture and design of dwellings in the area varied considerably so this proposal would not be seen to be out of keeping. The characteristics and topography of the site was shown and views from the property and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered the acceptability of the proposal in relation to the Development Plan and this formed the basis of the recommendation being made.

One member of the public – a neighbour - had objected on the grounds that the rear gable end window would overlook their property to the rear of the site, causing a loss of privacy. Moreover, it was claimed that work had already started on the extension.

Clive Bailey – who was the neighbour who owned No 28 – explained that despite the offer to obscure glaze one of the windows, a much similar view could be had from the adjacent one, given the orientation of the room. On that basis, privacy would still be compromised by virtue of overlooking. He was of the view that the issue had not been adequately addressed and asked for the application to be refused.

Formal consultation had seen **Lytchett Minster and Upton Town Council object to the application - in supporting the** neighbour's objection on overlooking. **This view was shared by Lytchett Matravers and Upton Ward Councillors Bill Pipe and Alex Brenton.**

Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application. Whilst the application was being progressed, in response to concerns raised, the applicant had agreed that the western element of the rear first floor window could be obscure glazed to reduce the

potential for overlooking. On that basis, officers considered the application to be reasonable.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised were and which they considered still required clarification were :-

- what opportunity was there to obscure glaze both windows and was this a practical option. This option was put by Councillor Worth as a solution
- what the distances were between neighbouring properties
- what alternative options were there to modify the proposal so overlooking was not an issue.

Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable. In particular the suggestion that both windows could be obscure glazed was considered to be an unreasonable condition, as it would result in poor amenity for future occupants. Officers confirmed that, should the application be refused, the applicant still had some means of achieving first floor accommodation as permitted development.

From debate, the Committee considered that given it would be unreasonable to ask for both rear facing windows to be obscured, they had little option other than to consider the application to be unacceptable – on the grounds of overlooking and compromise of privacy and which could not be readily overcome. On that basis, Members considered they could not support the application as it stood.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor John Worth and seconded by Councillor David Tooke, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed – unanimously - to refuse permission, based on the loss of privacy from overlooking, which could not readily be addressed.

Resolved

That application P/HOU/2022/01307 be refused.

Reason for Decision

On the grounds of the loss of privacy from overlooking.

280. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items for consideration.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 2.20 pm

Chairman

.....