

Present: Councillor Naomi Twedde (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Bob Bushell, Councillor Debbie Armiger,
Councillor Biff Bean, Councillor Chris Burke, Councillor
Liz Bushell, Councillor Gary Hewson, Councillor
Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Mark Storer, Councillor
Thomas Dyer and Councillor Rachel Storer

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Bill Mara and Councillor Edmund Strengiel

27. Confirmation of Minutes -10 August 2022

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 10 August 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

28. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

29. Member Statements

In the interests of transparency:

- Councillors Hewson and C Burke wished it to be recorded in relation to Item No 4 (a) of the agenda, *471-480 High Street, Lincoln*, that they sat on the board of the Upper Witham Drainage Board, but had no interest in the matter to be determined.

30. Update Sheet

An update sheet was circulated in advance of the meeting, which included:

- An additional consultation response in respect of agenda Item No 4(a) 471-480 High Street, Lincoln (2021/0598/FUL)
- An additional consultee response and an updated officer recommendation in respect of agenda Item No 4(b)-Lincolnshire Sports Partnership, Tanners Lane, Lincoln (2021/0584/FUL)
- Additional consultee responses and photographs in respect of agenda Item No 4 (c) Garage Court, Derwent Street, Lincoln (2022/0542/RM)

RESOLVED that the update sheet be received by Planning Committee

31. Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No.172

Kieron Manning, Assistant Director, Planning:

- a. advised members of the reasons why a temporary tree preservation order made by the Assistant Director for Planning under delegated powers should be confirmed at the following site:

- Tree Preservation Order 172: 1 no. Acer Pseudoplatanus (Sycamore) and 1 no Aesculus Hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut) tree in the back garden of Greestone House, Greestone Place, Lincoln, LN2 1PP
- b. provided details of the individual trees to be covered by the order and the contribution they made to the area
 - c. reported that the making of any Tree Preservation Order was likely to result in further demands on staff time to deal with any applications submitted for consent to carry out tree work and to provide advice and assistance to owners and others regarding protected trees, however, this was contained within existing staffing resources
 - d. reported that the initial 6 months of protection for these trees would come to an end for the Tree Preservation Order on 26 November 2022
 - e. confirmed that the reason for making a Tree Preservation Order on this site was as a result of an application by the occupier to fell both of the trees; the trees were located within a Conservation Area, and it was through the assessment process that the Arboricultural Officer identified they were worthy of a Tree Prevention Order to ensure their protection in the future.
 - f. advised that following a one month consultation period, no objections had been received to the order
 - g. advised that confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order here would ensure that the tree could not be removed or worked on without the express permission of the council which would be considered detrimental to visual amenity and as such the protection of the tree would contribute to one of the Councils priorities of enhancing our remarkable place.

RESOLVED that Tree Preservation Order No 172 be confirmed without modification and that delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to carry out the requisite procedures for confirmation.

32. Applications for Development
33. 471 - 480 High Street, Lincoln

The Planning Team Leader:

- a) described the application site, located at the south end of the High Street on the eastern side, previously part of a Peugeot Garage which was now vacant, and included the former United Reform Church to the boundary of the site fronting High Street
- b) added that the site lay adjacent to the South Park/St Catherines roundabout, with Sincil Dyke located to the south, residential properties on the other side of the bank fronting South Park, and residential properties to the north lining Spencer Street
- c) confirmed that the site was situated within the St Catherines Conservation Area No 4

- d) stated that the scheme was submitted by Torsion Care, also the applicant for a planning permission recently granted to build a care home fronting High Street (2021/0597/FUL); whilst the applications had been submitted separately due to funding arrangements, the applicant intended to construct the two schemes simultaneously should the current application be granted
- e) advised that planning permission was sought for a new building comprising 20 retirement living apartments and conversion of the former United Reform Church to form 5 residential flats; the new building would be accessed via Cross Spencer Street with provision of 27 car parking spaces on the site including accessible spaces, an attenuation pond, refuse and cycle storage
- f) added that the proposals included demolition of the former Abacus Motor Group Showroom and ancillary motor repair buildings
- g) reported that pre-application discussions had taken place and further discussions had continued throughout the application process with the applicant and their architect; revisions had been submitted to address officer concerns regarding overlook, design and access
- h) provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
- Policy LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
 - Policy LP9: Health and Wellbeing
 - Policy LP10: Meeting Accommodation Needs
 - Policy LP11: Affordable Housing
 - Policy LP12: Infrastructure to Support Growth
 - Policy LP13: Accessibility and Transport
 - Policy LP14: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk
 - Policy LP16: Development of Land Affected by Contamination
 - Policy LP21: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
 - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment
 - Policy LP26: Design and Amenity
 - Policy LP27: Main Town Centre Uses-Frontages and Advertisements
 - Policy LP29: Protecting Lincoln's Setting and Character
 - Policy LP33: Lincoln's City Centre Primary Shopping Area and Central Mixed Use Area
 - Policy LP35: Lincoln's Regeneration and Opportunity Areas
 - National Planning Policy Framework
- i) advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
- Principle and Policy Background
 - Developer Contributions
 - Assessment of Impact to the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
 - Impact on the Residential Amenity
 - Highways and Drainage
 - Archaeology

- Contamination
 - Other Issues
- j) outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise
- k) referred to the Update sheet which contained an additional response received in respect of the proposed application for development
- l) concluded that:
- The development would relate well to the site and surroundings, particularly in relation to siting, height, scale, massing and design.
 - The proposals would bring a vacant site back into use and would ensure the character and appearance of the Conservation Area was preserved.
 - Technical matters relating to noise, highways, contamination, archaeology and drainage were to the satisfaction of the relevant consultees and could be dealt with as necessary by condition.
 - The proposals would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of CCLP Policies and the NPPF.

Ian Ward, representing the applicant, Torsion Care, addressed Planning Committee in support of the application, making the following points:

- His company was expert in delivering communities for people to live, building modern care homes, assisted living, and extra care facilities of the future.
- They operated across the country including Lincolnshire and the East Midlands.
- It was considered that the best use for the site was the establishment of a care home and retirement apartments.
- The applicant had worked jointly alongside the case officer to arrive at the best possible scheme for the area.
- He referred to objections regarding potential overlooking onto South Park resulting from the Environment Agency having taken away trees; revisions had taken place to the scheme to address officer concerns regarding overlooking, design and access.
- The proposed building had been reduced in size from four-storey to mainly two-storey along Sincil Dyke rising to three-storey on its western corner where it met the care home.
- The number of units had been reduced to 20 residential units including the conversion of the existing former United Reform Church to form 5 additional 5 residential apartments.
- The width of Spencer Street was to be widened as part of the conditions of grant of planning permission for the care home.
- There was provision of 27 car parking spaces for the retirement living accommodation, two of which would serve the units in the former United Reform Church. This exceeded the required number of car parking spaces for retirement homes.
- His company specialised in the construction and operation of care facilities and community living.
- The proposed scheme would be of significant benefit to the City of Lincoln Council; it would also encourage and support the local community

- He hoped Members would offer their support to the planning application before them this evening.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following comments were received from members:

- There had been a great deal of pre-application discussion to arrive at the present scheme.
- There had been no objection from the Highways Authority in respect of access.
- The care home scheme approved in April 2022 had been conditioned to prevent communal rooms on the second floor, south-side of the development being converted into habitable accommodation.
- The previous scheme was important in reducing bed blocking in local hospitals.
- The scheme before us this evening did not impose any issues with overlooking due to being reduced in height from 4 to in the main two storeys.
- It was difficult to understand why living accommodation was prohibited in other areas of the City due to flood risk, and in this case ground floor accommodation was proposed next to Sincil Drain.
- The proposed scheme would result in a massive change in demographics for the area, having great physical impact in a small heavily built up area.
- Spencer Street was an unsuitable access for the amount of vehicles that would use the road.
- It was pleasing to note that overlooking had been reduced in the revised plans, although there would still be an element present.
- The site should be developed, however, a more radical approach was required.
- The proposed building had a pleasing look.

The following questions were received from members:

- Were the alterations proposed to the Church purely internal?
- Was it clear that policies LP11: Affordable Housing and LP9: Health and Wellbeing had been adhered to? The application should make sure the scheme met these policies to be viable.
- S106 developer contributions had been requested in line with planning policy for affordable housing, playing fields/play space and the NHS. Why had the amount requested been reduced from £647,878.75 to £127,539?
- Was the revised s106 figure arrived at before the reduction in the number of dwellings was agreed?
- How was the viability clause administered logistically?
- Had Policy LP10: Meeting Accommodation Needs been met in that the block overlooking the Sincil Drain had no lift to the upper floor?
- Would there be a total of 20 retirement flats plus 5 in the Church for open use?
- An energy efficiency statement was to be submitted later. Were there likely to be any changes made to the build in this respect, as a result?

The Planning Team Leader offered the following points of clarification to members:

- In terms of energy efficiency, specified criteria must be met to reach the proposed EPC rating B, as detailed within the officer's report. This standard was above that of building regulation requirements. A pre commencement condition was proposed for the submission of an energy statement detailing how these conditions would be met, subject to the agreement and satisfaction of Planning officers.
- There would be the establishment of 20 retirement flats plus an additional 5 on the open market in the former Church.
- All the ground floor flats would be accessible. Policy LP10: Meeting Accommodation Needs, required 30% of the properties to be accessible, this number had been exceeded as part of the design of the scheme.
- Alterations to the former United Reform Church involved no additional building construction.
- The applicant had submitted a viability appraisal to show that the original proposed developer contribution rendered the scheme unviable. A viability expert chosen by officers and independent to the applicant had checked the revised submitted figure of £127,539, based on the original policy requirements. Each policy set out the reasons for the contribution required. National Planning Policy Framework dictated the rate to be applied, together with the process to deal with situations when the requirements could not be met by the developer. Both National Planning Policy Framework guidance and viability expert advice had been followed here.

Councillor Burke advised that the Highways Authority had failed us in not objecting to the proposed development access on Spencer Street which was inadequate. He also suggested that members should request that national legislation be reformed as the development in its current format would put unacceptable pressure on local medical practices in meeting the demand of elderly residents

Councillor Bob Bushell observed that although he was unhappy with the situation regarding reduced developer contributions, he accepted the constraints applied by National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Dyer asked whether the updated figures had been reached before recent increases in costs of materials?

The Planning Team Leader advised that the calculation had been reached fairly recently, about two months ago.

Councillor Bean asked what role the applicant played in the viability study?

The Planning Team Leader confirmed the process. The applicant was required to submit the viability appraisal costs in greater detail, which were then subject to officer and independent viability expert scrutiny to determine whether or not they were reasonable, based on widely accepted profit margin figures and National Planning Guidance.

RESOLVED that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to the signing of an S106 agreement to secure contributions to affordable housing, local green infrastructure and the NHS, and also subject to the following conditions:

- 3 Year time limit for commencement
- Development in accordance with approved plans

- Details of bat/bird boxes to be submitted
- Details of external lighting to be submitted
- Noise mitigation measures to be submitted
- A scheme for electric vehicle charging points to be submitted
- Contaminated land further information to be submitted
- Anglian Water - details of foul drainage to be submitted
- Details of materials to be submitted
- Details of surface water drainage to be submitted
- Details of landscaping to be submitted
- Details of boundary walls and fences to be submitted
- Archaeological WSI and foundation design
- Construction of the development (delivery times and working hours)
- Waste collection times to be restricted to avoid noise sensitive hours
- Construction and Delivery Hours to be restricted to avoid noise sensitive hours
- Highway construction management plan to be submitted
- Stopping up of access on the High Street once new access is brought into use

(Councillors Armiger, Dyer and Liz Bushell requested that their vote against this planning application be recorded.)

34. Lincolnshire Sports Partnership, Tanners Lane, Lincoln

The Assistant Director of Planning:

- a) described the application site, located at the bottom of Tanners Lane, currently accommodating a two storey warehouse along the west boundary with a hardstanding and a number of adjoined portacabins to the east
- b) advised that the site was currently used by Lincolnshire Co-operative Society for storage, accessed to the east from the High Street, via the single width of Tanners Lane
- c) described the layout of the site as follows:
 - A small car park to the north, beyond which was the Coach House and Firth Court, both occupied as offices;
 - The Ritz (Weatherspoon's) to the north east;
 - A service yard/car park to the east which sat to the rear of 137-140 and 141 High Street, and shared access to the site from Tanners Lane;
 - A former chapel, 134 High Street, to the east of the service yard, that abutted Tanners Lane, now occupied by Flames of Lincoln;
 - Tanners Court to the south of the site, a three and four storey residential development; and
 - To the west Royal Mail Sorting Office.
- d) confirmed that the site was not situated within a Conservation Area although it was abutted to the north by the West Parade and Brayford Conservation Area, which also incorporated properties on the High Street to the east; whilst The Ritz, The Coach House and 134 High Street were

of significance, these were not listed and there were no other listed buildings in the vicinity

- e) advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a single storey extension to the roof of the existing two storey warehouse and a four storey extension to the east elevation to facilitate the conversion to 21 student cluster flats to accommodate in total 80 en-suite bed spaces along with shared communal areas
- f) reported that the extensions would be modern additions, intended to reflect and enhance the industrial character of the existing warehouse
- g) confirmed that there would be no on-site parking although cycle parking would be available within the landscaped forecourt, together with provision of an enclosed bin store
- h) reported that prior to the submission of the application, the site was subject to extensive pre-application discussions with the architect, applicant team, Planning Officer and Principal Conservation Officer; officers raised a number of concerns in terms of scale and massing of the extensions for the initial proposal, since then a number of alternative schemes had been considered prior to the formal submission of the current proposals
- i) provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
 - Policy LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
 - Policy LP9: Health and Wellbeing
 - Policy LP12: Infrastructure to Support Growth
 - Policy LP13: Accessibility and Transport
 - Policy LP14: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk
 - Policy LP16: Development of Land Affected by Contamination
 - Policy LP18: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living
 - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment
 - Policy LP26: Design and Amenity
 - Policy LP33: Lincoln's City Centre Primary Shopping Area and Central Mixed Use Area
 - Policy LP37: Sub-Division and Multi-Occupation of Dwellings within Lincoln 86
 - National Planning Policy
 - Central Lincolnshire Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document
- j) advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
 - Principle of Use
 - Developer Contributions
 - Visual Amenity
 - Impact on Residential Amenity and Neighbouring Uses
 - Noise
 - Access and Highways
 - Climate Change and Low Carbon Living
 - Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

- Contaminated Land
- Archaeology

k) outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

l) referred to the Update sheet which contained an additional response received in respect of the proposed application for development, together with an updated officer recommendation in respect of the proposed scheme for an additional condition to the standard archaeological conditions requiring evaluation trenching to be undertaken at the site

m) concluded that:

- The principle of the use on the site, within the Central Mixed Use Area, was considered to be acceptable.
- The retention of and works to the existing warehouse were welcomed, which would enhance its historic character.
- The design and scale of the extensions were considered to be acceptable, complementing the original architectural style of the building and surroundings.
- The proposals would therefore also preserve and enhance the views into and out of the conservation area.
- Neither the use nor the external works would cause undue harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties or uses and, subject to appropriate noise mitigation measures, the development would provide an appropriate level of amenity for future occupants.
- The site was in an accessible location, also offering cycle parking.
- A S106 agreement would secure a financial contribution towards local healthcare infrastructure.
- Matters relating to highways, climate change, flood risk, drainage, contamination and archaeology had been appropriately considered by officers and the relevant statutory consultees, and could be dealt with as required by condition.
- The proposals would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of CLLP Policies LP1, LP2, LP9, LP12, LP13, LP14, LP16, LP18, LP25, LP26, LP33 and LP37, as well as guidance within the NPPF.

Stuart Allcock, local business owner, addressed Planning Committee in objection to the proposed development, covering the following main points:

- Tanners Lane was a very narrow access to the application site.
- Tanners Lane serviced vehicular access for the businesses in occupancy at 137-141 High Street
- The proposal would be similar to the halls of Residence at the University, with parents coming up the lane when students arrived and left at the end of term to drop off/pick up suitcases.
- There was a small town car park to the rear of the 139-140 High Street, used by his staff and customers which he believed would be used by visitors to the proposed student accommodation, thus impacting on the operation of his business.
- Putting a traffic order on the lane would not prevent this from happening.
- The lane would be used by vehicles delivering takeaways, Amazon, supermarket deliveries etc.

- His customers would complain about this inconvenience in access to the car park behind his shop resulting in a loss of custom at Speedframe.
- He hoped his views would be seriously considered.

Adam Wilson, representing the agent for the proposed development, addressed Planning Committee in support of the planning application, covering the following main points:

- He thanked members of Planning Committee for allowing him the opportunity to speak.
- This was a unique development.
- The designers worked from a local practice most of whom lived in the City.
- The development would have its own identity and raise the standard of student accommodation.
- The site represented part of the industrial growth of the City, sympathetic ideas had been taken from the existing warehouse.
- The applicant had worked through the objections received as part of the planning process.
- A turning point for vehicles had been created on site.
- Improvements to anti-social behaviour including a reduction in drug use/vandalism on Tanners Lane would be welcomed in the area.
- The development would improve a forgotten street in a key location.
- There had been no objection from the Highway Authority.
- There would be no available parking, only a turning area for vehicles.
- St Marks Shopping Area car parks were very close by for short-term use of students and their families on arrival/pick up times at end of term.
- The design and context of the scheme was supported by planning officers.
- As the City continued to grow there would be a finite number of buildings that could be converted to student accommodation. If this opportunity was not taken, purpose-built accommodation would not be available close to the University only further away in residential areas.
- The style/atmosphere of the building would be pleasing.
- The flats would be built in clusters with fewer bedrooms.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following comments were received from members:

- Tanners Lane was not pedestrian friendly, currently consisting of a cobbled access road.
- There had been no objection from the University regarding over intensification of student accommodation.
- The operator of the accommodation should ensure it was well utilised by students, and provide opportunities for others to live there if not successful as such.
- The accommodation was ideally situated close to the City Centre.
- The concerns raised tonight by local businesses were understood.
- There were car parking issues.
- The Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal. If there became a problem related to student cars, local businesses should complain direct to Lincolnshire County Council as Highways Authority.
- The area was not well lit for pedestrians access.
- Royal Mail had also objected due to noise issues caused by their delivery office impacting on the student accommodation.

The Chair referred to conversations to be arranged between herself, the University and Planning Officers as to the current take up of student accommodation. She also highlighted that the Highways Authority had suggested a condition be imposed on grant of planning permission to manage drop offs/collections at the site.

The following questions were received from members:

- Developer contributions for student flats were limited. Was it possible to impose a condition for the development only to be used for student accommodation, to be referred back to Planning Committee for any proposed change of use?
- Was it possible for members to request a Traffic Order be imposed on the site?
- Who was responsible for Tanners Lane in its poor condition?
- The plans provided an opportunity to revitalise a very run down area., could the condition of the access road be addressed as part of the development?
- Would operation of works traffic be conditioned appropriately?

The Assistant Director of Planning offered the following points of clarification to members:

- There would be S106 implications should there be change of use of the development further down the line. The current use Sui Generis was for student occupation only. There was no need to impose a condition as such on grant of planning permission as any change of use would come back to Planning Committee for consideration.
- Access issues: Access to the site was not ideal. It was difficult where historic buildings were concerned. A marked area had been drawn up on the plans for turning of vehicles when making deliveries.
- The access road was an adopted highway and not a private lane.
- County Council Traffic Orders: He was not aware of any powers available to impose a traffic order on the access road. This could be factored into the member decision tonight, although the Highways Authority had not raised any objections to the proposals.
- Drop offs: If members were so minded a further condition could be imposed on grant of planning permission to secure a management plan for use of surface car parks nearby for this purpose.
- Noise concerns raised by Royal Mail: Planning Officers had held lengthy discussions with the Environmental Protection Officer. A Noise Impact Assessment had been conducted and he was satisfied that any concerns could be dealt with via conditions.
- A Construction Management Plan would be submitted to deal with impact of construction.

The Assistant Director of Planning suggested conversations could be held by officers with Lincolnshire County Council separate to tonight's planning decision to discuss whether a Traffic Regulation Order was appropriate to the development. Tanners Lane was an adopted road and as such as a matter for the Highways Authority to determine.

A motion was moved, seconded, voted on and carried that provision of a

Management Plan for Drop-Off/Collection Points for students be required as an additional condition of grant of planning permission.

RESOLVED that planning permission be Granted subject to the following conditions with delegated authority granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to secure the NHS financial contribution through a S106 agreement:

- Time limit of the permission
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Samples of materials including hard surfacing
- Site levels and finished floor levels
- Noise assessment
- Assessment of noise mitigation measures prior to occupation
- Boundary treatments
- Contamination
- Surface water drainage management strategy
- No surface water ground infiltration without prior consent
- Archaeology
- Construction management plan
- Landscaping implementation
- Provision of cycle storage prior to occupation
- Hours of construction/delivery
- Management plan-drop off/collection points for students.

35. Garage Court, Derwent Street, Lincoln

The Assistant Director of Planning:

- a) advised that Reserved Matters planning permission was sought including access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, for the erection of 4 dwellings on a parcel of land on Derwent Street, situated off Carholme Road
- b) described the area characterised by two-storey terrace properties, currently occupied by 18 single storey lock-up garages with outline permission granted for up to 4 dwellings
- c) provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
 - Policy LP26:Design and Amenity
 - National Planning Policy Framework
- d) advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
 - Principle of the Development
 - Visual Amenity and Design
 - Impact on Neighbours
 - Technical Matters
- e) outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

f) referred to the Update sheet which contained additional consultee responses and photographs in respect of the proposed application for development

g) concluded that:

- The proposed development would be of an appropriate design and would assimilate well into the streetscene.
- The proposal would have no adverse impacts on neighbours and would be an acceptable use in this location.
- The proposal therefore accorded with national and local planning policy.

Julie Lamb, local resident, addressed Planning Committee in objection to the proposed development, covering the following main points:

- She lived on the curve of Derwent Street , to the front of which a car park would be built as shown on the photographs included on the Update Sheet.
- She had lived there for 16 years.
- The road was not wide.
- Emergency vehicles struggled to access the road due to its width.
- There was not enough room for turning space.
- If the houses were moved back 5.5metres a car parking space could be accommodated in front of the dwellings rather than reducing the available car turning area at the end of the street.
- The lamp post close to her house would need to be moved, making the area very dark around her property.
- One neighbour would experience overlooking from the proposed development.
- Construction vehicles parked on the side of her house meaning she had to wait to gain access to her driveway.
- The car parking area had been removed as part of the land although it did not belong to the developers.
- Cars often turned round at night in front of her window and that of neighbours, having to reverse due to lack of turning space.
- She hoped Planning Committee would listen to the impact on existing residents which would occur as a result of the proposed build.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following comments were received from members:

- The concerns again related to highway issues, however as the Highways Authority had raised no objections to the proposed scheme there was no valid reason to vote against it.
- The remit of Planning Committee was to consider the application before it this evening, which already had outline planning permission.
- Land ownership was a legal matter and not within the remit of Planning Committee.
- Streets in the City Centre were typically narrow.
- There was sympathy for existing residents, however, car ownership had expanded in the modern world since the houses were originally built.

- If the planning application was to be refused, the Planning Authority would be open to serious challenge.
- This was the best development officers could provide here.
- The level of infill however was not acceptable

A motion was moved, seconded, voted on and carried that provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points be required as an additional condition of grant of planning permission.

RESOLVED that planning permission be Granted subject to the following conditions:

- Works to commence within 3 years
- Works to be carried out in accordance with the plans
- Hours of working restriction
- Electric Vehicle Charging Points to be provided.