

COUNTY BOROUGH OF BLAENAU GWENT

**REPORT TO: THE CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING,
REGULATORY & GENERAL LICENSING
COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: PLANNING, REGULATORY & GENERAL LICENSING
COMMITTEE - 30TH JULY, 2020**

REPORT OF: DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT OFFICER

COUNCILLOR D. HANCOCK (CHAIR)

Councillors W. Hodgins
D. Bevan
S. Healy
J. Hill
C. Meredith
K. Rowson
T. Smith
B. Thomas
G. Thomas
D. Wilkshire
B. Willis

WITH: Service Manager Development and Estates
Head of Legal and Corporate Compliance
Team Manager Development Management
Team Manager Built Infrastructure
Team Manager Natural Environment
Team Leader Development Management
Planning Officer x 3
Press and Publicity Officer
Service Manager Performance and Democratic

AND: **Public Speakers**

Mr. S. Joshi (Applicant) and Councillor L. Elias (Ward Member) - Plasgeller, Intermediate Road, Brynmawr, NP23 4SF - Two single storey extensions to provide a complex care unit to the east side (front elevation) of the existing care home together with removal of 2x TPO trees

Hywel May (Applicant) and Councillor Davies (Ward Member) - 37 Howy Road, Rassau, Ebbw Vale, NP23 5TW - Conversion of existing residential property to a 2 bed children's care home

Terry Morgan (Agent) and Mrs Allyson R. Barnes (Objector) - Land at Leyton Williams Haulage Yard, Parkside Garage, Catholic Road, Brynmawr
Proposed dwelling

DECISIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
No. 1	<p><u>SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION</u></p> <p>It was noted that no requests had been received for the simultaneous translation service.</p>	
No. 2	<p><u>APOLOGIES</u></p> <p>An apology for absence was received Councillor M Day.</p>	
No. 3	<p><u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS</u></p> <p>The following declarations of interest and dispensations were reported:-</p> <p>Councillor W. Hodgins - Item No. 6 - Planning Report (Application No. C/2019/0190 - Land at Leyton Williams Haulage Yard, Parkside Garage, Catholic Road, Brynmawr)</p>	
No. 4	<p><u>APPEALS, CONSULTATIONS AND DNS UPDATE JULY 2020</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Service Manager Development & Estates.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the information contained therein be noted.</p>	

<p>No. 5</p>	<p><u>LIST OF APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 15 JUNE 2020 AND 13 JULY 2020</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Senior Business Support Officer.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the report be accepted and the list of applications decided under delegated powers between 15th June, 2020 and 13th July, 2020, be noted.</p>	
<p>No. 6</p>	<p><u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORT</u></p> <p><u>PLANNING REPORT</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Team Manager Development Management.</p> <p><u>Application No. C/2020/0100</u> <u>Plasgeller, Intermediate Road, Brynmawr NP23 4SF</u> <u>Two single storey extensions to provide a complex care unit to the east side (front elevation) of the existing care home together with</u> <u>removal of 2x TPO trees</u></p> <p>At the invitation of the Chair, the Planning Officer outlined the application which related to the proposed two storey extensions to provide a complex care unit to the east site of Plasgeller, Intermediate Road, Brynmawr. The development site was one of four large detached two storey buildings which operated as a complex of care homes.</p> <p>With the assistance of slides, the Planning Officer noted that two mature Sycamore trees which were located along the front boundary, adjacent to the highway. These trees along with others trees on the Road are feature of the area and were protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The Officer advised that planning permission had been refused under delegated powers in 2019 on the basis that there would be a loss of TPO trees. It was added that no appeal was made against this decision and the time</p>	

for appeal had now lapsed. Therefore, the applicant chose to resubmit the application, however, this application proposed that the extensions would protrude approximately 2m closer to the street frontage as well as the removal of the trees.

The Officer further provided an overview of the application which outlined the proposed extensions, development plans and responses received from the consultation. It was informed that the objections received from residents had been fully supported by Alun Davies, AM.

The Officer reiterated the loss of two important street trees that were protected by a tree preservation order due to the high amenity value. The mature sycamore trees were healthy and well established trees which showed no evidence of health and safety concerns. Given the health of the trees and their valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the area, the Officer felt that the removal of the trees purely to facilitate this development was not justified. The Applicant had felt that the trees overshadowed the care home and posed a health and safety risk to residents. However, the Officer advised that no request had been made to the Council to carry out works to the trees.

The Officer felt that although parts of the site required excavation due to the sloping nature of the land, it would not be impossible to construct in these areas. It had been suggested that the wrap-around extension could be accommodated on the opposite side of the existing day room or attached to the adjacent building within the site. The additional space would be desirable and would be beneficial to residents within the home. However, the Officer was of the opinion that there was no reason that the extensions could not be accommodated elsewhere within the site.

The Officer added that the agent had suggested that without the proposed extensions the future viability of the business would be under scrutiny, however it was stated that there was no evidence to support this claim. There were no exceptional circumstances that would justify supporting a scheme that was environmentally

and visually unacceptable. The Officer acknowledged that Social Services supported the concept and aspirations of the business to improve facilities which would be subject to a satisfactory design solution being achieved through the planning process.

In conclusion, it was concluded that the development failed to comply with both national and local policy. The removal of protected trees would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area and would fully expose the site resulting in 2 extensions which would be an unacceptable dominant the feature along the street.

Thereupon the Officer felt that the application be refused for the reasons outlined in the report.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor L. Elias (Ward Member) addressed the Committee. The Ward Member informed that there were 5 trees along Intermediate Road which made it an attractive area which was also a walkway to St Mary's Primary School.

The Ward Member explained that he had been associated with Plasgellar for 35 years which accommodated 3 homes with 40 beds and over the years beds had been removed to make lounge space for residents. The Ward Member advised that No. 1 Intermediate Road had been acquired by the company and left empty for over 15 years although planning had been renewed on 3 occasions for this building.

The Ward Member further noted traffic problems in Intermediate Road and advised that any increase in traffic would cause greater problems as there was insufficient parking in the area.

It was felt that the removal of the trees and proposed position of the development would increase noise levels. The Ward Member advised that during the warmer weather windows of the home are open and the noise levels are unbearable. Due to the complex needs of patients they are often heard by residents shouting out. The removal of the trees and proposed position of the

development would further increase noise levels. The Ward Member was mindful that the facility was on a school route and therefore young children would be passing by on a daily basis. It was also reminded that the Council had previously incurred due to the removal of a protected tree.

The Ward Member wished to object to the proposal and fully accepted the officer's recommendation for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chair the Public Speaker (Mr. S. Joshi, Applicant) addressed the Committee. Mr. Joshi informed the Committee that he was the Managing Director of Plasgellar which operated 4 care homes on the site at Intermediate Road.

He concurred that the Ward Member, Councillor Elias had been associated to the home, however over the years beds had not been increased they had decreased from 120 to 110. Mr. Joshi advised that over the years lounge/communal space had been required for patients, therefore beds had been reduced to accommodate this requirement.

Mr. Joshi further explained that there was 140 staff when the home was at maximum capacity, however resident numbers are down and the going forward communal space was key to patient wellbeing. It was reported that the home had been extended 3 years ago to specialise in complex dementia needs. The proposal had been for complex needs residents which required a specialist unit with a larger unit to be integrated due to the high specification care needs. Mr. Joshi pointed out that the extension would house the only specialised care unit in Gwent. At present the home was tackling the current Covid-19 pandemic, although the home still had long waiting lists with 3 current patients being local to Brynmawr. The Applicant advised that the care provided attracted patients from all areas due to the specialised setting.

Mr. Joshi referred to comments made by Andrew Day from Social Services who supported the application and advised that living

space was a key to requirement of the Social Services Wellbeing Act which was an obligation of Welsh Government and the Local Authority. The additional space would allow 1-2-1 critical care and support which would enhance the home and improve the quality of care provided for dementia patients.

The Service Manager Development and Estates advised that the Local Authority was supportive of the business unfortunately from a planning perspective the development could not be accepted as the Local Planning Authority could not go against the streetscene and TPOs advice. A suggestion for alternative options within the site had been put forward to be explored.

At this juncture the Chair invited comments/observations from Members of the Committee.

A discussion ensued and Members sympathised with the care of the dementia patients, however it was felt that the officer's recommendation was acceptable.

A Member fully supported the development and proposed that the application be granted. The Member felt that the trees could be replaced with Sycamore Trees, which were a fast growing species. The Member felt that the development would enhance the lives of patients which included his constituents from the Brynmawr Ward.

There was no seconder to the proposal and it was

RESOLVED, that planning permission be **REFUSED**, as outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.

Application No. C/2020/0093

37 Howy Road, Rassau, Ebbw Vale NP23 5TW

**Conversion of existing residential property to a
2 bed children's care home**

The Team Leader Development Management advised that the application sought planning permission to change the use of a

semi-detached dwelling into a 2 bedroomed residential children's care home. The Team Leader added that the proposed care home would accommodate a maximum of 2 children who would be cared for by 2 members of non-resident staff working 24-hour shift pattern. The home manager would be present throughout the day Monday to Friday between 9.00 am – 5.00 pm and 2 members of staff through the night.

It was further informed that the care home would cater for children aged between 10-17 years old on long term placement. The objective of the home was to create an environment where the children would live with staff as a family.

The Team Leader advised that it was a very fine line as to whether planning permission was required for the proposal as the property would retain a number of characteristics that are similar to the existing residential use. However, the fact that a Home Manager would be present and the precise number of visits to the home were unknown, the Team Leader reached the opinion that the operations tip the property from a C3(a) to C2 use for which planning permission was required.

The Team Leader advised that in terms of the principle of development the property would remain as a residential use within a residential area and was considered to be compatible with the surrounding residential areas.

It was noted that objections had been received in relation to parking. The Team Leader explained that careful consideration was given to the number of spaces required and the number of vehicle movements generated and it was considered that there was sufficient off and on-street parking provision to accommodate the proposal and given the number of staff that vehicle movements were not likely to be excessive. The Highway Authority raised no objection to the development subject to the off-street parking spaces being provided and retained in perpetuity. This could be conditioned if planning permission was granted.

With respect to impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers, the Team Leader explained that other than the presence of a Home Manager and the changeover of staff, the home would operate very much like an average family home. Potential impacts had been considered however given the nature and level of the proposed use the officer was satisfied that the proposal wouldn't have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

However, a condition was suggested to control the use and numbers of children being cared for to ensure the development would not become something which may have different, potentially unacceptable impacts. In planning terms, there are only limited physical changes proposed to the building and as such there are no concerns regarding visual impact

The applicant clearly indicated that the children would live together as a single family. The proposal had been considered within this context and the Team Leader was of opinion that the building was large enough to accommodate 2 children.

The proposed care home would also need to be registered, inspected and regulated by the Care Inspectorate Wales. It was a matter for this regulatory body to ensure that the care home was suitable to meet the specific needs of the children. If planning permission was granted, the proposed care home could not proceed without other necessary consents in place in line with the aforementioned regulatory bodies.

It was further noted that residents had raised concerns about the children causing antisocial behaviour. These concerns were based on the assumptions that the children would not be properly managed. It was difficult for the planning process to give any significant weight to the potential behaviour of individuals. The proposed care home could generate antisocial behaviour, as could the any residential property. If antisocial behaviour did occur this would be a matter for the staff/management of the care home and

the police. The Officer noted that Gwent Police had not provided any comments on the proposed care home application. The discussion of possible ASB had been based on assumptions of care homes, although it was felt that these opinions should be expressed with caution.

It was confirmed that other objections in relation to the loss of value of properties and the fact the applicant does not live in the Borough were not material planning considerations.

In conclusion, the Team Leader Development Management noted the recommendation and advised that the proposed care home was considered to be compatible with the neighbouring residential use and was acceptable in land terms. The development was unlikely to result in any unacceptable impact on visibility, amenities, parking and the highway and therefore felt that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor G. Davies (Ward Member) addressed the Committee. The Ward Member advised that he was not against the concept of the care home, however he felt that this development would have a negative impact on local residents. The Ward Member informed that he had been contacted by a number of residents who raised concerns in relation to the suitability of the area, the children to be homed at the property and traffic concerns. He added that one resident had suffered severe anxiety following the consultation of the proposed development.

The age of the children would be 10 years old onwards, however the Ward Member felt that this particular property had very limited outdoor space in which children could play outside.

The Ward Member concurred with concerns raised by residents in relation to parking. He pointed out that Howy Road was a two-way road and the one side of the road was always full to capacity with parked cars. In some instances vehicles have had to reverse the length of the road to allow other

vehicles to pass safely. The Ward Member felt that even with the designated car parking there would be an increase in traffic.

At the invitation of the Chair the Public Speaker (Mr. H. May) addressed the Committee. Mr. May advised that visits had been made to residents of Howy Road over a 2-day period with directors. The consultation exercise was undertaken to address any questions or concerns the residents may have had on the proposed care home. It also provided an opportunity to inform residents of the service to be provided.

Mr. May informed that he had worked in the children's care services for some years and advised that a number of properties had been looked at to accommodate the facility. The property at Howy Road met all statutory requirements which included location and community area. A very selective process was undertaken to determine the site and advised that residential areas were preferred.

It was noted that there was an unfortunate perception in relation to children's homes. These homes were often placed out in the country away from residential areas and there remained a belief that these homes could be associated with an increase in incidents of anti-social behaviour. The home in Howy Road would offer a 'family setting' to children and Mr. May advised that children with high levels of behavioural issues would not be placed in this setting as rules would not allow such placements. The facility would be aimed at children who needed minimum support and was different to other services offered within Blaenau Gwent.

At this juncture, the Chair invited comments/observations from Members of the Committee.

A Member wished to thank officers for presenting the application to Committee for consideration as he had been contacted by a number of residents who had raised strong objections. The Member added that whilst it was not planning policy to take into consideration views of local residents he felt that the concerns of

residents should be considered and outlined concerns of residents:-

- Possibility of de-value of neighbouring properties
- Increased parking and traffic
- Worsened road conditions (potholes)
- Higher amount of litter as Council vehicles are unable to frequent the road due to parked cars
- Developers are not from the area, so not aware of local concerns
- Anti-social behaviour
- Residents are a mix of ages, with older residents with health issues Increased stress for residents

- No one would want to live next door to such a facility, therefore making selling properties impossible
- Consultation was poor by applicant undertaken on a Bank Holiday
- Was the home registered
- Would it house children from Blaenau Gwent?
- Who would oversee the running and operation of the facility?
- Lack of outside play area at the property
- Would risk assessments of the area be carried out and could these be presented to the Authority

Another Member noted concerns raised in connection with the children and advised that there was no other information supplied about the children other than their possible ages. However, planning permission could not be considered on children's potential behaviour. A similar facility was located in the Badminton Ward which had been in operation for some time with no issues.

Members further mentioned the management of the facility and raised concerns around the property being semi-detached. It was felt that residents of this property would be greatly affected by a care home directly attached to their property.

The Service Manager Development and Estates noted the

comments raised and advised that the planning process considered the views of the public, however the concerns must be legitimate planning matters. A number of the concerns raised including the management of the children were not the remit of the Local Planning Authority and the proposed facility would be regulated by the Children Inspectorate for Wales as are other similar organisations.

In terms of parking concerns, it was reported that the SPG determined the amount of parking spaces and in this instance four spaces were required. Therefore, no objections were received from the Highways Authority as the actual requirement of parking mirrored the proposed application.

The Team Leader Development Management reiterated that the number of visitors to the proposed facility would be no different to those frequenting a normal family home. With regard to lack of outdoor space, the Team Leader noted that there was a generous garden to the front and a yard to the rear of the property.

Mr. May advised that properties had been looked at in Torfaen, Caerphilly and Blaenau Gwent and the final decision on location considered a number of factors which included house prices. The Care Inspectorate for Wales determined the age range of children to be placed in homes and although the ages of children were 10–17 years it was felt that the children at Howy Road would be between 10-13 years. The proximity of the house to the community would play a key factor in the children's age range. Mr. May stated that the company would be accountable by law for the children both inside and outside the home.

Further concerns were raised in relation to the application and a Member proposed that the application be refused, this proposal was seconded and

A vote was thereupon taken

4 Members supported the proposal to refuse the application; and

6 Members supported approval of the application.

It was therefore

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to the conditions outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.

Application No. C/2019/0190

Land at Leyton Williams Haulage Yard,

Parkside Garage, Catholic Road, Brynmawr

Proposed Dwelling

Councillor W. Hodgins declared an interest in this application.

The Service Manager Development and Estates outlined the planning application for a proposed dwelling at land at Leyton Williams Haulage Yard, Brynmawr.

The Officer noted that outline planning permission had been previously refused on two grounds. In order to address previous reasons for refusal the application had been submitted with changes in the boundary. To ensure previous concerns were fully considered Noise Impact Assessment and a tree survey carried out. The Officer stated that as this was an outline planning application all matters with the exception of access was reserved for future consideration. It was informed that Members should

focus on the principle residential development and access.

The Service Manager Development and Estates further outlined the application with the assistance of slides. The Officer noted the consultation process and provided an overview of the responses received.

The Officer noted the previous application which was refused on grounds of incompatible land use, visual impact and unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of nearby residents. The dwelling would have been located within an active haulage yard and it was considered to be unacceptable. The activities of the haulage yard in terms of noise, fumes and ancillary activities would prejudice future occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The Applicant had addressed some of the issues by fencing between proposed development and the haulage yard. The area would be landscaped along the site of boundary with Catholic Road. The previous issues had also been addressed with Environmental Health and the Biodiversity Officer.

The concerns of objectors were acknowledged, however it was stated that the matters raised were not a reason for refusal. In terms of the access, the proposed plot would be via Catholic Road with a newly formed entrance created to the eastern side of the road, adjacent to the existing drive at No. 4 Catholic Road. As part of the development the section of Catholic Road would be widened and a 1.2m wide footpath would be provided on land currently in the applicant's ownership.

The Officer advised that following numerous site visits to the area he had sighted that residents park along the road as a result of limited on-plot parking and vehicles often needed to use the open driveway of 4 Catholic Road in which to turn. He further acknowledged residents concerns that the proposed plot would increase current parking problems, including access for emergency vehicles. However, the Highway Authority raised no objection to these matters and it was felt that the road widening

and footpath would benefit both the area and residents.

The Service Manager Development and Estates concluded that he felt that the issues related to the previous application had been addressed in terms of planning policy and was of the view that the principle of a single dwelling on site was acceptable. He therefore noted the recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions noted in the report.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mrs. Allyson R. Barnes (Objector) addressed the Committee. Mrs. Barnes advised that there was a great deal of concern amongst residents in respect of the planning application. There was a long and complicated planning history around Catholic Lane and the residents felt that the Planning Report was extremely unbalanced. Mrs. Barnes added that the report did not show the true reflection of the situation at Catholic Road and was of the opinion that the design put forward was misleading.

Mrs. Barnes welcomed a site meeting at the location for Members to have sight of the concerns raised by residents. It was felt that Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council had a duty of care to residents and advised that their safety should be paramount. Mrs. Barnes advised that the Lane was too small to accommodate two vehicles and over the years a number of near misses had occurred. There was an understanding for a turning area on the Lane, however if this was revoked vehicles would need to reserve down the length of the road to vacate the Lane. It was added that residents felt that this additional development in the area would only worsen a bad situation.

Mrs. Barnes also noted that there was no pavement in the area and widening the lane would create greater hazards for residents. There were also concerns around access for emergency vehicles.

At this juncture the Chair invited Terry Morgan (Agent) to speak to the Committee. Mr. Morgan advised that it was the intention to increase width of the road and provide a footpath with improved streetlighting. The surrounding area in the applicant's ownership would be improved. The former Haulage Yard would be returned to original development with an attractive dwelling, an improved footpath, trees and greatly improved surroundings. Mr. Morgan felt that the development should be seen as an improvement to the area.

The Team Manager – Built Environment advised that the Highway Authority had asked for the improved highways to bring the road up to modern standards as well as a footpath.

A The Ward Member concurred with concerns raised around parking and vehicular access. It was also noted that the footpath was only available on a part of the road and felt that it would be more beneficial to use the entrance at the top of Catholic Road. The Member also noted the loss of TPO trees, which was acceptable for this application, however an application previously had been refused for this reasons.

The Service Manager Development and Estates advised that the trees to be removed as part of this application were thinning compared to the trees at Intermediate Road which had been healthy.

At this juncture the Chair invited comments/observations from Members of the Committee and it was suggested that a site meeting be held for Members to have sight of the area. The Chair felt that due to the current pandemic it was more appropriate for business to be addressed at this meeting.

The Ward Member proposed that the application be refused in order for the entrance to be reconsidered, this proposal was seconded and

A vote was thereupon taken

4 Members supported the proposal to refuse the application; and

6 Members supported approval of the application.

It was therefore

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to the conditions outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.

Application No. C/2019/0333

Land Adj. The Spirals, Dukestown Road, Tredegar

Retention of Domestic Garage (Revised Scheme)

The Team Manager - Development Management advised that planning permission was granted in July 2018 for a detached house and garage on land adjacent to the Spirals, Dukestown Road, Tredegar. Following concerns raised by a neighbour in relation to the size of the garage and a visit to the site it was found that the garage had been built 0.5m higher than that originally approved. It was initially proposed to retain the garage as built however following concerns raised the plan was amended to a proposal which reduced the overall height of the garage by 500mm, to the height previously approved.

The Officer noted the responses received following consultation and further outlined the application with the assistance of slides. She advised that she had made a site visit to assess the impact and based on findings, the applicant was asked to amend his application and reduce the height of ridge of the garage roof, to the height of the garage for which planning permission had been previously approved.

The Officer advised that she was of the opinion that the proposal in its current form was acceptable. The reduction in height of the

garage was built to align with that originally approved. It was felt that it would be unreasonable to require the garage to be further reduced to account for the relatively minor changes to the size of the building. Overall, the Officer advised that a garage with the dimensions for which planning permission was now sought would not have an unacceptable impact upon on neighbouring residential properties. Therefore, the Team Manager - Development Management noted the recommendation that planning permission to be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

At this juncture the Chair invited Ward Members to address the Committee.

A Member advised that he had visited the site and felt that a great deal of work and cost had been incurred by the Applicant to address the changes required.

The Team Manager - Development Management advised that following dialogue with the Applicant a revised plan had been submitted. The Service Manager Development and Estates added that following a complaint the matter was investigated and an amendment was reached with the cooperation of the applicant.

Following further discussions, it was unanimously

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to the conditions outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.

Application No. C/2020/0111

Arnant, Graig Road, Six Bells, Abertillery NP13 2LR

Retention and completion of re-profiling works to embankment, extension of residential curtilage and associated works

The Team Manager - Development Management advised that the application related to a detached dwelling known as 'Arnant'

located at Graig Road, Six Bells.

The house sat within a basin with the surrounding land rising steeply to the sides and rear of the property. Following a routine site visit in the area the removal of trees and re-profiling works were reported. The Officer informed that although the removal of the trees did not require planning permission the re-profiling works being undertaken were significant enough to warrant a planning application. Following discussions with the applicant the purpose of the works was confirmed and an application had been submitted to seek approval of the retention and completion of re-profiling works to embankment, extension of residential curtilage and associated works

The Officer provided an overview of the application with the assistance of slides. Members were referred to the responses to the public consultation and other key areas of the Planning Officers report. It was noted that based upon the findings within the report, the Officer was satisfied that there was significant evidence in this instance to allow extensions of the existing garden.

In conclusion, Team Manager - Development Management acknowledged that the proposal to extend the garden was a departure from the LDP, as outlined in the report, however given the residential context of this particular site it would not visually erode the countryside or harm the character and appearance of the area. In respect of the re-profiling works to the embankment, it was felt that it would not have a negative impact. The proposed tree planting and soft landscaping would ensure the development gave due regard to LDP Policy by enhancing the overall visual appearance of the site. Therefore, the Officer referred Members to the recommendation to grant planning permission.

The Chair welcomed the application and felt that it would enhance the area. The land was currently used for dumping rubbish, therefore he had no objections to the application.

	<p>Following discussions, it was unanimously</p> <p>RESOLVED that planning permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.</p>	
No. 7	<p><u>TIME OF FUTURE COMMITTEE MEETINGS</u></p> <p>The Chair proposed that future meetings be held at 2.00 p.m.</p> <p>RESOLVED accordingly.</p>	
No. 8	<p><u>EXEMPT ITEM</u></p> <p>To receive and consider the following report which in the opinion of the proper officer was an exempt items taking into account consideration of the public interest test and that the press and public should be excluded from the meeting (the reason for the decision for the exemption was available on a schedule maintained by the proper officer).</p>	
No. 9	<p><u>ENFORCEMENT CLOSED CASES BETWEEN 16 JUNE 2020 AND 13 JULY 2020</u></p> <p>Having regard to the views expressed by the Proper Officer regarding the public interest test, that on balance the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information and that the report should be exempt.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the public be excluded whilst this item of business is transacted as it is likely there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 12, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).</p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Service Manager Development & Estates.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report which contained information relating to a particular individual be accepted and the information contained therein be noted.</p>	

