

# **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 2023, 7.10 - 8.35 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett, Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Cathy Brennan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor George Dunstall, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Matt White, and Councillor Alexandra Worrell.

## **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

## **2. PLANNING PROTOCOL**

The Chair referred to the planning protocol and this information was noted.

## **3. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair) and Councillor Yvonne Say. Councillor Cathy Brennan was present as substitute.

## **4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor John Bevan declared an interest in relation to Item 9, HGY/2022/0664 – 175 Willoughby Lane, London N17 0RX, as he had commented on the scheme during the consultation period. He noted that these were observations and had not been made in his role as a ward councillor. It was clarified that he would be considering the item with an open mind and would take part in the discussion and voting on the item.

## **6. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 10 October 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Chair referred to the note on planning applications and this information was noted.

## **8. HGY/2022/4415 - 103-107 NORTH HILL, HORNSEY, LONDON, N6 4DP**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a new care home (Class C2 - Residential Institution), together with a well-being and physiotherapy centre. The proposed care home includes up to 70 bedrooms, hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon, restaurant, café, lounge, bar, wellbeing shop general shop, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, landscaping and associated works.

Valerie Okeiyi, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Planning Officer highlighted that a late representation had been received from 1A View Road which had been summarised in the addendum. For information, the text of the representation was displayed for those present to read in full.
- In response to a query, it was corrected that the Committee had considered an application for this site and approved planning permission in October 2022, rather than October 2021.

Aurell Taussig spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he lived next to the site and had spoken in objection to the application previously. He believed that the developer should be required to adjust the design of the scheme to reduce the loss of light for his garden and windows. It was stated that the proposal would be taller, bulkier, and wider than the existing building. In relation to sunlight, Aurell Taussig commented that he would experience a loss of more than 50%; he believed that this was not permitted as it would be in excess of the maximum permitted loss of 20% as set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines.

It was highlighted that the report commented that, as the neighbouring garden was overshadowed by the existing building and by trees, that there was no entitlement to additional protection. Aurell Taussig stated that the assessment did not make sense, was contrary to the Council's policy on daylight and sunlight, and wrongly focused on the existing situation rather than the impact of the new development. He noted that his dining room would experience a high reduction in winter light, which would be in breach of the BRE guidelines, and he felt that his comments had been ignored. He believed that the development would lead to a sense of enclosure in his garden and would result in a loss of amenity and privacy; it was stated that planning permission had been refused on these grounds in previous cases on Yeatman Road and Southwood Lawn Road and it was felt that decisions should be consistent. It was requested that planning policy was applied and that the design for the proposal was changed to lessen the impact on surrounding properties.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Mitesh Dhanak, Applicant (Highgate Care Ltd), stated that he had worked in the care sector for 25 years, had operated a number of successful and award winning care homes, and had been operating in Haringey since 2008 at Priscilla Wakefield House. It was stated that the scheme would support 90 jobs, would retain care use on the site, and would provide a spacious and modern, purpose-built facility. It was commented that the applicant team did not accept the suggestions relating to the design and the unacceptable impact of the proposal. It was stated that officers and the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had demonstrated strong support for the proposals, following rigorous testing. There had been detailed discussions at the previous Committee meeting and the applicant team believed that the scheme would provide a much-needed facility for the local community.

Neeraj Dixit, Agent (ND Planning), noted that the current proposal was the same as the application that had been approved unanimously by the Committee in June 2022. It was stated that there had been no material change in the planning circumstances. It was believed that the scheme had a high quality design, was an appropriate scale in its context, and would result in less than substantial harm to the Highgate Conservation Area which would be outweighed by the proposed benefits. It was noted that Historic England and the QRP had no objections. The height of the proposal was considered to be modest and appropriate; officers had found that nearby residential properties would not be materially impacted by loss of outlook or privacy. In relation to sunlight and daylight, it was stated that the proposal performed well against the BRE guidelines in this urban location; it was added that this was guidance rather than policy. It was hoped that the Committee would support the scheme.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- In relation to a query about the light levels in the basement, the applicant team explained that there would be no accommodation in the basement. Following comments from officers and the QRP, staff accommodation and dining areas had been moved to higher parts of the building which would have better levels of light. It was added that there would be some lightwells to provide additional light to the basement.
- Some members asked for clarification on the suggestion that the proposal would result in a 50% loss in sunlight and how this related to the BRE guidelines. Neeraj Dixit, Agent (ND Planning), noted that he was not a daylight and sunlight expert; he believed that the comments made by the objector were correct but that this would only apply to a limited number of windows. It was stated that the applicant's Daylight and Sunlight Consultant had seen the objections and confirmed that, although there was an impact on a small number of windows, the overall light in the property and the location was still very good. The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that there would be a window to one habitable room at 109 North Hill, reported to be a dining room, which would lose a noticeable amount of winter sunlight. It was commented that, overall, there would still be plentiful daylight and annual sunlight under the BRE guidelines but that the winter sunlight standard would not be met. It was added that the garden at 109 North Hill would experience a fairly significant loss of 'sun on ground' but it was noted that it did not currently meet BRE standards in this respect.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum.

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 vote against, and 0 abstentions, it was

## **RESOLVED**

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
3. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 14/03/23 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
4. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

## **Conditions**

- 1) Three years
- 2) Drawings
- 3) Materials
- 4) Boundary treatment and access control
- 5) Landscaping
- 6) Lighting
- 7) Site levels
- 8) Secure by design accreditation
- 9) Secure by design certification
- 10) Land Contamination
- 11) Unexpected Contamination
- 12) NRMM
- 13) Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
- 14) Combustion and Energy Plan
- 15) Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Facility
- 16) Construction ecological Management Plan
- 17) Landscape Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan
- 18) Tree Protection Plan
- 19) Arboricultural method Statements

- 20) Landscape Plan and aftercare programme
- 21) Energy strategy
- 22) Gas boilers
- 23) Overheating
- 24) Living roof
- 25) BREEAM Certification
- 26) Movement monitoring (Basement development)
- 27) Construction Management Plan (Basement development)
- 28) Cycle Parking
- 29) Construction Logistics Plan
- 30) Gym restriction
- 31) Outpatients facility
- 32) Satellite antenna
- 33) Kitchen Extract
- 34) Restriction to use class
- 35) Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
- 36) Fire safety
- 37) Plant noise
- 38) Legacy of Mary Feilding
- 39) Detailed Construction Management Plan (Basement development)
- 40) Piling Method Statement
- 41) Surface Water Drainage Condition
- 42) Secured by Design Accreditation (final fitting stage)**

### **Informatives**

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Asbestos
- 8) Secure by design
- 9) Thames Water underground assets
- 10) Water pressure
- 11) Ramps

### **Section 106 Heads of Terms:**

1. Section 278 Highway Agreement
  - Reinstatement of redundant crossover in North Hill at the former access, and meet all of the Council's costs
2. Sustainable Transport Initiatives
  - Monitoring of travel plan contribution of £2,000 per year for a period of 5 years
  - £20,000 towards parking management measures

- £4,000 towards permit free with respect to the issue of Business Permits for the CPZ
3. Carbon Mitigation
- Be Seen commitment to uploading energy data
  - Energy Plan and Sustainability Review
  - Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of £404,700 plus a 10% management fee
4. Employment Initiative – participation and financial contribution towards Local Training and Employment Plan
- Provision of a named Employment Initiatives Co-Ordinator;
  - Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies during and following construction;
  - 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents during and following construction;
  - 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees during and following construction;
  - Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff);
  - Provide a support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship towards recruitment costs.
5. Monitoring Contribution
- 5% of total value of contributions (not including monitoring);
  - £500 per non-financial contribution;
  - Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000
5. The above obligations are considered to meet the requirements of Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).
6. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) Section 278 Highway Agreement for reinstatement of redundant crossover in North Hill at the former access and meet all of the Council's costs. 3) A contribution towards parking management measures. 4) A contribution towards permit free with respect to the issue of Business Permits for the CPZ. 5) Implementation of a travel plan and monitoring free would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policies T1, Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32, DM48 and Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policies TR3 and TR4.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team and to provide other employment initiatives would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP9 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017.
  3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SI 2 of the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
7. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (6) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
  - (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
  - (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

**9. HGY/2022/0664 - 175 WILLOUGHBY LANE, LONDON, N17 0RX**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings on the site and redevelopment of the land to the west of Willoughby Lane / Dysons Road for the erection of modern employment premises to provide flexible employment space across use classes E (light industrial), B2 and B8 (with ancillary offices), car parking, service yard areas, landscaping and associated works.

Sarah Madondo, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- In relation to a query about the reduction of light to neighbouring gardens, the Principal Urban Design Officer explained that the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines stated that a garden should get two hours of sun on at least 50% of the garden area on a typical day across the year; this was known as the 'sun on ground' test. It was noted that the assessment had found that the majority of neighbouring gardens would have plentiful sun both before and after the development. In addition, there was one property on Malham Terrace which was currently non-compliant with the 'sun on ground' standard and this would also be non-compliant as a result of the development; this was not considered to be a serious loss. There was also one property on Middleham Road which would fall

from 50% to 48% as a result of the development. It was explained that the numbers provided by the consultants had focused on the amount of loss rather than the total amount of sun on ground. In summary, it was noted that the majority of properties would still meet the sun on ground test, one property would marginally fail (where it was not failing currently), and one property would significantly fail (where it was also significantly failing currently).

- It was enquired whether there was an opportunity to improve the public alleyway adjacent to the site as part of the section 278 highways agreement. The Transport Officer noted that the alleyway was not in the scope of the application as the site would be accessed from Dyson's Road. It was commented that the section 278 highways agreement would facilitate works in relation to access and parking. It was added that there would also be a section 106 contribution towards pedestrian crossings and cycling improvements.
- Some members noted that the fence on site was proposed to be 2.5 metres high but enquired whether railings could be used, rather than a solid fence, and whether it could be lower. The Planning Officer explained that the materials for the fence would be conditioned. It was noted that this question would be further addressed by the applicant.
- Some members acknowledged that there were road safety and speeding issues on Willoughby Lane and that the applicant would be making a pedestrian crossing contribution; it was asked whether there was a timetable for the improvements. The Transport Officer explained that it was difficult to provide an exact timetable but it was noted that there would be design works, a safety audit, and consultations and that it would be aimed to complete any works by the time the development came into use. It was highlighted that the applicant had submitted an Active Travel Zones Survey which had identified pedestrian crossings, the roundabout, and Brantwood Road as priorities.
- It was suggested by some members that it would be beneficial for any proposed brick to match the colour of other brick buildings in the immediate area. The Head of Development Management noted that the applicant had indicated that they would seek to use a buff brick but that officers' preference would be red brick. It was noted that materials would be conditioned but it was suggested that an Informative could be included to note that the proposed brick should reflect the surrounding area and that there was a preference for red brick.
- It was confirmed that the trees which comprised the boundary treatment would be located on the applicant's site and that maintenance would be the responsibility of the applicant. It was noted that this would be conditioned but that the condition could be enhanced with a requirement to submit a Management Plan to demonstrate how the area would be maintained. It was added that some trees would be provided on the footway; the Council would have responsibility for the maintenance of these trees but they would be funded by the developer.
- Some members noted that, in the digital copy of the papers, some of the stakeholder comments had been cut short as a result of formatting issues and it was requested that this was checked in future.
- It was noted that the application proposed to relocate the existing access approximately 15 metres to the north of its current position which would require some changes to existing on-street parking arrangements, for which a Traffic Regulation Order would be required. It was stated that the highway works would be carried out under a section 278 highway agreement and an amendment to the Traffic Management Order would be required to reflect changes to the on-street



parking layout. The report noted, at paragraph 6.4.4, that this would be a requirement of the section 106 agreement but members noted that this was not included in the section 106. The Transport Officer confirmed that this would need to be included in the section 106 Heads of Terms.

- In relation to the proposed cycle corridor contribution, the Transport Officer noted that there would be a contribution towards feasibility and design but that any potential improvements would depend on the results of the initial work and it was too early to say what might be delivered. It was commented that cycling improvements were aspirational and the contribution, in conjunction with the crossing improvements, was considered to be a positive part of the application.
- It was confirmed that Condition 15, which related to the Urban Greening Factor (UGF), had been removed as set out in the addendum.
- In relation to trees, the Head of Development Management noted that the application would provide a financial contribution of £9,000 towards the installation of street trees. It was added that the landscape architect had estimated that six trees would be provided but that, as the contribution was a set financial amount, there could be options to provide additional trees.
- It was commented that there was a requirement for no less than 20% of the peak construction workforce to be Haringey residents and it was enquired whether this could also apply to the site after the construction period. The Head of Development Management explained that such a requirement was only applied where there was a specific end user in mind. As the developer did not have an end user in mind, this sort of obligation could be restrictive and could have a negative impact on employment. Instead, a contribution of £60,542.72 to support local people into jobs was recommended as part of the planning obligations.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- Matthew Thomas, Architect (Michael Sparks Associates), noted that the proposed fence and walkway were a requirement set out by the Metropolitan Police Secured by Design Officer; this would ensure that occupiers had a safe environment. It was noted that the applicant would be seeking transparent fencing as much as possible and it was currently proposed to use a weld mesh fence. It was added that the height of the fence would be primarily based on the advice from the Secured by Design Officer but it was highlighted that there were conditions relating to the boundary treatment which would require submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority.
- In relation to the UGF, some members enquired why the scheme had not proposed living roofs and greening on site. Matthew Thomas, Architect (Michael Sparks Associates), stated that the roof would have solar panels and would need to meet the necessary daylight requirements which meant that there was limited room for other things. It was explained that the internal space was designed to be flexible and this required breaking columns; a green roof would involve additional weight and would present difficulties. It was stated that the development was reasonably small and that, although options for green and brown roofs had been investigated, they were not considered to be feasible.

It was noted that the recommendation was to grant planning permission as set out in the report and the addendum and with the following amendments:

- To include an Informative to note that the proposed brick should reflect the surrounding area and that there was a preference for red brick.

- To amend Condition 20 to include an additional requirement to submit a Management and Maintenance Plan be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate how the area would be maintained.
- To include an additional Head of Term in the section 106 agreement relating to section 278 (highway works) agreement.

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions, and subject to the amendments above, it was

## **RESOLVED**

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informative subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 6<sup>th</sup> March 2023 or within such extended time as the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability/Head of Development Management shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
3. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
4. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

### Summary Lists of Conditions, Informative and Heads of Terms

#### **Summary Conditions (a full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of this report)**

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials submitted for approval
- 4) Land contamination
- 5) Unexpected contamination
- 6) NRMM
- 7) Waste and recycling
- 8) Restrictive in use classes
- 9) CMP
- 10) Cycle parking Design and Layout
- 11) Surface Water Drainage
- 12) Management and Maintenance

- 13) Secure by design
- 14) Energy Strategy
- 15) Future Den Connection
- 16) Be Seen
- 17) Overheating
- 18) BREEAM Certificate
- 19) Living Roofs
- 20) Circular Economy
- 21) GLA whole life carbon assessment
- 22) External lighting
- 23) Boundary Treatment
- 24) Noise
- 25) Servicing and delivery plan
- 26) Section 278 (Highway Works) Agreement
- 27) GLA whole life carbon assessment

### **Informatives**

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Hours of construction
- 6) Fire Brigade
- 7) Thames Water
- 8) Signage
- 9) Asbestos

### **10) Materials**

### **Section 106 Heads of Terms:**

- 1) Energy Statement
  - a. An amended energy plan to be provided prior to above ground floor construction and Sustainability Review is to be provided on first occupation of the development.
  - b. Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of plus a 10% management fee to be recalculated using Part L2013 software, based on £2,850 per tonne of carbon emissions if it does not meet the zero carbon target.
- 2) Green Lease
  - a. For the developer to enter into a green lease with future occupiers that requires the future occupiers to engage with Energetik on a future DEN connection.
- 3) Site – Wide Travel Plan

- a. To include details of welcome packs that will be provided to all new residents (to include information on public transport and cycling/walking connections).
  - b. To appoint a travel plan co-ordinator to work in collaboration with the Estate Management Team, to monitor the travel plan initiatives for a minimum of five years.
  - c. Provision of a contribution of £3,000 per annum for five years towards monitoring of the travel plan.
- 4) Employment and Skills
- a. Submission of an employment and skills plan.
  - b. No less than 20% of the peak construction workforce to be Haringey residents.
  - c. Provision of financial contribution £ £60,542.72 at which will be used by the council to provide and procure the support necessary for local people who have been out employment and / or do not have the skills set required for the jobs created.
- 5) Pedestrian crossing facilities at the Dysons Road/Leeside Road/Willoughby Lane
- a. Provision of financial contribution of £120,000
- 6) Highways
- a. Feasibility and design of the Brantwood Road Highways Works £50,000
  - b. Not to implement until a Section 278 (Highway Works) Agreement has been entered into**
- 7) Urban Greening Factor
- a. Provision of financial contribution of £9000 towards the installation of street trees.
- 8) Section 106 Monitoring contribution £9103.027
5. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
- 1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and/or financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SI2 and SI 4 of*

*the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.*

2. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sustainable transport measures, would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, give rise to unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T1, T2, T6, T6.1 and T7, Local Plan Policy SP7 and Policy DM31 of the Development Management DPD.*
  3. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team to provide employment initiatives would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP9 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017.*
  4. *The proposed development, in the absence of a S.278 agreement securing Brantwood Road Highways Works, would have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T1, T2, T6, T6.1 and T7, Local Plan Policy SP7 and Policy DM31 of the Development Management DPD.*
6. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (5) above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and;
  - (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and;
  - (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (6) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

## **10. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

### **RESOLVED**

To note the report.

**11. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

**RESOLVED**

To note the report.

**12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

**13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 6 March 2023.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....