

## MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

**MINUTES** of a **MEETING** of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held on 5 April 2023 at 2.15 pm

### **Present**

#### **Councillors**

P J Heal (Chairman)  
S J Clist, Mrs C Collis, Mrs F J Colthorpe,  
L J Cruwys, Mrs C P Daw, B Holdman,  
D J Knowles and F W Letch

### **Apologies**

#### **Councillor(s)**

R F Radford and B G J Warren

### **Also Present**

#### **Councillor(s)**

Mrs M E Squires

### **Also Present**

#### **Officer(s):**

Richard Marsh (Director of Place), Maria De Leburne (District Solicitor and Monitoring Officer), Adrian Devereaux (Area Team Leader), John Millar (Area Team Leader) and Sarah Lees (Member Services Officer), David Parker (Member Services and Policy Research Officer) and Angie Howell (Member Services Officer).

## 126 **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor B Warren who was substituted by Cllr Mrs C Daw
- Councillor R F Radford

## 127 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (0:00:00)**

The following members of the public attended the meeting to ask questions in relation to the Staple Cross Farm and Crofts Estate Applications.

**John Neave** referring to No. 3 on the Plans List asked the following:-

Question 1) - While it was widely recognised that there was a need for more affordable Social housing within the Mid Devon District, has any consideration been given to an alternative site for this proposed development, for example the recently approved site within Sandford Parish known locally as Peddlars Pool/Libbets Grange for which approval has been granted for some 257 dwellings and other amenities. This development would likely be far more suitable for the proposed dwellings in Sandford and a fairly straight forward Amendment or Variation to the Peddlars pool development would resolve the current proposal.

Question 2) - Given the proposed development at Crofts Estate by the applicant, were any tenders submitted by a competitive provider or potential shared ownership provider. If not, why not?

Question 3) - If this proposed development were to be given approval, it was likely that there would be a substantial increase in revenue back to MDDC from that received currently from garage rentals, (EG rental income, council tax etc). Has any consideration been given to allocating some of this revenue back into Sandford Community in order to benefit the whole community?

Question 4) - A Field survey was undertaken by Merry Andersen, Arbtech Consulting, on 13/12/2022 to include Bat roosting, foraging habitat and flight line. This survey also considered other species such as hedgehogs etc. This survey, by their own admission, was incomplete as they could not gain access to any of the garages, and cannot be complete to any right-thinking individual, given that the primary species, (bats and hedgehogs), would have been in hibernation at this time. Would this Committee consider requesting that a full and proper survey was undertaken not only at the appropriate time of year, (usually April to October) but also the appropriate time of day (usually dusk/early evening)?

It may be worth noting that under The Conservation Regulations, including Habitat Regulations and the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as well as the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, there may be strong legal argument for the protection of bat foraging, commuting habitat and flight lines, which a full and proper survey should highlight. Public authorities, while conducting their functions, should be mindful of regarding the conservation of biodiversity.

Taking the above into account should be a merit of good practice rather than solely being reliant on the developers or applicant.

Question 5) - Finally I would just like to respectfully request that this Committee throw out this application in its entirety given the level of feeling within the Sandford community and the number of objections submitted.

Had the Applicant consulted with the local community in the first instance instead of showing a reckless disregard towards it, then we may not have been in the position that we find ourselves today. Thank you.

**Paula Kovacs** referring to No. 3 on the Plans List stated that she appreciated this opportunity to share my thoughts on this proposed development, not only because I have been a resident of Crofts Estate for nearly twenty three years and would, obviously, be directly affected by any planned changes, but also because I feel strongly that we need to maintain a democratic process. I agree with Cllr Elizabeth Lloyd who commented in her article entitled ‘Placemaking matters’ in the March 9 issue of The Crediton Courier – and I quote: “I’m only frustrated that I and others, often feel powerless in the face of developers that do things TO a place rather than work WITH a place”

As I stated in the letter of objection I sent to Council’s Development management, whilst I acknowledge that more affordable housing was very much needed, I feel very strongly that placing a new development in the middle of this small housing estate, was totally inappropriate. As many of my fellow residents have also stated in the comments they have submitted, the lack of parking at Crofts has reached a critical point. The meeting with MDDC officers organised some years ago, to discuss the parking situation, didn’t produce any results.

And the situation has deteriorated further since then, so we desperately need more parking, not only for the residents of Crofts Estate but also for St Swithins Garden and the village of Sandford generally.

If, as one resident has suggested in his submission, the current garages were demolished and replaced with parking to include electric charging points as well as some disabled parking spaces that, in my opinion, would be the very best use of this land. In an email Development Manager Angharad Williams sent to me she stated, and I quote “The Planning Officer’s role was to query whether this proposal represents, in planning terms, a good use of the land”. I would like to suggest that the aforementioned parking proposal, rather than the zedpod development, would indeed, be best use of the land at Crofts. If the Council does decide to approve the zedpod application, may I suggest that, at the very least, 1) the Council considers painting some white lines on the current Crofts car park, so that what little parking there was, apportioned appropriately and that 2) some extra parking space in Crofts is created by transforming a couple of grassed areas into concrete hard standing. Thank you.

**Robert Gray** referring to item 1 and 2 on the Plans List asked the following:-

Question 1) - We would like to know has a site visit been done by the Planning Committee as requested by the Borden Gate Parish Council from the meeting in January as no feedback has been received. What was the feedback from the visit? If no visit then why was this delicate case with multiple issues not been visually looked at?

Question 2) - The RAC paper contains no assessment of the business plan, noting that it was a confidential document. That need does not however extend to silence exhibited by RAC on the content of the plan. There was no expression of opinion on:

- Whether the business would be profitable and if so at what point.
- Whether the business would attain viability or indeed the measure of viability.
- Any opinion of the resale values of the livestock.
- Any opinion on how the livestock would be sourced and sold.
- Any opinion on the need for marketing (this was particularly relevant for the geese).
- The nature of the fixed and variable costs identified in the business plan.
- How the applicant intends to reduce his current of site work to transition to the full time labour requirement on site.

We would like the answers to the above:-

Question 3) - Was the Committee aware that there are three dwelling being built opposite the entrance to Staple Cross Farm as this wasn’t mentioned in the applications and has been shown as a poultry shed on the map in the agent’s submission?

Question 4) - On the planning applications submitted for Staple Cross Farm, the facts do not seem to be correct. I am the owner of the site opposite Staple Cross Farm. As of the 9th June 2020 planning was granted ref no 20/00570/full, stating the erection of 3 residential dwellings, following demolition of 2 agricultural buildings which I own.

On the applicants planning application for Staple Cross Farm it doesn't state the fact there has been planning permission granted for residential occupancy opposite. On the 11/05/2022 work commenced on my development for the three dwellings.

From the date of commencement there has been a temporary bungalow that has been lived in by the applicant. It was a scar on the landscape. So my question is – were the Planning Committee aware of this and if so how has this been allowed because as a developer it would not be acceptable that a residence can just happen regardless of the rules and it's been nearly a year?

Question 5) - Following on from my previous question, I am the owner of the site opposite Staple Cross Farm, building three properties all within my planning consent. When I bought the site I was aware of the storage barn. Since then we have started work on my site and an illegal farm popped up with immense geese noise and has turned in to an eyesore in the beautiful countryside. If this farm and geese are allowed to continue it would depreciate my site, business and make it difficult to sell these properties with the mess, eyesore and noise opposite. My question is – Why was this allowed to happen with no planning consent, and the applicant continues regardless with no thought to myself acting within my planning and rules and disregard to planning regulations?

Question 6) - My question to you all is 'what were the applicants bringing to the community of Staple Cross'. Myself and other resident here today are bringing people to the area and supporting the local community and surrounding areas.

**Louise Webb** referring to Item 3 on the Plans List asked has the long overdue assessment of existing properties' parking allocation been conducted yet and resolution agreed?

**Mellissa Tobin** referring to Item 3 on the Plans List asked:-

Question 1) - It has only just come to light that CCTV is to be installed with these pods. Can someone please advise as to why that was exactly?

Question 2) - I feel this meeting was just paying 'lip service' now to the extremely ill-informed residents and that the plan would go ahead anyway.

Question 3) - How was the asbestos going to be removed when there was a watercourse 5 metres, not 10, away from the garages?

Question 4) - A legally binding agreement states that the Council must provide provision of suitable relocation to the current occupiers of the garages. Can MDCC tell us exactly where that would be?

Question 5) - As our Public Servants, the planning department must ensure that ALL residents are kept informed by LETTER. Many residents here are elderly or infirm and do not have access to a computer or email. Some still have no idea about what was proposed where many have had their homes for decades.

Question 6) - As Government was meant to be providing service to the public, and the public here strenuously object to this development, what assurances do we have that our voices would actually be heard?

The Chairman informed those present that the questions would be answered when the application was discussed.

**128 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT (00:11:17)**

Members were reminded of the need to make declarations where appropriate.

**129 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (00:13:30)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2023 were **AGREED** as a true record and duly **SIGNED** by the Chairman

**130 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (00:14:09)**

The Chair informed the Committee of the sad loss of Honorary Alderman Paul Williams who was a member of the Committee for many years and was a very committed Councillor.

He also thanked Councillor Dennis Knowles as it was his last meeting of the Committee after 25 years' service. His input had been valued and much appreciated and the Committee wished him a very happy retirement.

**131 WITHDRAWALS FROM THE AGENDA (00:16:27)**

The Chairman announced that application 22/00067/MFUL had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**132 THE PLANS LIST (00:16:40)**

The Committee considered the applications in the \*Plans List.

Note: \* List previously circulated and attached to the minutes.

- a) 22/02301/FULL - Retention and regularisation of changes made to an agricultural storage building to mixed use of agricultural storage and livestock at Staple Cross Farm, Hockworthy, Devon.**

In response to the public questions asked the Area Team Leader stated that:

- No formal site visit had been carried out. The Case Officer had visited the site twice before and photos taken which formed part of the presentation.

The Area Team Leader outlined the application by way of a presentation which highlighted:-

- The site was approximately 250m NW on the edge of Staple Cross.
- It related to an agricultural building that had been on site for a while and was unauthorised in its current state. The application was to regularise the

building and allow it to be used for occupation of livestock as well as storage for agricultural machinery and hay etc.

- It was previously permitted under prior notification but built slightly differently as it was now 1.5m taller than permitted.
- As part of the original prior notification it wasn't permitted for use by livestock due to it being within 400m of the nearest protected building.
- Several objections had been received relating to issues such as impact on heritage matters, general impact on the countryside and neighbouring amenity. Issues had been raised with Environmental Health in relation to the temporary housing of geese following the need to house them during avian flu and the impact of flood risk, parking and ecology matters.
- There was already a building permitted in the location of the same footprint and size.
- It differed only in that it was 1.5m higher and that it was proposed to house livestock.
- The Conservation Officer had raised no issues regarding general visual impact affecting heritage and flood risk.
- Environmental Health Officers didn't believe the level of agricultural use of livestock would raise significant issues.
- To the south there were 2 large buildings parallel to the road which were former poultry buildings which had been granted permission for demolition and rebuild for 3 residential units. They were approximately 150m south of the building.
- The nearest residential dwellings were approximately 100m from the site. The Environmental Health Officer had raised no objections.
- The nearest heritage assets were to the east of the property with a number of listed buildings to the north of the property. The application didn't represent any additional harm or impact to the listed buildings.
- Taking into account existing building it was not considered to be a problem in terms of livestock. If there were any particular issues with noise/smells there was scope for Environmental Health to investigate, however they didn't have any concerns regarding impact on nearby residents.

Consideration was given to:-

- Whether the Local Planning Authority was adhering to its own policies.
- The height of the proposed building and whether it was policy compliant.
- The existing building and it being used to house geese during the Avian Flu epidemic.
- That farmers should be allowed to farm their land as the countryside isn't just for tourism.
- Landscaping and additional screening to construct a hedgerow to plant native species trees.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to conditions contained within the report with delegated authority given to the Director of Place to add a further condition with regard to the agreement of a scheme of landscaping, details of which should be provided within three months of the decision date and thereafter implemented in the next available planting season.

(Proposed by Cllr Mrs P Colthorpe and seconded by Cllr Mrs M Collis)



**Reason for the decision:** As set out in the report.

Notes:-

- Cllr P J Heal, Cllr L Cruwys, Cllr M Collis, Cllr S Clist, Cllr P Colthorpe, Cllr Ben Holdman, Cllr D Knowles, Cllr F Letch, Cllr C Daw all made declarations in accordance with the protocol of Good Practice for Councillors dealing with planning matters as they had received correspondence.
- Amanda Burden spoke as Agent for the Applicant.
- Peter Stratton spoke as the Objector.
- Councillor Collis spoke as the Ward Member.

**b) 22/02127/FULL - Retention of a temporary agricultural workers dwelling at Staple Cross Farm, Hockworthy, Devon.**

The Area Team Leader outlined the application by way of a presentation which highlighted the following:-

- This was the same site which was an application for a temporary dwelling which would be tied to this site for 3 years in order for the applicant to fully establish their business with the keeping of the geese for Christmas market and a number of cows for sale.  
For also primarily meeting the essential needs for bucket rear calves – the owners currently have 41 with a projection at the end of 3 years for 130 forming the herd.
- The applicant had to support their proposals with an independent appraisal of their business to demonstrate the need for one or more worker to be present on the site.
- There had to be a firm intention of developing the enterprise.
- Reading Agricultural Consultants (RAC) are an established agricultural consultancy and they had been instructed by the Council to appraise the information submitted.
- This was the second appraisal carried out at the applicant's expense.
- The intention was for the applicant to develop the business to enable them to meet the needs of the policy within a 3 year period. They had 3 years to build the business. A permanent dwelling wouldn't normally be granted if business didn't develop within that time frame. This would have to be considered at the time if that were to happen.
- RAC had confirmed there was sufficient justification as there was a firm intention to develop the enterprise and sound financial planning.
- It had been seen by an Agricultural consultant and it shows a profitable business within 3 years.
- There was relevant case for approving the application.

In response to the public questions asked the Area Team Leader stated that:

- In terms of whether the Committee were aware of the 3 dwellings – yes the Committee were aware and the Environmental Protection Team had considered the application regarding geese noise and the visual impact on the

open countryside and confirm there should not be any impact on the neighbouring dwellings and businesses.

- The temporary mobile home was not considered to have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
- If this were granted they would have the 3 years to establish this – the officer's recommendation and the independent appraiser was that there was sufficient information to recommend approval.

Consideration was given to:

- Whether the temporary mobile home fitted in with design quality and the visual impact it has.
- The external finish of the mobile home ie timber cladding or repainting the outside.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that approval be given for the retention of a temporary agricultural workers dwelling subject to conditions in the report with delegated authority given to the Director of Place to add a further two conditions with regard to the final material finish of the retained temporary dwelling and agreement of a scheme of landscaping, details of which should be provided within three months of the decision date and thereafter implemented in the next available planting season.

(Proposed by Cllr P Colthorpe and seconded by Cllr B Holdman)

**Reason for the decision:** As set out in the report.

Notes:

- Cllr P J Heal, Cllr L Cruwys, Cllr M Collis, Cllr S Clist, Cllr P Colthorpe, Cllr Ben Holdman, Cllr D Knowles, Cllr F Letch, Cllr C Daw all made declarations in accordance with the protocol of Good Practice for Councillors dealing with planning matters as they had received correspondence.
- Amanda Burden spoke as Agent for the Applicant.
- Peter Stratton spoke as the Objector.
- Councillor Collis spoke as the Ward Member.

**c) 23/00119/FULL - Erection of 5 affordable dwellings following demolition of existing garages with associated parking, landscaping and works at Land and Garages at NGR 282671 102585, Crofts Estate, Sandford.**

The Area Team Leader informed the Committee of 2 updates:-

- The Lead Local Floor Authority had determined the application as a “minor” planning application and confirmed that they would not be providing a consultation response so no formal objection was raised on the drainage matter.
- An objection letter had been received from a local resident.



The Area Team Leader outlined the application by way of a presentation which highlighted:-

- The application was for the erection of 5 affordable dwellings made up of 4 x 1 bed room units. 2 at ground floor level and 2 at first floor level
- 1 x 2 story 1 bed unit
- All housed within a single 2 story block on site.
- All intended for social rent as part of the Housing Revenue Account portfolio.
- The application site Croft Estate in Sandford - located to the north west of Sandford within a settlement limit of Crofts Estate and outside of the conservation area.
- The site was bounded to the south by the access road for 6 dwellings located in Church Parks to the west.
- Private sewerage treatment plant was to the west.
- In the north and west lies 2 storey residential properties in the Croft Estate with those to the north standing at an elevated level.
- There were 11 garages and space to park 4 vehicles
- Currently 5 void garages were on the site. The Housing Team commented that only 1 garage was being used to park a vehicle.
- Any garage tenant would be offered a different garage if theirs were to be demolished.
- The garages were not just for residents of Sandford – they were available for anyone to rent regardless of where they live.
- Only 4 were rented out to Sandford residents.
- 10 parking spaces were proposed, 5 spaces will have direct access from Church Parks and the other 5 spaces would have direct access from Croft's Estate.
- Additional landscaping had been proposed in the south east corner of the site.
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan – the ground floor units would be accessed to the south of the site. With bin stores to the front of the properties.
- The right hand side unit would be accessed from the north with a bin store area.
- An access enclosed staircase on the north side elevation would provide access to the 2 first floor apartments.
- All units were 1 bed.
- The 2 first floor apartments would be served by first floor balconies, which would provide a minimum of 5m<sup>2</sup> of private outdoor amenity.
- The ground floor units had a similar area underneath the staircase.
- The apartment blocks would be set 18.1m south and at a lower level in relation to 1-4 Crofts Estate. The block would follow the same dual pitch roof orientation of the existing houses.
- There was at least a 15.6m side elevation to the corner of the block with the nearest Bungalow in St Swithins Gardens.
- 16.1m corner of the new block to the façade distance to the nearby neighbours to the south.
- Distance of the block would be 15.1m from the Conservation Area Boundary
- Solar panels could be seen on the roof. These would be installed to the south facing roof slope.

- Negative carbon emissions were possible across the site which would therefore be supported by Policy DM2 of the Local Planning Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
- Regarding the sustainability credentials of the zed pods – the modules would be super insulated, airtight and triple glassed windows and doors and mechanically ventilated to further reduce energy losses combined with on-site renewable generation of hot water.
- The materials used would be a cream render which will pick up the render properties within the Croft Estate
- The ridge of the zed pod development would be 3.9m lower than the ridge point of 1-4 Crofts Estate.
- The ridge development will be 2.7m higher than the bungalow.
- The Flood Risk Assessment confirmed that flow control would be used and attenuation provided on site to accommodate storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 45% climate change event.
- To minimise flood risk, finished floor levels were proposed to be set 300mm above surrounding existing ground levels.
- Mature trees would form a boundary for the Conservation area.

The Area Team Leader also addressed the questions raised during Public Question Time:

The application was indeed seeking to provide much needed affordable housing. The level of provision (5 units) was designed to meet specific local needs at an appropriate sustainable, central location within the village to a high standard. The application was being made on behalf of MDDC on land within its control and the proposed housing will be vested long-term on our Council housing stock. The Council had no access to/control over the Libbets Grange development however we would expect the private developer(s) of that site to meet policy requirements in terms of market affordable housing provision separately to this Zed Pods development.

Tenders were not a planning matter. The Housing Team had commented that they were not sure what was meant by a competitive provider? The chosen contractor to take forward the development (should Planning Permission be granted) would be subject to a separate procurement decision by the Council which was unrelated to the planning decision. As Council housing for long-term secure social rent tenure then shared ownership was not relevant. Nonetheless, beyond formalising use of the proposed dwellings as affordable housing (in this case the most, at the most affordable social rent level), then the exact nature of the tenure was not a material consideration for the planning committee.

Regarding revenue this was not a planning consideration. However the Housing Team note that housing would create additional revenue into the Council housing account, however this was essential to meet the development cost (including associated long-term borrowing) as well as the ongoing maintenance of the properties. Without this rent the application would not be viable and no affordable housing would be completed.

In terms of Ecology, the applicant was aware of the need to comply with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1991, and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. As noted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment was submitted with this application noting that there was an

external inspection of the garage buildings with the conclusions of the ecologist being that bats were very unlikely to be roosting within these buildings due to a lack of access and the identification of inaccessible roost value habitat, However a precautionary working method during and post-development had been set out and mitigation and biodiversity enhancements were proposed.

Para. 5.8 of the report sets out the findings of an ecological survey, in particular "...No further survey effort was required to evaluate the site if the recommendations and enhancements outlined were provided. Biodiversity enhancements for bat roosting and bird nesting were outlined to result in biodiversity gains. A condition was, therefore, recommended requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations within the ecological appraisal and for confirmation of the biodiversity enhancement measures installed throughout the development to be provided prior to occupation of the dwellings."

As a Council, we had consulted directly with residents, ward members and as with any application we had also fully complied fully with the public notice and consultation requirements. This window before the planning committee decision and at the committee itself was of course part of that consultation period. Its effectiveness was demonstrated in these questions being raised.

The proposal in front of Members was that outlined within the report for the provision of five affordable units with associated parking and landscaping and it was considered that this would be an appropriate use for the site.

The plans submitted show one CCTV camera located adjacent the security gate at the north east corner of the site, shown on plans as rear staircase. There is no wider CCTV system planned for this development.

This development had been assessed against its planning merits taking into consideration policies to the Mid Devon Local Plan and material planning considerations. It was also within the necessary timeframe.

In terms of asbestos management, the requirement for demolition was that it should be carried out in such a manner as to minimise the potential for airborne nuisance, additional land contamination and/or the creation of additional contamination pathways either on the site or at adjacent properties/other sensitive receptors. It will need to be done in line with Health and Safety Executive requirements, whereby all potentially hazardous materials should be assessed, a works plan and risk assessment. This was separate from planning.

The relocation of the garages was not a planning matter but as noted previously, the Housing Team advised that current garage tenants would be offered an alternative garage in the surrounding area as per their tenancy agreement. Though this was a matter of personal choice for current garage tenants and as you know the existing garages were either fully utilised or particularly used for parking.

Neighbour notification letters were sent out to adjoining properties, a site notice posted and a press advert placed were 27 representatives who have been informed of this application.

The comments were from those who have made representations have been noted in the report and have had the opportunity to address this Planning Committee through public questions and on the item itself.

Fundamentally, it should be noted that the proposal provides parking at a level slightly exceeding policy requirements under DM5 and that the new parking spaces around the development will not be allocated to any resident or be marked as such. An assessment of the existing properties' parking allocation was a planning requirement and the Housing team note that one hasn't been conducted on any of our estates within the district.

However in summary:

- A lot of the garages were empty
- Poor suitability of existing garages for modern vehicles
- Predominance of use for storage not parking
- Opportunity to regenerate poor asset/remove asbestos for wider housing and planning gain
- Availability of other MDDC garages locally or more widely for existing garage tenants with choice
- Policy exceedance on new parking provision – available to residents and visitors with no allocation, permit or restriction
- Although not directly relevant; the Housing Team were reviewing resident only restrictions at the adjacent, under-utilised St Swithan's parking

Consideration was given to:-

- The angle of the solar panels.
- DM3 and DM5 and whether this was cast iron.
- Concerns regarding meeting parking requirements and garages.
- The delivery of the Zed Pods.
- Flooding issues.

**It was therefore RESOLVED** that Planning permission be granted subject to the conditions.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

**Reason for the decision:** As set out in the report.

Notes:-

- Cllr P J Heal, Cllr L Cruwys, Cllr M Collis, Cllr S Clist, Cllr P Colthorpe, Cllr Ben Holdman, Cllr D Knowles, Cllr F Letch, Cllr C Daw all made declarations in accordance with the protocol of Good Practice for Councillors dealing with planning matters as they had received correspondence.
- Councillor Letch declared that he knew some of the protesters.
- Laura Eimermann spoke as Agent for the Applicant.
- Chris Hetherington spoke at the Objector.

- Cllr E Lloyd (comments read out by the Chair) and Councillor M Squires spoke as Ward Members.

### 133 MAJOR APPLICATIONS WITH NO DECISION (02:30:05)

The Committee had before it, and **NOTED**, a list \* of major applications with no decision.

The Committee agreed that:

1. 23/00394/MARM – To Committee
2. 23/00152/MFUL - To Committee if minded to refuse.
3. 22/00857/MFUL – remain delegated
4. 23/00227/MFUL – remain delegated
5. 23/00252/MFUL – remain delegated

Note: \* list previously circulated and attached to the minutes.

### 134 APPEAL DECISIONS (02:33:58)

The Committee had before it, and **NOTED**, a list \* list of appeal decisions.

Note: \* list previously circulated and attached to the minutes.

(The meeting ended at 5.20 pm)

**CHAIRMAN**