

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday 4 March, 2021 at 5.30pm

Digital Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Held in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulation 2020; and conducted according to the Council's Standing Orders for Remote Meetings and those set out in the Council's Constitution.

Present:

Councillor Bird (Chair)
Councillor Perry (Vice Chair)
Councillor P. Bott
Councillor Chattha
Councillor Craddock
Councillor Harris
Councillor Harrison
Councillor Hicken
Councillor Jukes
Councillor Murray
Councillor Nawaz
Councillor M. Nazir
Councillor Rasab
Councillor Robertson
Councillor Samra
Councillor Sarohi
Councillor M. Statham
Councillor Underhill
Councillor Waters

Officers:

Phillipa Venables – Director, Regeneration and Economy
Alison Ives – Head of Planning and Building Control
Michael Brereton – Group Manager – Planning
Leon Carroll – Senior Planning Officer
Sharon Bennett-Matthews - Solicitor, Planning & Environment
Kevin Gannon – Highways Development Control and Public Rights of Way
Cameron Gibson – Regeneration Officer, Trees
Beverley Mycock – Democratic Services Officer

Welcome

At this point in the meeting, the Chair welcomed everyone and explained the rules of procedure and legal context in which the meeting was being held. He also directed members of the public viewing the meeting to the papers, which could be found on the Council's Committee Management Information system (CMIS) webpage.

Members in attendance confirmed they could both see and hear the proceedings.

33/21 Apologies

No apologies had been submitted.

34/21 Minutes of 4 February, 2021

The Chair **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Craddock that the minutes of the meeting held on 4 February, 2021, a copy having been previously circulated to each Member of the Committee, be approved and signed as a true record.

The Chair put the recommendation to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members.

Resolved (unanimous)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2021, be approved and signed as a true record.

35/21 Declarations of Interest.

There were no declarations of interest.

36/21 Deputations and Petitions

There were no deputations introduced or petitions submitted.

37/21 Local Government (Access to Information) Act, 1985 (as amended)

There were no items to consider in private session.

38/21 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, the Chair advised them on the procedure whereby each speaker would have two minutes to speak.

The Chair reminded Members that should they be minded to go against officer's recommendations, planning reasons must be provided.

39/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 3 – 20/1003 – THE CAMBRIDGE, ARUNDEL STREET, WALSALL, WS1 4BY – RE-SUBMISSION OF (19/0949): PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM A FORMER PUBLIC HOUSE (A4 USE CLASS) TO A DAY NURSERY (D1 USE CLASS) WITH THE CREATION OF 2 NEW OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES, A CYCLE STORAGE, AND RE-OPENING THE FORMER CENTRAL FRONT ACCESS, THE NURSERY WILL RUN BETWEEN 7:30 – 18:00 MONDAY – FRIDAY, FOR TODDLERS AND YOUNG CHILDREN.**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted

(see annexed)

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

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

Councillor Ditta stated that she was speaking on behalf of local residents. The residents were not against the day nursery in principal only the unsuitability of its location. The immediate street was a very narrow, one-way street and not suitable for dropping off children at the nursery due to existing parking problems and heavy traffic within the location. Although the nursery was aiming to cater predominately for the local community who could walk there to drop off their children, this may not always be the case. The nursery would be situated in a one-way street and on the corner of a junction and therefore there were concerns what impact the development would have on traffic and traffic movement.

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

Mrs Kang stated that she was the applicant and had been managing nurseries for 18 years and owned an established nursery in Walsall. The former public house had remained vacant for a number of years due to poor demand by locals. The disused property would be converted into a day nursery that would provide jobs for the local community and much needed nursery places for local 2, 3 and 4 year old children, some of whom may be vulnerable, disadvantaged and have English as an additional language. Mrs Kang assured Committee that nursery start and end time sessions would be staggered to reduce an influx of parents arriving at the same time to alleviate traffic issues and noise concerns although most parents would be from the local community and within walking distance. The previous use as a public house would have generated noise during the evenings and weekends whereas the nursery would operate Monday to Friday and close at 6pm. The day nursery would be registered and monitored by Ofsted.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers.

Members queried the following:-

- Had residents experienced any problems with anti-social behaviour or traffic issues when the PH had been in operation? Councillor Ditta stated that the main objection from residents was in relation to any potential traffic generated by a day nursery. Parents would drop off children in cars and taxis whereas the PH did not generate much traffic.
- In what location was the applicant's other day nursery? Mrs Kang advised that her other day nursery was located on Lincoln Road in the Chuckery and had been operating for seven years.
- How would staff parking and parents dropping off their children be facilitated? Mrs Kang advised that she would target and recruit staff from the local community within walking distance. With regards to parents driving to drop off their children, Mrs Kang stated that child attendances would be tailored to meet parents' needs and there would therefore be staggered drop offs. She added that in her current nursery, she had worked with the local school in relation to start times to eliminate any potential influx of traffic and she stated that the proposed day nursery would be operated in a similar way. There was on-street parking available around the premises during the day, which would enable parents to park temporarily to drop off their children.
- Would the nursery be open on weekends? Mrs Kang confirmed that it would not operate during the weekend.
- Was there not a local need for a day nursery following the closure of Palfrey Day Nursery? Councillor Ditta stated that there was a demand and that her only concern was the location of the proposal on a junction.
- Would it be a private or supported nursery for local children only and would staff be from the local community also? Mrs Kang advised Committee it would be a private nursery and would also provide state funded places for families on low income and with English as an additional language. She stated that she could not guarantee that all children would be from the local area and ideally she would like the employees to be the local area but again that could not be guaranteed.

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

- Whether the street was one-way only and would that result in an impact on parking and congestion? The Presenting Officer confirmed that the street was one-way but that officers that not feel the proposal would create any additional impact on traffic or parking.

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

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

That planning application number **20/1003** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and subject to finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with nineteen Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

That planning application number **20/1003** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and subject to finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Solicitor, Planning and Environment read out the resolution for the benefit of Members and the public

40/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 4 – 19/0846 – 4 FIELD MAPLE ROAD, STREETLY, SUTTON COLDFIELD, B74 2AD – CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED 6 BEDROOM PROPERTY 2.5 STOREY HIGH ON LAND ADJANCE TO 4 FIELD MAPLE ROAD.**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted

(see annexed)

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

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

Mr. Wheeler stated that there were a number of terraced houses nearby and he lived in close vicinity to the proposed development, which would overshadow his property. He would want the trees to be kept because should they be removed from the side of the proposed plot, he would experience loss of privacy and his property would be affected by loss of sunlight behind the top of the proposed house as his property was on lower ground than that of the application site. Mr. Wheeler stated that his property would be impacted upon greatly by such a large building overshadowing his premises

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

Mr. Deffley stated that he was speaking on behalf of his client. The scheme was based on an approved house design within Field Maple Road, which shared similarities including situated next to the same zone of trees. The proposed house would be set into the ground on the one side and above the ground on the other side due to the cross section gradient. The original proposal was for 2.5 storeys with a gable roof and we were only asked to reduce the height and mass of the building in the last month. The design now

met amenity and spatial standards and reflected adjacent properties. The narrow line of protected trees along the side of the site were within a private garden and any trees lost would be replaced with new, superior specimens that would add to the local amenity. Mr. Deffley added that his client had been in dialogue with the Council's Tree Officer in relation to the narrow group of self-seeding trees within the application site and that this would be explained further by the next speaker. Mr. Deffley advised that the application had taken nineteen months with four different planning officers to reach the stage it was at currently and he did not feel the application had been given enough attention over that length of time. In concluding, he requested that Members approve the application.

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

Mr. Allen stated that he wished to speak in relation to the arboricultural issues within the site. Three trees been identified for removal due to their poor condition regardless of the planning application and five trees would be required to be removed as part of the application. This could be mitigated by the planting of alternative species of trees that would better add to the screening value to the adjoining property. The TPO was a woodland order. It included a number of trees on the opposite side of the public right of way which clearly represented a woodland setting but also included a linear belt of trees within the boundary of the applicant's property. The applicant had requested the removal of 5 trees to facilitate the development. Mr. Allen stated that whilst the removal of the trees may impact slightly on the remaining trees, the positioning of the building would act as a wind-block from prevailing winds thus protecting the 10 remaining trees. He further added that whilst he appreciated and respected the Authorities tree officer, the proposed replacement planting of more superior species of trees had not been taken into consideration.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers.

Members queried the following:-

- How many trees would need to be removed in total Mr. Allen advised that 8 trees in total would need to be removed, 3 of which were in poor condition including a silver birch and a Scots pine. The applicant would replace the 8 trees with inter-planting of Holly under the existing retained trees to enhance the screening for the neighbouring property. A number of more superior, heavy standard trees would be planted along the rear boundary
- Had the applicant considered amending the dwelling design to prevent damage or removal of trees? Mr. Deffley advised that his client had already reduced the mass and height of the property. He stated that the trees required for removal were spindly and not in as good quality as other trees around the area and that the proposed dwelling would be of a similar size to other homes within the location.
- Where would the replacement trees be located and would they be of a similar height? Mr. Allen stated there would be replacement planting within the context of the existing gap to retain screening to either the front or the rear of the property for amenity value. The replacement trees could be of varying ages and heights to ensure their maturity at different times.

- Could the speakers comment on the Tree Officers concerns that the removal of the trees would put pressure on the remaining trees? Mr. Allen advised that trees in close proximity to each other do protect each other but that the building would act as a wind shield for the remaining trees.

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

- Could the Tree Officer clarify that what pressure would be put on the remaining trees should the indicated trees be removed? The Tree Officer stated that he was in agreement for the removal of 3 of the trees due to their poor condition but the removal of the other 5 trees would have a impact on the remaining trees. By way of explanation, the Tree Officer stated that the land was steeply graded downwards. The removal of trees from a group that provided collective shade and shelter from adverse weather conditions may increase the risk that the remaining trees may fail. The removal of 1 of the 2 large Scot pines would increase the failure of the remaining Scot pine due to the loss of its shelter and support which was compounded by the sloping ground. The other trees to the front whilst spindly, provided a cohesive group that provided shelter to each other and should they were split up, there would be a risk of their failure in adverse weather. He added that prevailing winds emanated from the southwest and therefore the building would unlikely provide shelter to the trees.
- Was the Scot pine to be removed diseased? The Tree Officer confirmed the Scot pine trees were both healthy.
- Was it likely a disease could pass between trees? The Tree Officer advised that one of the silver birch trees for removal was diseased but it would be unlikely the disease would spread as any disease would stay within its respective species.
- Were the trees not suppressed being planted so close together and were their roots entwined? The Tree Officer stated that some of the trees may have been self setters and the roots systems would be entwined. Some of the smaller trees may have been suppressed due to natural competition but there would be a risk to the remaining trees should the smaller trees be removed.
- Had the application been refused purely on the grounds of the protected trees and would it not be acceptable for the applicant to replace the 8 trees with healthier specimens than the current trees on site? The Tree Officer advised that the removal of the 5 protected trees would cause a considerable detrimental impact on the remaining trees and may result in tree failure to any of the remaining trees. This could then cause a hazard to the application house or to a neighbouring property.

Members considered the application and Councillor Hicken **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Bott:-

That planning application number **19/0846** be refused, for the reasons contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with nineteen Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimously)

That planning application number **19/0846** be refused for the reasons contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Solicitor, Planning and Environment read out the resolution for the benefit of Members and the public

41/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 5 – 20/0559 – 61 MANOR ROAD, STREETLY, B74 3NF – ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING.**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted

(see annexed)

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

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

Mr. Sugden stated that he was the applicant. He acknowledged there had been objections from neighbours around the application being a detached property. He stated there were numerous detached dwellings along Thorley Road and 19 detached properties within Manor Road and he believed an additional, detached property would be in keeping in the area. In relation to the outside of the building, he would render all sides of the dwelling in white as per the existing buildings within the street scene. The driveway to number 61 Manor Road allowed for up to 6 vehicles and driveway would be split and shared with the proposed new dwelling and each driveway would accommodate 3 vehicles. Mr. Sugden thanked officers for the planning advice provided.

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

Members considered the application and Councillor Craddock **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Statham:-

That planning application number **20/0559** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with nineteen Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimously)

That planning application number **20/0559** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Solicitor, Planning and Environment read out the resolution for the benefit of Members and the public

42/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM 7 – 20/1541 – 75 LINCOLN ROAD, WALSALL, WS1 2DW – FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH FRONT DORMER AND ADDITION OF NEW PITCHED CANOPY OVER GROUND FLOOR BAY WINDOW**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted

(see annexed)

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

The Committee then welcomed the first speaker on this item, Mrs Padden, who wished to speak in objection to this application.

Mrs Padden stated that she lived in Princess Avenue, which was just round the corner from the proposal. The orientation and proximity of the houses makes the angles between them quite sharp and very close to one another. There was a significant difference in the ground levels between properties, with the application property already being 1.5m above her own. The extended roof on the extension would be overbearing and create shadowing which would impact on both her property and on her neighbour's property greatly by blocking the sky line and obscuring sunlight. Mrs Padden stated that neither her neighbours nor herself had been contacted by officers following a site visit to the applicant in order to view the situation from their view point. The roof of the existing single storey extension should have been designed to limit the impact on neighbours to the rear of the site. However the extended roof within the plans would have a significant impact on the existing situation and would take make her light amenity even worse that what it currently was. Mrs Padden concluded by stating that any additional update extension to the property in question would have further unacceptable and detrimental impact on her property and she asked that permission be refused.

The Committee then welcomed the second speaker on this item, Mrs Russell, who also wished to speak in objection to this application

Mrs Russell stated that she was speaking to support the first speaker, Mrs Padden's objections. Mrs Russell stated that the proposal did not affect her personally as her amenity had already been lost following previous extensions carried out under permitted development rights. She stated that she had not

been aware of any site visit by officers. The extension would appear dominating in Mrs Padden's garden and would be detrimental to her amenity. Mrs Russell said the property was already out of keeping within the area and that a site visit to Princess Avenue by officers would demonstrate the concerns of the neighbouring properties.

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

Mrs Iqbal stated that the extension was required as she had five children and her teenage son was currently sharing a bedroom with a younger sibling. Her elder son needed his own space in order to be able to study. She stated that she had worked with planning officers following a 2017 refusal and the plans had been amended accordingly with regard to reducing the height and width of the extension. Mrs Iqbal added that the previous reasons for refusal in relation to impact on neighbouring and surrounding properties had now been overcome.

There were no questions by Members for the speakers.

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

- Had officers made contact with Mrs Padden with regard to the site visit to check whether the proposal would be overbearing? The Presenting Officer advised that officers would always try to capture the surrounding environment and surrounding properties. In this instance, a photograph had been provided by Mrs Padden for consideration. He added that site ground levels would have been picked up and factored into their decision.
- Would the increase in the roof line impact on sunlight into the neighbouring properties? The Presenting Officer provided a visual diagram of the sunlight onto the nearby properties at varying times throughout the day. He advised that due to the orientation of the site, the impact in relation to loss of light already occurred from the existing two-storey dwelling and therefore there was no indication that the extension would create any additional loss of light. The previous reasons for refusal related to a much more substantial extension. The new application included a pitched room that would allow for more light to pass over and officers did not consider that a significant reason for refusal.
- Would the proposal have any detrimental impact to properties in Princess Avenue? The Presenting Officer advised that the proposal to the front of the property would be of a modest scale and would have no impact to Princess Avenue.

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

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

That planning application number **20/1541** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 12 Members voting in favour, 6 Members voting against and 1 Member abstaining.

Resolved (12 in favour, 6 against and 1 abstained)

That planning application number **20/1541** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Solicitor, Planning and Environment read out the resolution for the benefit of Members and the public

43/21 **PLANS LIT ITEM 10 – 20/0767 – 5 YARE GROVE, WILLENHALL, WV13 2SH – SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted

(see annexed)

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

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

Mr. Dhanoa stated that the proposed extension would come very close to his garden fence, which would result in a loss of privacy and the nearby gardens were already small and compact. The extension was too large and would bring the building another 8m closer to his home. Mr Dhanoa stated that he could already hear the neighbours from his living room without the dwelling being extended even closer. He raised concerns with regard to additional noise and smells emanating from the new kitchen area which would be closer to his adjoining fence and he hoped the application could either be reduced in size or that permission be refused.

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

Mr. Kalsi stated that discussions had taken place between the applicant and Planning Officers and that the plans had been amended to reduce the size of the proposed side and rear extension. The current extension would have been approved under permitted development rights (PDR) had PDR not be removed for all properties within the estate. Mr. Kalsi alluded to extensions and conservatories in a number of already small, nearby gardens and that a number of properties within close proximity all had single extensions. In closing, Mr. Kalsi advised that all of the objections received had been considered by officers and that officers had no further concerns.

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

Members considered the application and Councillor Craddock **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Statham:-

That planning application number **20/0767** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with nineteen Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimously)

That planning application number **20/0767** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

The Solicitor, Planning and Environment read out the resolution for the benefit of Members and the public

44/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM 1 – 20/1151 – SHORT HEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL, PENNINE WAY AND ROSEDALE CHURCH OF ENGLAND INFANT SCHOOL, STROUD AVENUE, WILLENHALL**

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

Resolved(unanimously by roll-call)

That planning application number **20/1151** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

45/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM 2 – 20/0365 – WATLING STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL, WATLING STREET, WALSALL, WS1 4BY – PROPOSED 9.0M X 7.2M MODULE BUILDING TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TEACHING SPACE, TOILETS AND ABLUTION AREA.**

Councillor Craddock **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Samra and:

Resolved (unanimously by roll-call)

That planning application number **20/0365** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

46/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM 6 – 20/1526 – DARLASTON HEALTH CENTRE, PINFOLD STREET, DARLASTON, WEDNESBURY, WS10 8SY – ERECTION OF SECURE BIN STORE IN EXISTING CAR PARK AND WIDENING OF EXISTING RAMP TO MAIN ENTRANCE. PROPOSED BIN STORE TO CONTAIN CLINICAL AND NON-CLINICAL WASTE, INCLUDING COVID-19 RELATED WASTE**

Councillor Bott **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by the Chair and:

Resolved (unanimously by roll-call)

That planning application number **20/1526** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission subject to conditions and subject to the finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

47/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM 8 – 20/0927 – 95 PARK HALL ROAD, WALSALL, WS5 3HS – FIRST FLOOR REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION AND CONSERVATORY**

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

Resolved (unanimously by roll-call))

That planning application number **20/0927** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the amendment and finalising of planning conditions, as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

48/21 **PLANS LIST ITEM 9 – 20/1294 – 57 DICKINSON DRIVE, WALSALL, WS2 9DL – TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS.**

Councillor Sarohi **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by the Chair and:

Resolved (unanimously by roll-call)

That planning application number **20/1294** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and subject to finalising of conditions, as contained within the report.

49/21 **Termination of meeting**

There being no further business, the meeting terminated at 8.00 pm

Chair

Date