

MEETING AW.04:1213
DATE 15:08:12

South Somerset District Council

Draft Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held at Horton Village Hall, Horton on **Wednesday, 15th August 2012.**

(6.05 p.m. – 9.15 p.m.)

Present:

Members: Cllr. Angie Singleton (in the Chair)

Dave Bulmer	Ric Pallister (until 9.00 p.m.)
Carol Goodall	Ros Roderigo
Brennie Halse	Andrew Turpin (until 6.45 p.m.)
Jenny Kenton	Linda Vijeh (until 8.35 p.m.)
Paul Maxwell	Martin Wale
Nigel Mermagen	

Officers:

Andrew Gillespie	Area Development Manager (West)
Paul Philpott	Community Development Officer (West)
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Andrew Gunn	Area Lead West
Linda Hayden	Planning Officer
John Millar	Planning Officer
Chloe Beviss	Planning Assistant
David Julian	Economic Development Manager
Greg Venn	Conservation Officer
Jo Morris	Committee Administrator

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

33. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 18th July 2012, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

34. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Mike Best, John Dyke, Sue Osborne and Kim Turner.

35. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Cllr. Andrew Turpin declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 – Request for a Community Grant – Forton Community Association, as he was a member of Tatworth and Forton Parish Council and had previously been invited to attend meetings with Forton Community Association.

Cllrs. Dave Bulmer, Brennie Halse, Jenny Kenton and Martin Wale declared their personal interests in planning application no. 12/01946/FUL, as comments had been submitted by Chard Town Council on which they also served as councillors.

Cllr. Angie Singleton declared her personal interest in planning application no. 12/01610/FUL, as comments had been submitted by Crewkerne Town Council on which she also served as a councillor.

Prior to consideration of planning application no. 12/01858/LBC, Cllr. Ric Pallister declared his personal and prejudicial interest, as he was a personal friend of the applicants. He left the room during consideration of this item.

36. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 4)

No questions or comments were raised by members of the public.

37. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 5)

No announcements were made by the Chairman.

38. Area West Committee - Forward Plan (Agenda Item 6)

Reference was made to the agenda report, which informed members of the proposed Area West Committee Forward Plan.

The Area Development Manager referred Members to the proposed draft timetable outlined in the Forward Plan for reports from members appointed to Outside Organisations. Members were asked to confirm with the Area Development Manager that the dates outlined were acceptable or alternatively suggest a suitable date.

Members noted that Cllr. John Dyke had expressed a preference to give his report in November/December. Cllr. Angie Singleton commented that the Crewkerne Leisure Management (Aqua Centre) AGM would be held in September and therefore she would prefer to give her report in October.

The Area Development Manager updated members that the report on Stop Line Way due to be considered in September was no longer required.

RESOLVED: that the Area West Forward Plan be noted as attached to the agenda subject to the above amendments being taken into account.

(Resolution passed without dissent)

*(Andrew Gillespie, Area Development Manager (West) – 01460 260426)
(andrew.gillespie@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

39. Request for a Community Grant – Forton Community Association (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 7)

The Community Development Officer introduced the report, which asked members to consider an application for financial assistance towards the construction of Forton Community Centre. He explained that the project would be taken forward in two phases – phase 1 being the construction and ground works and phase 2 the fitting out, which would

be assisted by Jake Hannis, the District Council's Senior Sport & Healthy Lifestyles Officer. The Community Development Officer referred members to the recommendation outlined in the report highlighting that a time limit condition had been proposed to ensure that necessary funds were secured for phase 2 of the project.

Mr John Adams, representing Forton Community Association addressed the Committee. He explained that they were seeking financial assistance to enable the project to proceed. Members were informed that the project was on schedule and they were well on the way to agreeing final layout plans. He commented that the project would also benefit the surrounding areas including Horton, Chard and Ilminster. He informed members that many local tradesmen had been very generous in supporting the project; they had sufficient funds to cover the materials and were aiming to commence the groundwork in 2013. He explained about the types of groups that would benefit from the project including dance troops, cricket team and drama groups. He further explained that fundraising for the project was ongoing and that many fundraising events had been held and other organisations also approached for grant funding. It was hoped that in the future the hall would be self-funding. In conclusion, he informed members that Forton Community Association had recently achieved Charitable status.

In response to questions, Members were informed that the land that the Centre was being built on was owned by Forton Community Association and that once built the Community Centre would also be owned by the Community Association. Members were assured that the Community Development Officer was content with the proposed project costs.

In response to a concern over funding not being secured for phase 2 of the project, Mr Adams outlined examples of income received and profit generated through fundraising events and use of the current facilities by local football teams.

Clarification was sought regarding Forton Community Association being confident that they had spoken to the appropriate people regarding the recovery of VAT. Reference was also made as to whether there would be a Business Plan to ensure sufficient income, once the project was completed. In response, Mr Adams explained that although a Business Plan was not currently in place, Forton Community Association were more than confident that they could complete the project.

Cllr. Andrew Turpin, Ward Member spoke in support of the project. He referred to the tremendous cohesion between the Parish Council and the Community Association and that the village was passionate about taking the project forward. He referred to the clear need to accommodate the local football teams and that this should be commended.

During the ensuing discussion, Members expressed their support for the project and commended the village for taking it forward and felt that provision of football pitches was very important to the wider community. Some members expressed slight concerns over the ability to secure funding for phase 2 of the project and hoped that appropriate procedures were in place regarding personal liabilities but were satisfied with the grant being a provisional offer and subject to the necessary funds being raised to complete the project within the next 12 months.

Members unanimously supported the Officer's recommendation outlined in the report.

RESOLVED: That a provisional grant offer of £12,500 be made to Forton Community Association towards the Forton Community Centre Project, subject to the necessary funds to complete the project being raised within the next 12 months.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

Reason: To consider an application for financial assistance towards the construction of Forton Community Centre.

*(Paul Philpott, Community Development Officer (West) – 01460 260359)
(paul.philpott@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

40. Budget Monitoring Report for the Period Ending 30th June 2012 (Agenda Item 8)

The Area Development Manager (West) summarised the report, which updated Members of the current budgetary position of the Area West Committee as at the end of June 2012.

Members noted that the contribution towards the Snowden Park project no longer appeared in the report as this project had been completed.

Members were content to approve the recommendations outlined in the report.

RESOLVED: (1) That Members reviewed and commented on the current financial position of Area West budgets; and
(2) That the position of the Area West Revenue Reserve be noted.

(Resolution passed without dissent)

*(Catherine Hood, Corporate Accountant – 01935 462157)
(catherine.hood@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

41. Reports from Members on Outside Organisations (Agenda Item 9)

No reports were made at the meeting by members who represented the Council on outside applications.

42. Motions (Agenda Item 10)

The following motion was proposed by Cllr Andrew Turpin:

Proposal

That in order to promote or facilitate greater use of public transport in getting to meetings, that Area West Committee venues are sited where there is public transport available.

The motion was not seconded.

43. Feedback on Planning Applications Referred to the Regulation Committee (Agenda Item 11)

There was no feedback to report as there were no planning applications that had been referred recently by the Committee to the Regulation Committee.

NOTED.

*(David Norris, Development Manager – 01935 462382)
(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

44. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 12)

The Committee noted the details contained in the agenda report, which informed members of planning appeals lodged, dismissed and allowed.

NOTED.

(David Norris, Development Manager – 01935 462382)
(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)

45. Date and Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda Item 13)

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday 19th September 2012 at 5.30 p.m. Venue to be confirmed.

NOTED.

(Jo Morris, Committee Administrator – 01935 462055)
(jo.morris@southsomerset.gov.uk)

46. Planning Applications (Agenda Item 14)

The Committee considered the applications set out in the schedule attached to the agenda and the planning officers gave further information at the meeting and, where appropriate, advised members of letters received as a result of consultations since the agenda had been prepared.

12/01783/FUL – Alterations and the erection of a two storey extension to dwellinghouse, conversion of existing garage into habitable room, the erection of a detached double garage and the formation of a new vehicular access. The Mole Hole, Hare Lane, Broadway – Mr C Mould

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. The Planning Officer updated the report with an amendment to condition 4 so that the bathroom windows in the rear elevation would not be fixed closed. She also recommended an additional condition to remove permitted development rights for the enlargement of windows and to prevent any additional first floor windows in the extensions. The main considerations of the application related to the impact upon the character of the dwelling and street scene, and the impact upon neighbouring amenity. The proposals were considered to be of an acceptable design and were not harmful to the character of the dwelling and would not result in direct overlooking. The Planning Officer's recommendation was for approval.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr John Houghton and Mr Alan De-Withey, in objection to the application. Views expressed included the following:

- A request was made for a fence to be erected on the boundary line prior to work commencing;
- Objection to the bathroom window overlooking neighbouring bedroom window;
- The proposal was considered to be overdevelopment on an inappropriate site;
- Government guidance stated that no extensions should dominate and it was felt that this proposal was not in proportion;
- Objections to the side extension as it would dominate neighbouring garden and home;

- It was felt that the proposal would affect the streetscene, it would be seen from the Lane and would be far more apparent due to the removal of two trees in the front garden;
- The double doors of the extension facing north would overlook the neighbouring rear garden;
- The proposal would result in loss of open rural aspect and loss of sunlight to the neighbouring bedroom and garden;
- Objections to the first floor windows as they would overlook the neighbouring property.

The applicant's agent, Mr Simon Stroud, commented that the overall height of the cottage was considerably lower than Farnham House. He noted that the overall footprint was only 20% more than the existing building. The Mole Hole had been built in the early 1800's and the majority of buildings in the vicinity had been built later.

The applicant, Mr Colin Mould referred to many homes in the vicinity that had new build and extensions. He commented that he had tried to address some of the concerns raised by submitting amended plans including the removal of a proposed balcony. He was currently undergoing a boundary dispute and had tried his best to compromise. In referring to the windows overlooking at ground floor level, he explained that the patio door looked out at a 6ft fence. He commented that there were already two windows to the east of the property. He believed that there was still an adequate distance between his and the neighbouring property. He said that there was evidence from speaking to local neighbours that they were in favour of the proposal. In conclusion, he said that he was looking to improve the footprint and that there were other properties that were closer together.

Ward Member, Cllr. Linda Vijeh commented that local relationships had broken down and that she felt that in order to be fair it was beneficial for members to hear the views of both parties concerned. She referred to the main concern of the proposal in that the extension would be considerably higher and felt that the current level of privacy would be impacted upon and that the proposal was also domineering.

During the ensuing discussion, one member felt that the proposal was acceptable in terms of size and that overlooking was not unreasonable. It was acceptable that buildings needed to be modernised to accommodate family need. He also felt that it was unreasonable for the bathroom window to be sealed up.

In response to a member question concerning distances, the Planning Officer informed members that it was 2 metres from the back of the extension to the boundary and 1 metre to the side. Members were also informed that the size of the proposals was not considered to be a large increase.

Members requested that an additional condition be included to agree boundary treatments prior to commencement of the development.

Member, Cllr. Linda Vijeh, commented that she supported the views of the local residents and the parish council in objection to the application and was therefore unable to support the officer's recommendation.

A proposal was made, and subsequently seconded to approve the application as per the officer's recommendation subject to the following amendment to condition 4 plus two additional conditions:

- An amendment to condition 4 so that the bathroom windows would not be fixed closed.

- An additional condition to remove permitted development rights for enlargement of windows and to prevent any additional first floor windows in the extensions.
- An additional condition to agree boundary treatments.

On being put to the vote the proposal was approved with 9 members in favour and 1 against.

RESOLVED: That planning application no 12/01783/FUL be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and subject to the conditions detailed in the agenda report and subject to an amendment to Condition 04 so that the windows will not be fixed and subject to two additional conditions relating to the following:

The removal of permitted development rights for enlargement of windows and to prevent any additional first floor windows in the extensions.

To agree boundary treatments.

(Voting: 9 in favour, 1 against)

12/01610/FUL – Change of Use of 4 No. Units from office units (Use Class B1) to 4 No. residential flats, 1, 2, 5 & 6 The Barley Yard, Crewkerne – Boldacre Estates

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application set out in the agenda report. The main considerations related to the loss of business premises and the robustness of marketing undertaken. It was felt that the units had been robustly marketed and that the proposed development would not lead to a significant adverse effect on employment opportunities. The Planning Officer's recommendation was for approval.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer and the Economic Development Manager clarified points of detail raised by members. Members were informed of the following:

- A local market appraisal was undertaken in June, and it was felt that there was a reasonable availability of B1 premises;
- There was little demand for B1 units compared to flats, which had been substantiated by local estate agents. It was difficult to see where the demand for B1 units would come from;
- A bin store would still be available. Somerset Waste Partnership had been consulted but no response had been received;
- The provision of affordable housing had been included as the original development and would not normally be for 4;
- The units had been marketed through 4 separate agents and were available on several websites and had also been mentioned in national publications, regional and national press;
- There were currently two households allocated to each bin store;
- There were 6 units located on the ground floor, 1 was currently occupied with 1 would be retained;
- It was believed that all the units had the same covenant;
- The 4 units relating to the application had not been occupied;
- Existing properties at the site had the same amount of amenity space as the proposed flats.

The Senior Legal Executive confirmed that the covenant was a separate issue to planning permission and that it was an issue for the landlord and the applicant. It was

not reasonable to refuse the application because of the covenant. She would assume that the units were marketed as B1 units with the covenant attached as any other marketing would be unfair.

The Committee noted the comments of Jo Dawson of Crewkerne Town Council. She indicated that Crewkerne Town Council had recommend refusal as they were keen to ensure that there was adequate start up units offering employment locally in the town. She referred to other developments in Crewkerne requesting B1 units, therefore indicating a need as well as increased housing in the town which would also generate a need for more employment opportunities. She commented about the increase in carbon footprint if people were required to travel elsewhere for employment. She referred to the covenant in place and questioned whether this had been in place when original planning permission was granted.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr Paul Dance referred to the robust and extensive marketing undertaken over the last 6 years and the number of large incentives which had also been put forward. He commented that the units were not located in the town centre and that there was a lack of local amenities near by. In referring to the covenant, he explained that an insurance company owned the freehold of the building and nothing could be done about the situation. The units were located predominately in a residential area and would compliment the surrounding area. It was felt that commercial units would attract more parking than residential properties. He explained that the units would provide small flats for rent and that estate agents had a waiting list for this type of property. In referring to the issue raised concerning provision for bins, he did not feel this was an issue as there was an allocated area and he could not see that a great deal more refuse would be generated.

The Applicant, Mr Andrew Hurst commented that he had failed to provide proper marketing details in his previous application. He explained that marketing had been undertaken including the offer of 12 months free rent and that no interest had been received. He referred to part of the problem being the tightly controlled covenant. He had tried hard to market the units but there was no demand for start up offices and that people tended to work from home. He informed members of his personal circumstances and concluded that there was a demand for flats and that he could not see any other option for the units.

Ward Member, Cllr. Angie Singleton, commented that she supported the views of Crewkerne Town Council. She referred to the lack of Class B1 in the town and that she knew of only two suitable units available for immediate occupation. Reference was made to two new proposed developments in Crewkerne with proposals for B1 units, indicating a need in the town. She expressed concerns regarding the marketing of the units and that the lettings board could not be seen from the road. She reiterated that the units were ideal for start up businesses with parking spaces offered and were also close enough to other car parks. Reference was made to Crewkerne town expanding and that there was no other such business accommodation in the town.

During the ensuing discussion, members supported the officer's recommendation to approve the application subject to an additional condition for the provision of bin storage and clarification as to whether any of the units shall be for affordable housing. The majority of members accepted that everything possible had been done under the circumstances to find occupiers for the units. It was felt that there had been extensive marketing, the units had been empty for 6 years and the present economic climate was unlikely to change. It was also felt that lessons should be learnt and taken into account when considering other developments in Crewkerne with proposals for B1 units.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application with conditions as per the Officer's recommendation subject to an additional condition to ensure adequate provision

for bin storage. It was agreed that the decision would not be issued until legal advice was sought as to whether any of the units should be affordable, as a period of 8 years had lapsed since the original planning application. The Area Chair, Ward Member and Cllr. Ric Pallister would be informed of the outcome of the legal advice.

RESOLVED: That planning application no 12/01610/FUL be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation subject to:-

- (i) the prior completion of a Section 106 planning agreement (in a form acceptable to the Council's Solicitor(s)) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued to ensure the provision of an element of affordable housing, if considered necessary following advice from Legal Services and with the agreement of the Area Chair, Ward Members and Cllr. Ric Pallister;
- (ii) the conditions detailed in the agenda report and subject to an additional condition to ensure adequate provision for bin storage.

(Voting: 10 in favour)

12/02242/FUL – Alterations and the change of use of premises from financial and professional services (Use Class A2) to 1 No. residential unit, 36A Holyrood Street, Chard – Mike Loveless & Sons

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application set out in the agenda report. He indicated that there was no parking provision proposed, despite requirements for two spaces under the County Parking Strategy. The County Highway Authority had not objected on the grounds that the previous use would have generated significantly more vehicle movements than those associated with the proposed domestic use. The proposal was considered to be acceptable as there was a good mix of retail and residential units in the area and there would be no detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. The Planning Officer's recommendation was for approval.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr Simon Gitsham, informed members that the premises had been vacant since August 2011 and that there had been no interest for commercial use since the premises had been marketed. The best viable use was for a two bed flat. He considered there to be no design concerns and that the works would improve the building. In referring to concerns raised over lack of parking, he outlined the reasons why he considered the application to be acceptable including the previous use generating more vehicle movements, the site being located in a sustainable location and in close proximity to local amenities. The occupiers would not need to be reliant on the use of a car although there were several car parks with reasonable capacity in close proximity to the premises.

Members were informed that Tony Prior, Chair of Chard Town Council Planning Committee would have liked to have spoken against the application but was unable to attend the meeting.

Ward Member, Cllr. Brennie Halse referred to the requirement for 2 parking spaces under the County Parking Strategy and commented that this made sense when considering new builds but the proposal was for a change of use. She commented that few buildings had designated parking and suggested that other areas would have similar

problems if the Strategy were to apply in all circumstances. If members were to consider the policy being appropriate for new build only, an approval could be made.

During the ensuing discussion, the majority of members supported the officer's recommendation to approve the application and considered there to be acceptable reasons to go against the County Parking Strategy in line with the County Highway Authority. One member against the officer's recommendation felt that it was important for shops frontages to remain and that if the application was approved it could be the beginning of the end of a commercial street, which would greatly affect viability of the local area. Another member expressed concerns relating to community safety issues, as the public car park was located behind the premises and vehicles could not be seen from the premises. Reference was also made to vehicle movement and that not many people would drive to the Betting establishment and that residents would tend to park for longer periods of time.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the officer recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried 7 in favour and 3 against.

RESOLVED: That planning application no 12/02242/FUL be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and subject to the conditions detailed in the agenda report.

(Voting: 7 in favour, 3 against)

12/01946/FUL – Formation of new access and parking, 17 The Beacon, Ilminster - Mr T Broom

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application set out in the agenda report. The Planning Officer referred to the main concerns, which related to highway safety and vehicles reversing onto a classified road. The Highway Authority had no objection to the proposal and viewed the scheme as an enhancement, as vehicles would be off the road. He reported that the Highway Authority had considered it unnecessary for an officer to attend the meeting, despite a request to attend. The Planning Officer updated members with a further e-mail he had received from John Gallimore, of the Highway Authority in response to comments received in objection. It stated that the cars currently parked in front of the proposed access would go into the newly created parking area within the cartilage of number 17. There was no record of accidents in the section of road concerned and that it would be difficult to recommend refusal on lack of turning in these circumstances. The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

In response to a member question, the Planning Officer stated that he was not aware that Highways would be marking the road to stop parking in front and confirmed that dropped kerbs had been requested. It was felt that the public would not normally park in front of a parking area.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr Les Brown and Mr N Hill, in objection to the application. Views expressed included the following:

- There was no objection to parking on the land but the creation of 3 egresses onto a county highway;
- The road was always full of parked cars and the houses would have no access;
- The proposal would displace cars elsewhere;
- Vehicles should be limited to 1 access gate, this would solve the problem of only 1 parking space on the road;

- Reference was made to the historical importance of the site, which was felt should be taken into consideration.

Ward Member, Cllr. Carol Goodall informed members that unfortunately the other Ward Member Cllr. Kim Turner was unable to attend the meeting but felt strongly that the application should be refused. Cllr. Goodall expressed concerns relating to highway access, vehicles which would be displaced and that there would be nowhere for cars to park. She commented that a large number of vehicles treated the 'B' classification road as a racing track and it was only the parked cars that slowed them down. Another concern related to cars reversing out onto the road. She concluded that the proposed new access and parking area was located on a bend in the road and that she and her fellow Ward Member considered the proposal to be unsafe.

The Senior Legal Executive reminded members that the Highway Authority had no objections to the proposals and that if members were minded to go against the Officer's recommendation that full precise planning reasons for refusal would need to be agreed in order to avoid the potential for costs being awarded against the Council at appeal.

During the ensuing discussion, members supported the concerns of the Ward Members over the potential impact of the proposal on highway safety. They also felt that it was important to hear the views of the Highway Authority in relation to their decision.

The Area West Lead reiterated that a Highway Authority representative had been invited to the meeting but had felt that it was not necessary to attend.

A proposal was made to defer consideration of the application to the next meeting of the Area West Committee in order to allow attendance of the Highway Authority. The proposal was seconded and on being put to the vote was carried 7 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning application no 12/01946/FUL be DEFERRED to the next Area West Committee in order to allow the attendance of the Highway Authority.

(Voting: 7 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention)

12/01858/LBC – The carrying out of alterations to include replacement of window and doors on west elevation with glazed screen, Tower House, 19 Brettingham Court, Gas Lane, Hinton St George – Mr & Mrs R Kennedy

Cllr. Ric Pallister declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application, as a friend of the applicants. He left the room during consideration of the item.

The Planning Assistant introduced the application and informed members that the building had been converted to a dwelling in 1971.

The Conservation Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application. He considered that the principle of removing the existing door and glass above was acceptable and that the design and appearance of the proposed replacement was appropriate with the structure of the building. The Officer's recommendation was for approval. The Conservation Officer referred to the Parish Council's wish to retain the glass panel above the door. It was explained that the proposal was for 6 panes of glass with a door in the centre that would open higher than a standard door. A picture illustrating a barn entrance which had been constructed in a similar way was shown to Members as an example.

In response to questions, the Conservation Officer clarified points of detail raised by Members, which included the following:

- In response to whether consideration had been given to retaining the glass above, which would deal with the Parish Council objections, it was felt that this would be acceptable for more recent glass but old glass which had been recycled had a tendency to move;
- It was not appropriate to control the hanging of furnishings to the interior of windows and doors.

The Applicant, Mr Robin Kennedy stated that he enjoyed living in the village of Hinton St George and was keen to preserve the history of it and wanted to make his property more beautiful. He felt that the proposed alterations would offer more light as the inside room currently had no outlook. He was happy to preserve the existing glass above and offer it to another property in the village. He felt that the proposals were an improvement and would assist in restoring the property closer to how it would have previously appeared in the past.

The Ward Member, Cllr. Paul Maxwell, expressed his support for the application and was content with the proposed alterations.

During the ensuing discussion, one Member felt that the proposals would be an improvement and would enhance the appearance of the building. Another member expressed a slight concern over the future of the property, particularly if it was sold to another owner and that the erection of curtains/blinds could look untidy.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the Officer's recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously in favour.

RESOLVED: That planning application no. 12/01858/LBC be APPROVED as per the officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions outlined in the agenda report.

(Voting: unanimously in favour)

.....
Chairman