

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 14 June 2017 at 1.00 pm in the The Executive Meeting Room - Third Floor, The Guildhall

These minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda and associated papers for the meeting.

Present

Councillors Frank Jonas BEM (Vice-Chair)
Jennie Brent
Colin Galloway
Steve Hastings
Lee Hunt
Hugh Mason
Steve Pitt
Lynne Stagg (Standing Deputy)
Gemma New (Standing Deputy)

Also in attendance

Councillor Tom Wood

Welcome

The Vice Chair welcomed members of the public and members to the meeting. As Councillor Fleming was unable to attend this meeting, Councillor Jonas as Vice Chair explained he was chairing the meeting today. The Chair advised that he would be amending the order of the planning applications today so that those applications with deputations were heard first.

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The Chair, Councillor Jonas, explained to all present at the meeting the fire procedures including where to assemble and how to evacuate the building in case of a fire.

57. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Jim Fleming, Robert New and David Fuller. Councillors Gemma New and Lynne Stagg were in attendance as standing deputies.

58. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Councillor Jennie Brent declared an interest in planning application 3, 7 Parkstone Avenue in that she is a resident of Parkstone Avenue; however she did not know the applicant and this was not a personal or prejudicial interest.

Councillor Steve Pitt declared an interest in planning application 9, Princes House, 32 Kings Terrace, as he knew Mr Clarke, one of the people making a deputation on this application; however he had not discussed this application with Mr Clarke and this was not a personal or prejudicial interest.

59. Minutes of Previous Meeting - 3 May 2017 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 3 May 2017 be approved as a correct record to be signed by the Chair.

60. Updates on previous planning applications by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development (AI 4)

There were no updates on previous planning applications.

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development advised the committee that following their request that the HMO Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) be reviewed; a report would be going to a Special Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development (PRED) meeting in September to seek approval to go out to consultation on this.

61. Planning appeal decisions for the month of May (AI 5)

The City Development Manger introduced the report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

62. 16/01957/FUL - 15 Stubbington Avenue Portsmouth PO2 0HP - Change of use of the building to purposes falling within a house in multiple occupation (class C4) (report item 10) (AI 15)

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that the 'red line' of the application site now includes the rear garden where storage of refuse/recycling materials and cycles (to be secured by condition 3) would be capable of being provided.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr G Bhakad, applicant whose points included:

- Was happy to carry out works to remove the kitchen facilities for the flats and instead a communal kitchen has been provided.
- Work will be carried out in two stages to minimise disruption.
- Objective to turn the property into a HMO

Members' Questions

In response to questions, the following matters were clarified:

- Each bedroom would have an en-suite to include a shower/bath, WC and basin. The bedroom on the ground floor will have access to the bathroom on the ground floor.
- Officers explained that to apply with the adopted parking standards SPD two spaces would be required. There is one space in front of the property and

another space could be provided if the wall at the front of the property is removed. Officers confirmed that a planning condition could be added that the wall must be removed to create a second parking space.

- With regard to having a bathroom adjacent to the kitchen, officers advised that as long as there are washing facilities in the bathroom and a door separating the two this was acceptable under building regulations.

Members' Comments

Members raised concern that two parking spaces for this property was insufficient however felt that this would not be sufficient grounds on which to refuse the application.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report and an additional condition that the provision of a total of 2 car parking sites to be provided on site.

- 63. 17/00250/FUL - Land bounded by Queen Street, Havant Street, Old Star Place and Wickham Street Portsmouth - Construction of building comprising 4991 sqm of floorspace (GEA) for ground floor restaurant (class a3) and 120-bedroom hotel (class c1) on six upper floors (after demolition of existing buildings) (report item 4) (AI 9)**

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that condition 20 requires a minor correction, to refer to drawing revision D (not C).

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr David Nesbitt FRICS, Chairman of Trustees of the Royal Maritime Club, objecting whose points included:

- The development would create serious transport and parking issues. The location is close to lots of attractions and the existing car parking spaces are already utilised.
- Prospect of local parking issues including unauthorised parking at nearby premises including the Royal Maritime Club.

Mr John Alderson, General Manager at the Royal Maritime Club, objecting whose points included:

- The proposed main entrance to the hotel is where Queen Street narrows and there is no provision for guest drop off/pick up without blocking the cycle lane.
- Has no issues with the proposed location of the restaurant and bar entrance.
- The location is on a busy corner where buses and traffic turn and this development would create driver distraction.
- 120 bedrooms could mean up to 240 additional pedestrians, where will the footfall go?
- The proposed location of the fire escape emerges onto the street corner. It would be more sensible for this to exit onto Old Star Place.

- 7 storey building which will overshadow existing buildings and not be sympathetic to the area.

Mr Mark Thackery, Agent from Walsingham Planning whose points included:

- The applicant has worked closely with the planning department for over a year to get to the stage of feeling confident to present this to committee.
- The site is allocated for dense development and a hotel is acceptable for this site.
- All PCC standards have been applied to the application.
- A travel plan has been included with the application which makes sure that people who are pre booking know where car parks and train stations are located to ensure minimal disruption.

Mr Neil Rowe, on behalf of the applicant Premier Inn Hotels, whose points included:

- Within 400m of the site there are 2,300 car parking spaces.
- The application is in accordance with the PCC parking standards SPD.
- Does not conflict with retail parking.
- Dedicated loading bay to the rear of the site and there will be two 30 minute delivery slots a day.
- The on-street parking spaces will be retained.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The windows will be made from power coated aluminium. Windows will be fixed and not openable and it was felt that not having bars would make the windows more simple and attractive. The design review panel did not discuss the windows, their concerns focussed on the bulk of the building.
- With regard to the materials, all grey areas on the proposed images would be Portland stone cladding, including the curve onto Old Star Place and the upper floors.
- The drainage arrangements were clarified; the drainage team were satisfied that alternative drainage provision was available and this was subject to details to follow. Condition 16 related to the drainage and would also cover details of a green roof. Officers would not discharge the conditions without first consulting with Southern Water.
- It was clarified that none of the buildings that would be demolished were locally or statutory listed and they are all considered to be in a poor state of repair.
- It was clarified that there are coach loading bays further along Queen Street outside the Ship and Castle.
- Officers were confident that if the emergency services are required that there is enough space on Queen Street for them to access the site.
- Provision for nesting boxes was covered under condition 13. Officers did not yet have the detailed scheme but would ask the applicant to ensure that nesting boxes are included to form part of the biodiversity scheme.
- The applicant would use an appropriate ecological specialist to deal with matters such as ensuring that demolition of the existing buildings will not take place during bat breeding season.

Members' Comments

Members' thought that this was a great scheme and liked the proposed design of the building. It was felt that the area is well served by car parks and also the newly developed Hard Interchange and this would help the city's accommodation need during large events taking place in the city.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions listed in the City Development Manager's report.

64. 17/00332/FUL - Princes House 32 Kings Terrace Southsea - Change of use of part basement (storage unit 2) to form an artist studio (Class B1C) (report item 9) (AI 14)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Ms Elizabeth Hughes, Director of Princes House objecting whose points included:

- Not suitable for use as an artist's studio as has very low ceilings and a lack of light.
- Concerns basement area will be turned into industrial use if application is approved.
- Not a self-contained unit, there are no bathrooms in the studio so tenants would need to use the stair and lift to access these.
- Previous unlawful uses within the basement.
- Décor damages and vandalism have taken place and other tenants are insecure.
- None of the residents want this to be approved.

Mr Darren Vincent, local resident and Director of Princes House objecting whose points included:

- Concerns with safety of the substances used in the basement adding more risk to other tenants in the building.
- If used as a workspace it will exacerbate parking issues.
- Issues of security in the building.

Mr David Clarke, resident of Princes House objecting whose points included:

- Artists will be using toxic materials.
- Tenants will have access to electric and gas meters, post and the front door so huge security issues and the residents do not support this.

Mr Brian Organ, applicant whose points included:

- Ceilings are 10ft high and there is lots of light to the basement.
- There have been no objections to the current tenant using the basement.
- There is a separate entrance to the rear so the tenants using the studio would not interfere with the front entrance, tenants post etc.
- Happy to agree to the proposed conditions from the planning officer.

Councillor Tom Wood, ward councillor, whose points included:

- Although conditions go a long way to mitigating the detrimental impact of this application asks that this is rejected.
- B1c use is not disruptive however report states that this is a different matter as it is within a residential building.
- Noise travels well in Princes House and if used as a studio will be additional noise which will be heard in the ground floor flats.
- Often residents do not report noise complaints to environmental health however this does not mean there have not been noise issues.
- In 1996 a condition was imposed on the property that the basement would only be used for storage as anything else would create too much noise for other residents.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The studio would be a self-contained unit with lockable doors. The planning officer did not know whether it was possible to incorporate toilet facilities into the unit.
- Class B1c was for light industry and within a residential area this would need to have no significant impact on residential amenity. Significant harm would include noise pollution.

Members' Comments

Members felt that this would create a detrimental effect on living conditions and felt that this was not acceptable. There is also a lack of sound insulation so noise from the studio would have an effect on other residents.

RESOLVED that permission be refused for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed use of part of the basement as an Artist Studio would not be compatible with the residential nature of the larger building and would result in a detrimental impact on the occupiers of adjoining properties, particularly those within Princes House, in terms of increased noise and disturbance. The proposal is therefore, contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

- 65. 17/00063/FUL - 37 Eldon Street/51 King Street Southsea PO5 4BS - Conversion of part of building to form 6 dwellings; external alterations to include rear (east) extension, second floor extensions and changes to fenestration; change of use of part ground floor to form a wine bar (Class A4 - Drinking Establishment - 70sqm) (Amended scheme to 16/01772/FUL) (report item 7) (AI 12)**

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that the applicant has provided amended drawings showing an amended site boundary, removing a disputed piece of land to the eastern boundary. Condition 2 has been updated to reflect the amended drawings and now reads as follows:
'Unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings -

Drawing numbers: 1540/E/02 Rev-C, 1540/P/20 Rev-N, 1540/P/21 Rev-G, 1540/P/23 Rev-A, 1540/P/24 Rev-A, 1540/P/25 Rev-A, 1540/P/26 Rev-A, 1540/P/27 Rev-A and 1540/P/28'.

The removal of the section of land referred to above reduces the amount of space available to provide bicycle storage facilities. Whilst the Highways Authority has previously raised concerns in respect of the facilities proposed, this amendment would only exacerbate the matter.

It is not considered that the bicycle storage facilities now proposed are adequate for the development and a condition seeking alternative provision is unlikely secure alternative facilities fully in line with the requirements of the Parking Standards SPD. However, having regard to the positive elements of the proposal and the site's proximity to the city centre, it is considered that an objection solely on the inadequacies of the bicycle storage facilities could not be sustained.

The recommendation remains unchanged.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Paul Dawson local resident objecting, whose points included:

- The site is two buildings which are separate and therefore are two different settings.
- Concerned with the setting of 51 King Street and the proposed second storey extension. All buildings in the pedestrianised area including the King Street Tavern are grade II listed.
- The roof extensions being set back by 2.5m will make them somewhat less visible however the impact will still be intrusive.
- No objections to the development of the site but do not think this will be an enhancement to the area.
- Extremely small site for such an extensive development.
- It has been acknowledged that the site cannot meet the parking standards.
- Waste disposal acknowledged as unusual and is inadequate.

Mr Jonathon McDermott, agent whose points included:

- Previous application for the site was submitted earlier this year but was withdrawn. This application has greater emphasis on design and matching the King Street scene.
- Planning guidance states the need to preserve and enhance. Heritage assets should not be allowed to be left derelict as this site has.
- Development complies with national standards.
- The waste disposal is not unusual and there is a communal store accessed via a footpath, which has received the support of the council's waste officers.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The existing pitch of the roof is not visible from King Street. The 2.5m setback will reduce the prominence but it will still be visible although be a stepping effect.

- The bin store for the proposed wine bar will be in the building and waste will be moved to bins at the front of the property for collection.
- The proposed roofs would be finished in slate with the retention of brickwork where possible. The parapet will be topped with natural stone.

Members' Comments

Members' felt this was a good proposal although there were some concerns about the roofline and parking. There were also some concerns about the King Street frontage and the impact of the dormer window. On balance it was felt that this was a sensible use of the site and it would create good quality homes that are needed in the city.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report.

66. 17/00443/HOU - 191A Havant Road Portsmouth PO6 1EE - Construction of two storey rear extension (report item 11) (AI 16)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mrs Donaldson, objecting on behalf her parents who are neighbouring residents whose points included:

- The proposed extension would have a negative impact on the amenities of their property. (She circulated photographs to the committee to highlight this).
- The photographs show the close proximity of their property to the neighbouring property.
- The proposed extension would block out light to a corner of their garden.
- As the properties are on a hillslope the proposed extension will increase the feeling of being overlooked.
- Has since found out that the three windows at the back of the extension will be obscured glass.
- Four new skylights will create a direct loss of privacy.
- Asks that the committee consider refusing the application or if this is not possible that the skylights should not be permitted. Alternatively the skylights should be non-openable and be obscured glass.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Velux windows or skylights do not require planning permission and are covered under Permitted Development rights. These do not form part of the application therefore so a condition cannot be added that these are obscured glass.
- The distance between the northern end of the development and the neighbouring property is 15m.

Members' Comments

Members' felt that the main cause of concern was overlooking however as the windows to the back of the development will be obscured glass felt that this would help to limit this. Members' also felt that 15m between the proposed development and the neighbouring property was sufficient and would not have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring residents.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions in the City Development Manager's report.

67. 17/00198/HOU - 7 Parkstone Avenue Southsea PO4 0QY - Construction of single storey rear extension (after removal of existing ground floor conservatory) (report item 3) (AI 8)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Len Edwards, neighbouring resident, objecting whose points included:

- Unsympathetic alteration to the property which will erode the character of the area. (He circulated photos to members to highlight his points).
- Inconsistencies as the height does not reflect actual situation - his property is 1 foot lower than the application site.
- Distances from the extension to his property are not accurate they range from 2m to 2.6m to 3.2m to 3.6m at the bay window. It is not 4m as indicated in the report.
- Extension is too high and too close to his property and will create a crowding of structures in a small area.
- Water will run off into neighbouring properties.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Measured from the application side, the height of the proposed extension is 3.2m and the existing structure is 2.7m which is an increase of 0.5m. From the neighbouring property due to the difference in the land heights he would see an increase of 0.8m.
- This proposal will not be any closer to the neighbouring property than the existing conservatory. The footprint of the development already exists.
- The extension would be rendered to match the existing property.

Members' Comments

Members' were of the view that a 0.5m increase in height of the extension was too much, particularly as the gardens in this area are small. It was felt that this would increase the sense of enclosure particularly as the bay window of the living room of the neighbouring property is only 3m away from the boundary wall. In addition the angle of sight of 45 degrees would cause a detrimental effect to the living area of the neighbouring property.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension would, by reason of its siting adjacent to the common boundary with No 43 Nettlecombe Avenue and its height result in a significant impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No 43 Nettlecombe Avenue in terms of increased sense of enclosure and loss of light. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

68. 17/00555/FUL - 22 Jessie Road Southsea PO4 0EN - Change of use from purposes falling within a C3 (dwelling house) or C4 (house in multiple occupation) to a seven bedroom/seven person house in multiple occupation (sui generis) (report item 12) (AI 17)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Anthony Lane, applicant, whose points included:

- He owns seven other properties in the city that are HMOs, all to a very high standard. He has never had any issues with any of his other HMO properties.
- There are no specific size guidelines in terms of a shower room.
- Confusion over the size of what a communal area should be. The communal area for this application is 20sq.m. Nowhere does it mention 23sq.m as the minimum size.
- Unsure why this application has not been supported by the private sector housing team.
- Smallest bedroom is 7.05sq.m and has a double bed and all other pieces of furniture required.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following points were clarified:

- There are no specific standards for the size of communal living space. Officers will be guided by the Private Sector Housing team who will consider the size of the kitchen, dining and living areas to ensure all occupants can cook/eat in the space comfortably. Starts at 5.5sq.m per person and then increased on a per person basis. Therefore the communal living space for this application was calculated at 23sq.m
- The planning officers take this advice from the housing team and use this to inform their decision. On this occasion it was decided that due to some of the bedrooms being too small for a chair/living space, the amount of communal space is not appropriate. If the Public Sector Housing Team consider that that it the space is not sufficient for them to grant a licence for the number of people proposed, this would be an indication that the quality of accommodation would not be acceptable in planning terms

Members' Comments

Members' felt that this application was an over intensive use of the property.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposed change of use of the building to a House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis) would, as a result of the proposed layout and**

size of the communal facilities (kitchen, living and sanitary facilities), fail to provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers and would represent an over intensive use of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

(2) Without appropriate mitigation the development would be likely to have significant effect on the Portsmouth Harbour and Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Areas and so is contrary to Policy PCS13 of the Portsmouth Plan and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended).

- 69. 17/00111/FUL - 167-169 London Road Hilsea - Conversion of ground floor retail unit to provide 2no. 2 bed dwellings and 1no. 1 bed dwelling with external alterations to include removal of canopy and replacing shopfront with new windows and doors (re-submission of 16/01049/FUL) (report item 8) (AI 13)**

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that Condition 2 has been updated to reflect the submission of amended drawings after the Committee Report was published. Condition 2 now reads as follows: 'Unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings - Drawing numbers: Existing 8573 01 & Proposed 85730 01 Rev-D received 13.06.2017.

Condition 3 has been amended to reflect the amended drawings. Condition 3 now reads: '(a) Prior to the commencement of development, precise details in respect of materials and architectural detailing (Window cills, headers and door surrounds) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. (b) The development shall then be carried out in full accordance with the details approved pursuant to Condition 3(a)'.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The proposed properties 2 & 3 would have a single aspect and some areas would not benefit from natural light. The kitchens would benefit from borrowed light from the front of the property.
- This is not in a residents parking zone.

Members' Comments

Members' were concerned about the quality of residential amenity particularly as the kitchen and bathrooms would have a very small amount of natural light. Concerns were also raised that there is no parking for this development in an already crowded area which would cause additional traffic and parking issues.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed residential units would fail to provide off-street parking in accordance with the requirements of the Parking Standards and Transport**

Assessments Supplementary Planning Document. This would exacerbate the existing on-street parking shortfall in an area where on-street demand regularly exceeds the spaces available, increasing the occurrences of indiscriminate parking at junctions which would result in reduced visibility and the obstruction of crossing points to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy PCS17 of the Portsmouth Plan.

- 2. The proposed residential units would, by reason of their single aspect layout, depth and window size, result in limited levels of natural daylight reaching the rear of each dwelling failing to provide an appropriate standard of living accommodation to the detriment of the residential amenities of future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.**

- 70. 17/00338/FUL - Cornerstone House 120 London Road Portsmouth PO2 0NB - Conversion of part of ground floor to create 2 no. 1 bed self contained flats and an enlargement to the cycle storage area, with external alterations to include installation of new windows and doors (report item 1) (AI 6)**

The planning officer introduced the report.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The windows to the front of the properties would be clear glazing.
- The three other units also on the plan that adjoin the planning application had previously been dealt with under a prior approval application. With prior approval applications not able to look at all the planning merits.

Members' Comments

Members' felt that there was inadequate light provision, particularly for apartment 2. Members' also felt that the council has a parking policy which should be adhered to and this application did not provide any parking.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed residential units would fail to provide off-street parking in accordance with the requirements of the Parking Standards and Transport Assessments Supplementary Planning Document. This would exacerbate the existing on-street parking shortfall in an area where on-street demand regularly exceeds the spaces available, increasing the occurrences of indiscriminate parking at junctions which would result in reduced visibility and the obstruction of crossing points to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy PCS17 of the Portsmouth Plan.**

2. **The proposed dwelling shown as 'Apartment 2' would, by reason of its single aspect layout, depth and window size, result in limited levels of natural daylight reaching the rear of the dwelling failing to provide an appropriate standard of living accommodation to the detriment of the residential amenities of future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.**

71. **17/00530/FUL - 25 Newcome Road Portsmouth PO1 5DR - Change of use from House in Multiple Occupation (class C4) to 7 person 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (sui generis) (report item 5) (AI 10)**

The planning officer introduced the report.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- There is a WC, shower and basin in each of the shower rooms and a separate WC on the ground floor.
- The only change is that the front lounge becomes bedroom 7.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Managers report.

72. **17/00623/FUL - 39 Tottenham Road Portsmouth PO1 1QL - Change of use from purposes falling within class C4 (house in multiple occupation) or class C3 (dwelling house) to 7 person 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (sui generis) (report item 6) (AI 11)**

The planning officer introduced the report.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The only change would be that the study on floor 3 would become bedroom 7.
- Bedroom 7 was 7.75sq.m which is seen as reasonable accommodation.

Members' Comments

There were some concerns raised by one member about the lack of communal space however the Assistant Director advised that the Private Sector Housing Team had no adverse comments to make with regard to the size of the communal areas.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Managers report.

- 73. 17/00354/HOU - 68 Central Road Portsmouth PO6 1QX - Construction of first floor extension with alterations to roof 2 include dormer extension on front and rear roof slopes, construction of single storey extension to rear and installation of windows to side elevation at first floor level (report item 2) (AI 7)**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda and will be considered at a future meeting.

- 74. Date of next meeting (AI 18)**

The committee noted the date of the next meeting of Wednesday 28 June at 1pm.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm.

.....
Signed by the Chair of the meeting