



Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Committee held in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Uckfield on Monday 29th January 2024 at 7.00pm

Cllr. K. Bedwell (Chair)
Cllr. J. Love

Cllr. C. Macve (Vice Chair)
Cllr. D. Bennett

IN ATTENDANCE:

2 members of the public
Cllr. D. French – as a member of the public
Linda Lewis – Administrative Officer
Minutes taken by Linda Lewis

1.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and officers were reminded to make any declarations of personal and/or prejudicial interest that they may have in relation to any item on the agenda, but none were forthcoming.

2.0 STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON MATTERS ON THE AGENDA AT THE CHAIRMAN'S DISCRETION

Two members of the public wished to speak regarding WD/2023/2935/MRM and WD/2023/2939/ MRM.

P63.01.24 It was **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Orders to allow for members of the public to speak.

Resident no 1 called for Redrow Homes to consider additional parking provision on site, since visitors would likely park in residential roads as the Victoria Pleasure ground car park was full for most of the day.

Resident no 2 stated that he had submitted an objection to Wealden DC on Friday 26th January 2024, which had not yet been uploaded to the portal. He felt that the number of adjoining/neighbour letters was low and suspected there were more yet to appear on the portal. He raised concerns on the following issues:-

- Although there was provision for a school, this would be in the future, where would children moving to this development go to school now? They would have to use transport to travel to school and this would create increased traffic and congestion at peak times;
- That cycle ways and walkways were not sustainable for pedestrians and cyclists;
- Pedestrian safety - not all properties had a pavement outside of the premises. There needed to be pavement on both sides of the road;
- As the dwellings would now be at close proximity to the sewage treatment works, he had concerns for residents that would suffer from odour and fly infestation. Originally the sewage works were built in countryside;
- Concerns that there was Japanese Knotweed on the site;
- The entrance to the Taylor Wimpey site with the traffic calming measures would be a disaster;
- Raised concerns for the quality of the housing and that design features needed to be re-considered.

P64.01.24 It was **RESOLVED** to reinstate Standing Orders.

3.0 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were recorded from Cllrs. S Mayhew and P. Ullmann due to work commitments and sickness.

4.0 MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 8th January 2024

P65.01.24 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Plans Committee of the 8th January 2024, be taken as read, confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4.2 Action List

Members noted no change to the action list.

5.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chair stated that the following applications would be considered together.

WD/2023/2935/MRM LAND WEST OF UCKFIELD (SITE SD1), INCLUDING LAND BOUNDED BY LEWES ROAD, NEW TOWN, A22, UCKFIELD SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND LAND TO THE WEST OF A22 NORTH OF HORSTED POND GATE.

Reserved Matters application (access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) pursuant to Condition 2 of Outline Planning Permission Reference no. WD/2015/0209/MEA for Land to the West of Uckfield, comprising delivery of 1884 sq.m of employment floorspace, public realm enhancements, parking facilities and associated infrastructure.

WD/2023/2939/MRM LAND WEST OF UCKFIELD (SITE SD1), INCLUDING LAND BOUNDED BY LEWES ROAD, NEW TOWN, A22, UCKFIELD SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND LAND TO THE WEST OF A22 NORTH OF HORSTED POND GATE.

Reserved Matters application (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) pursuant to Condition 2 of Outline Planning Permission Reference no. WD/2015/0209/MEA for Land to the West of Uckfield, comprising the erection of 750 no. dwellings, local neighbourhood centre, strategic open space, child play provision and residential parking facilities, together with 10,627 sq.m. of business floorspace, parking facilities and associated infrastructure, and fully serviced school site, including access arrangements.

In advance of the meeting, the Committee Clerk had forwarded the response received on the 26th January from Redrow Homes to the questions members raised at their meeting of the 8th January 2024. The Chair read those responses as follows:

Q. One of the Industrial Units appeared to have a huge number of disabled parking bays. Who were the potential occupiers?

- A.**
- At present we are not in a position to share any details about potential occupiers, as we have not come to any formal agreements.
 - The proposed parking provision has been designed to enable flexibility in the use to ensure that ample parking can be provided should it be required.

Q. Odour mitigation needed to be made prior to any businesses occupying the industrial units;

- A.**
- The Section 106 agreement requires the odour mitigation contribution to be paid prior to the occupation of the business area.
 - Redrow have every intention of meeting the requirements of this obligation.

Q. Members acknowledged that the water drainage document was complex. Why were there so many SUDS across the site compared with the original drawing, as these were taking up building space, therefore creating a cramped/dense area for housing, within which there was little green space. Were these extra SUDs to do with surface water drainage?

- A.**
- The drainage basins shown on the outline drawings were based on an indicative surface water drainage strategy. The additional basin has been provided in the northern area of the site following the completion of a detailed drainage strategy, to ensure that the development can be appropriately drained and there is no increase in flood risk off site.

- The drainage strategy seeks to maximise the amount of usable space while enhancing biodiversity, and we are confident that the residential layout, rather than being cramped, will afford residents the privacy and personal space that they rightly expect.
 - The submitted landscape plans show that the additional SuDS will be planted with a Meadow Mix, with additional trees and scrub mix to increase the overall quality of landscape and soften the required basin.
- Q. Members would like to see space provided for allotments, a cemetery, sports field, and an all-weather pitch (astro turf). It appeared that the community space for a preschool, small amenity with a facility for room hire was no longer on the plan;**
- A.**
- The Cover Letter submitted with the residential/wider employment application confirms that Redrow will be proposing allotments at Seghers Place as a gesture of goodwill. The detail of the allotments will be added to the plans on the next revision, during the determination period of the application and prior to a resolution.
 - None of the remaining facilities mentioned are a requirement of the outline planning consent and it will not be possible to add these in.
 - Redrow are willing to work with the Council and local members to meet local aspirations as much as possible. However, there is neither the space on site nor the viability within the development to allow these while also providing the number of houses which Wealden District Council expect to see within this application in order to provide a considerable, much-needed contribution to their housing land supply.
 - We have provided an area for the development of a primary school in accordance with the S106 agreement, and this will be transferred to East Sussex County Council.
- Q. We would like to see a mix of affordable housing to meet varying housing need. Houses needed to be affordable for local people to buy to a maximum of £115,000 and be terraced style and or maisonettes, similar to those within the Manor Park Estate;**
- A.**
- Affordable Housing is being proposed in accordance with the signed S106 agreement.
- Q. Why did the drawings now show a reduction of the green corridor, from the back of Boothland Wood to the Framfield Stream. This area now showed a road going through it?**
- A.**
- The green corridor is still retained.
 - A development parcel on the eastern boundary adjacent to the green corridor was shown on the drawings accompanying the outline application.
- Q. Concerns were raised regarding the bus route exit onto Lewes Road as this would be affected by any planning decision taken for the application for nine houses at South Side of Lewes Road;**
- A.**
- The bus route has been proposed in accordance with the outline application and detail set out and approved within the S106 agreement.
- Q. Query regarding two veteran trees at the bus route exit. One was deadwood with no root protection around it and was to be removed. What protection was to be given to the Oak tree?**
- A.**
- The bus route has been proposed in accordance with the requirements of the S106 agreement. Due consideration has been given to the protection of all trees that are to be retained on the site during the course of the development. This is set out in the Method Statement submitted with the applications.
- Q. Uckfield Town Council would strongly recommend that the 8 properties that backed onto Boothland Wood be removed from that location as there would be a fire risk due to their close proximity to the woodland and there not being sufficient widths for fire rescue vehicles. Members recalled a fire last year with a similar situation where fire engines could not access;**

- A. • The properties in this location are proposed in accordance with the outline masterplan. The development has been designed to meet the requirements of fire regulations.
- There has been no objection from East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service in this regard.
- Q. The annual infestation of flies was a problem that needed to be addressed. Had Welbeck or Redrow Homes had any discussions about this with Southern Water?**
- A. • Redrow have tried to make contact with Southern Water and WDC regarding the issue. We are aware that this is an ongoing issue which will require some discussion throughout the planning process and we are working hard to resolve the issue.
- Q. It was suggested that a footbridge be introduced at the pinch point over the river to the east of the SUDS basin to create connectivity to the existing Bellbrook Industrial Estate;**
- A. • All access/movement proposals will be provided in accordance with the outline planning consent and the S106 agreement.

Members were invited to comment on the application and discussed their disappointment that the previous comments made by the Town Council at the consultation event, and their meeting with Redrow Homes had not been addressed in this Reserved Matters application and that there were a number of consultee reports that had not been addressed by Redrow Homes. These were read by the Chair as follows:-

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY Report 10.01.24

The applicant had not provided the details on the construction of the Wetland Habitat from the original application 2015/0209/MEA.

THIS IS DUPLICATED FOR WD/2023/2939/MRM

The scheme should include the following features:

- wet woodland habitat as part of the tree planting proposals;
- floodplain meadows as part of the wildflower grassland proposals;
- new attenuation ponds and swales;
- provide for connectivity to adjacent ponds and watercourses to enhance the potential for breeding and dispersal of reptiles and amphibians on and around this site and to adjacent habitat;
- to operate as a water filtration system to maintain the quantity of the surface water run-off entering the Ridgewood Stream.

The developer has not provided a landscape management plan including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens), should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

The landscape management plan should be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations should be agreed in writing by the LPA. The scheme should include the following elements:

- details of the new ponds and swales;
- details of maintenance regimes;
- details of management responsibilities;
- details of any proposed planting scheme, which should be of native species where reasonably practicable, bearing in mind access for maintenance.

The developer has not provided a plan for the buffer zones for the Ridgewood stream

The scheme was for the provision and management of an 8-metre-wide buffer zone alongside the Ridgewood Stream and 5 metres around all ditches and wet woodland shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and any subsequent amendments should be agreed in writing with the LPA.

The buffer zone scheme shall be free from built development including lighting, domestic gardens and formal landscaping; and could form a vital part of green infrastructure provision. The scheme shall include:

- plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone,
- details of any proposed planting schemes (if necessary) which should be of native species and include riparian tree planting where possible; details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected during development and managed/maintained over the longer term including adequate financial provision and named body responsible for management plus production of detailed management plan,
- details of any proposed footpaths, fencing, lighting etc. Lighting should be minimal and/or low level to avoid disrupting the natural diurnal rhythms of a range of wildlife using and inhabiting the river and its corridor habitat.

The developer has not provided a Construction Environmental plan.

Construction Environmental Management Plan. This shall deal with the treatment of any environmentally sensitive areas, their aftercare and maintenance as well as a plan detailing the works to be carried out showing how the environment would be protected during the works. Such a scheme should include details of the following:

- The timing of the works;
- The measures to be used during the development in order to minimise environmental impact of the works (considering both potential disturbance and pollution);
- A map or plan showing habitat areas to be specifically protected (identified in the ES) during the works;
- Any necessary mitigation for protected species; • Construction methods; • Any necessary pollution protection methods;
- Information on the persons/bodies responsible for particular activities associated with the method statement that demonstrate they are qualified for the activity they are undertaking.

The developer has not provided a detailed method statement for removing or the long-term management / control of Japanese Knotweed and Himalayan Balsam on the site

Nature Space Report 04.01.24 THIS IS DUPLICATED FOR WD/2023/2939/MRM

Development falls in Amber risk Zone for Greater Crested Newts.

9 ponds within 500m of development. GCN will be impacted.

- Applicant advised to join the district licensing scheme – **SO FAR HAVE NOT**
- European Protected species licence is required and a surveying and mitigation plan for the GCN needed to be submitted - **SO FAR HAS NOT**

East Sussex Fire Brigade report – 14.12.23

- Needs adequate provision of fire hydrants.

Uckfield TC are seriously concerned about the risk of fire in Boothland wood following fires started last summer putting properties at risk in Shepherds Gate. They would request a copy of fire hydrant plan and where they are to be situated near Boothland wood to safeguard both the wood and adjacent properties, in case of fire;

They would also request an emergency access plan on how fire engines would access the Redrow Home side of Boothland wood should fire break out;

UTC request the removal or re-siting of the 6 houses backing onto Boothland Wood due to the increased fire risk to them.

EAST SUSSEX HIGHWAYS REPORT FOR UNIT 1 – 10.01.24

- There is no planned layout to provide accessibility provision to include public transport footways and cycleways to connect to the remainder of development;
- B1 – Car parking provision is excessive against county parking standards for non – residential use. 126 /63. Disabled blue badge holders were at the furthest point and have no accessible route to building;
- No pedestrian routes shown from parking spaces to building to mitigate accidents;
- No drawing shows bridge, acceleration deceleration lanes, lighting, construction details, there was no stage 2 road safety audit or details on road adoption;

- There were no details on access provision for waste water treatment works. Where was the access route that was on the original plan to safeguard residential properties from waste water traffic?
- Only access proposed is for motorised vehicles from A22. Where was the access for non-motorised vehicles?
- Access from proposed spine road would not provide footways to the building;
- There are no loading/unloading bays / areas;
- There are no defined designated cycle parking areas for employees, although marked for internal use in building. There is lack of short- and long-term secure cycle parking;
- Lack of showering facilities expected at reserved matters;
- There is no EC charging provision.

WD/2023/2929MRM – 750 DWELLING

NOTE NATURE SPACE AND GREAT CRESTED NEWTS AS ABOVE

Active Travel England Planning Response 10.1.24 DEFERRED /OBJECT

The layout of the site provides good permeability for pedestrians and cyclists. An opportunity to improve the permeability by providing additional access routes had been identified and is noted below under opportunities.

- Concerns were raised regarding the straight lengths of roads through the site and whether raised tables could be implemented to minimise vehicle speed in line with guidance provided in Manual for Streets;

- Further information had been requested on access points in the site numbered 4 and 5 on the Illustrative Masterplan in the Design and Access Statement in respect of LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility guidance. Again, additional information on the widths and surface material that would be used for the footpath/cycle path around the site perimeter and through green spaces was requested to ensure suitability to all users;

1. Space for cycle parking should be considered at the earliest possible stage of a scheme design or building development (paragraph 11.1.4);

2. Personal security within cycle parking areas may also be of concern if the parking was remote and not overlooked by adjacent buildings. Cycle parking, and routes to and from it, should be clearly marked, overlooked, well-maintained, well-lit and integrated into the built environment (paragraph 11.2.2) 3. As with car parking, a proportion of the cycle parking (typically 5%) should be provided for non-standard cycles to accommodate people with mobility impairments. (11.3.2) 4. Recommended dimensions for cycle parking are provided in Table 11-2 5. Details of the requirements for workplace facilities are provided in section 11.7.

Areas of Concern

- Internal Layout Concerns were raised regarding the extent of 'straights' throughout the site, where the alignment of internal streets could give rise to excessive vehicle speeds contrary to the policy expectation to create an inclusive and welcoming environment;
- Raised tables, planting, rain gardens or other features that break the alignment may be necessary at junctions and other locations;
- Further information was requested on these access points to ensure suitability for pedestrians and cyclists and compliance with LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility guidance;
- Surface material of footway/cycleway. Loose surfaces such as gravel or mud can also present a skidding hazard, increase the risk of punctures and make cycles and clothing dirty in bad weather. Cyclists would also be affected by ruts and potholes that could throw them off balance. Smooth, sealed, solid surfaces would offer the best conditions for everyday cycling. Loose surfaces are also not suitable for wheelchair users;
- The Landscape Masterplan illustrated pedestrian/cycle routes around the site's perimeter and through the site further detail on the width of this route and the material that would be used;

- confirmation that drop kerbs would be placed where appropriate along these pedestrian routes to ensure the site would be fully wheelchair accessible in line with Inclusive Mobility guidance.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REPORT IS THE SAME AS ABOVE.

The Chair concluded that apart from the archaeological report and one other, none of the consultee responses had been answered.

P66.01.24 Following a lengthy discussion for both applications, it was **RESOLVED** that members could not agree to support the Reserved Matters on either of these applications and would therefore **object** until Redrow Homes had met the requirement of the consultation reports of the Environment Agency, East Sussex Fire and Resue, Active Travel England and ES Highways.

Members would also like the following concerns and comments to be addressed:-

- Uckfield TC would ask that despite not being included in the original Section 106 agreement, could consideration be given to the idea of a foot and cycle bridge across the river to Uckfield TC land/Brambleside, Uckfield, that would join the footpath into the town, in order to future proof the access for the proposed 'river walk' and to encourage non-motorised use;
- Uckfield TC were disappointed that the original plans for public space/public house and community building had been removed from Item 15 on the original Master Plan;
- Members would request that garages must be 3m wide, as the 2.4m garage proposed could not accommodate a modern vehicle allowing passengers to get in and out;
- Members would recommend that pavements are provided on both sides of the road, as there were a high number of properties with no pavement at all directly outside. This was considered to be a safety issue especially for young families
- Members would request clarification from the East Sussex Rights of Way team on the proposed route of the footpath crossing the A22 (UCK/11/1) to the Owlsbury Farm Land and public footpath;
- Uckfield TC would ask that consideration be given to using sustainable and environmentally friendly building materials, for example, solar panels and air or ground sourced pumps in the properties;
- Uckfield TC would request that a 'time frame' be considered for the provision of a primary school and that land be released early in the development. This would allow residents of the new dwellings, being built north to south, to have available education on site, before the development is complete, which could take up to 10 years;
- The Town Council would request that all attenuation ponds had petrol interceptors to stop them silting up and polluting the Ridgewood Stream and the subsequent backflow causing flooding onto the bypass;
- Uckfield TC would request the provision of playing fields and/or a hybrid 3G pitch, as current recreational space was now oversubscribed in the town. Originally three recreational spaces were mentioned as part of the original plan;
- Uckfield TC would like to ask if the industrial site was intended for retail rather than industrial use as parking space would suggest it was. This was not what was agreed on the original Section 106 agreement;
- The Town Council would like clarification on the waste water access route which was included in drawing SL083EMP, although not on BDML08EMP;

- Members would respectively point out that the bridge over the Ridgewood stream encroaches into the flood plain, which regularly floods and if constricted would cause back flooding onto the bypass;
- Uckfield TC would ask that consideration be given to the timing of the construction of the access road to the industrial site so it was not built at the same time as alterations to Copwood and Little Horsted roundabouts, as this would cause major transport congestion issues. UTC would also like clarification on when the alterations to the roundabout would be completed as these were supposed to be done at the completion of the first 100 houses at the Taylor Wimpey Site;
- Members were concerned that traffic congestion experienced in the High Street would cause residents from this development to avoid the town centre and go onto the bypass to shop elsewhere. This would be un-sustainable and make the development non-inclusive and see residents isolated, as being experienced by residents currently residing in phase 1A and 1B of the Taylor Wimpey development;
- Uckfield TC are very concerned about the lack of secondary school provision at this stage and would politely request some clarification on future provision;
- Uckfield TC continue to be concerned about the high risk to and from Boothland Wood and would ask ESFRS to ensure adequate fire hydrant provision. Members reiterated their concern for the houses proposed to be sited adjacent to Boothland Wood which in the opinion of the Town Council would cause a safety risk from and to them, as experienced by fires in the wood and fields in the summer of 2022;
- Members were concerned about the wet sand and running sand at the west of Boothland Wood where housing is proposed;
- Members would request clarification on access and maintenance provision for the 5G antenna which was currently situated where the gardens of properties no. 211 and 212 would be;
- Uckfield TC remain concerned about the bus route access onto Lewes Road and also the damage to the six large oak trees on the access road. Members would request David Massheder; Tree and Landscape Officer of Wealden DC, to carry out a tree survey to include the single veteran oak where the Herdsman Cottage was, in order to stop damage to trees or tree roots. It was noted that this was not mentioned in the tree management plan and members questioned why this was not included in the drawings?
- Uckfield TC were concerned about the properties proposed by the boundaries where there are changes in ground levels and the possibility of boundary lines collapsing - referring to the Taylor Wimpey issues with Cress Farm and this exact problem;
- Uckfield TC were told at the consultation that all properties would have large front gardens and would like clarification as to why at least approximately 100 houses had only a very small green area at the front;
- Could Redrow explain why houses designed for those with disabilities have staircases?

P67.01.24

Members **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Orders to extend the meeting to 9.30pm, as the time was approaching 9.00pm.

- It was noted that the odour report stated that there were only 90 complaints of odour reported over 10 years, but this was because there was a field buffer. The proposed development would be built next to the sewage works and therefore odour mitigation must be considered;
- Uckfield TC were willing to supply extra data regarding flies;

- Members would ask for confirmation that the proposed access into the water treatment work was HGV compliant and did Redrow Homes know when they would take up usage of this access?
- Members would ask for clarification on what percentage of affordable homes was being provided and of this, what percentage of houses 'Places for People' would be taking on;
- Uckfield TC would ask that the Forestry Commission be consulted on how to enhance and protect Boothland Wood. The fruit orchard suggested by Redrow is not compatible with an ancient woodland;
- Uckfield TC are concerned regarding the lack of parking provision for Victoria Pleasure ground usage, with access coming off of the A22. The parking is already at capacity and parking needs to be provided on the development site for non-motorised access to the recreational area;
- As this would now be a residential area, consideration must be given to noise and light pollution during construction as this development would take years to complete. Uckfield TC's recommendation would be 0700 to 1730 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 Saturdays and no working on Sundays or public holidays;

Members commented that the whole application appeared to have been rushed and consultee responses including feedback provided at the consultation event generally had not been addressed.

WD/2023/2887/LB 2 BUCKSWOOD GRANGE, ROCKS ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 3PU

Removal and replastering of the lower ground storeroom, and the provision of a vent to the flue within the chimney breast.

P68.01.24 It was **RESOLVED** to support the application as long as this was to the satisfaction of the Conservation Officer.

6.0 DECISION NOTICES

Approved:

WD/2022/1303/MAJ

PHASED DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 9 NO. DWELLINGS, ACCESS, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE.

RIDGEWOOD HOUSE, LEWES ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5SN

WD/2023/2899/F

INSTALLATION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC SOLAR PANELS.

7 SUNNYBROOKE CLOSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1EY

WD/2023/2692/F

CLOSURE WORKS TO HALIFAX BANK TO DE-BRAND EXTERNALLY BY REMOVING THE FASCIA/PROJECTING SIGNS AND ATM AND MAKING GOOD THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING 122 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1PX

Response to Town Council:

WD/2023/2692/F

CLOSURE WORKS TO HALIFAX BANK TO DE-BRAND EXTERNALLY BY REMOVING THE FASCIA/PROJECTING SIGNS AND ATM AND MAKING GOOD THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING 122 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1PX

The window panel to the right of the ATM contains a letter box and not a night safe. There is no alternative letter box within the glazed entrance door. It is considered unreasonable to request that this is changed as part of the closure works and would be a matter for a new occupier to address according to their needs, with appropriate planning permission due to the location within the Conservation Area.

I confirm that I have received a copy of the letter written to Lloyds Banking Group. The contents are noted; however, I can only deal with the application as submitted.

The reason for supporting subject to the stipulation regarding the night safe does not raise material planning reasons and therefore the decision is delegated to Officers.

Appeal Decision:

Site visit made on 27 October 2023 by Jane Smith MA MA MRTPI; an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 12 January 2024; Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/W/22/3310350

30 Sycamore Court, Uckfield, East Sussex TN22 1TY

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed new 2-bedroom single storey dwelling at 30 Sycamore Court, Uckfield, East Sussex TN22 1TY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WD/2022/1465/F, dated 31 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the related schedule.

Members noted the decision notices.

The meeting closed at 8.59pm.