

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> January, 2020 at 5.30 pm**

**In the Council Chamber at the Council House, Walsall**

### **Present:**

Councillor Bird (Chair)  
Councillor Perry (Vice Chair)  
Councillor P. Bott  
Councillor Craddock  
Councillor Murray  
Councillor Nawaz  
Councillor M. Nazir  
Councillor Rasab  
Councillor Samra  
Councillor Sarohi  
Councillor Statham  
Councillor Waters

1/20

### **Apologies**

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillors Chattha, Creaney, Harrison, Hicken, Jukes, Robertson and Underhill.

2/20

### **Minutes**

#### **Resolved**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2020, a copy having been previously circulated to each Member of the Committee, be approved and signed as a true record.

Arising from a discussion on the minutes, the Chair instructed Officers to provide Councillor Bott with an update on the land adjacent 26 Bradely Lane, which he was still awaiting.

3/20

### **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Perry declared a non-prejudicial interest in plans list number 13 (19/1104).

4/20

### **Deputations and Petitions**

There were no deputations introduced or petitions submitted.

5/20

**Local Government (Access to information) Act, 1985 (as amended)**

**Exclusion of Public**

**Resolved**

That, where applicable, during consideration of the relevant item(s) on the agenda, the Committee considers that the relevant item(s) for consideration are exempt information for the reasons set out therein and Section 100A of the Local Government Act, 1972 and accordingly resolves to consider those item(s) in private.

6/20

**Application List for Permission to Develop**

The application list for permission to develop was submitted, together with supplementary papers and information for items already on the plans list.

(see annexed)

The Committee agreed to deal with the items on the agenda where members of the public had previously indicated that they wished to address the Committee and the Chair, at the beginning of each item for which there were speakers, confirmed they had been advised of the procedure whereby each speaker would have two minutes to speak.

7/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 2 – 19/0945 - FORMER HARVESTIME BAKERY - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 88 RESIDENTIAL UNITS COMPRISING 18 X 1 BED FLATS, 25 X 2 BEDROOM HOUSES, 41 X 3 BEDROOM HOUSES, 4 X 4 BEDROOM HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, LANDSCAPING AND 164 CAR PARKING SPACES.**

The report of the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation was submitted

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information / revised recommendation as set out within the tabled supplementary paper.

The Committee welcomed the first speaker on this item, Councillor Hussain, who wished to speak in objection to this application.

Councillor Hussain stated that he was in attendance to object on behalf of his constituents. The main objections to this proposal were around the current parking situation, traffic and congestion which caused residents much

consternation. The previous outline application had recommended refusal on highways grounds. The residents who lived in the surrounding area were forced to suffer on a daily basis and this proposal would only serve to exacerbate this problem, as well as ASB and crime. These matters required resolution first before any application should be approved on this site.

The Committee then welcomed the second speaker on this item, Councillor Gultasib, who also wished to speak in objection to this application.

Councillor Gultasib stated that from the moment she had been elected, the issues within this area had been brought to her attention straight away by residents. She had seen the issues herself and had witnessed fights, ASB and road rage. If this development were to be approved it would exacerbate the problems. She mentioned that a 120 signature petition had been submitted from local residents highlighting the extent of their objections. Whilst residents did not oppose a development on this site, the current one did not address any of the existing problems and would only serve to increase the misery currently suffered by local residents.

The Committee then welcomed the third speaker on this item, Mrs Burns, who wished to speak in support of this application.

Mrs Burns stated that this site was ideally located for a residential development, having being designated so within the SAD, with it being close to the town centre and with good public transport links. The current site was an eyesore and was being utilised for ASB / fly-tipping. Outline consent for this site had been granted in 2016, and her client had worked with Officers to bring forward this viable scheme. The development would comprise mixed housing types and a quarter would be designated for affordable housing.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers

Members queried the following: -

- If Mrs Burns accepted that this development would negatively affect existing nearby residents. Mrs Burns stated that she felt the impact would be negligible.
- If Mrs Burns had been to the site and surrounding area and if she was aware that a shooting had taken place there. Mrs Burns advised that she was not aware of a shooting taking place and that ASB was taking place on the site in its current state.
- If Mrs Burns had visited the site in the morning or at night when traffic and parking pressures were at their peak. Mrs Burns replied that she had not.
- What the likely loss of current parking spaces on Raleigh Street would be. Mrs Burns stated that she agreed with the Officers' forecast of approximately 3 – 5 spaces would be lost.
- If there was a possibility that a compromise could be reached with the developer to mitigate the parking impact. Mr Burns advised that these matters had been considered extensively between the developer and Officers and this was the best / most viable scheme.

- In view of the fact that many children cross the surrounding roads, were the developers happy with the road safety of this scheme. Mrs Burns stated that Highways had recommended this area being designated as a 20MPH zone along with speed bumps.
- If the developer would be willing to switch their contribution from open space to highway improvements. Mrs Burns stated that she could not answer without speaking to her client.
- If residents were against the development of this site. Councillor Hussain stated that the residents were not against the development of this site, but much more consideration needed to be given to the existing residents and on improving the parking and traffic flow around the area.
- How many workers / cars accessed this site when it was operational as a bakery. The Chair stated that it was approx. 160 workers and that workers there mostly worked evening shifts.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to: -

- If the parking proposed for this site met with Council policies. The Presenting Officer advised that the parking set out for this application would adhere with Council policies.
- If this development would create a 'gated community'. The Presenting Officer advised that it would not, but the area where the flats would be, would have a gated area to address and mitigate ASB.
- If residents from the surrounding area could access this new estate and park on the new roads. The Presenting Officer advised that the new estate would be accessible and future tenants could potentially come to agreements over parking. However, this development was not there to accommodate parking for neighbouring residents.
- If the new roads on the estate were to be of adoptable standard. The Highways Officer confirmed that the roads would be built to adoptable standard, but it would be for the developer to decide whether to have them adopted or not.
- Whether local residents had been considered as part of the consultation process as, being so close to the Town Centre, not as many parking spaces would be required for such a development due to the availability and accessibility of the local town centre public transport network. The Highways Officers stated that the application had sought to meet the Council's parking requirements, which it had.
- Where / how the S106 contribution figure had been arrived at. The Presenting Officer advised that an independent external valuer had been used.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the application.

The Chair **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Craddock:-

That planning application no. **19/0945** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to Grant Planning Permission Subject to amending and finalising conditions and a Section 106 Agreement to secure

contributions towards the provision of Affordable Housing (18 one bed apartments, 2 two bed houses, 2 three bed houses), Urban open space, on-site landscape management and maintenance in perpetuity and an uplift clause further to a reassessment of viability, and subject to: -

- No new material considerations being received within the re-consultation period;
- No further comments from a statutory consultee.

In addition, that: -

1. highways officers be instructed to conduct a consultation on how we can improve the traffic and road safety arrangements in this particular location of Raleigh street and Jessel Road to enable the issues of parking to be addressed, and as part of this consultation we take on board a possible one way system in conjunction with local Ward Councillors and residents in the affected areas.
2. the £50k for public open space, by agreement with the developer, be considered to be used for mitigation measures on the highway.
3. the agent be requested to consult with the applicant to see if they would be prepared to consult with the residents' Committee and local Ward Councillors to ensure that their views are heard and considered.
4. an additional condition be added that when 50% of the development is built, that the viability be readdressed by way of a new assessment.
5. if the developer does not agree to the contributions being utilised for highways improvements, then it will still be payable and used for open space improvements.

The Motion, having been put to the vote was declared carried with Members voting unanimously in favour:-

### **Resolved**

That planning application no. **19/0945** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to Grant Planning Permission Subject to amending and finalising conditions and a Section 106 Agreement to secure contributions towards the provision of Affordable Housing (18 one bed apartments, 2 two bed houses, 2 three bed houses), Urban open space, on-site landscape management and maintenance in perpetuity and an uplift clause further to a reassessment of viability, and subject to: -

- No new material considerations being received within the re-consultation period;
- No further comments from a statutory consultee.

In addition, that: -

1. highways officers be instructed to conduct a consultation on how we can improve the traffic and road safety arrangements in this particular location of Raleigh street and Jessel Road to enable the issues of parking to be addressed, and as part of this consultation we take on board a possible

one way system in conjunction with local Ward Councillors and residents in the affected areas.

2. the £50k for public open space, by agreement with the developer, be considered to be used for mitigation measures on the highway.
3. the agent be requested to consult with the applicant to see if they would be prepared to consult with the residents' Committee and local Ward Councillors to ensure that their views are heard and considered.
4. an additional condition be added that when 50% of the development is built, that the viability be readdressed by way of a new assessment.
5. if the developer does not agree to the contributions being utilised for highways improvements, then it will still be payable and used for open space improvements.

***Councillor Nazir left the meeting at the conclusion of this item and did not return.***

8/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 7 – 18/0058 - CALDERFIELDS DRIVING RANGE, ALDRIDGE ROAD - PROPOSED ADVENTURE GOLF COURSE AND THE ERECTION OF ADMINISTRATION BUILDING.**

The report of the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation was submitted

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information / revised recommendation as set out within the tabled supplementary paper.

The Committee welcomed the first speaker on this item, Mr Lowe, who wished to speak in objection to this application.

Mr Lowe stated that he was present in his capacity of the general manager of Calderfields Gold Club. 11 years ago, the applicant had sold the Golf Club, the associated car park and all of its assets, but had retained the golf range and shop as a standalone business. The Golf Club, over the last 10 years or so, had transformed and had become one of the most prestigious venues for weddings and golfing functions in the Borough. In view of this, it was not uncommon for the car park to be full to capacity. In his view, the proposed adventure golf course would be unsightly and not aesthetically pleasing in the green belt, comparing it to something you might see at the seaside or a theme-park. The application had failed to demonstrate a valid need for erecting such a development within the green belt. The proposed building would be constructed within the garden of the house, which was granted on appeal as a residential development, not a commercial enterprise. There was no parking whatsoever to service this proposal. He had viewed a land registry TP1 document on several occasions, which precluded any use of the existing car park, save for access to the driving range and shop. He felt that

these inconsistencies invalidated this application which, he felt, should be duly refused. Should these matters have been properly investigated and addressed, this application would not have come forward to Committee.

The Committee then welcomed the second speaker on this item, Mr Brookes, who wished to speak in support of this application.

Mr Brookes stated that the proposal introduced a new feature to the driving range in the form of an adventure / crazy golf course, which would be aimed at all ages, particularly families, from young to old. Having this facility at the range would introduce people to an outdoor pursuit, encourage youngsters to get outdoors and would create jobs. He stated that he agreed with the Officer's view that this development fell within one of the 6 permitted exceptions for development within the green belt as it preserved the openness of the site. In closing, Mr Brookes stated that he knew of another example in Kent, which was similar to this one where permission had been granted.

The Committee then welcomed the third speaker on this item, Mr Singh, who also wished to speak in support to this application.

Mr Singh stated that this development would generate a sizeable social and economic benefit for the area and would encourage young people to engage in outdoor pursuits. There was sufficient parking available, the car park offered approximately 149 spaces. There would not be any health and safety concerns as this development was essentially a crazy golf course and all balls would stay on the ground. The site would be secured by an open 2.4M screen. This development was aimed at families and no alcohol would be served. The development would not be visible from the road as the nearest road was approximately 250M away and it would be situated behind the building. In closing, Mr Singh stated that this development would create local jobs as a relatively small scheme.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers

Members queried the following: -

- Why the application had taken so long. Mr Singh advised that the delay had been due to the fact that the Council had had staffing and resourcing issues during this period.
- How the requirement for no lighting, as set out on page 135, matched up with the proposal to operate until 10.00pm in the summer. Mr Singh advised that the applicant was very conscious of the ecology of the site. The roof of the building would be a 'living roof'. The applicant was confident that some low level lighting could be introduced, but this would require a separate application in the future.
- If the applicant would be content to undertake a bat survey if the Committee were minded to approve the application. Mr Singh stated that he was sure his client would be happy to undertake a bat survey and that he would be willing to install bat boxes around the site.
- If the applicant accepted that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the local community. Mr Singh advised that, as a

designer, he was always mindful of the impact of a new development on neighbouring residents. However, in this case he felt that any impact would be negligible as the nearest road was some 250m away and most of the objectors lived greater than 3/4 of a mile away. To counter balance this, there were also letters of support.

- If the letters of support were all similarly drafted. Mr Singh advised that there was 5 points made across the 3 letters of support.
- If the concerns raised by the objectors were material planning considerations. Mr Singh advised that, as Officers had pointed out, the objections raised were not material planning considerations.
- What noise would be generated by the site. Mr Singh stated that all activity would generate some noise. Noise would be generated during the construction phase, and then there would be some noise generated once the scheme became operational. However, the site was essentially located in the middle of a field and any noise generated would be negligible.
- Use of the nearby car park. Mr Singh stated that he was not a lawyer. He agreed with the contents of Page 179 on this issue and it was a civil matter. Mr Lowe advised that he had seen the TP1 agreement several times and the car park was not in the applicant's ownership. He also objected as the pictures shown in the Officer's presentation had seemingly been taken during the winter as snow was visible in the pictures. This, he stated, was not a fair or accurate representation of how well utilised the car park would usually be.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to: -

- If any of the objections raised were material planning considerations. The Presenting Officer advised that they were not.
- The location of both supporting letters and those in objection to the application site. The Presenting Officer highlighted where all the letters of support and objection had come from.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the application.

Councillor Bott **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Rasab:-

That planning application no. **18/0058** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to Grant Planning Permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions, as set out within the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion, having been put to the vote was declared carried with Members voting in favour:-

**Resolved (10 in favour and 1 against)**

That planning application no. **18/0058** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to Grant Planning Permission subject to the



amendment and finalising of conditions, as set out within the report and supplementary paper.

***Councillor Nawaz wished to have his name recorded as having voted against this motion.***

9/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 10 – 19/0761 - 82 FREIZLAND LANE - ERECTION OF 2 NO. DETACHED TWO STOREY HOUSES ON SIDE GARDEN LAND.**

The report of the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation was submitted

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein.

The Committee welcomed the only speaker on this item, Mr Warke, who wished to speak in support of this application.

Mr Warke stated that he, personally, did not believe that the proposed development would be a tight squeeze on the land in question. He also disagreed with the Officer's view that the driveway to the rear of the proposed properties would cause or attract ASB, fly tipping and / or crime as it was located on a residential road and opposite a convenience store which had CCTV. In addition, he also disagreed that the proposed development would cause a blind spot when considering that the bush which is there at present was overgrown and protruded far greater than the development would. The houses would be set back further from the road than the existing bush, which would open up the area.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers

Members queried the following: -

- If the design could be amended to address the concerns of the police in relation to crime and ASB. Mr Warke advised that he felt the application, as currently proposed, was better as access to the driveway was off a side road instead of the main road which would be better for highway safety.
- If local school coaches still used the main road to pick up and take children to the local school. Mr Warke stated that he was unsure, but it was a very busy road.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to: -

- If the development complied with all of the Council's standards. The Presenting Officer advised that it did.

- If there were any objections to this application on highways grounds. The Highways Officer advised that there were none.
- If the main objection to the application was about its design. The Presenting Officer advised that they felt the design could be improved upon, that one dwelling on this land could be supported and that neighbouring properties had more space which meant this design would not fit in with the character of the street scene.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the application.

The Chair **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Rasab:-

That planning application no. **19/0761** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission, subject to the finalising of conditions on the grounds that the proposal would make the best of use of the land available, would contribute to the aesthetic appearance of the area and it meets space and separation standards.

The Motion, having been put to the vote was declared carried with Members voting unanimously in favour:-

### **Resolved**

That planning application no. **19/0761** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission, subject to the finalising of conditions on the grounds that the proposal would make the best of use of the land available, would contribute to the aesthetic appearance of the area and it meets space and separation standards.

***Councillor Craddock was not present for the duration of item, in view of the fact that he had called it in. He duly returned to the meeting after this item had been concluded.***

10/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 9 – 18/0900 - FOXHILLS FARM BEACON ROAD ALDRIDGE - REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING FARMHOUSE, RIDING STABLES AND RIDING SCHOOL BY THE WAY OF AN ERECTION OF 4 NO. DWELLING HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING THE ALTERATION OF EXISTING SITE ACCESS, FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS ON SITE. (REVISION TO SCHEME APPROVED UNDER 14/1552/FL).**

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information / revised recommendation as set out within the tabled supplementary paper.

Mr Timothy was in attendance but indicated that he did not wish to speak as there were no objectors, but would be happy to answer any questions if required.

There were no questions by Members for either the speaker or Officers.

**Resolved** (unanimously)

That planning application no. **18/0900** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

***Councillor Perry left the meeting at the conclusion of this item and did not return.***

11/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 13 – 19/1104 - 36 RAILSWOOD DRIVE - FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION.**

The report of the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation was submitted

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein.

The Committee welcomed the first speaker on this item, Mr Timothy, who wished to speak in objection to this application.

Mr Timothy stated that he was acting on behalf of the neighbouring property. His clients did not object to the principal of the applicant extending their property. However, they objected to the extension being proposed due to its adverse impact, which would result from its siting, size, massing and the overbearing impact it would have on their property. In addition, the proposed development significantly breached the 45-degree rule and he urged the Committee to support the Officer's recommendation to refuse this application.

The Committee then welcomed the second speaker on this item, Mr Reeves, who wished to speak in support of this application.

Mr Reeves stated that he was the applicant. He reported that he had made his intentions to build an extension known to his neighbours very early on, and prior to the application being submitted. At that time, he was not aware of the 45-degree rule and was only made aware of it when speaking with a Planning Officer. The properties in question were staggered from east to west. Neither properties would be affected by loss of sunlight due to the sun's path and the orientation of the houses. The only loss of view for the neighbours would be into his garden. Whilst a loft and garage conversion had been considered, they were not viable. The neighbours had benefited from being able to build a similar extension, which appeared unfair to him.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers

Members had no questions for the speaker

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to: -

- If the application were to be refused by the Committee, could the applicant still build a loft conversion with a dormer window under permitted development rights. Officers advised that this was correct.
- If clarity could be provided with regard to the 45-degree rule in this case. Officers highlighted the rule on the presentation slide and confirmed that habitable rooms were where the measurements must be taken from.
- If there were other similar examples in the surrounding area, as suggest by Councillor Perry. The Officer advised that each case must be determined on its own merits and in this case, Officers could not support this application due to the adverse impact on the neighbouring property.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the application.

The Chair **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Nawaz:-

That planning application no. **19/1104** be refused for the reasons as set out within the report.

The Motion, having been put to the vote was declared carried with Members voting unanimously in favour:-

**Resolved** (unanimous)

That planning application no. **19/1104** be refused for the reasons as set out within the report.

12/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 12 – 19/0611 - LAND OFF MONTGOMERY ROAD, BENTLEY - DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING DISUSED GARAGES AND PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A PAIR OF SEMI-DETACHED TWO STOREY HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND GARDEN SHEDS.**

The report of the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation was submitted

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional

information / revised recommendation as set out within the tabled supplementary paper.

The Committee welcomed the only speaker on this item, Mr Connor, who wished to speak in support of this application.

Mr Connor stated that he was acting on behalf of WHG for this application. He highlighted that there had been a small number of objections from neighbours, but nothing of a material planning nature. More importantly, none of the statutory consultees had raised any objections to this application. In view of this, he urged the Committee to endorse the Officer's recommendation to approve.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers

Members had no questions for the speaker.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to: -

- If a ground survey for any mine shafts would be conducted. Officers advised that this would be covered as part of the existing conditions.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the application.

The Chair **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Samra:-

That planning application no. **19/0611** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions and subject to a S106 agreement to secure a landscape management plan, as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion, having been put to the vote was declared carried with Members voting unanimously in favour:-

**Resolved** (unanimous)

That planning application no. **19/0611** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions and subject to a S106 agreement to secure a landscape management plan, as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

13/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 1 – 19/1136 - LAND NORTH OF ROYAL OAK BOSTY LANE - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURAL TO A TWO FIELD SECURE DOG WALKING/EXERCISING FACILITY AND RELOCATION OF ACCESS APPROVED UNDER 17/1149.**

**Resolved** (unanimously)

That planning application no. **19/1136** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions, as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

14/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 3 – 19/0382 - LAND ADJACENT, 24 WOODWARDS ROAD - 13 NO. DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS ROAD, PARKING AND GARDENS.**

**Resolved** (unanimously)

That planning application no. **19/0382** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions and a Section 106 agreement to secure an Open space contribution a landscape management plan, as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

15/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 4 – 19/0679 - GREEN ROCK TAVERN - OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (ALL MATTERS RESERVED).**

**Resolved**

That planning application no. **19/0679** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions and subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure provision for affordable housing and open space, as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

16/20

**PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 5 – 19/0353 - CALDERFIELDS HOTEL GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB. CHANGE OF USE OF TWO ROOMS WITHIN GOLF ACADEMY BUILDING ASSOCIATED WITH SHORT DISTANCE PRACTICE AREA AND 9 HOLE GOLF COURSE TO PROVIDE A SPORTS INJURY TREATMENT ROOM AND A ROOM FOR BEAUTY PARLOUR/SPORTS INJURY THERAPY.**

**Resolved**

That planning application no. **19/0353** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions and a deed of variation to the S106 agreement to tie into the agreement for the original approval for 15/0455/FL as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

17/20      **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 6 – 18/1601 - CALDERFIELDS HOTEL GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB - 4 NEW FLOODLIGHTS TO BE FIXED TO THE NORTH EAST ELEVATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURE.**

**Resolved**

That planning application no. **18/1601** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions and resolution of the ecology concerns and a deed of variation to the Section 106 agreement to tie into the agreement for the original approval of 15/0455/FL as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

18/20      **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 8 – 19/1273 - NOTTINGHAM DRIVE - CONSTRUCTION OF CAR PARK AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.**

**Resolved**

That planning application no. **19/1273** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions as set out in the report and supplementary paper.

19/20      **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 11 – 19/1115 - BROWNHILLS WORKING MANS CLUB - ERECTION OF 4 HOUSES AND 1 BUNGALOW WITH ACCESS OFF HEDNESFORD ROAD AND LAWNOAKS CLOSE (REVISED SCHEME FROM 18/0687).**

**Resolved**

That planning application no. **19/1115** be delegated to the Interim Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission subject to the amendment and finalising of conditions as set out in the report and supplementary paper

**Termination of meeting**

There being no further business, the meeting terminated at 8.08 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

