

Minutes

CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

1 December 2010

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present:</p> <p>Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) Paul Buttivant Peter Curling Janet Duncan (Labour Lead) Dominic Gilham Brian Stead</p> <p>Officers Present:</p> <p>Jales Tippell, Matt Duigan, Jason Traves, Manmohan Ranger, Sarah White & Gill Brice</p> <p>Also Present:</p> <p>Councillor George Cooper</p>	
115.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>	
116.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p>	
117.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There had been no matters that had been notified as urgent.</p>	
118.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.</p>	

119.	RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2009/2752 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)	Action by
	<p>1. Outline application (all matters reserved, except for access): Demolition of some existing buildings; A) Creation of up to 1,296 residential dwellings (Class C3) of between 2 to 6 residential storeys; B) Creation of up to 77 one-bedroom assisted living retirement accommodation of between 3 to 4 storeys; C) Creation of a three-form entry primary school of 2 storeys; D) Creation of a hotel (Class C1) of 5 storeys of up to 90 beds; E) Creation of a 1,200 seat theatre with ancillary café (Sui Generis); office (Class B1a) of up to 13,860sq.m; energy centre (Sui Generis) of up to 1,200sq.m; and retail (Class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5) of up to 2,850sq m; in buildings of between 4 to 6 storeys as well as a tower element associated with the theatre of up to 30m; F) Creation of a local centre to provide up to 150sq.m of retail (Class A1 and A2) and 225sq.m GP surgery (Class D1); Means of access and improvements to pedestrian linkages to the Uxbridge Town centre; car parking; provision of public open space including a district park; landscaping; sustainable infrastructure and servicing.</p> <p>2. In addition to the above, full planning permission is sought for: A) Change of use of the Grade II listed former cinema building to provide 600sq.m Class D1/2 use (no building works proposed); B) Change of use and alterations to the Grade II listed Hillingdon House to provide 600sq.m for a restaurant (Class A3) on the ground floor and 1,500sq.m of office (Class B1) on the ground, first and second floors; C) Change of use and alterations to the Carpenters building to provide 1 residential dwelling (Class C3); Creation of 29 residential dwellings (Class C3) to the north of Hillingdon House of between 2 to 3 storeys as well as associated amenity space and car parking; Change of use of Lawrence House (Building No. 109) to provide 4 dwellings (Class C3), associated amenity space and car parking including a separate freestanding garage; D) Change of use and alterations to the Sick Quarters (Building No. 91) to provide 4 dwellings (Class C3) as well as associated amenity space and car parking; E) Change of use of Mons barrack block (Building No. 146A) to provide 7 dwellings (Class C3) as well as associated amenity space and car parking.</p> <p>585/APP/2009/2752</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, two representatives of the Petitions received objecting to the proposal and the agent addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The 2 petitioners made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the current plan was to be approved there would be an increase in traffic and there were concerns how this would be managed. • Vine Lane was a narrow 2 lane road, which was overloaded with vehicular traffic already. • Traffic calming measures have been installed along Vine Lane but traffic still speeds up causing a danger to pedestrians and cyclists. 	<p>Jales Tippell Jason Traves Matt Duigan</p>

- No thought had been given to the present plan and the additional traffic that would use Vine Lane when the access was re-opened.
- A number of residents would use the Vine lane access as a short cut when it was open.
- There was a school close to the access to the site, which would cause problems at the start and finish of the school day.
- Traffic from outside of the site would use this access to avoid St Andrews roundabout.
- There are severe misgivings about the plan if this application was to be approved.
- English Heritage comments have been disregarded.
- To retain the past military history of the site more than the 4/5 Listed Buildings being retained should be redeveloped and not demolished.
- The Supplementary Planning Guidance expressed the view point that an assessment of the assets for the potential for the regeneration of the site should be considered, this had not been done.
- No attempt had been made to retain the barrack blocks in the square, especially as conversion of the Mons block was tenable.
- The residents view remains that the proposals do not maintain the character or historic fabric for the future.
- The proposal was not felt to achieve an attractive accessible extension to the Town Centre.
- The surface crossovers do not achieve a suitable pedestrian access to the Town Centre.
- The provision of an elevated travelator has not been given due consideration.
- It was felt that the SPG had been overlooked in some areas in favour of the development.
- The application should be given further consideration by the applicant.
- Re-development of RAF Uxbridge was an opportunity to provide a bus route to serve the proposed development but there has been no mention of this.
- North Uxbridge Residents Association had recently had a meeting with TfL regarding bus traffic around Uxbridge to no avail.
- There was already traffic congestion in Belmont Road and York Road, as buses park there due to the limited space in Bakers Yard.

The Chairman asked officers to clarify the situation in regard to the comments made in relation to the possibility of routing a bus through the proposed site.

Officers advised that TfL was responsible for the buses and they had looked at the proposals with a view to running a bus through the site. They had advised that there would be no purpose served by this as there were routes within walking distance of the site.

The agent made the following points:-

- The road layout had been designed to enable a bus route to run

through the site should TFL's views change in the future

- A lot of modelling had been carried out in Vine Lane, which showed that there would be 1 car every 4 minutes, which evaluated to a 2% increase in traffic movements.
- The roads through the site had been designed in a way to ensure that rat running would take longer east to west.
- At the exhibition residents concerns had been taken into consideration and a majority of those attended preferred to cross to the Town Centre at ground level. This was in addition to the improvements being made to the subway access.
- An assessment and survey of all the buildings had been undertaken by an independent advisor. The most significant buildings on the site had been retained and the application had now been amended to include the retention of the rifle range.

Members of the committee asked for clarification on a number of points on the information provided by the agent.

A Ward Councillor before addressing the meeting advised that he had a personal and prejudicial interest in the application as plan handed out at the meeting illustrated that his son lived in a property that would be affected by the re-alignment of the roundabout at Chippendale Way/Park Road.

Officers asked for an adjournment for advice to be sought as a member of the committee also had the same interest and would need to leave the meeting.

During the adjournment officers showed the Ward Councillor a larger plan that showed that the new road alignment would not affect the properties occupied by his son. On Legal advice the Councillor was advised that this was a personal interest and not prejudicial, which meant that the committee member could remain in the meeting and discuss and vote on the application.

On the re-adjournment of the meeting the Ward Councillor advised the meeting that on looking at the more detailed plans the new road alignment would not affect the property where his son lived. He would only therefore need to declare a personal interest. The Ward Councillor withdrew his previous prejudicial and personal interest and declared a personal interest. The committee member also declared a personal interest and was able to remain in the meeting and discuss and vote on the application.

The Ward Councillor made the following points:-

- This was a military site and if development carried out in the right way this would be a benefit to the community.
- Parking restrictions are currently being considered in relation to Honey Hill, Vine Lane and Blossom Way, if there was not a traffic problem in the area why were parking restrictions being considered.
- Reference had been made to the school being provided, there was a shortage of school places and a school was needed as part of this development.

In answer to an issue raised in relation to whether Chippendale Way junction was to be signalled officers advised that the only signals being provided would be for the pedestrian crossing. No other junctions were to be signalised.

A member raised concerns about the increased traffic using Vine Lane access and asked how this would be managed. Further concerns were raised about the St Andrews roundabout and Chippendale Way junctions as it was felt that with additional traffic they would barely function. There were also issues in regard to the entrance to the Chimes car park as this was currently unsafe. The transport assessment needed to be looked at further so that there was a better understanding of the current traffic problems in the area. Parking was a further concern and the proposal would attract rat running, which had not been taken into account.

The Chairman asked for clarification of the traffic assessment of vehicles using Vine Lane and Honey Hill as there was always queuing traffic at the junction at peak hours. This along with the American Community School close to the access raised a number of concerns.

Officers advised that both junctions had been assessed as part of the transport assessment. It was suggested that if members had concerns, measures could be put in place to control the Vine Lane access. This could include traffic calming, width restrictions or a gate for emergency access only to prevent rat running.

The Chairman suggested that the committee should consider having the details for the management of the access onto Vine Lane from the site back to committee for a decision. This would ensure that members concerns had been addressed. It was moved, seconded and agreed that condition 28v as amended would come back to committee for a decision.

It was also suggested and agreed by the committee that before the details of the access comes back to committee for a decision that the American Community School and Vine Lane residents be consulted on the details.

Officers advised that the transport assessment was scrutinised by the Local Authority, Transport for London and independent consultants. The model considered the access and the bus route through the site and included predicted growth along with existing and committed development in the area. The traffic engineer had been involved in the discussions on the S106 undertaking in regards to appropriate mitigation measures, which had been included as part of the application. There may be a possibility that this access can be restricted in some way, which would be shown in the details. There had been a sum of £500,000 Transport Fund included as part of the S106 for any additional work that may be required once the access was in use.

Members stated that they had real concerns about the access from the site onto Vine Lane and consideration should be given to restricting the access.

Members stated that they were reassured by the fund that had been included as part of the S106 for any future mitigation measures. It was suggested that Grove Road and Montague Road and junctions into the Chimes Car Park needed further consideration as at certain times of the year there were queues for access the car park.

Concerns were also raised in relation to the stance taken by Transport for London in not wanting to run a bus route through the site. This was not the way to promote public transport and it was suggested that there needed to be further talks with Transport for London.

A member asked for an informative to be added to ensure that the Hotel element included a drop off point for coaches. This was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

In answer to an issue raised in relation to parking for brown badge holders officers suggested that this be added as an informative. An informative was agreed by the committee.

The committee asked for confirmation that in relation to the 7 storey building that there were no issues in relation to aircraft using RAF Northolt and the relationship to properties in the surrounding area.

Officers advised that a number of statutory consultations had been undertaken, which included the Ministry of Defence, there had been no safeguarding objections received as part of the consultations. In regard to the surrounding area, officers advised that the 7 storey element had been located close to roadways so they met Council policy in relation to overlooking and overshadowing.

In answer to a question raised officers advised that the detailed application if submitted after the Local Development Framework had been agreed would have to comply with the new changes. The committee were also advised that the reserved matters included the scale and height of the buildings.

A member asked that English Heritage had raised significant objections, can officers advise why these had not been taken forward.

Officers advised that the buildings that warranted retention had been retained on the site. The plans had been amended to retain the firing range on the site, which would be included in the District Park.

In answer to an issue raised on who would be responsible for the firing range now that it had been retained, officers advised that this would be included as part of the District Park. The responsibility for the management of the range was not yet clear but would be retained for the future and would be a public asset. The ownership/maintenance issue would be clarified in the management plan and be separate from this application. The Green Spaces team were currently looking at taking on the maintenance of the District Park and there was to be a contribution was included as part of the S106 for the continued maintenance of the Park.

The figures in regard to the number of parking spaces was incorrect in the report 30, this was amended by officers. Conditions 29 & 30 needed to be amended accordingly.

The recommendation was moved and seconded with the following amendments:

Two additional informatives added on Brown badge spaces and Hotel drop off point for coaches and conditions 29 & 30 amended to include the amended parking space figure. Condition 28v was to come back to committee for a decision.

Resolved –

1 That the application be referred to the Greater London Authority (under Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008).

2 That subject to the Mayor not directing the Council under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 to refuse the application, or under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission, subject to any relevant amendments agreed by the Head of Planning and Enforcement and also those requested by the Greater London Authority and the following:

a) That the Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:

(i) The provision of affordable housing equivalent to a minimum of 15% of the total number of habitable rooms comprised within the residential units on the site and for which 53% are to be of the social rent tenure

(ii) The gifting of land to be used to accommodate a theatre

(iii) The gifting of the land for 3 Form Entry primary school and contribution of £8,608,900 to build the equivalent of a 2 Form Entry primary school

(iv) The provision of a Primary Care Trust facility PCT facility on to be let at a peppercorn rent and to a fit out to a detailed design to be agreed by the Council and the Hillingdon Primary Care Trust or a one-off contribution of £624,507.94 subject to the agreement of the Hillingdon PCT if an off-site facility is preferable to the PCT

(v) An undertaking for provision of land and 'laying out' of the District Park plus management and maintenance of the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) in a plan to be agreed with the Council and the Environment Agency (EA) and Thames Water (TW) plus a separate maintenance contribution of £285,000

(vi) A financial contribution of £1,620,000 for the St Andrews roundabout pedestrian subway upgrade (For avoidance of any doubt, this is different and in addition to the highways related surface level works being requested in item 'xiii')

(vii) A financial contribution of £500,000 towards a transport fund to cover the costs of implementing supplementary mitigation measures (both interim and permanent) to address unforeseen highway impacts that emerge during the course of the development (For avoidance of doubt, this is different and in addition to the undertaking in item 'xiii')

(viii) A financial contribution of £45,000 towards parking management

(ix) The provision of a 10 year Sustainable Travel Plan and an undertaking to implement initiatives not necessarily limited to and likely to include an Oyster-card programme to be agreed with the Council and TFL

(x) A financial contribution of £120,000 for bus stop upgrades or lesser figure as identified in a bus stop audit to be undertaken at no cost to and for approval of by the Council and TFL

(xi) An undertaking to enter into a s278 agreement for pedestrian connectivity works as recommended in the Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) Audit and subject to a detailed design to be approved in writing by TFL and the Council

(xii) The provision of a car club on site for at least 6 car parking spaces and subject to a detailed design to be approved in writing by TFL and the Council

(xiii) An undertaking to enter into a s278 agreement and to fund the cost of highway works subject to a detailed design to be approved in writing by TFL and the LPA prior to the commencement of development, not necessarily limited to and to include the following:

a. Construction of a new signalised site access junction on Hillingdon Road (A4020) and closure and reinstatement of the existing access

b. Alterations and improvements to St Andrews Roundabout including surface level pedestrian crossings

c. Alterations and improvements to the Park Road/Chippendale Way Roundabout

d. Widening of Park Road between St Andrews and Chippendale roundabouts to provide 3 lanes each way including land dedication, alterations to street lighting and all highway trees affected by the widening

e. Improvements to the signal junction at The Green Way/Hillingdon Hill and Kingston Lane/Hillingdon Hill including linking these two sets of signals together with SCOOT or UTC and with the new site access signals. The detailed design to be agreed with TfL and LBH.

f. Improvements to the Park Road/Honeycroft Hill signal junction, Hercies/Honey Hill Junction, Park Road/Harefield Road signal junction and the Swakeleys Roundabout. The detailed design to be agreed with TfL and LBH.

g. Prior to commencement of the development the following 5 junctions are to be assessed and to deliver any mitigation works which are deemed necessary, being:

i. Chippendale Way/Montague Road signal junction

ii. Chippendale Way/ Sainsbury Site Access Roundabout

iii. Chippendale Way/Belmont Road Roundabout

iv. Swakeleys Roundabout in conjunction with The Park Road/Harefield Road signal junction.

(xiv) The provision of CCTV equipment as well as a financial contribution of £200,000 towards its maintenance and control room monitoring. Details of the CCTV equipment and locations are to be agreed in writing by the Council and Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Officer. They shall include public areas of the application site (Not limited to and including the town centre square, neighbourhood square, St Andrews Roundabout, District Park, in particular its bridge crossing points) as well as consideration of locations outside the application site

(xv) The gifting of the listed cinema as well as a financial contribution of £750,000 for improvement or completion of the improvements works to the specified value in a detailed design to be agreed with the Council and English Heritage

(xvi) A financial contribution of £100,000 towards library facilities

(xvii) The provision of satisfactory training and employment opportunities as part of the construction on site to be agreed with the Council

(xviii) The provision of hotel and leisure employment opportunities on site associated with the hotel on site to be agreed with Hillingdon Council

(xix) An undertaking to provide a heat distribution network on site with the final detailed design to be agreed with the Council and the GLA

(xx) An undertaking to establish and maintain a management company with responsibilities to be agreed with the Council as set out but not necessarily limited to those referred to in the Outline Estate Management Strategy including a parking management plan

(xxi) An undertaking to protect trees to be retained as part of the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council

(xxii) An undertaking to prepare applications for the discharge of conditions including reserved matters in accordance with the provisions of the supporting documents for the outline permission and in particular the Design Code

(xxiii) An undertaking to prepare and implement an Ecological Mitigation, Enhancement and Management Plan for the site

(xxiv) An undertaking to prepare and implement a management plan for Hillingdon House (xxv) An undertaking to prepare and implement a way finding and signage strategy linking measures within the application site with external routes to bus stops, the town centre and station and Brunel University

(xxvi) A financial contribution of £148,000 for the Council to monitor the s106 and the viability reviews at each phase of the development

(xxvii) An undertaking from the Developer to commit to a financial review mechanism in the legal agreement which will enable deferred contribution payments to be paid and affordable housing units to be provided if the justification for discounting the standard provision no longer applies. An undertaking from the Developer to agree with the Council an upper limit on the deferred contribution payments/affordable housing units prior to implementation of [phase 1] of the development.

The financial review mechanism will require (as a minimum) the following;

- a. To submit to the Council, at triggers to be agreed by both parties, up-to-date economic viability assessments to enable viability reviews over the course of the development.**
- b. Together with the economic viability assessment, the developer will submit a detailed supporting report evidencing the developer's financial positions and justification for the conclusion in each viability assessment.**
- c. At each submission, to provide to the local planning authority and/or an independent financial consultant any additional information or clarification as and when required at no cost to the Council.**
- d. At each submission, the Council will confirm an agreed form of viability assessment, including any deferred contributions to be paid and/or deferred affordable housing units to be built out and the timescales for doing so.**
- e. The economic viability assessments, supporting report and any other accompanying documentation will be compiled and submitted at no cost to the Council.**
- f. The Developer will undertake to pay the costs of the local planning authority's independent financial consultant and any subsidiary assistance required to enable the consultant to properly consider the assessment and reports submitted during the course of the development.**

(xxviii) Due to the discounted nature of this scheme, an undertaking from the Developer that, if for whatever reason, it becomes apparent that a contribution is no longer required for a particular purpose, the Local Planning Authority will have the option to allocate the monies to another purpose that will also mitigate the impacts of this development.

- b) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 and 278 Agreements and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.**
- c) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement and conditions of approval.**
- d) That if any of the heads of terms set out above have not been agreed and the S106 legal agreement has not been finalised within 12 months of the date of this Committee resolution, or any other period deemed appropriate by the Head of Planning and Enforcement, then the application may be referred back to the Committee for determination.**
- e) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning and Enforcement under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.**
- f) That if the application is approved, the conditions and**

	<p>informatives set out in the officer's report, addendum sheet and added by the committee be imposed subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning and Enforcement prior to issuing the decision</p> <p>At the conclusion of this item a 10 minute adjournment was moved, seconded and agreed.</p> <p>When considering Item 6 on the agenda additional information came to light that had not been provided to the committee. During discussion members withdrew the above decision and agreed that the application be deferred to enable this information to be provided.</p>	
120.	<p>RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/209/2754 (Agenda Item 6)</p>	<p>Action by</p>
	<p>Alterations to Grade II listed Hillingdon House and the associated demolition of adjoining wing, temporary buildings and other buildings within curtilage of Hillingdon House. Alterations to 'Carpenters' building and alterations to curtilage walls (Application for Listed Building Consent.)</p> <p>585/APP/209/2754</p> <p>The petitioners and agent declined the right to address the committee on this application.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and advised members of a 5 amended drawings that had been received as follows:</p> <p>3300/22 -209 B, 3300/21 - 210 B, 3300/20 - 2305 B, 3300/22 - 306 B, 3300/22 – 308 B.</p> <p>A member stated that this was a good proposal and moved the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>A member asked whether the housing located close to the Listed Building could be moved further away.</p> <p>Officers advised that a lot of thought had been given to the 13 metre distance between the Listed Building and the proposed new houses. The 15 metre rule was for guidance and related to overbearing and overshadowing. This application was under the guidance with consideration given to the scale and type of proposed dwellings. As the distance was flank wall to flank wall the 13 metre distance was felt to be acceptable in this instance.</p> <p>A member asked whether the 29 new residential properties proposed in close proximity to the Listed Building formed part of this application.</p> <p>Officers advised that the previous application that members had approved included an outline application and a full planning application for certain parts of the development. The application in relation to the detail and siting of the 29 residential properties was approved as part as Item 5.</p>	<p>Jales Tippell Jason Traves Matt Duigan</p>

Members felt that the committee had not been provided with all the information, on which they had based the decision on Item 5. No plans in relation to the full planning permission had been shown nor information provided on the details or siting being approved.

The Chairman asked the Legal Adviser whether the decision made on Item 5, could be re-visited in view of the information that had now come to light.

The Legal adviser informed the committee that as additional information that members were not made aware of when considering the previous application had come to light and the meeting had not closed it would be possible to revisit the decision on the earlier application.

Members made a request for information in relation to the bulk, size, location of the proposed new 29 dwellings and their proximity to the Listed Building.

Officers reported that the building was 13 metres away from the Listed Building from flank wall to flank wall so there would be no overlooking. The proposed units were set behind an established tree screen and were not in a prominent position.

Members raised concerns that the proposed 3 storey dwellings would be replacing an existing single store building. The 13 metre distance was contrary to our design ethos and was felt to be too close to the Listed Building and needed to be moved further away.

Officers reported that Hillingdon House could not be seen at present from the north of the site, so it was not felt that the new dwellings would affect the setting of the Listed Building.

It was asked whether the 29 new residential units conformed to planning guidelines and whether it infringed the policy in regards to 45° line.

Officers reported that the proposed residential block in this location was an enabling development to allow the refurbishment of Hillingdon House. The 13 metre distance rule was flank wall to flank wall. Officers further added that the existing 45° line was breached and did not afford to the Councils HDAS. The 45° arc on other elevations would not affect neighbouring occupiers.

The committee felt that officers had been enthusiastic about the outline application in regards to concerns raised by the petitioners and failed to take on board the implications for the full planning permission. They also felt that they had only discussed the outline and not the full planning permission, which was an error and felt that planning permission should not be granted for something that the committee had not seen accurate plans for.

It was felt that the decision should be revisited and the application deferred to enable the committee to receive further information on the full planning permission.

	<p>The Chairman advised that if this committee was not properly advised and relevant information was not brought to the attention of the committee residents would have a case for Judicial Review.</p> <p>Officers reported that the conditions and informatives in the report refer to both the outline and full planning permission. The petitions were mostly in relation to access and discussion was mainly around these issues. When members visited the site they were shown the District Park and the proposed Court Yard dwellings. There was a difference in levels and it was not felt that the Listed Building would be harmed with the residential being in the proposed location.</p> <p>The Legal Adviser reported that as the committee had not been in possession of all the information when making a decision on Item 5 that they could revisit that decision.</p> <p>Members stated that they regretted what had happened but they were not aware of the details for the full planning permission. The discussion centred on the outline application and the petitioners concerns. Members had raised concerns about the full planning permission and would not have supported the application in regard to the 29 new dwellings. There needed to be a more satisfactory arrangement between the Listed Building and, which is infringed our policies.</p> <p>The Chairman stated that at the site visit officers advised that the planning application should be taken first and the Listed Building Application taken after. Had the applications been taken the other way round the issue in regard to the 29 new residential units would have come to light before the outline and full application was discussed.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and agreed that the decision previously made on Item 5 be withdrawn and that the decision be re-visited.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and agreed that Item 5 and 6 be deferred to enable full information to be provided on the 29 new dwellings and updated plans to be provided.</p> <p>Resolved – That Item 5 & 6 be deferred to enable officers to provide full information on the applications and updated plans to be provided to the committee.</p>	
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.25 pm.</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Gill Brice on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.