

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Vanessa King (Chairperson)

* Councillor Dominique Williams (Vice-Chairperson)

Councillor Bilal Akhtar	* Councillor Richard Mills OBE
* Councillor Joss Bigmore	Councillor Patrick Oven
* Councillor David Bilbe	* Councillor Maddy Redpath
* Councillor Yves de Contades	* Councillor Joanne Shaw
Councillor Lizzie Griffiths	* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor
* Councillor Stephen Hives	Howard Smith
* Councillor James Jones	* Councillor Cait Taylor

*Present

Councillor Fiona was also in attendance online.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bilal Akhtar, Lizzie Griffiths and Vanessa King with no substitutes. (Councillor Dominique Williams would act as Chairperson for the meeting in Councillor King's absence).

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11 September 2024 were agreed and signed by the Chairperson as an accurate record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Prior to the consideration of application 23/P/00417, Land adjacent to Ockham Lane, owing to the public interest, the Committee was asked to waive the Public Speaking Procedure Rules to extend the time permitted to speak from three to

five minutes. This extension of time would also apply to all committee members to give minutes which was agreed.

PL5 23/P/00417 - LAND ADJACENT TO OCKHAM LANE, OCKHAM, GU23 6NT

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for construction of up to 70 new homes (C3), the formation of a new means of access onto Ockham Lane, new footpaths and cycle routes, the creation of areas of open space and allotments, new surface water drainage, new landscaping and habitat creation, ground works and other infrastructure.

Prior to the consideration of the application, the following persons addressed the Committee in accordance with Public Speaking Procedure Rules 3(b):

- Councillor Imogen Jamieson (Ockham Parish Council) (to object);
- Mrs Frances Porter (Villages Against Wisley Town – VAWNT) (to object);
- Mr Owen Jones (LRM Planning) (in support on behalf of the applicant)

The Committee received a report from the planning officer, Hannah Yates. Changes were highlighted, as detailed in the supplementary late sheets, to a Grampian condition no.27. The proposed change was to make this a prior to commencement condition rather than a prior to occupation condition to ensure that the Hallam scheme was not delivered before the start of the Taylor Wimpey scheme. There was also a proposed change to the education contributions, in particular on primary provision. Early years and secondary provision remained the same, as outlined in the report. The Taylor Wimpey scheme was required to deliver the primary school in full and once built would fully mitigate the impact of the proposed development. The primary school must be transferred to Surrey County Council (SCC) by the occupation of 650 units of the Taylor Wimpey application. There would therefore be an interim period before there was any primary provision and SCC requires a proportionate payment to cover this interim period. Planning officers considered this was necessary to meet the CIL requirements related to the development and fairly related in scale and kind.

Additional responses had also been received from Surrey County Council Fire and Rescue and Send Parish Council. Lastly, an email had been sent from Ockham Parish Council to all councillors regarding the judicial review that the Parish Council had issued against the appeal decision on the Taylor Wimpey application. The email stated that the case officer had misrepresented the actual position of the planning appeal on the majority of the former Wisley Airfield local plan allocation A35. Ockham Parish Council believed it was important members were

aware that the appeal was subject to a S288 statutory review in the High Court. The next part of the process was on 5 December 2024 and until the judicial review process was completed, there could be no reliance upon the appeal conditions. In response to those comments, planning officers believed that until the decision was quashed by the court, which may not be the case, Taylor Wimpey had an extant permission. This was a recent and relevant planning decision that should be afforded significant weight.

The Committee noted the application proposal for which details of access were sought now, with layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for consideration later. When considering the application, it was important to remember that detailed consideration was required for the use and amount of development and the means of access, which was defined as the accessibility to and within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians, the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fitted into the surrounding access network. All other considerations were deferred until a reserved matters application.

The Committee noted a map which showed the key constraints of the A35 allocation. Flood zones 2 and 3 ran along Stratford Brook along the periphery of the site. The Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) was located to the north as well as a SSSI area. Located close by was also the SNCI and part of those areas also formed the Ockham and Wisley Local Nature Reserve. The Green Belt surrounded the whole site. Ockham Conservation Area was located to the west of the site. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) which was relatively new was located along the access to Little Upton. There are also many footpaths running through and adjacent to the site.

The A35 allocation was split into three different land ownerships; Taylor Wimpey, Hallam the subject of this application, and CBRE. This application site formed the smallest part of the allocated site under policy A35 of the local plan strategies and sites. There was an area of SANG above the application site and fell outside of the allocation as it was within the zero to 400 metre buffer of the TBHSPA which was to the north.

Taylor Wimpey recently had a hybrid application, on the A35 allocation, approved at appeal subject to a S106 and a large number of conditions. There is an ongoing judicial review, but the permission still stands at this time and is a relevant material consideration.

The Committee noted various photos taken of the site at various stages over the past two years. The access point that would be created to the site was located

beyond an oak tree which was in the hedge line and just in front of where the speed limit changed from 40mph to 30mph as you moved into the village. This part of the site had the best visibility. The existing access points into the site were of substandard visibility. Ockham Lane did consist of dense hedgerow, however, there were some gaps.

The Committee noted the plans that had been submitted for approval as part of the outline application. The vehicle access would be in the form of a simple priority junction off Ockham Lane to the western side of the site at 6 metres wide reducing in width as you enter the site. This width was sufficient to allow two large vehicles to pass and was consistent with the advice contained in the manual for streets. It was proposed that the junction radius had been provided to accommodate the swept path of the largest design vehicle that accesses the site on a regular basis e.g. a large refuse vehicle. The visibility requirements were 2.4 metres by 70 metres both ways. Road users waiting to turn right into the proposed site access from Ockham Lane could see beyond the required stopping site distance. Vegetation within the visibility splays would be removed and cut back to ensure the displays were not obstructed. Pedestrian access to the site would be provided via a new link to the western end of the site. The submitted plan shows the original scheme containing works to Ockham Lane, which the applicant was no longer intending to provide following discussions with the County Highway Authority. A condition had therefore been recommended which required an updated scheme to be submitted and agreed prior to occupation. The scheme would need to include pedestrian and cycle access. This would ensure the proposal aligned with the traffic calming works on Ockham Lane, which are approved and required as part of the mitigation on the Taylor Wimpey site.

The proposed access point was just to the west of the existing change in speed limit. There was some tree and hedge removal required as shown on the extract of the tree retention plan. The bigger category B tree, with the biggest canopy, is being retained.

Paragraph 8.4.8 of the strategic development framework SPD stated that the site would have two principal points of access, talking about the A35 site as a whole, from Wisley Lane, and from Old Lane. Minor access points from Ockham Lane may be permissible where they served a limited number of dwellings to be agreed with Surrey County Council, and where there was no onward vehicle connection to the site. Surrey County Council no longer objected to the access onto Ockham Lane following the receipt of further information. The access was therefore in accordance with the SPD in this regard.

The Committee noted the land use and building heights parameter plan. The proposed areas of residential development comprised of residential uses and associated infrastructure, which included roads, car parking, pedestrian cycle links, open space, landscaping, and drainage systems. Building heights were capped at a maximum of two stories.

The Committee noted the access and movement parameter plan and were shown the key vehicle movement corridor. There would be a footway and cycleway along the northern half of the lane. The secondary movement corridor formed a loop background connecting to the primary route. The proposed principal pedestrian and cycle connection routes ran along the frontage and up into the Taylor Wimpey scheme to the north. A key pedestrian cycle route ran east to west across the A35 as a whole and connected all the land parcels across the allocation. There was also a connection zone to be used for potential emergency access. Surrey County Council Fire and Rescue commented that an emergency access here would not be essential. However, condition 30 did allow for this matter to be revisited if necessary, during the discharge of this condition.

The Committee noted the green and blue infrastructure parameter plan. This showed the location of the different typologies of open space and the broad locations for SUDS solutions. The proposed allotments and play area were shown. In order to demonstrate that the parameter plans were acceptable, illustrative material had been submitted to show a potential way the site parameters could come forward delivering the numbers of dwellings applied for. This illustrative material takes the form of an illustrative master plan. This illustrative plan had a number of positive aspects. It showed an acceptable relationship to the adjacent broadwalk and the public open space area. Any relationship with Beacon Park, which was acceptable, with footpath and cycle link offset from the boundary hedge and a tree lined overlooked by build frontages. There was a positive use of open space responding to the constraints of the site. The western open space here provided the green pause between the site and the Conservation Area. The central green space was a positive space, and the soft edges were considered to be responsive to the context of the site. Whilst the response to Ockham Lane was less successful, it was considered that the parameter plans would be able to guide a better response at the reserved matters stage. This plan was illustrative and was not being approved as part of this submission.

The submitted material also includes a site wide master plan in accordance with policy D1. This was to ensure a coordinated approach and the creation of a legible new settlement. The applicants, along with Taylor Wimpey and CBRE, had jointly agreed an illustrative master plan for the entire allocation. This was based

on the principle of one new settlement, consisting of three different neighbourhoods. From west to east, these were Stratford View, Upper Ockham, and Upton End. The application site formed a distinct part of Upton End, transitioning to Ockham Village. The design concept of this neighbourhood was a transition to the open countryside, having a more rural character than the other neighbourhoods. In addition to the parameter plans for approval, there would be sufficient design control over the site as it moved forward through to delivery, with an approved design principles document and the requirement for a site wide and neighbourhood design code, which were covered by planning conditions recommended at 13 and 14.

For context, the Committee noted the approved parameters for the Taylor Wimpey site. Of particular note was the local centre in the middle and the primary school provision. The local centre would also include the community building. The Committee noted the access and movement parameter plan and the sustainable movement corridor moving through from west to east. The Committee also noted the green and blue infrastructure parameter plan which showed the location of two of the main parks between the neighbourhoods and the SANG that surrounds the development.

The Committee noted that the Grampian condition was a key aspect of the proposal, as this application was only acceptable as part of the wider A35 allocation. It was the Taylor Wimpey scheme that would deliver infrastructure to make the place sustainable. This Grampian condition would not allow any commencement of the Hallam proposal until the delivery of the offsite cycle infrastructure, which would be delivered by Taylor Wimpey. In relation to Grampian conditions, the PPG noted that even a limited or some prospect of the action being performed within the time limit of the permission, then the Grampian condition could be appropriate in principle. Whilst it was acknowledged there was still some uncertainty until the statutory review process is concluded on the Taylor Wimpey permission, that permission is extant and still held significant weight. Given this was the case, it could not be argued that there was no prospect at all of the works required under the Grampian condition coming forward in the relevant time scales.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that less than substantial harm had been identified in relation to a number of heritage assets. Although great weight and considerable importance had been afforded to the heritage harm, it was considered that the public benefits of the housing, both market and affordable, along with the other identified benefits were sufficient to outweigh the identified heritage harm. The application was broadly consistent with the current development plan policies, and it was concluded that the proposal was in

accordance with the development plan when read as a whole. The benefits were considerable and clearly and demonstrably outweighed the harm identified, which includes heritage harm. The recommendation was therefore to approve the application subject to a section 106, securing the heads of terms and conditions which are set out on pages 23 to 44 of the agenda and the updated condition on the late sheets.

Councillor Catherine Young, Ward Councillor for Clandon and Horsley, was invited to speak for five minutes. Councillor Young acknowledged that the site was allocated with presumption in favour of development. However, in her view severe harm would be caused to the gentle and tranquil hamlet of Ockham, which in the planning balance provided sound justification for refusal of the application, given the harm caused to the local road network, the increased risk to highway safety, and the impact on the Conservation Area and the ribbon development of old cottages that make up Ockham. In the 10 years that this site A35 has been looked at, it was never intended that there would be an access point from this site onto Ockham Lane. Indeed, Surrey County Council originally objected to the application and there were no strong reasons as to why they had changed their mind. The access for this site must be through the main site, if allowed, as this new proposal was unsustainable and would severely impact highway safety. There was no doubt that the continued extra flow of construction traffic and the future number of cars from new residents would cause harm by way of vibrations on the foundations of these old houses and roads. Increased congestion would also impact air quality and public health.

Councillor Young observed that Ockham Lane was a narrow, winding, rural country lane with limited traffic capacity and no passing places. Cottages and farms line the road and the rest was flanked by very tall, mature hedgerows, making sight lines for oncoming traffic tricky at best. There may as yet have been no fatalities but that was because locals take extreme care. The highway proposals therefore did not meet the tests of the NPPF, Chapter Nine at paragraph 115, nor did they satisfy the requirements of Guildford's policies, A35, ID3 and D1.

Councillor Young suggested that harm to the local character must be seen as a second substantive reason for refusal. This development of 70 homes would permanently change the little hamlet beyond recognition. Why was this piece of valuable farmland accepted into the local plan? It provides such an important buffer between the Taylor Wimpey new town development planned for the Wisley airfield and the tiny hamlet of Ockham. This area is extremely rural and is the setting and gateway to Ockham, tucked away amongst green fields and farmland. Notably, Historic England still raised issues of harm to the conservation

area at page 66-71 of your report, recommending a further reduction of dwellings and increased buffer zones. The conservation officer also raised significant concerns on page 74 at point 100, noting the harmful impact of a strong and suburban like development. It was in breach therefore of policy D1 place shaping as it does not reflect or respond to the distinct local character or respond to the local pattern of development and the landscape setting. None of the policies in D4 listed on page 127 were adhered to giving further cause of concern.

Councillor Young made the final point that there will be a harmful impact on the local landscape setting. Policy A35, criteria 24, required sensitive design at site boundaries that had significant regard to the transition from village to green field. This was explained on page 126. All those consulted recommend a wider buffer zone along Ockham Lane. This had not been delivered by the applicant despite several plan amendments, and it was too important to leave to reserved matters. The NPPF paragraph 180 states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognizing the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This application failed to do that. It therefore failed to deliver the principles of policy A35. Councillor Young concluded that the harms that she had identified during her comments, as well as all the objections submitted from and spoken about by local residents, provide strong reasons for refusal.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the application was premature given that the judicial review was still to be heard. However, in response to a suggestion that the application should be deferred until after the end of the statutory review, concerns were expressed that the applicant would likely lodge an appeal against non-determination, and there may be a risk of associated costs being awarded.

The senior planning officer, Hannah Yates was commended by members for providing an exceptionally comprehensive report.

The Committee noted views that the positive aspects of the proposal were that 40 % of the proposed houses were affordable, which was considerably more than normal. Also, the mix of housing was that at least 75 % of the houses would be three bedroomed or less. The Committee noted that the report also drew on the conclusions of the Inspector's decision on the Taylor Wimpey proposal with regards to air quality and ecology, including the effects on the SANG and TBHSPA, as well as the potential damage to heritage assets. However, this was in relation to the Taylor Wimpey site and, although very limited or less than substantial harm to several of the features in the locality were identified and the Conservation Area itself, they were considerably further away from the Taylor

Wimpey site than they were from this site. The Committee noted concerns that these conclusions related to the adjacent site and they should form their own assessment of the application impacts on these elements for the application currently under consideration.

The Committee noted comments that the conclusions from Historic England were important, as they indicated that the harm to the Conservation Area had not been minimised by this proposal and therefore was in breach of National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 195, and questioned whether the impacts were both justified and outweighed by public benefit, which would therefore put it in breach of paragraphs 200 and 202 of the NPPF. The Council's Conservation Officer had made a recommendation to lessen the impact of the proposed scheme by removing a number of dwellings along the southern boundary to the site. Then the amended proposals, whilst adjusting the layout of dwellings across the site, with a very slightly enlarged buffer, did not appear to address the concerns raised by Historic England, with even more dwellings proposed along the southern road. The Committee noted comments made that Historic England had therefore maintained their concerns about the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area and continued to recommend a meaningful reduction in dwellings along the southern boundary road of the site so that deep planting along Ockham Lane can effectively screen houses to the north. It would therefore have a harmful effect on the significance of the area.

The Committee noted comments that the proposal was located in an allocated site of the local plan. The statutory consultees final responses from County Highways, Natural England and the Flood Authority did not provide a sufficient basis for the Committee to refuse the application. If the application went to appeal for example, it was considered that the balance of harm against need would be difficult to prove.

The Committee noted further comments that this site was the least sustainable one in the local plan A35 allocation. Given it was the last site to be submitted should we therefore hold it to a higher standard. In terms of weighing the harms and benefits, this part of the site is the buffer and did not provide a gentle transition to an increased density as anticipated on the Taylor Wimpey site and appeared to be an extension of it. Concern was again expressed at how the County Highway Authority had removed their original objection to the access now proposed onto Ockham Lane by this application. When the site was adopted by the Local Plan it was never envisaged that there would be access onto Ockham Lane. Whilst this was not part of the proposal, concern was also expressed if an access to the main site was put in at a later date therefore creating a rat run onto Ockham Lane. The application could not be supported on that basis.

The Committee noted comments that the original view of Surrey County Council as Highway Authority was that the road system, particularly Ockham Lane and its immediate roads running into it, could not be cost effectively developed sufficiently to make it sustainable in transport terms, which was a really critical consideration. Nevertheless, support was offered for the proposal.

The Principal Planning Officer Hannah Yates was invited to comment on what had been said so far by the Planning Committee. The Committee noted that in relation to points made about the access point onto Ockham Lane, the Strategic Planning Development Framework stated that minor access points from Ockham Lane may be permissible where they served a limited number of dwellings to be agreed with Surrey County Council and where there is no onward vehicle connection to the wider site. There was also a condition included that ensured there would be no through route between the site and the wider A35 site. A further point raised by the Committee was about the proposal being contrary to D3 and the heritage harm caused. It was important to reiterate that this did need to be weighed against the public benefits when considering heritage harm. With regard to traffic modelling, the applicant had submitted a transport assessment as part of the application which included traffic modelling. The Taylor Wimpey scheme did model the entire allocation, which included the 2000 dwellings, and this was considered to be acceptable by both National Highways and the County Council in terms of impact on strategic and local road network.

The Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown also stated that any comments about whether development should or should not happen here and whether or not the A35 site was sustainable, had all been rehearsed through the plan making process. The Planning Committee could not therefore revisit the principle of development on this site. The SPD enabled an access point on Ockham Lane and there was no technical support for there being a highway safety issue with the access as proposed. If members were minded to move towards a refusal, they should therefore consider that in the full knowledge that there was no technical support for that from a highway safety point of view. In relation to the judicial review process, this was not a decision around whether or not the right decision was made at appeal, it was about whether procedurally the right process was followed. If a judicial review was successful, then the decision would revert to the Secretary of State and the appeal would be re-run.

The Legal Advisor, Angela Watson, commented that there was a statutory challenge against the Inspector's approval of the Taylor Wimpey application currently lodged with the court and listed for a hearing. However, it was important to emphasise to members that there was currently an extant planning

approval on the major proportion of the site and that carried weight as a material consideration in members' determination of this application. She also observed that the extant permission for the Taylor Wimpey site had been granted following a lengthy and detailed public inquiry before an experienced Inspector. She stated that a lot of points in objection that had been raised before the Committee were not linked to the grounds of challenge against the Taylor Wimpey approval. The Committee had to decide the planning merits of this application, whereas the issues before the Court were not matters of planning merits, but rather issues around the legality of the Inspector's decision.

It was apparent that some Committee members did not support the officer's recommendation to approve the application. The Chairperson, Councillor Williams, therefore asked if any Committee member wished to propose a motion contrary to the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Pat Oven indicated that he wished to propose a motion to refuse the application and suggested the following reasons for refusal: By virtue of its effect on the Conservation Area adjacent, the proposal would fail to meet paragraph 195 of the NPPF, in that harm to the Conservation Area was not minimised, and that there was insufficient public benefit to meet paragraphs 200 and 202 of the NPPF. By virtue of that effect as outlined by various experts (being the Historic England representative, the Council's Conservation Officer and the GBC consultant on landscape) the effect on the area was such that D14 would not be met. The development would not reflect the distinctive local character, would not respond to and reinforce the distinct local pattern of development, including landscape setting, and would also be in breach of paragraph D4 of the local plan development management policies which required development to achieve high quality design and respect local distinctiveness. Developments were required to be sympathetic to local character and history and establish or maintain a strong sense of place and that policy D4 was not accordingly met.

The reasons for refusal were discussed at length between Councillor Oven and the Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown.

A member of the public approached Councillor Oven during the discussion taking place regarding the reasons being put forward for refusal. The Legal Advisor, Angela Watson, asked Councillor Oven to confirm what had been said to him, for transparency reasons, so that a view could be taken as to whether what was said was relevant or irrelevant and whether it may have affected Councillor Oven's views. Councillor Oven said that he had no idea of being approached until he was touched on his left shoulder. At no point did Councillor Oven speak to the member of public, it was not a conversation just a monologue. Councillor Oven

stated that the member of the public had said to him 'If you want to go on Highways grounds Pat, we will back you.' Councillor Oven confirmed that he was not going to use highways grounds as one of his reasons for refusal and therefore what was said had no bearing on his motion. The Legal Advisor, Angela Watson, explained that in light of Councillor Oven's explanation, and if the remaining committee members were satisfied with that, Councillor Oven's proposed motion to refuse could stand and the committee could continue to discuss the reasons for refusal being put forward.

The Chairperson, Councillor Williams advised that given Councillor Stephen Hives had left the meeting he therefore could not participate in the vote.

The Chairperson, Councillor Williams asked for a seconder of the motion to refuse the application. Councillor Joss Bigmore seconded the motion to refuse.

For clarification, the Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown read back to the Committee the reason for refusal being put forward which was: 'That the proposed development would neither preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and would have less than substantial harm on the heritage assets, which was not outweighed by the public benefit and would be contrary to the relevant policies.'

A vote was then taken on the proposed reason for refusal, by a show of hands:

In favour of the reason for refusal: For: 4; Against: 5; Abstain: 1. (1 councillor did not vote). The vote on the reason for refusal was therefore lost.

The committee considered whether any further reasons for refusal could be advanced to support Councillor Oven's motion to refuse the application, however none were forthcoming. Officers therefore advised that the motion to refuse could not be progressed and Councillor Oven was asked if he wished to withdraw his motion. He reluctantly did so and no dissent to that withdrawal was signified by the meeting.

Councillor David Bilbé requested a deferral of the application as he felt that the reasons for refusal could not be constructed in Committee. The Chairperson, Councillor Williams confirmed that Councillor David Bilbé would need to provide a reason for deferral which he did not pursue.

The Chairperson, Councillor Williams therefore moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 23/P/00417 subject to a S106 and Councillor James Jones seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Patrick Oven		X	
2	James Jones	X		
3	Cait Taylor	X		
4	Howard Smith	X		
5	Yves de Contades	X		
6	Joanne Shaw	X		
7	Maddy Redpath		X	
8	Dominique Williams	X		
9	Richard Mills		X	
10	Joss Bigmore		X	
11	David Bilbé			X
	TOTALS	6	4	1

In conclusion, having taken consideration of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00417 subject to the updated condition no.27 as detailed in the supplementary late sheets, and to the following:

- (i) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant permission and make minor amendments to the wording of conditions subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

- Provision of a contribution towards Local Highway Network Safety and Resilience Improvements
- Provision of a contribution towards Access for All Improvements at Horsley and Effingham Junction Stations
- Provision of a Car Club
- Provision of E Bike hire
- Provision of SANG and its management and maintenance in perpetuity
- Contributions towards SAMM and the SAMM+ package
- The provision of 40% affordable housing – inclusive of first homes
- Provision of a contribution for early years, primary and secondary education facilities
- Provision of a contribution to a health facility
- Provision and maintenance of all open space typologies
- Management of BNG for 30 years
- Provision of a contribution towards the Local Centre
- Details on stewardship

(ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning. The recommendation is to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

PL6 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.40 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman