

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

8 December 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Davies (P)
Darbyshire (P)
Evans (P)
Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)
Mitchell (P)
Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)
Tait (P)

585. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Mitchell replace Councillor Evans on the Planning Development Control (Hampshire Chronicle, Winchester) Sub-Committee.

586. **PLANNING PROTOCOL**

Councillor Jeffs informed the Committee that he had been contacted by Councillor Beveridge (Portfolio Holder for Planning) stating that an unnamed Member and officer had claimed that the Conservative Group on the Planning Development Control Committee were pre-discussing planning applications as a political group, contrary to the advice in the Council's Protocol on Planning Matters.

He informed the Committee that the claim was untrue and that the matter would be progressed with the appropriate officers.

587. **MRS LESLEY WELLS**

The Committee welcomed to the meeting Mrs Lesley Wells, who had been appointed as the Council's Enforcement Manager.

588. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (PEEKS PLC, HEADBOURNE WORTHY) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC487 refers)

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE 29 NO DWELLINGS, 5,574 M SQ. OFFICES/RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (B1), VARIOUS CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ACCESS AT PEEK PLC, LONDON ROAD, HEADBOURNE WORTHY
(PDC494 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Peeks plc, Headbourne Worthy) Sub-Committee held on 22 November 2004 (attached as Appendix A to the Minutes).

The Minutes were considered in conjunction with Report PDC494, which had been prepared subsequent to the Sub-Committee meeting to address points raised by Members. The Committee noted that this Report had not been made available for publication within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item on the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration in order to determine the planning application at the earliest opportunity.

In considering the application, the Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Jenkins from Hampshire County Council's Highways Department. In answer to Members' questions, Mr Jenkins stated that the County Council had taken into consideration both the Peeks plc site application and also the application at 1 Court Road, Kings Worthy, which was opposite this application site and had also been determined at this Committee meeting. Mr Jenkins added that because the crossing of London Road in this location was not at a high level of pedestrian usage, a signalled pedestrian crossing would not be appropriate, but a central pedestrian refuge would be achievable, together with a re-designed bus stop. Developer contributions from both schemes could be utilised as part of the Safer Routes to School Scheme to achieve these works. Mr Jenkins added that London Road at this point would not be appropriate for the introduction of a thirty mile per hour speed zone but the works outlined above would have the effect of narrowing the carriageway and therefore reducing traffic speeds.

The officers were asked to investigate whether a gated entrance from the pedestrian crossing point into the proposed open space play area was achievable.

In discussing the area for public open space, the Director of Development Services confirmed that the designated open space would remain in the ownership of the developer, but the developer had indicated that they would provide appropriate play facilities in consultation with Kings Worthy Parish Council. The green space provided met the Council's open space requirement.

Although it was noted that the application was outline at present, the Director of Development Services agreed to investigate whether improved landscaping could be incorporated at the south-east corner of the site in order to reduce inward views.

It was also acknowledged that the applicant had discussed the possibility of a footpath diversion with Hampshire County Council's Rights of Way Officer, and this would be progressed as a separate application for a public path diversion order.

At the conclusion of debate the Committee agreed that the submitted application represented a good scheme and that the applicants should be commended for their consultation with the public in progressing the plans.

In respect of Report PDC494, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the application:-

Councillors Baxter, Bennetts, Beveridge, Busher, Davies, Jeffs, Johnston, Mitchell, Pearson, Read, Saunders, Sutton, Tait (13)

No Members voted against the application.

There were no abstentions (Councillors Darbyshire and Evans had left the meeting at this point).

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED:

1 That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Peeks plc, Headbourne Worthy) Sub-Committee held on 22 November 2004 be approved and adopted.

2. That in respect of Report PDC494, the application be approved as set out in the schedule of Development Control decisions which forms an Appendix to the minutes.

589. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS** (Report PDC489 refers)

The Schedule of Development Control decisions arising from the consideration of the above Report is circulated separately and forms an Appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 3 and 5 as he was an observer to the local Council for the Protection of Rural England Committee, who had made representations on the schemes and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 5 as his wife was a member of New Alresford Town Council, which had made representations on the application, but he had taken no part in consideration of this Item himself and he stayed and voted thereon.

In the public participation part of the meeting the following items were discussed:

In respect of Item 1 – 5 Sarum View, Winchester - application to fell 3 No Beech trees; crown lift and thin 1 No. Beech tree (to create 2 No. specimen trees, following advice); Mr A Clarke spoke in objection to the application.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the application:-

Councillors: Bennetts, Beveridge, Darbyshire, Jeffs, Johnston, Mitchell, Pearson, Saunders and Sutton (9).

The following Members voted against the application:-

Councillors: Baxter, Davies, Evans and Tait (4).

Abstentions: Councillors Busher and Read (2).

The application was approved and the decision taken is as set out in the schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes.

In respect of item 2 – 1 Court Road, Kings Worthy - application to demolish existing dwellings and replace with 5 No 3 bedroom dwellings, 9 No 2 bedroom dwellings and 5 No 1 bedroom apartments, together with associated car parking, landscaping and new access, Mr A Smith spoke in objection to the application and Mr P White spoke in support. The Director of Development Services reported that in respect of this application, the developer was making a contribution for highway improvements of £48,000, of which £10,000 would be allocated for footpath improvements. It was agreed that by means of an additional condition, the landscaping and fencing bordering the site to London Road be reinforced to prevent children being able to access London Road.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the application:-

Councillors: Beveridge, Davies, Evans, Mitchell, Pearson, Saunders and Sutton (7).

The following Members voted against the application:-

Councillors Baxter, Bennetts, Darbyshire, Jeffs, Johnston, Read and Tait (7).

Abstentions: Councillors Busher (1).

With the voting tied at seven-seven, the Chairman used her casting vote in favour of the application.

The application was approved and the decision taken is as set out in the schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes.

In respect of item 5 – 47 West Street, Alresford - the erection of a food store with 2 No 1 bedroom and 1 No 2 bedroom flat above, 8 No 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings, 3 No 1 bedroom flats, all with associated garages, car ports, parking and new access (as amended by plans dated 25 October 2004), as amended above, Mr R Atkins representing New Alresford Town Council spoke in objection to the application and Mr McFarlane, agent, spoke in support.

The Director of Development Services reported that a 780 signature petition had been signed by customers of the present Southern Area Cooperative store seeking support for their need for a larger store in Alresford and that the need outweighed Highway objections. In addition, Councillor Cook, a Ward Member, had written stating that he agreed with Highway Officers' reasons for refusal; that Alresford Town Council were justified in its objection and that he questioned the value of the petition submitted by Southern Area Cooperative. He added that the application did not reflect the need in the local area as there was already a Tesco Express in Alresford. He asked that a Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit the application site to assess the highways issue.

In introducing his representation on behalf of New Alresford Town Council, Mr Atkins stated that he had not been in contact with Ward Councillors, the Portfolio Holder for Planning, or Councillor Davies prior to consideration of this item by the Committee. In making his representations Mr McFarlane, agent, stated that the applicant was willing to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to provide that two of the dwellings be retained as key worker dwellings.

In answer to Members' questions, the Director of Development Services stated that it was not possible to designate part of a public highway for a specific use, i.e. to have an area designated where heavy goods vehicles could park on the highway in order to service the proposed store. In addition, it was confirmed that the petition undertaken by Southern Area Cooperative had been undertaken by an independent shopper survey company. The threshold for affordable housing provision was 15 units, but the scheme provided 14, together with a retail use. The Director added that the applicant had not confirmed in writing the offer to provide two key worker dwellings.

The Director also clarified that although access to other retail uses within Alresford was inadequate, these uses were historical and that any new application should have a design that worked satisfactorily. He added that if the width of the access for reversing HGVs was widened to 5 metres, this would still not meet highway safety criteria due to the number of blind spots that would still exist for a manoeuvring vehicle. The Director stated that it was not the applicant's wish to service the retail units from the rear area.

Amendment (1) Mitchell (2) Tait

"That with regard to item 5 – 47 West Street, Alresford, the application be deferred for one month for the applicant to negotiate with the Director of Development Services to attempt to achieve a satisfactory scheme that addresses the Highway Officers' objections."

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the amendment:-

Councillors: Mitchell, Sutton and Tait (3).

The following Members voted against the application:-

Councillors: Baxter, Bennetts Beveridge, Busher Darbyshire Davies, Evans, Jeffs, Johnston Pearson, Read and Saunders (12).

Amendment lost.

The Committee then considered the original recommendation to refuse the application. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the recommendation to refuse the application:-

Councillors: Baxter, Bennetts, Beveridge, Busher, Darbyshire, Davies, Evans, Jeffs, Johnston, Mitchell, Pearson, Read, Saunders, Sutton (14).

The following Member voted against:-

Councillor Tait (1).

In agreeing to refuse the application, the Committee amended Condition 2 to delete the reference to 'rear' in discussing loading and parking and also agreed that an Informative be added that the provision of social housing would be favoured by the Committee over the applicant's offer to provide key worker housing. The decision taken is as set out in the schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes.

In respect of item 6-3 Clarendon Close, Denmead, Waterlooville - garden shed (retrospective), Mr Lander-Brinkley, speaking on behalf of Denmead Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application and Mr J Reed spoke in support.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the application:-

Councillors Baxter, Bennetts, Beveridge, Busher, Darbyshire, Davies, Evans, Jeffs, Johnston, Mitchell, Pearson, Read, Saunders, Sutton, Tait (15).

No Members voted against the application.

The application was approved and the decision is as set out in the schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes.

The following items were not subject to public participation.

Item 3, Railway Cottages, Station Road, West Meon, was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

In respect of item 4 – 102 Downs Road, South Wonston, Winchester – application for a detached 2 bedroom bungalow with parking area and new access, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 32(i), one quarter of the Members present and voting required that a recorded vote be taken in respect of the application.

Division List

The following Members voted for the application:-

Councillors: Bennetts, Beveridge, Busher, Darbyshire, Davies, Evans, Jeffs, Johnston, Mitchell, Pearson, Read, Saunders, Sutton (13).

The following Member voted against the application:-

Councillor Baxter (1).

Abstentions: Councillors Tait (1).

The application was approved and the decision is as set out in the schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes.

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken on the Development Control applications, as set out in the Schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes, be agreed as set out above.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 6.40 pm.

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (PEEK PLC, HEADBOURNE WORTHY)
SUB-COMMITTEE****22 November 2004**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (P)

Baxter (P)
Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Darbyshire (P)Davies (P)
Jeffs (P)
Johnston (P)
Read (P)Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Hutton

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor de Peyer

Officers:Mr J Hearn (Team Manager, Planning)
Mrs S Leonard (Planning Officer)
Mrs A Toms (Environmental Health Officer)
Mr N Baldwin (Housing Enablement Officer)
Mr N Culhane (Traffic Engineer)
Mr M Edwards (Arboricultural Officer)
Mr S Dunbar-Dempsey (Open Space Project Officer)
Mrs H Brushett (Conservation Officer)
Mrs M Kirby (Principal Planning Officer)

-
590. **OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE 29 NO. DWELLINGS, 5574 METRE SQUARED OFFICES/R&D (CLASS B1 USE), VARIOUS CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ACCESS AT PEEK PLC, LONDON ROAD, HEADBOURNE WORTHY, WINCHESTER**

(Report PDC484 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Holmes of Quayside Architects (along with four other representatives of the applicant, Castle Investments (Winchester) Ltd) and approximately 12 members of the public.

Councillor Hutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as he was a member of Kings Worthy Parish Council and had participated in their discussion on the application, but had not participated in the vote.

The site was located off London Road and was adjacent to the Grade 2* St Marys Church and part of the Winchester-Canterbury Pilgrims Way public footpath (Nuns' Walk) passed through the site. The land was currently used for employment and there was a significant area of open space to the north east of the site. All of this open space was within the boundary of the Kings Worthy conservation area and was privately owned by the applicant. It was proposed that the current employment use buildings would be demolished and replaced by 3 no. three-storey B1 use office blocks formed around a square. These buildings would not be in the conservation area and were at a minimum of 180 metres from the church, which is as far as the site boundaries allowed bearing in mind the need to provide car parking.

Members noted that there was an outline planning consent granted in 1997 for B1 office/R and D use and "other" unspecified employment use on the site. Development on site had been delayed because of a legal agreement concerning off-site traffic improvements and the permission was renewed in September 2003.

Subsequently, an application for outline planning permission was submitted in March 2004 through which the new owners, Castle Developments (Winchester) Ltd, sought permission for a mixed use development to include 25 dwellings, 5575 metre sq offices/R&D, various landscaping and alterations to the existing access. This application was refused under officers' delegated powers on 22 June 2004 because of its form, siting, landscaping and an unacceptable urban design approach which would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area and the church. It had also been refused because of a lack of information regarding the height and massing of the commercial buildings and their relation to the housing units and inadequate information regarding the impact on trees and highways. There were also refusal reasons relating to the proposed housing mix and the provision of affordable housing and open space. The applicants had taken this refusal to appeal and this was likely to be decided by a public hearing in September 2005.

Following discussions with officers, the applicant had submitted a revised outline application to overcome these concerns. The revised application seeks outline consent for 29 dwellings, 5574 metre sq offices/R&D (class B1 use), various car parking, landscaping and alterations to existing access.

The Open Space and Residential Development

The residential buildings would be developed around the south-western and south eastern fringe of the Open Space. Although the Open Space was protected in the Local Plan (by policies WDLP EN2 and RT2), it was noted that there was a current permission for development on part of the land. On behalf of the applicant, Mr Holmes explained that the gradient of the slope from the Open Space to the area of land currently used as car parking space would be reduced. This area of car parking would be developed as residential dwellings and as a car park for the church and Members noted that this ground would be raised slightly to give the dwellings a better view of the Open Space and to provide a sense of containment.

Members noted that a significant amount of detail had been submitted to illustrate how the dwellings fitted the site in terms of their relationship to the open space and St Mary's Church beyond; how they related to the significant changes of level across the site; how they related to the existing and adjacent commercial buildings; and how the dwellings related in form and height to the proposed commercial development. The Sub-Committee were also shown axonometric drawings which further helped to illustrate the form and disposition of the houses and commercial buildings.

The Conservation Officer stated that it was not normal to accept outline applications in conservation areas and that, if planning permission were granted, the reference to 'for illustrative purposes only' should be removed from the drawings and that the Local Planning Authority should be asked to consider the design of the buildings. Mr Holmes considered that this would be possible and emphasised that a considerable level of detail had been submitted to demonstrate that an acceptable scheme could be accommodated on the site. Further controls could be imposed by condition and Members noted that the Local Planning Authority had powers to refuse any subsequent unsatisfactory proposals submitted. Mr Hearn concurred with this view.

Although the proposals before Members were only an outline application, Mr Holmes anticipated that each of the residential dwellings to be developed would be individual in its character and would be sympathetic to the conservation area in terms of detailed design and the use of materials. Members noted the comments of Mrs Brushett who explained that any subsequent full application would need to ensure the preservation of the conservation area through the imposition of conditions which ensured a very high quality of design.

Members also noted that the proposed location of the residential dwellings occupied slightly more of the Open Space than the previous application and Mr Hearn explained that this was to enable the provision of an area of landscaping against the access road boundary to the south west and to facilitate a better urban design solution.

It was noted that part of the Green would (whilst remaining in private ownership) be designated as Open Space and Members were concerned that a condition or any subsequent Section 106 legal agreement should ensure that the Green remains as a single, continuous area of land without any physical divisions by fences or other means of enclosure, regardless of its official designation. Mr Holmes agreed that the character of the Green would remain unchanged.

The Employment Buildings

Mr Holmes explained to the Sub-Committee the proposals for the development of 3 no. three-storey office buildings.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey explained that the positioning of the office buildings had created a pinch-point of approximately only 2 metres between the site's boundary and the boundary of Winchester House on the A33. This pinch-point would result in the loss of important vegetation cover between the site and the A33 and a Member remarked on the importance of this belt of trees in reducing traffic noise on-site.

In response, Mr Holmes stated that to re-position the office buildings further to the west and therefore away from this boundary would result in reducing the size of the C-shaped courtyard between the buildings. Furthermore by virtue of the triangular shape of this part of the site, to re-position this building Mr Holmes suggested would result in an unnecessarily large area of approximately 16 metres between the south-eastern point of the office and the A33 boundary. Mr Holmes also stated that glimpses of the development were only possible from south travelling traffic on the usually fast flowing A33 as it joined the A34.

Following debate, the Sub-Committee agreed that this issue should be further investigated. However, in response to a suggestion that this office block should be divided into two, Mr Holmes explained that this would not meet with the needs of its potential occupiers who were likely to demand large flexible internal spaces. Mr Hearn added that any proposals to alter the route of Nuns Walk may require the approval of the County Council.

Environmental Health Issues

Mrs Toms explained that it was difficult to determine what industrial uses had been conducted on the site from 1972 and therefore suggested that a desktop investigation be undertaken to determine whether there were any potential contamination issues to be addressed. In response, Mr Holmes stated that whilst there might be contamination of the land to be developed for the offices (which would be dealt with by health and safety conditions during its construction) there was no evidence that any contaminative activities had occurred on the area to be redeveloped for residential dwellings. However, following debate, the Sub-Committee agreed that the study should be undertaken.

Mrs Toms also reported that the results of a noise survey conducted at four metres from the ground (and at the likely level of first floor bedrooms) had indicated that the noise from the surrounding roads was in Noise Exposure Category C (NEC) during the day-time and NEC Category B at night (in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 24). She suggested that these findings should therefore require the applicant to include noise abatement measures through good design as part of any future detailed planning application. In response, Mr Holmes explained that the previous residential application, now at appeal, had not raised noise issues as a problem and he considered that this concern could be overcome by conditions.

Highways Issues

In summary, Mr Culhane reported that officers had no objections in highway terms to the outline application and that the proposals for car parking within the site met with policy guidelines.

Mr Culhane stated that as part of the current planning consent, the County Council had required the construction of a ghost-island for traffic waiting to turn right from London Road into the site. However, since the amended outline application before Members was likely to result in fewer traffic movements than that which was permitted within in current consent, the County Council had recommended that the acceleration and de-acceleration lanes into the site should be removed, reducing the road to two lanes, so that the right turning vehicles would help slow traffic along London Road. However, further towards Kings Worthy, part of the de-acceleration lane would remain as a layby for the existing bus stop outside the site.

Mr Culhane raised some minor concerns regarding the possible conflict between pedestrians and vehicles within the site which he suggested could be resolved by alterations to the proposed footpath. However, Mr Holmes indicated that the applicant would be unwilling to create a footpath along both sides of the internal roadways as they considered this would be unsympathetic to the character of the development.

During debate, both Members and members of the public raised concerns about the possible increase of traffic along London Road that the development could generate, particularly in light of the potential redevelopment of a site opposite the Peeks site. Mr Holmes explained that the current outline application proposed to create approximately 40 fewer car spaces than the 2003 consent permitted. 231 spaces would be provided for the offices, 48 for the residential units and 20 car parking spaces would be reserved for the use of St Mary's Church. In response to a request from a member of public, Mr Holmes stated that it would not be possible for the applicant to officially dedicate any parking on site for the Jubilee Hall (which was located at the site's entrance onto London Road) but that any such arrangement would be subject to negotiation with the occupiers of the offices.

In response to concerns raised about the speed of traffic along London Road, Members agreed that the possibility of a pedestrian island/refuge should be considered with the County Council.

The Sub-Committee also discussed the off-site contributions from the applicant to improve the highway and it was agreed that a representative of the County Council Engineers should be invited to attend the meeting of Planning Development Control Committee which would determine this application.

Affordable Housing

The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant had disputed the Council's request that 30% of the residential development should be provided as affordable housing and that Mr Holmes had offered to transfer ownership of the Open Space to either the City Council or Parish Council in exchange for reducing the percentage of affordable housing sought. In response, Members underlined that maximising the provision of affordable housing units on site was one of the Council's main strategic priorities and noted Councillor Hutton's comments (as a Ward Member and Member of the Kings Worthy Parish Council) that the Parish Council were reluctant to take on the financial responsibility of an additional village green. It was further noted that the policy relating to the provision of affordable housing was completely separate to the policy relating to the provision of accessible Open Space and it was important that the provision of one should not be allowed to compromise the provision of the other.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a member of the public supported the proposal of the transfer of the Open Space to public ownership and spoke against the Council's aim to achieve 30% affordable housing.

A Member also questioned whether the one and two bedroom flats that had been offered by the applicant for affordable housing reflected the housing need in the area.

Trees

The Green was bordered against London Road by a line of thick conifer trees and, inside the site, by five horse-chestnut trees. Mr Edwards reported that these horse-chestnut trees were in poor condition and should be replaced by a line of large trees. He suggested that once these trees had grown sufficiently, it would be appropriate to remove the conifers to allow increased views of the Green from London Road. In response, Mr Holmes indicted the applicant's willingness to comply with this suggestion. Mr Holmes also reported that remedial works were about to commence

on the line of mature poplar trees to the south of the Green and that, once construction had begun, these trees would be removed.

Other Issues

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hutton (as a Ward Member) echoed the concerns raised regarding the traffic issues and recommended that the Parish Council should be involved in any negotiations to improve London Road that may be held between the County Council and the applicant.

At the invitation of the Chairman, several members of the public raised concerns regarding the application, which included the loss of views from the existing industrial units across to the church and the security and access to the industrial units.

Conclusion

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members agreed that, with further consideration of the pinch-point between one of the office blocks and the A33 boundary, a legal agreement to prevent the segregation of the Open Space, and a resolution of the affordable housing issue, the outline planning permission should be recommended to Planning Development Control Committee for approval.

RECOMMENDED:

That it be recommended to the Planning Development Control Committee that planning permission be approved subject to further consideration of the following issues:

- pinch-point between office block no.1 and the A33 boundary;
- a legal agreement to prevent the segregation of the Open Space
- resolution of the affordable housing issue
- resolution of the contaminated land issue
- resolution of highways issues.

The meeting commenced at 11.30am and concluded at 1.45pm

Chairman