

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday, 6th June, 2018, 2.00 pm

Councillors: Sally Davis (Chair), Rob Appleyard, Jasper Becker, Paul Crossley, Matthew Davies, Eleanor Jackson, Les Kew, Liz Richardson (Reserve) (in place of Bryan Organ), Will Sandry (Reserve) (in place of Caroline Roberts) and David Veale

1 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

2 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN (IF DESIRED)

A Vice Chairman was not required on this occasion.

3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from:

Cllr Bryan Organ - substitute Cllr Liz Richardson
Cllr Caroline Roberts – substitute Cllr Will Sandry

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was no urgent business.

6 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS

The Democratic Services Officer informed the meeting that there were a number of people wishing to make statements on planning applications and that they would be able to do so when these items were discussed.

7 ITEMS FROM COUNCILLORS AND CO-OPTED MEMBERS

There were no items from Councillors or Co-Opted Members.

8 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Cllr Jackson asked that in future the minutes indicate who speakers are (e.g. whether agent or applicant). She also asked that a summary of the ward councillor's statement be set out in the minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 April 2018 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

9 **MAIN PLANS LIST - APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ETC FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered:

- A report by the Group Manager (Development Management) on various planning applications.
- An update report by the Group Manager (Development Management) on items 1, 4 and 10 attached as *Appendix 1* to these minutes.
- Oral statements by members of the public and representatives. A copy of the speakers' list is attached as *Appendix 2* to these minutes.

RESOLVED that in accordance with the delegated powers, the applications be determined as set out in the decisions list attached as *Appendix 3* to these minutes.

Item No. 1

Application No. 17/02588/EFUL

Site Location: Parcel 4234, Combe Hay Lane, Combe Hay, Bath – Full planning permission for the erection of 171 residential units, open space, green infrastructure, landscaping and associated works including provision of vehicular access from Combe Hay Lane

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to permit. He updated members on the following matters:

- Although the masterplan for the strategic allocation has not yet been submitted for formal approval it is a material consideration in the determination of the current application. Approval of this application without agreement of the masterplan would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider strategic allocation and not having an agreed masterplan is not considered to be a sufficient reason to refuse the application.
- Southstoke Parish Council has sought a Legal Opinion, given its concerns that a piecemeal grant of planning permission in advance of the agreement of a comprehensive masterplan for the wider allocation may prejudice the deliverability of the wider allocation in accordance with the Placemaking Principles. A response to each of the issues raised was provided in the update report circulated to the Committee.
- Additional comments had been received since the publication of the original report and these were included in the update report. These included two letters of support and objections relating to increased traffic congestion, impact on the AONB and greenbelt and the availability of other brownfield sites for housing. One additional objection was received after the publication of the update report on similar grounds.
- The Highways Officer has asked for an additional condition to be included

should the Committee approve the application.

Representatives from Southstoke, Wellow and Combe Hay Parish Councils spoke against the application.

A representative from Bath Preservation Trust and a resident spoke against the application.

The agent and applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Neil Butters, local ward member, spoke against the application. He expressed concern regarding the impact on the environment and increased highway congestion and the subsequent adverse impact on Combe Hay Lane. He felt that if the final development comprised of 450 houses this was a very high number. He stated that an approved masterplan should be provided for the whole site. He referred to the legal opinion provided by Southstoke Parish Council which concluded that the application does not meet the minimum requirements of Policy B3a.

Councillor Steve Hedges, adjoining local ward member, spoke against the application. He expressed concern regarding the potential increase in traffic congestion in Odd Down, taking into account the Mulberry Park development comprising 700 new homes. Some roads in the area were already gridlocked at peak hours and air pollution was also a concern. He also referred to the lack of an agreed masterplan.

Councillor Veale, local ward member on the Committee supported the concerns raised by the Parish Councils and felt that traffic congestion would be an issue with surrounding roads being used as “rat-runs”.

The Case Officer and Highways Officer then responded to questions as follows:

- Allotment sites were proposed within the masterplan on land controlled by the applicant and would be secured through the S106 Agreement. The properties had gardens and a recreation area, including public footpaths, was accessible for leisure purposes. There were 33 dwellings per hectare which was broadly in line with planning policy.
- With regard to the accuracy of traffic forecasting the Highways Officer explained that a reliable modelling system was used which was based on data from similar developments. She also explained that there was no official definition of a “severe” impact. Under previous Government guidance (now withdrawn) 5% increase in traffic would be considered to be “significant”. It was acknowledged that with 450 dwellings on the site the predicted additional queue length would have a severe impact on the northbound approach to the Odd Down Park & Ride roundabout. The prediction for the current application before the Committee showed an increase of around 10 vehicles.
- There would be one vehicular access point to the site.
- With regard to the number of houses to be built on the whole site the Case Officer confirmed that the figure of 300 was not a cap. During the Placemaking Plan Examination the Council had acknowledged that 300 homes was a conservative estimate and 400 – 450 houses could be built in accordance with the Placemaking Principles. Highways impacts would,

however, need to be mitigated.

The Legal Advisor confirmed that the Committee should consider the application on its merits and in respect of what was being applied for. Some weight could be given to the masterplan given its inclusion in policy; however, the land was already allocated for housing and the application was for 171 dwellings and that was what needed to be considered.

The Group Manager, Development Management, explained that the Masterplan covers the whole site. It complies with the majority of the Placemaking Principles and a failure to fully comply with all the Principles was not considered to be a barrier to granting planning permission.

Councillor Jackson expressed concern about traffic congestion in the area, particularly around the Old Fosse Road and Combe Hay Lane. She felt that there would be a cumulative impact. She considered that the objectors had made some valid points regarding highways matters. Councillor Jackson was concerned about the impact on wildlife and trees in the area. She requested that the Section 106 Agreement should cover the provision of allotments, wildlife protection, green spaces and signage.

Councillor Kew acknowledged that large developments caused concern to local communities. However he felt that many of the problems around traffic flows were matters of perception. The land has been allocated for development and the masterplan issue was not a barrier to making a decision on this application. He felt that the layout was sensible and noted that the density was lower than in some other locations. The Council had a duty to develop the site and provide homes.

Councillor Jackson noted that, despite some concerns, the application was in line with the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan. She then moved the officer recommendation to permit the application. This was seconded by Councillor Kew.

Councillor Crossley noted that developments were taking place across B&NES and that this site has potential. However, he felt that this proposal represented piecemeal development and that the Committee should await the approval of the comprehensive masterplan for the site. There was currently no indication of future density. There was only one entrance and exit and surrounding roads comprised country lanes and potential "rat-runs". More detail was required as there were still too many outstanding questions which needed to be resolved.

Councillor Appleyard did not support the proposal to permit and felt that, while the layout was acceptable, the transport elements were a concern which warranted further discussion.

Councillor Richardson pointed out that the Committee could only consider the proposal for 171 houses as this was the application being put forward. It was acceptable within the Core Strategy and the location was very sustainable, being within walking distance of the regular Park & Ride bus service. There were also schools within walking distance. The design was good and she welcomed the 40% affordable housing allocation.

Councillor Becker liked the design but recognised that local roads were already congested.

The Group Manager, Development Management, explained that further phases of the development would have to be considered by the Committee in future. At that point members could consider the cumulative impact on highways and how any issues identified could be mitigated. The application for consideration at this meeting was for 171 houses only. He confirmed that the concerns raised by Councillor Jackson regarding allotments and open space would be addressed by the S106 Agreement.

Councillor Sandry felt that the design was good; however, he believed that Bath required more homes that young families could afford.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 6 votes in favour and 4 against to PERMIT the application subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the provision of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the issues set out in the report.

Item No. 2

Application No. 17/06214/FUL

Site Location: City of Bath College, Milk Street, Bath – Demolition of existing building and erection of new hotel

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to delegate to permit.

A representative from the Hotel Association and Bath Independent Guest House Association spoke against the application.

The Agent and Applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones, acting local ward member, spoke regarding the application. He felt that the architecture was good but had concerns about the flat roof with plant on the top as this would be visible from higher areas of Bath. He also referred to the current economic climate and the increase in Airbnb rooms which were leading to a chaotic increase in bed spaces. This was likely to impact on the hotel and guest house sector. If the Committee were minded to approve the application he requested that a condition be included to ensure that the demolition of the existing building was carried out in a sustainable manner.

The Case Officer responded to questions as follows:

- In regard to a question regarding Bath design boundaries he stated that James Street West already had a wide range of architectural styles with no definable character. This meant that there was a good deal of scope for architects and he felt that this was an acceptable design.
- He confirmed that some highway works were proposed which would include drop-off points. There would be a condition requiring full highway plans to be submitted and this would ensure that there were adequate bus drop-off points. The provision of cycle racks could also be explored if necessary.

- He confirmed that the provision planned in the Core Strategy for 500-750 bedrooms has already been met. He stated that new hotel provision provided in the city since 2011 amounted to 762 additional rooms (including those currently known to be in the pipeline). He explained that Airbnb rooms were not categorised as hotel rooms.

Councillor Becker felt that the application should be rejected on the grounds that it is not compliant with policies B4, BD1, D1-D5 of the Placemaking Plan. He did not believe that it satisfied the design values or enhanced architectural values. It contradicts what the Council is trying to achieve in the centre of Bath. Kingsmead Square should be the benchmark for this area. The demolition of a building that is only 25 years old proves that this type of architecture is a failure. He felt that the applicants should come back with an improved design and that the Committee should also take some time to analyse whether more hotels were needed in the city centre. He then moved that the application be refused for these two reasons. It was to be delegated to officers to refuse.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Jackson who also agreed that the building was of poor design due to its scale, height and massing which would not preserve or enhance the conservation area.

Councillor Richardson noted that James Street West had an eclectic mix of buildings but that this did not preserve or enhance the area.

Councillor Sandry felt that the urban design aspects of this application were not good and that a more interesting proposal could be put forward. He noted the large increase in the number of Airbnb rooms in the city over the last year. He also felt that the proposed building should be one storey lower.

Councillor Crossley referred to the economic impact of the proposal. He noted that the target of an additional 750 hotel rooms had already been exceeded. With the increase of Airbnb properties there was a risk of small local Guesthouses and Hotels going out of business. Another hotel was not required and there was a real need for low cost and social housing in the city.

The Group Manager, Development Management, informed members that officers believed that this design was acceptable for the James Street West area. He explained that the test was did the proposed development preserve or enhance in comparison to the existing building. The Committee did not need to wait until the outcome of the local plan review regarding the need for hotel rooms before making a decision. The application should be considered in line with the policies currently in place. He pointed out that economic impact was not a valid planning reason for refusal, in the absence of up to date evidence, and that the figure of 750 hotel rooms should not be considered as a cap. The site was a city centre location where hotels are appropriate uses. The building was no longer required by the college and so could be considered for redevelopment. Councillor Becker withdrew the second reason for refusal at this point leaving the design reason in place. This was with agreement of Councillor Jackson as seconder of the motion.

Councillor Jackson expressed concerns about the lack of disabled access to the proposed hotel. The Highways Officer explained that there was an aspiration to provide a flush surface on Avon Street and that building regulations and conditions

would ensure that the building was accessible for all.

Councillor Kew noted that the principle of a hotel on this site was acceptable and stated that if the application were refused on the grounds of design then the applicant could still reapply with revised plans.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 7 votes in favour and 3 against to DELEGATE TO REFUSE the application on the basis of the reasons put forward by Councillors Becker and Jackson.

Item No. 3

Application No. 15/01802/FUL

Site Location: Church Farm Derelict Property, Church Hill, High Littleton – Construction of new pedestrian and vehicular access to Church Farm, High Littleton from A39 High Street following removal of section of boundary wall

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit. She explained that the applicant had now agreed to retain the existing milk churn stand and has requested permission to move the bus stop slightly. Revised drawings have been received.

The Case Officer also reported that one additional comment had been received regarding the location of the bus stop, the potential to set a precedent and the possibility in future of further development on this site.

The registered speaker, who was a neighbour, spoke against the application.

Councillor Kew, local ward member, explained that the farmhouse had been derelict for over 20 years. Local people were keen for the house to be developed to improve the condition of the building. The access was needed to enable this to happen. Conditions could be put in place as necessary regarding pedestrian access.

Cllr Kew then moved the officer recommendation to delegate to permit subject to a Section 106 agreement. Cllr Crossley seconded the motion.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED unanimously to DELEGATE TO PERMIT the application subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 agreement as set out in the report.

Item No. 4

Application No. 18/00650/FUL

Site Location: Highfields, White Cross, Hallatrow – Erection of a dwelling house following demolition of conservatory

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to refuse. He explained that the parking concerns had now been addressed and that the third reason for refusal had subsequently been amended as set out in the update report.

Councillor Kew, local ward member, spoke in favour of the application. Although the site was outside of the housing development boundary he felt that Whitecross was a separate settlement in its own right. He noted that this was a simple garden site and that the house would be occupied by employees of the adjacent car wash

facility. He explained that there were 2 bus stops on the A37 and two convenience stores within half a mile of the property. A Post Office, church and schools were also close by which meant that it would be a sustainable development. Traffic lights onto the A37 also provided ease of access and egress.

Councillor Kew then moved that the Committee delegate to permit the application as the site was in an existing settlement, the plot was an infill site and the development would be in keeping with other dwellings in the area. The development would also enhance the character of the area. Councillor Matthew Davies seconded the motion.

The Highways Officer explained how distances to urban areas, employment and schools were calculated. She advised that, if the Committee were minded to permit the application, then they should consider including a condition to include a pedestrian phase within the traffic light system.

Councillor Crossley stated that the correct process would be to work with the community to include Whitecross within the housing development boundary. He felt that there were no extenuating circumstances to permit development in this location and was concerned that it could set a precedent leading to further development in the area.

Councillor Sandry did not consider that Whitecross was a settlement in its own right and stated that development was not appropriate in this area.

The Group Manager, Development Management, explained that Whitecross was not a settlement but a group of dwellings. There were no real facilities in the area and he would caution against permitting this application. The site was some distance from the housing development boundary and the development would be contrary to policy. It was not a rural workers' dwelling and could set a precedent for building in open countryside.

Councillor Richardson noted that the Parish Council was supportive of the application.

Councillor Jackson noted that although the site was outside of the housing development boundary there was a pattern of settlement and this would be infill development on a large plot.

Councillor Kew stated that there was good access to this single plot and that it was not in open countryside. Schools could be accessed by local footpaths and facilities were closeby.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 4 votes in favour and 6 against. The motion was therefore LOST.

Councillor Crossley then moved the officer recommendation to refuse permission. This was seconded by Councillor Sandry.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 5 votes in favour and 5 votes against. The Chair used her casting vote in favour of the motion. It was therefore RESOLVED to REFUSE the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Item No. 5**Application No. 18/01057/VAR**

Site Location: Grey House, Staunton Lane, Whitchurch – Variation of condition 11 (Plans List) of application 17/03785/FUL (Erection of a new 3 bedroom dwelling with double garage)

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit. Revised elevations were now available and it was noted that the number of dormer windows had been reduced from three to two and have been reduced in size.

Councillor Bob Goodman spoke on behalf of the local ward member, Councillor Paul May, against the application. He pointed out that plans for a 4 bedroom property had been rejected and a 3 bedroom property had been approved. This application was now for a 5 bedroom property. He expressed concerns regarding road safety and setting a precedent. He felt that enforcement action should be taken.

Councillors asked questions relating to the dormer windows, the use of the garage area and the solar panels to which the Case Officer responded.

Councillor Richardson asked a question regarding parking requirements. The Case Officer explained that there was currently parking provision for 2 cars, however, 3 parking spaces would be required for a 5 bedroom property.

Councillor Crossley moved the officer recommendation to permit. This was seconded by Councillor Jackson.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 5 votes in favour, 3 against and 2 abstentions to PERMIT the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Item No. 6**Application No. 18/01184/FUL**

Site Location: Garri House, Tynning Road, Combe Down, Bath – Erection of two-storey rear extension following demolition of single-storey rear extensions and minor internal works

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit.

The registered speakers, who were neighbours, spoke against the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr Bob Goodman, local ward member, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that the proposal would improve and tidy up the area around the property. He did not feel that there would be a negative impact on neighbouring properties or harm to the Conservation Area.

Councillor Jackson moved that consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit. This was seconded by Councillor Appleyard.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 3 votes in favour, 6 votes against and 1 abstention. The motion was therefore LOST.

Councillor Appleyard stated that a site visit would have been helpful given that the 2 ward councillors held different views and that there had been objections from neighbours.

Councillor Kew moved the officer recommendation to permit stating that this was a good application. This was seconded by Councillor Matthew Davies.

Councillor Crossley felt that the proposal was large and overbearing and that the application should be refused. It would adversely affect the amenity of the area and the impact on Gladstone Court was unacceptable.

Councillor Sandry noted that this area of Combe Down was of high density.

Councillor Jackson was not keen on the timber cladding and noted that a Victorian sash window would be lost.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 5 votes in favour, 3 against and 2 abstentions to PERMIT the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Item No. 7

Application No. 18/01224/FUL

Site Location: 4 Lytton Grove, Keynsham, BS31 1NE – Change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to 9 bed HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) (Use class sui generis) and the erection of a single storey rear extension

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit.

A representative of Keynsham Town Council and a local resident spoke against the application.

In response to a question the Case Officer confirmed that the utility sheds are not habitable as they are open sided.

Councillor Jackson moved the officer recommendation to permit. This was not seconded.

Councillor Kew stated that he was minded to refuse the application.

The Group Manager, Development Management, stated that there were no policy reasons to refuse this application. Members could take into consideration any impact on amenity or transport. If loss of amenity were considered to be a reason for refusal then clear details would have to be provided.

Councillor Sandry queried whether this would be an overdevelopment of the site. Officers stated that the area was not currently densely developed.

Councillor Crossley moved that the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. He noted that any increase in vehicles would be problematic in this location. This was seconded by Councillor Richardson.

The Case Officer confirmed that the property would have 4 allocated parking spaces.

Councillor Kew stated that it was difficult to refuse an application for an HMO in this location because the Council policy was not to allow too many in one particular area. This area did not have a high concentration of HMO properties.

Councillor Appleyard advised against an inclination to be resistant to HMOs as they make up a valid part of the local housing stock. He felt that the proposed layout was good.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 3 votes in favour, 6 votes against and 1 abstention. The motion was therefore LOST.

Councillor Appleyard then moved the officer recommendation to permit the application. This was seconded by Councillor Jackson.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 6 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 1 abstention to PERMIT the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Item No. 8

Application No. 18/01435/FUL

Site Location: 27 Westfield Park, Newbridge, Bath, BA1 3HS – Change of use from residential (Class C3) to HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) (Class C4)

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit. She explained that there was only one other HMO within 100m of the property. The property was shown to provide 4 rooms for occupation and, as such, any condition granted must be restricted to such a level of use.

One registered speaker, who was a neighbour, spoke against the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Jackson advised against making negative assumptions regarding HMO residents. She moved the officer recommendation to permit the application.

Councillor Sandry seconded the motion stating that although HMOs can be controversial there is a clear policy setting out a 10% saturation area.

Councillor Appleyard understood both the aims of the applicant and the concerns of the local residents. He hoped that the applicant and residents could communicate to find a suitable solution.

Councillor Crossley was opposed to the application as he felt that towns and cities should be populated by families and that Universities should take responsibility for housing their students. He was concerned of the detrimental effect on the local amenity as it would upset the balance of the community.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 8 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 1 abstention to PERMIT the application subject to the conditions set out

in the report.

Item No. 9

Application No. 18/01367/FUL

Site Location: 17 Queenwood Avenue, Fairfield Park, Bath, BA1 6EU – Erection of rear pitched roof dormer (Revised proposal)

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to refuse.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones, on behalf of the local ward member, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that although the house was the highest in the street it was not prominent in terms of the city as a whole as it was screened by trees. Eleven out of the seventeen houses in the street already have dormer windows so this was not unusual in the area. It was important to retain families living in this location.

Councillor Appleyard noted that dormer windows can be contentious and moved that consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit. This was seconded by Councillor Jackson.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 2 votes in favour, 4 against and 4 abstentions. The motion was therefore LOST.

Councillor Kew noted that there were a number of dormer windows in this area already and that he felt the proposal was acceptable. He moved that the Committee delegate to permit the application as he did not consider the dormer window to be overly large or dominant and felt that the proposal was in keeping with other dormer windows in this location. This was seconded by Councillor Appleyard.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED unanimously to DELEGATE TO PERMIT the application subject to conditions.

Item No. 10

Application No. 18/01253/LBA

Site Location: 6 Johnstone Street, Bathwick, Bath, BA2 4DH – Internal alterations for the installation of a corner shower unit, 12 recessed ceiling lights and for the retention of ground floor shutters (Regularisation)

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to refuse. She reported that the applicant had now agreed to paint the shutters. Exposed pine was not considered to be an aesthetically appropriate treatment in the context of a 19th century Georgian townhouse.

The registered speaker, who was a neighbour, spoke against the application.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr Peter Turner, local ward member, spoke in support of the application. He pointed out that the applicant had converted a former HMO into a family home and had greatly improved the building. He also stated that there would be inconsistency

if the application were to be refused because spotlights were used in other listed buildings.

In response to a question the Case Officer confirmed that the installation of a shower in its current location was unlikely to cause damage to the property as the room was large and there was ventilation.

Councillor Jackson queried whether a false ceiling would compromise the listed building status. She felt that the spotlighting was incongruous in a listed building such as this.

The Group Manager, Development Management, stated that as a Grade I listed building the property had national significance. He advised the Committee to consider the application in its own right without regard to the situation in other listed properties.

Councillor Kew welcomed the proposal to paint the shutters. He noted that modern ceilings could be removed in the future and stated that a shower was a simple piece of apparatus which could also be removed if necessary.

The Case Officer confirmed that listed building consent had been given for the work that had taken place but that there was no evidence that the applicants had discussed their plans with the Council.

Councillor Sandry moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application as he felt that neither the location of the shower nor the spotlighting were appropriate in this type of building. This was seconded by Councillor Jackson.

Councillor Crossley spoke against the motion stating that a house has to adapt over time and that it was important for listed buildings to become modern homes. The house had been in a poor condition and the applicants had upgraded and improved it. He agreed that the shutters should be painted at the front and rear of the property. However, he disputed whether harm had been caused by the installation of the shower and spotlighting.

Councillor Appleyard had concerns that if too many changes were allowed then these may not be reversed in the future. It was very important to look after listed buildings.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 5 votes in favour and 5 votes against. The Chair then used her casting vote against the motion. The motion was therefore LOST.

Councillor Crossley then moved that the Committee delegate to permit the application subject to conditions including the requirement to paint all shutters. This was seconded by Councillor Matthew Davies.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 5 votes in favour and 5 votes against. The Chairman then used her casting vote in favour of the motion. It was therefore RESOLVED to DELEGATE TO PERMIT the application subject to conditions to include the requirement to paint all shutters (at both the front and rear of the property).

10 **QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT - JANUARY TO MARCH 2018**

The Committee considered the quarterly performance report from January to March 2018.

RESOLVED: To NOTE the report.

11 **NEW PLANNING APPEALS LODGED, DECISIONS RECEIVED AND DATES OF FORTHCOMING HEARINGS/INQUIRIES**

The Committee considered the appeals report.

RESOLVED to NOTE the report.

The meeting ended at 7.30 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services