

**PLANNING**

4 February 2015  
10.00 am - 4.15 pm

**Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Dryden (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Gawthrope, Hart, Hipkin, Pippas, C. Smart and Tunnacliffe

**Officers:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell  
City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer  
Democratic Services Manager: Gary Clift  
Principal Planner (City): Tony Collins  
Principal Planner (City): Toby Williams  
Senior Planning Officer: Catherine Linford  
Senior Planning Officer: Angela Briggs  
Planning Officer: Michael Hammond  
Planning Officer: Sav Patel  
Planning Officer: Elizabeth Thomas  
Legal Advisor: Victoria Watts  
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
New Neighbourhood Team

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**15/14/PLAN Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**15/15/PLAN Declarations of Interest**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Member</b>     | <b>Interest</b>   |
|-------------|-------------------|---|
| 15/17/PLAN  | Councillor Dryden | Personal: Board of Governors for Addenbrookes Hospital. Did not take part in the discussion and vote and left the room. |
| 15/18/PLAN  | Councillor Smart  | Personal: The former Executive Councillor for Housing which initialised the project                                     |
| 15/23/PLAN  | Councillor Hipkin | Personal: Objector is a friend. Took no part in the debate or the vote  |

**15/16/PLAN Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2014 & 7 January 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**15/17/PLAN 14/1633/REM : Land To The West And South West Of Addenbrookes Campus**

The Committee received an application for reserved matters.

The application sought approval for the reserved matters pursuant to outline approval 06/0796/OUT for a total of 59,821sqm (Gross External Area excluding plant) Bitotech and Biomedical Research and Development floorspace, to include:

- i) R&D Centre and Corporate Headquarters,
- ii) R&D Enabling Building,
- iii) Support Building and Energy Centre,
- iv) Associated car, motorbike and cycle parking,
- v) Hard and soft landscaping,
- vi) Internal roads, supporting facilities and ancillary infrastructure.

The Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet which had been circulated prior to the meeting. Three bullet points were identified with further objections to the application with officer responses to those three points. Also included was a summary of a letter circulated to the Committee from the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) in which there were three main points.

The Legal Advisor to the Committee explained on the first bullet point which was hazardous activities on the site. The objection included concerns that the Council did not have enough information from the applicant, particularly on storage and disposal of sensitive materials such as chemical waste. No one was disputing that public safety is a material consideration and officers had treated it as such. There were areas governed by separate legislation and there were areas where planning overlapped with other controls and other legislation. The key point running through case law was that the Council needed to be satisfied that it had sufficient information on which to base its decision as the Local Planning Authority. Here, the Environmental Health Officer was content that the Council has received enough information on these issues as the Local Planning Authority. If that information had exposed an obvious risk to public safety which we believed could not be addressed,

then that could form a reason to refuse an application - but this was not the case. There are other regimes for controlling the storage and disposal of sensitive materials administered by bodies such as, the Health and Safety Executive and the Environment Agency. As part of making its decision, the Council is entitled to and should have regard to the existence of these regimes. There was nothing to suggest that those regulatory authorities could not or would not exercise adequate control on those issues and the Committee was entitled to assume that these other regulatory regimes would operate effectively.

In relation to the second point made by BUAV, the Planning Officer advised the Committee that the Council asked the question of the applicant through their agent whether the building design will enable compliance with the EU Directive, and it was confirmed to the Council that it would. This was to establish that EU Directive requirements had been part of the design process. The BUAV letter referred to the need for dog runs to comply with the Animals (Scientific) Procedures Act 1986. No dog runs had been proposed and there was nothing in the information provided by the applicant to suggest that dogs would be proposed to be brought on site. If this were to change in the future and dogs were brought onto the site which would require dog runs, this would need to form a new application and would need to be considered by the Council separately, including the noise impacts highlighted in the BUAV letter.

On the third point, concerning noise from protests, the Legal Advisor referred to paragraph 8.147 of the report, which acknowledged that noise was a material consideration and makes a point about the extent to which, in the officer's view, noise from protests could reasonably form a ground for refusal of this application. The Legal Advisor stated that it was right to say that noise from peaceful protest was not a direct result of the development, in the way that noise made by visitors was, or noise made by machinery being operated on site, for example; rather than emanating from the development itself or its use, it was noise from third parties who might choose to protest against what would then be a lawful, permitted use of the site. This was a grey area, but noise and other disturbance resulting from peaceful, lawful protest was capable of being a material consideration. The fact that it doesn't flow directly from the development is a factor that made it difficult to predict, in terms of the extent of noise and disturbance that could be caused by protests. The weight to be given to this was a matter for Committee. It should be noted that the police had not raised an objection to the application. As far as unlawful activities were concerned or unlawful breaches of the peace, it would be for the police to keep order.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Arron Mahthai, Vikki Semple and Lulu Agate.

The representation from Arron Mathai covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern over the use of substances which could be used as chemical warfare agents. The officers had not received sufficient information from the applicants on such usage to properly advise the Committee.
- ii. The issue of use of dog experimentation had not been properly addressed by the applicants or in the Officer report. There should be a condition put on the application so that dogs cannot be used.
- iii. Protest was a material planning consideration that the officers had not advised the Committee properly of, so the Committee could not make an informed decision.

The representation from Vikki Semple covered the following issue:

- i. The applicant's degenerative experiments on animals were contrary to the Animal Welfare Act 2006 s41, s42, s71, s72. More information was needed on the proposed use of animals.

The representation from Lulu Agate covered the following issues:

- i. There would be increased vehicular movements, leading to more noise and pollution.
- ii. There was concern about waste disposal, contaminated animal body waste and incineration was not ideal.
- iii. The new road to Addenbrookes was not a positive contribution to the environment.
- iv. There was increased demand on the water supply because of all the development

The Committee received a representation in support to the application from Dr Osbourn (on behalf of the applicant).

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6-0 with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for reserved matters in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**15/18/PLAN 14/1648/REM: Homerton Business Centre, Purbeck Road**

The Committee received an application for reserved matters.

The application sought approval for the reserved matters scheme (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 95 residential units including affordable housing, together with associated landscaping (the provision of a central amenity space and the reconfiguration of the existing on-site balancing pond to the south), car and cycle parking, and associated infrastructure works pursuant to application 13/1250/OUT.

The Committee received a representation in support to the application from Joanna Thorndike (agent).

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for reserved matters in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions and amended condition 16 recommended by the officers.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Condition 16 (Cycle Parking) needs to read 'Requires discharge, requires further information' instead of 'Discharged'.

**15/19/PLAN 14-1811-FUL:35 Tenison Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two-storey pitched roof extension to the rear of the house, to provide an additional two bedrooms, one on each floor. The proposed extension would be 5.4m deep, and 5.2m wide, abutting the common boundary with 37 Tenison Road.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ruth Devermond.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Requested that the Committee reject the application.

- ii. The proposed extension would have a serve adverse effect on the neighbouring properties.
- iii. Would bring an increase in noise to the area.
- iv. Stated that the area had an over concentration of HMO's (Housing in Multiple Occupation) filled with short term student occupancy.
  - 15 HMO on either side of the building, representing 27% of the local area.
- v. Many houses in the area have been reverted back to families' homes since the 2006 condition of eight units per HMO.
- vi. Stated the application goes against 5/7 of the 2006 Local Plan.
- vii. The proposed extension would make a bad situation in the area worse.

The Committee received a representation in support to the application from Mervyn Martin (applicant).

Councillor Robertson addressed the Committee as a Ward Councillor.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The application did not comply with 3/4, 3/14 & 5/14 of the 2006 Local Plan.
- ii. Reported that none of the properties in the local area had two stories extensions but only single extensions.
- iii. The proposed extension would spoil the character of the location, over shadow neighbouring properties and would be visually dominate.
- iv. The proposed extended would block off the gap between No 35 & No 37 Tenison Road reducing the light to the side of both buildings and create a sense of enclosure.
- v. Approval of the application could encourage similar applications which would further spoil the appearance and character of the area.
- vi. The design does not respect the character of the local area and the local amenity would be impacted.
- vii. Already 24 HMO's on this road and the number does not need to be increased.

#### The Committee:

Councillor Smart proposed that the term warden was changed to 'resident warden' in condition 5.

The Officer then proposed additional text be included at the end of the condition 5 strengthen the condition (additional text underlined).

Condition 5 would read as follows:

'The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Management Plan for the building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of the role of the resident warden and contact details for neighbours, which shall be displayed on the external front facade of the building at all times, and shall ensure that at least one of the rooms is occupied by a warden at all times when the property is in use as a House in Multiple Occupation. The use as a House in Multiple Occupation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Management Plan.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)'

Resolved (**7 Votes to 0, with 1 abstention**) to accept the amended condition.

Resolved (**5 Votes to 3 votes**) to grant the application for full planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the condition recommended by the officers and the amended condition.

### **15/20/PLAN      14/1649/FUL : Land To R/o 8 Montreal Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The amended application sought approval for the demolition of number 8 Montreal Road and the erection of 1 two bedroom and 3 three bedroom houses.

The Officer highlighted to the Committee additional standard conditions CC80 and CC81A to remove permitted development rights for extensions and additional windows before the start of the report.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Matter.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The application goes against 3/10, 3/10c 3/4, 4/7 and 4/11 of the 2006 Local Plan and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework

- ii. The Officer's report states that the proposed application is similar to that of application 14/0480/FUL, this is factually incorrect, there is now an additional house on the plans.
- iii. The full permitted development is 33% bigger with a significant increase to the roof profile with the number of bedrooms increasing from five to a total of eleven.
- iv. Permitted development had been removed as condition from application 14/0480/FUL to prevent an increase which had not been referenced in the Officer's report.
- v. Stated that an appeal to increase the roofline for application 14/0480/FUL had been dismissed by a Government Inspector the previous year.
- vi. The proposed application would violate the historical character of the area and have a negative impact to the surrounding properties.
- vii. The development would sit on the boundary of the Mill Road conservation area and is opposed by the Mill Road conservation society.
- viii. The plot for this application is not for suitable development as this would take away all the garden land.
- ix. The proposal would have an adverse impact, in terms of height, landscape and the closing down of available views to neighbouring houses which would dominate the local area.

Amy Richardson (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following statement was read out from Ward Councillor Zoe Mogadhas:

- i. I am writing to support and highlight the concerns already raised by the Romsey resident residing at 380 Mill Rd with regard to the proposed development planned at the back of his family garden.
- ii. The proposed site was a locked in section of land previously used as garden and allotments. Gardens back onto this fenced open space area from Mill Road, Montreal Road, Montreal Square and Hobart Road. The garden at 380 Mill Road is a short section of lawn with a shed and will be particularly affected by the new buildings proposed on this land.
- iii. The main objection is one of enclosure. The National Planning Policy Framework supports the idea that protection be given to the amenity of existing dwellings, they should not feel enclosed and dominated.
- iv. Currently the residents sitting in either kitchen or garden have an open feeling of skyline due to the distance of proximity to the next property. The height of the proposed houses on this site will completely cut out the feeling of space and light currently available to them.



- v. The original planning permission granted by East Area Committee to build on this site was done with inaccurate measurements contained within the report to committee. The report stated an 18 metre distance from the house at 380 Mill Rd to the new build property proposed when plans show the distance will be more likely around 14 metres. Can planning officers clarify the significance of this mistake in the granting of the original planning consent, with reference to the section in the NPPF which looks to protect the amenity of existing dwellings from the feeling of being enclosed and dominated?
- vi. The report before you suggests that the new proposal is similar in scale to the original proposal but there is a significant increase in the intensification from 3 to 4 houses, 2 storeys to 3 and 5 bedrooms to 11.
- vii. On 9 January 2013, John Evans, planning officer, states that permitted development rights was agreed to be removed from this site. An inspector had visited this site and declined a request to raise the ridgeline by 60cm saying the residents of no 378-380 would feel enclosed.

Councillor Baignet addressed the Committee as a Ward Councillor.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Although the report states that the development would not overlook Hobart Road there would be a negative impact to this area with a domar window at the back of the proposed property overlooking this road.
- ii. Significant invasion of privacy on the surrounding properties.
- iii. The proposed development would bring an increase to noise.
- iv. Create a loss of light to the neighbouring properties.
- v. Expressed concern that there would not be suitable access for emergency access to the back of the properties due to the development on the corner of Mill Road and Montreal Road.
- vi. The back gardens represent a haven to many of the surrounding residents which would be affected by this development.

The Committee:

Resolved **(5 Votes to 3 votes)** to grant the application for full planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the condition and additional conditions recommended by the officer.

**15/21/PLAN      14/1382/FUL : Land Rear Of 268 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought refusal for the erection of a residential development consisting of 1 x 5 bedroom house and 6 x 4 bedroom houses, along with internal access road, car, cycle parking, with hard and soft landscaping.

The Committee received written representation from Peter Mckeown in support of the application, who was also present to speak in support of the application.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Margaret Prosser.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Advised the Committee that she was speaking on behalf of local Queen Ediths' residents.
- ii. The refusal of the application supported the protection of the following:
  - City boundaries
  - Green open spaces
  - Wild life
  - General way of life.
- iii. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the City's urban edge of the surrounding area.
- iv. Would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
- v. Stated that the proposals were in direct conflict of the 2006 Local Plan and National Planning Policy Guidelines.
- vi. Acknowledged that family homes were required but did not meet the housing needs set out by the Local Plan.

Councillor Ashton addressed the Committee as a Ward Councillor.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. This application is not just about the loss of a few trees.
- ii. A large number of trees were destroyed before the application had been considered. Officers had been sent to stop the work.
- iii. The area is of scientific interest, with a yearly walk to look at the bats and glow worms.
- iv. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact to the local area.

- v. Not the right location for the development and would have a negative impact on the neighbouring gardens.
- vi. A survey carried out from an independent consultant had determined that the application did not meet the Local Plan Guidelines.
- vii. The proposed development would create an increase in traffic to the local area and the proposed additional junction would create an additional hazard.

#### The Committee:

Resolved (**7 Votes to 1 vote** ) to refuse the application for full planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the condition recommended by the officer.

#### Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

On page 228-229, the Recommendation should read:

#### **1. REFUSE for the following reasons:**

1. The introduction of development on this edge of city site, which has an important role in providing a buffer and transition between the urban environment and designated protected sites to the east and south, would, by virtue of its incongruous scale, intrusive and unsympathetic design and angled layout of the buildings, have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site, and setting of the city. The proposed design would also appear out of character with the existing built form along Queen Edith's Way and in doing so introduce an alien form of development adjacent to Lime Kiln Road. For these reasons the proposed development in conflict with policies 3/2, 3/4, and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and government guidance the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. The proposed development would result in the loss of five trees which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders and several others trees along the eastern and southern boundary which are group protected. As a group these trees make a significant contribution to the character of this edge of city site. Given the limited size of the amenity space associated with the houses it is likely that future residents will be pressured into having to remove/reduce the size of these and other trees. The removal of trees from the site would expose the development

to both the surrounding area and the dwellings to the west in Queen Edith's Way. In so doing, the development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the site and the contribution it makes to the wider setting of the city and would adversely affect the residential amenity of occupiers in Queen Edith's Way. The development would be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Government Guidance in section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. The proposed development would due to the angled layout of dwellings and scale of development, create a walled barrier which would enclose the rear gardens of dwellings in Queen Edith's Way and have an adverse effect on outlook from these dwellings. The rear elevation of the proposed dwellings would also contain windows which would directly overlook the rear gardens of the existing dwellings such that it would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the existing residents in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed development would create an adverse sense of enclosure on the existing residents and cause loss of privacy to gardens that are not currently overlooked. For these reasons, the proposed development conflicts with policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
4. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012

**2. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development**

**15/22/PLAN      14/1820/FUL : 25 Cambridge Place**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use from offices (use class B1) to form a residential development consisting two 1 x bed flats and 3 x studios along with associated access arrangements and external alterations.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Lady Acland.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Speaking on behalf of herself and her neighbours.
- ii. The property was currently tenanted and the tenants wished to remain.
- iii. The impact on existing parking problems would be unacceptable.
- iv. There was no provision for service vehicles and no off road parking provision.
- v. Proposal contravenes both local and national guidance on space standards.
- vi. Lacks amenity space.
- vii. Requested that the Committee reject the application or added conditions to limit short term lets.

Peter McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

At the request of Councillor Blencowe, officers undertook to clarify the position regarding visitor parking permits.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1 with 1 abstentions)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers and the additional informatives:

- i. The residents of the new residential units will not qualify for Residents Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets.
- ii. The applicant is encouraged to ensure all future tenants/occupiers of the flats are aware of the existing local car club service and location of the nearest space.

**15/23/PLAN 14/1872/FUL : 39 Windsor Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a covered area to side of dwelling to provide support to an existing first/second floor extension which was inadequately supported.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Loades.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Was not initially against the application.
- ii. Had requested an adequate gap between the two buildings to allow for maintenance.
- iii. Fences had been removed and digging work commenced prior to the granting of permission.
- iv. Applicant had submitted three applications and the plan had been changed repeatedly.
- v. Concerned about future building work.
- vi. Similar extension in the street had all allowed a bigger gap between build lines and there was no need to build so close to neighbour.
- vii. Extension was currently supported by poles.
- viii. Requested that application be rejected until concerns were addressed.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0, with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**15/24/PLAN 14/1936/FUL : Land Between 2 And 3 Shaftesbury Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of a new dwelling on land Between 2 And 3 Shaftesbury Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 8BW.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Chisholm.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Speaking on behalf of neighbours who object to the proposal.
- ii. Would be overbearing to neighbours.
- iii. Use of stone was out of character with area.
- iv. Angle of vision from first floor windows was intrusive.
- v. Conservatory to rear of building would become a living area and intrude on neighbours.
- vi. Adverse impact on neighbours.
- vii. Final designs were unclear.

Mr Poulson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **15/25/PLAN      14/1653/FUL : Land To Rear Of 551-553 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 3 dwellings on land to the rear of 551-553 Newmarket Road, Cambridge CB5 8PA.

The Committee noted small errors in the text of the report.

The Principal Planning Officer stated that it would be possible to amend the conditions to require obscured glazing to the first floor window that objectors considered to overlook neighbours.

It had been suggested that there was a covenant on this land and the Principal Planning Officer stated that this was not a planning consideration.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Pauline Turner, Mark Turner and Mark Howe

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The process was unfair and objectors had not had sufficient time to plan their objections.
- ii. The process had been uncomfortable.
- iii. Other application for development in the area had been refused.
- iv. Proposed build line was very close to existing buildings.
- v. Contradicts earlier decisions.
- vi. Would result in loss of amenity, light and privacy.
- vii. Would result in a feeling of enclosure.
- viii. Would dominate the area.
- ix. Would be closer to the existing properties than suggested by the plans as they were based on original plans and did not show current position.
- x. Unacceptable overlooking.
- xi. Plan contravenes Local Plan.
- xii. Would result in overlooking and loss of light.
- xiii. Site plan was incorrect.
- xiv. Nearby bungalow would suffer intrusion and loss of daylight.
- xv. Loss of tranquil setting.
- xvi. Adverse impact on wildlife.

The Committee expressed concerns about the vehicle access to the site. Concerns were raised about cyclist and pedestrian safety when using the narrow access road. Concerns were raised about access for emergency vehicles.

The Chair suggested deferring the application until the highways department had provided satisfactory answers to the following questions:

- i. Did the width of the access road offer safe passage for all users?
- ii. Was there sufficient provision for cyclists and pedestrian users?
- iii. Was the width sufficient for service, emergency and construction vehicles?
- iv. Would the egress conflict with the nearby crossing or it's visibility?
- v. Would there be an impact on the nearby bus stop?

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0, with 1 abstention) to defer the application.**



**15/26/PLAN 14/1769/FUL : 220 Victoria Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use of dwelling (use Class C3) to a 7 bed house of multiple occupation (sui generis) to 220 Victoria Road.

Mr Belton (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**15/27/PLAN Planning Code of Good Practice**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services.

The report referred to the updated Planning Code of Good Practice which had been considered at the meeting of the Civic Affairs Committee on 28/01/15.

The Planning Code of Good Practice had been updated using the model guidance provided by the Local Government Association and the Planning Advisory Service.

The Committee were advised that the Civic Affairs Committee had endorsed the approval of the updated Code and the report would then go to Full Council in March.

The Head of Planning Services explained the changes to the document and advised that the Civic Affairs Committee had recommended that the Code be reviewed every three years.

The Committee:

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Tunnacliffe seconded that the Code be reviewed every two years instead of every three years.

**Resolved (7 votes to 1 abstention)** to:

- i. Endorse the approval of the updated Planning Code of Good Practice.

- ii. Recommend that the Code be reviewed every two years.

The meeting ended at 4.15 pm

**CHAIR**