

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at the **Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton. on Wednesday 9 May 2018.**

(9.00 - 11.20 am)

Present:

Members: Councillor Nick Weeks (Chairman)

Hayward Burt	Mike Lewis
Tony Capozzoli	William Wallace
Nick Colbert	Colin Winder
Anna Groskop	

Officers:

Helen Rutter	Communities Lead
Kelly Wheeler	Case Services Officer (Support Services)
Dominic Heath-Coleman	Planning Officer
Terena Isaacs	Community Support Assistant
Pam Williams	Neighbourhood Development Officer (East)

NB: Where an executive or key decision is made, a reason will be noted immediately beneath the Committee's resolution.

90. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 11th April, copies of which had been circulated, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments to minute number 89 – 17/04588/REM Vedelers Hey, Balsam Park, Wincanton.

Members agreed that the 5th paragraph on page 10 should read –

Councillor Colin Winder, Ward Member, advised that a S106 was agreed at the outline approval stage and suggested that an informative should be included to remind the applicant of this agreement. He also suggested that condition 11 did not comply with paragraphs 203 and 204 of the NPPF and should be removed as it was a legal matter and should be dealt with by a legal agreement. Councillor Mike Lewis suggested that it should be dealt with by way of an informative.

It was also suggested that informative 2 should be amended to include the additional wording at the end of the informative; *it should be dealt with by a legal agreement.*

The Case Services Officer agreed to clarify whether the planning permission decision notice had been issued and it was later agreed after the meeting that this additional amendment could not be included within the minutes of the previous meeting as this wasn't agreed at the meeting.

91. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies of absence were received from Councillors' David Norris, Mike Beech, Henry Hobhouse and Sarah Dyke.

The Chairman advised that the regulation committee had recently considered a planning application for a site in South Petherton, which had been approved by the Regulation Committee.

92. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Councillors William Wallace, Anna Groskop and Mike Lewis, members of SCC (Somerset County Council), would only declare an interest in any business on the agenda where there was a financial benefit or gain or advantage to SCC which would be at the cost or to the financial disadvantage to SSCC.

93. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted that the date of the next scheduled meeting of the committee will be at the Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton on Wednesday 13th June at 9am

94. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 5)

There were no questions from members of the public present.

95. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman made no announcements.

96. Reports from Members (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Mike Lewis highlighted the Local Government Boundary Commissioners review, the report for which had recently been published. He advised that there were changes proposed for Area East, pointing out the suggested new 3 member Ivelchester, Northstone and St Michaels Ward.

Councillor Colin Winder expressed his concern that planning applications were being encouraged for a site in Dimmer, however as the land use was unclear within the local plan and due to road safety concerns, applications were being refused and upheld on appeal. It was suggested that the Chairman would discuss this issue with the Planning Policy team. The Communities Lead agreed to arrange a meeting with the Chairman and Planning Policy officers to discuss the issue.

The Chairman advised that there was meeting to discuss to proposals for the A303 would be taking place this Friday in Yeovil.

97. The Balsam Centre - Allocation of Healthy Living Centre Funding for 2018/19 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 8)

The Neighbourhood Development Officer presented her report to members. She explained that the purpose of the report was to request authorisation from the committee to release the funds of £10,000 from the Healthy Living Budget towards the Balsam Centre.

She introduced Sue Place, the Chief Executive Officer for The Balsam Centre.

Sue Place informed members that the centre was doing extremely well and that more and more client referrals were being received. She explained that a wide variety of services were being provided and hoped that this funding would support the match funding requirement for the Lottery funded 'Like Minds' mental health project and would also encourage other funders to support the centre. She also advised members that a fourth counsellor had been employed to specifically support with men that required mental health support.

In response to a members question, the Neighbourhood Development Officer confirmed that the funding was historically a district-wide programme which was developed to support all 3 healthy living centres across the district, however as the Balsam Centre was the only remaining healthy living centre within the district, the budget, as well as the monitoring of the budget, was passed permanently to Area East Committee and ring-fenced for healthy living initiatives. She further advised that this was funding which was held in regular funding rather than in reserve funds.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that members noted the report and agreed to award the £10,000 ring-fenced for the Healthy Living Centres to the Balsam Centre for the delivery of their work programme.

On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that members noted the report and agreed to award the £10,000 ring-fenced for Healthy Living Initiatives from the Community Grants budget to the Balsam Centre for the delivery of their work programme.

(Voting: unanimous)

98. The Retail Support Initiative Update (Agenda Item 9)

The Community Support Assistant presented her report to members.

She advised that the report summarised the progress of the last year, included car park data and suggested alterations to the operating criteria of the Wincanton 'top-up' scheme to simply include units which had been empty for six months or more rather than specifying individual units.

She advised that information leaflets about the scheme are delivered to businesses in the three towns, Information for rural and farm shops are emailed to businesses which were thought to be eligible to advise them of the scheme.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded to note the report and to agree the amendments to the operating criteria.

The Neighbourhood Development Officer advised that the scheme had been less successful in rural settlements when compared to previous years. She explained that information packs had been sent to these businesses rather than hand delivered. She suggested to members that it would be useful if they were able to assist in providing leaflets about the grants to rural businesses if they were happy to.

In response to a question from a member, the Neighbourhood Development Officer explained that a tailored list of businesses which they felt were eligible could be made available to members to assist with delivering information packs to rural businesses. She also advised that she was aware that the Wincanton Town Centre Regeneration project would be commencing shortly and explained that an early review of the RSI scheme was suggested for early next so that the future delivery of the RSI scheme could be designed to complement the regeneration project recommendations.

On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that members noted the report and agreed the amendments to the operating criteria of the Retail Support Initiative.

(Voting: unanimous)

99. Area East Annual Parish & Town Council Meeting Summary of Issues Raised - For information (Agenda Item 10)

The Neighbourhood Development Officer presented her report to members. She advised that the event was well-attended and that a lot of information was delivered on the evening.

In response to a members' question, the Communities Lead confirmed that CDS would soon be launching the next phase and advised that the SSDC funding had been withheld until the second phase had been launched and clarity over the future scheme had been given by CDS. Another member advised that Gigaclear would be unable to provide broadband in Yeovilton until next year.

Concern was raised from another member that residents were receiving scam phone calls offering to assist with providing broadband. The Communities Lead advised that she would discuss this with the Avon and Somerset Police and notify parish clerks of the best method to be informed of any current scams.

During the discussion, the broadband speeds on the Wincanton Trading Estate and other rural businesses were mentioned. The Neighbourhood Development Officer confirmed that she was aware that there was a critical need for superfast broadband on the Wincanton Trading Estate. She explained that businesses on the estate were already investigating alternative providers and she would continue to seek clarification from CDS about the programme delivery and coverage.

The Communities Lead pointed out to members that a new voucher scheme would be available imminently and that this could be a way forward for rural communities.

RESOLVED: that members noted the report.

100. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 11)

The chairman agreed with the Committee that a workshop on the new style of Area Plans should be held after the June meeting, subject to the volume of planning applications.

Members noted that there would be a confidential report on the June agenda to discuss legal advice concerning planning application appeal 17/03029/OUT at Henstridge.

Members asked for an update report on the Wincanton Regeneration Programme.

In August there will be a report on the Heart of Wessex Rail Partnership seeking a funding contribution.

A member asked if the local plan would be brought back to Area East Committee. The Area Communities Lead agreed to discuss the process for finalising the plan with the Spatial Planning team.

Members also asked that further work be done to inform and liaise with parishes about the changes occurring due to the SSDC Transformation process.

It was agreed that the Wincanton Hospital report would be removed from the Forward Plan.

Members noted the Area East Committee Forward Plan.

101. Planning Appeals (For Information Only) (Agenda Item 12)

Members noted the planning appeal which had been received.

102. Action List (For Information Only) (Agenda Item 13)

Members noted the action list.

103. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 14)

Members noted the Schedule of Planning Applications to be determined by Committee.

104. 17/02643/OUT - Land At Dancing Lane Wincanton (Agenda Item 15)

Application Proposal: Outline application for up to 23 dwellings with approval for means of access sought and all other matters reserved for future consideration.

The Area Lead Planning Officer presented his report to members. He explained that the application had been referred to Area East Committee twice before; it was deferred the first time and subsequently approved the second time subject to conditions and the prior completion of a S106 or Unilateral Undertaking to secure a planning obligation review mechanism to secure financial surplus.

He advised members that following ongoing negotiations with the applicant, the applicant was not prepared to sign an agreement to secure the review mechanism. He advised that he had sought legal advice and reviewed case law and it was his recommendation that the application be approved, without a section 106 and to no longer seek to secure a planning obligation review mechanism.

The Chairman advised that the application had been 2-starred under the scheme of delegation and would be referred to the Regulation Committee should the application be refused.

In response to a members' question, the Senior Planning Lawyer confirmed that the planning application could be approved without a S106 agreement. She also advised that this would not be setting a precedent as this application had received specific advice and had been looked at in some detail.

The Area Lead Planning Officer confirmed that the application would still be liable to make CIL contributions. He also advised that he felt that it would be difficult to defend an appeal against non-determination. He also clarified that the original application was for 25 dwellings; however this application was for 23 dwellings.

Councillor Nick Colbert, Ward Member, advised that he had never supported development on this land; however his view had been over-ruled by The Planning Inspectorate. He felt that the best option would be to approve this application without the S106 agreement and the uplift clause. He also commented that the applicant had been very patient as the application had taken a long time to be approved.

Councillor Colin Winder, also Ward Member, agreed that he did not agree with the appeal decision to allow development on this land; however felt that the best option would be to support the officer's recommendation.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as per the officer recommendation.

On being put to the vote, this was carried 6 votes in support with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: that planning application 17/02643/OUT be **approved** as per the officer recommendation for the following reason;

01. The principle of residential development in this sustainable location on the edge of a market town is considered acceptable. The proposed development of the site would respect the character of the area, with no demonstrable harm to the setting of the nearby listed building, highway safety, flood risk and drainage, protected species, or residential amenity. As such the proposal complies with local plan policies SD1, SS1, SS5, SS6, TA5, TA6, HG3, EQ2, EQ3, EQ4, and HW1, and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

Subject to the following conditions;

01. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale of the development hereby permitted (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: As required by Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: As required by Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

03. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan at 1:5000 scale, received 20 June 2017.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

04. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures detailed in section 4 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (EAD, Sep 2014) unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: For the protection, conservation, and enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with NPPF chapter 11.

05. No works shall commence on the site until the works within the public highway shown on drawing 13780/T04, received 20 June 2017, have been fully implemented. A detailed design and specification for those works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any works take place and thereafter be adhered to in full.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

06. Any proposed roads approved at the reserved matters stage, including footpaths and turning spaces where applicable, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling, before it is occupied, shall be served by a properly consolidated and surfaced footpath and carriageway constructed to at least base course level between the dwelling and the existing public highway of Dancing Lane. The roads shall be subsequently completed in accordance with an approved timetable. The timetable shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority before any dwelling so served is first occupied.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

07. Before each dwelling hereby permitted is first occupied, a properly consolidated and surfaced access linking it to the relevant access road shall be constructed in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These access shall not be surfaced in loose stone or gravel.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

08. As part of a reserved matters application, a plan showing parking spaces in accordance with the Somerset County Council Parking Strategy shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the local planning authority. Each parking space shall be properly consolidated in the approved manner before any dwelling it is intended to serve is first occupied and shall thereafter be made available at all times solely for the parking of vehicles in association with those dwellings.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

09. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a construction management plan has been submitted to an approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of construction vehicle movements, construction operation hours, construction vehicular routes to and from the site, construction delivery hours, expected number of construction vehicles per day, vehicle parking for contractors, specific measures to adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of compliance with the Environmental Code of Construction Practice and a scheme to encourage the use of public transport by contractors, The plan as approved shall be fully adhered to at all times through the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity and in accordance with policies EQ2, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

10. As part of a reserved matters application, details of a 'no build zone' shall be submitted in plan form to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The 'no build zone' shall correspond closely to the area shown as undeveloped on illustrative layout site layout plan ref no 1174/03 dated 30 July 2014 and submitted as part of application 14/01704/OUT. No development shall take place within the 'no build zone' other than any that may be required in association with any approved drainage scheme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

11. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of a scheme for the protection of trees and vegetation around the periphery of the site, and specifically in the vicinity of Verrington Lodge, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be adhered to in full throughout all phases of construction activity relevant thereto.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

12. As part of a reserved matters application, details of measures for the enhancement of biodiversity, to include a landscape and ecology enhancement and management plan relating specifically to the 'no build zone', shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of conserving and enhancing biodiversity in accordance with policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

13. Prior to, and within 2 months of, the commencement of each significant stage of ground works, an update survey for badger setts shall be undertaken by a competent person, the identity of whom shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. A schedule of the said significant stages shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development commences. If any badger setts are found to be present within 30 metres (including on adjoining land) of any area of activity, the works shall not proceed until a method statement for the protection of badgers has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and any necessary Natural England licences have been obtained. Any method statement thus approved shall be implemented in full in the approved manner.

Reason: in the interests of conserving and enhancing biodiversity in accordance with policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

14. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until such time as a surface water drainage scheme (to include a full drainage masterplan, associated drainage calculations and a management plan governing future responsibility for and maintenance of the scheme) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained and managed in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements and management plan embodied within it.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and protecting against flood risk and in accordance with local plan policy EQ1 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development, a Measures only Travel Plan Statement is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such Travel Plan should include soft and hard measures to promote sustainable travel as well as targets and safeguards by which to measure the success of the plan. There should be a timetable for implementation of the measures and for the monitoring of travel habits. The development shall not be occupied unless the agreed measures are being implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable. The measures should continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and sustainable development and in accordance with policies SS1, SD1, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

Informatives:

01. The applicant will be required to enter into a suitable legal agreement with the Highway Authority to secure the construction of the highway works necessary as part of this development. Please ensure that an advisory note is attached requesting that the developer contact the Highway Authority to progress this agreement well in advance of commencement of development.

02. Development, insofar as it affects a right of way should not be started, and the right of way should be kept open for public use until the necessary (diversion/stopping up) Order has come into effect. Failure to comply with this request may result in the developer being prosecuted if the path is built on or otherwise interfered with.
03. The developer should be aware of the concerns of the SSDC Conservation Officer in regard to the submitted indicative layout and the likely impact on the setting of the nearby listed building. Similarly the developer should be aware of local concerns in regard to the submitted indicative layout as to the potential impact on the residential amenity of adjoining residents. Before submitting any reserved matters application the developer is advised to contact the planning department to discuss how the indicative layout could be amended to address the above concerns.
04. Please be advised that subsequent full or reserved matters approval by South Somerset District Council will attract a liability payment under the Community Infrastructure Levy. CIL is a mandatory financial charge on development and you will be notified of the amount of CIL being charged on this development in a CIL Liability Notice.

You are required to complete and return Form 1 Assumption of Liability as soon as possible and to avoid additional financial penalties it is important that you notify us of the date you plan to commence development before any work takes place Please complete and return Form 6 Commencement Notice. You are advised to visit our website for further details <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/cil> or email cil@southsomerset.gov.uk

(Voting: 6 in support with 1 abstention)

105. 18/00481/FUL - Border Farm Border Lane Brewham (Agenda Item 16)

Application Proposal: Change of use of land to residential and the conversion of existing garage to annexe ancillary to dwelling with oak framed extension and timber decking. Proposed installation of two conservation style roof lights to dwelling.

The Planning Officer presented his report to members. He used a PowerPoint presentation to provide images of the site and plans to show the proposed annexe. He also indicated the area of land which the applicants proposed to use as residential. He suggested to members that the site was in an isolated location and felt that the annexe could be considered tantamount to being a new dwelling. However, he confirmed that there was little scope to develop the existing dwelling.

Councillor Mike Beech, Ward Member, had given an apology for his absence at the meeting, however another Ward Member read out his comments. Councillor Mike Beech's comments included;

Brewham was a SS2 community, having two pubs, a church and a village hall. The Parish Council supported the application and that there were no local objections. The applicants should be applauded for their desire to provide support for aging relatives. He would be happy to see a non-fragmentation condition applied should Committee be minded to apply one. He hoped that the application be approved.

In response to a members question, the Planning Officer confirmed that the application was for an ancillary annexe, however was not physically attached to the main residence and appeared to have its own separate garden, which gave concern that the annexe could be considered as being a separate dwelling.

Another member pointed out that the application was for an annexe, not a dwelling and questioned whether it could be tied to the main dwelling through a condition or agreement. He also pointed out that the Parish Council had supported the application and offered his own support to the application.

It was proposed that the application should be approved as the existing garage caused no harm. Another member agreed and explained that he felt that the site was situated within an SS2 settlement.

In response to further questions, the Planning Officer confirmed that the annexe would use the existing access and that there was no opportunity for an additional access.

A member raised concern over the separate garden which was proposed as the large size of the garden gives the impression of being a separate dwelling.

The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that he did not recommend a condition to tie the annexe to the existing dwelling as planning permission would need to be obtained to subdivide the annexe from the existing dwelling before the annexe could be used as a separate dwelling and that these such conditions were not very effective.

It was suggested that an informative could be added to ensure that the applicant is aware that the permission would be given for the building to be used as annexe accommodation only.

During the discussion, the Area Lead Planning Officer advised that the location was not considered an SS2 location as the site was not an easy walking distance from the local services.

It was subsequently seconded that the planning application should be approved, contrary to the officer recommendation as the application was situated within a SS2 settlement, subject to a time limit restriction condition and an informative to advise the applicant that the building should be used as annexe accommodation only.

On being put to the vote, this was carried 5 in support and 2 against.

RESOLVED: that planning permission 18/00481/FUL be **approved**, contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reason:

01. The proposed annexe conversion is considered to be acceptable in this location and, by reason of its size, design, and materials is considered to respect the character of the area, and causes no adverse impact on residential amenity, the setting of the listed building, or highway safety, in accordance with policies SS2, EQ2, EQ3, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

Subject to the following conditions:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1378/001; 1378/002; 1378/003; 1378/004 and 1378/005 Rev.A received 9th February 2018.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

And informative:

The applicant should be aware that this approval relates to the use of the subject building (as extended) as an annexe only, forming a single planning unit with the host property, known as Border Farm. Any use of the accommodation hereby approved for any purposes other than as ancillary to the residential use of Border Farm, will require planning permission in its own right.

(Voting: 5 in support, 2 against)

106. 18/00403/FUL - The Orchard Inn Galhampton Hill North Cadbury (Agenda Item 17)

Application Proposal: The installation of 7 replacement windows and a means of fire escape to first floor

The Planning Officer presented his report to members. He advised that the application site was in a conservation area; however it was not a listed building. He advised that it was important that the historical features of the building were retained.

He explained that the Conservation Officer had stated that standard uPVC windows will harm the setting of the adjacent listed building.

Using PowerPoint he provided images of the site and drawings to show which windows would be replaced.

Mr M Hunt, representing the Parish Council, addressed members. He advised that the applicant had worked hard to establish a business and intended to remain in the village and he was pleased that he was working to smarten up the building. He explained that The Orchard Inn was close to unsightly buildings and that he disagreed with the comments of the Conservation Officer. He also pointed out that the building already had a rear uPVC conservatory.

Mr D Brown, the applicant addressed members. He advised that The Orchard Inn was not in a conservation area and not listed. He also advised members that the building already had a conservatory on the rear and other uPVC windows already installed; he thought that matching windows would look better. The windows proposed would match the existing uPVC windows and the windows on the cottage opposite. He pointed out that the windows were rated higher for safety and security and were in-keeping.

Councillor Nick Weeks, the Ward Member, explained that the other Ward Member, Councillor Henry Hobhouse had given his apologies for being unable to attend the meeting but had passed his views to Councillor Weeks. Councillor Hobhouse had asked Cllr Weeks to mention that the building already had a uPVC conservatory on the rear of the building.

Councillor Nick Weeks advised that he wanted to encourage businesses and that the new homes approved nearby would likely have uPVC windows installed. He recommended that the application be approved.

Following the discussion, members commented that businesses should be supported and that modern uPVC windows can look good and last a long time.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved, contrary to the officer recommendation.

On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously that the application be approved, subject to a time limit condition.

RESOLVED: that planning application 18/00403/FUL be **approved**, contrary to the officer recommendation, subject to conditions;

For the following reason:

01. The replacement windows, by virtue of their materials, form and design are appropriate on this building and would not detract from the character and appearance of the property and the setting of the adjacent listed building in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset local Plan and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

Subject to the following condition;

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details and specifications on the following approved plans: Details and drawings received on 05 February 2018, details received on 14 February 2018 and details received by email from the applicant on 15 March 2018.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

(Voting: unanimous)

Chairman