MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF TORFAEN COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
Held on Thursday 8th January at 4.00pm to 6.45 pm
In the Civic Centre, Hanbury Road, Pontypool, NP4 6YB

ATTENDANCE: Members of the Committee

Councillors:
Stuart Ashley  Brian Mawby (Chair)
Pamela Cameron  Norma Parrish
Veronica Crick JP  Philip Seabourne
Nigel Davies  Barry Taylor JP
Stuart Evans  Wayne Tomlinson
Alun Furzer  Neil Waite

Officers
Rachel Beale  Admin Assistant, Members Services
Polly Ellis  Solicitor, Legal
Rebecca Fahey-Jones  Corporate Scrutiny & Democracy Officer
Caroline Genever-Jones  Corporate Improvement Officer (Webcasting)
Norman Jones  Team Leader (Planning Applications)
Richard Lewis  Head of Development Management
Rebecca McAndrew  Principal Planner
Robert Murray  Principal Planner
Duncan Smith  Chief Officer Planning and Public Protection
Paul Wheeldon  Group Leader, Transportation and Highways
                   Development
Adrian Wilcock  Principal Planner

Others in the public gallery
24 members of the press and public (in shifts)
Councillor  David Daniels

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE – Councillors:
Ron Burnett  Jessica Powell

ABSENT – Councillors:
Keith James  Robert Kemp
1 ATTENDANCE AND INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Attendance and apologies are as recorded above.

1.2 The Chair introduced members and officers, explained their roles and outlined relevant procedures including public speaking rights, webcasting and emergency exits.

1.3 Note – the minutes are a summary of the meeting – the full proceedings can be seen at: http://www.torfaen.publici.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/159556

1.4 The agenda for and the reports presented to this meeting are also available to view at: http://www.torfaen.gov.uk/en/CouncillorsAndCommittees/Committees/CommitteeDirectory.aspx

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Following advice from the Legal Officer, the following interests were declared by members of the committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Type of interest</th>
<th>Reason for interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Ashley</td>
<td>12/P/00288</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>As member of Cwmbran Community Council &amp; Friends of the Earth Torfaen who were both consulted on application. Also a member of Canal Regeneration Group which has land adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Parrish</td>
<td>14/P/00474</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>As member of Pontypool Community Council who was consulted on the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Taylor</td>
<td>14/P/00474</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>As member of Pontypool Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Waite</td>
<td>14/P/00474</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Member of Race AFC – the club previously having an interest in the land being considered in the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – the minutes contain a summary of the debate which took place at this meeting, leading to the decisions listed below. The full public statements/debate in relation to each application are available to view at http://www.torfaen.publici.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/159556
3 PLANNING APPLICATION – 12/P/00288

Outline application for the development of land at Llantarnam for employment (B1), residential (C3), a neighbourhood centre (including A1 retail and D1 community uses), together with vehicular and pedestrian/cycle access including new highway junction on Newport Road, realignment of Malthouse Lane, re-grading of site to form new site levels and associated infrastructure works, parking, servicing, landscaping and public open space provision.

3.1 The Hof DM informed the committee of corrections that needed to be made to the report:

- Pg 5 – Note in the last paragraph refers to a previous application at Malthouse Lane – this is a duplication and is detailed over page;
- Pg 23 – 2nd paragraph under highways referring to weight limit – should read from the proposed new junction off Newport Road to Woodlands roundabout;
- Pg 25 – bottom of page under Housing Strategy – should read two-thirds socially rented and one-third intermediate
- Page 50 – 2nd paragraph – should state 'using the proposed new junction to Woodlands roundabout'
- Page 56 – under Crown roundabout – should read the Newport Road arm improvement
- Pg 57 – under proposed Head of Terms for Section 106 Agreement – section 2 relating to low cost housing – to provide on site this wouldn’t be truly low cost because of the value of the houses from a marketing point of view. Therefore we could take a monetary sum instead of the low cost houses. The housing department has advised that they have spoken with the RSLs and there may now be a way of doing this so amended to read that we can provide low cost housing.
- Pg 63 – there is a condition omitted. Condition 19 – this will be added to deal with the requirement to carry out the offsite highway improvement works to the Woodlands roundabout and the Crown roundabout and deal with the realignment of Malthouse Lane.

3.2 The HofDM informed members that a resident had recently submitted a call-in request to the Minister as they felt the decision should be made by the Minister and not the local planning authority. The report had been sent to the minister and he would make his decision on that. This did not stop the committee from making a resolution or from proceeding with the determination but prior to issuing that determination the minister would make his decision on whether he would deal with the application himself.

3.3 The Planning Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner setting out the contents of the report and detailing the proposed application. The full officer presentation can be seen at http://www.torfaen.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/159556
The Principal Planner highlighted to members:

- Other correspondences had been received from Glamorgan Gwent Archaeology Trust – they request a condition to record all archaeology features found during development. The authorities’ ecologist has identified that the site includes 3 seasonal water courses – in his response he stated that he was satisfied that the mitigation measures in place address the requirements of the SINC policy. Further comments had been received from Cwmbran Community Council relating to increasing the population of Cwmbran, impact on the M4, the impact the T junction would have on the traffic flow on Newport Road, impact on the historic park and infrastructure;
- The site is allocated within the Local Development Plan which was adopted in December 2013;
- Land is allocated at Llantarnam Strategic Action Area Cwmbran, for the construction of 450 dwellings, 8 hectares of employment land (B1) a neighbourhood centre and informal recreation provision aided by strategic highway infrastructure improvements;
- The inspector considered the allocation and provided his statement;
- The committee were shown an aerial shot of the proposed site;
- The site was split into four land parcels – The Cottage site, Welsh Government Land, Malthouse Lane North, Land to the South of Malt Lane;
- This was an outline application with all matters reserved except for access;
- The proposed changes to the highway infrastructure were detailed – T junction to serve phase one, and 4 arm roundabout to be constructed prior to the commencement of phase 2;
- There were off site highway improvements proposed;
- Newport City Council objected on the grounds that the application would be detrimental to the highway network in the Malpas ward. There had also been substantial local objection based on the impact the additional traffic generated on the highway network would have, especially in an area which already experiences congestion at peak times. The authority’s highway engineer and Welsh Government had not objected;
- Other key objection to the application was on the grounds of conservational heritage;
- Mitigation measures would need to be out into place to limit the impact on the conservational area.

3.4 There were 2 requests from local residents who wanted to speak but who were unable to attend the meeting. The first resident raised concerns relating to the traffic impact. The second resident raised concerns relating to the retail element of the scheme, raising concerns that it may become a focal point for anti-social behaviour.

3.5 Members requested further information on the land barriers referred to. The PP provided the committee with details of landscape buffer zones, highlighting on the maps where areas of landscape would be retained so there would be natural barriers between the Abbey grounds and any properties built.
3.6 Members queried potential housing design. The PP responded by informing the committee that it was recognised that in other residential areas a standard house design would be acceptable. However, as Malthouse north was in an area of registered park land, the statutory consultees who have an interest in the park and CADW have said that if this development goes ahead then mitigation measures needed to be put in place to ensure that the house designs would be sensitive to the location and area.

3.7 In response to a member question, the PP confirmed that the design brief would set out areas of landscape.

3.8 The following objectors spoke (with the key issues they raised listed and available to view in full on the webcast at the above address):

**Mr Roger Alma (Local resident)**
- Transport and access to amenities
- The information relating to sustainability of the development was based on incorrect and outdated information
- Public transport – the bus service as described in the application report did not exist. There were no buses at all through the centre of area to Newport during the day. Only means of transport left for people was motor car – another 450 houses would not ease this problem
- The roads in the area were not fit for purpose – the main road was narrow and badly surfaced;
- Half the street lights were switched off at night
- The transport survey seemed to be out of date by several years
- Amenities – there were no shops within safe walking distance and nothing definite can be promised by developer. The nearest shops in Llanyravon were not accessible by bus
- Nearest comprehensive school was mile away and to be demolished
- Nearest hospital is several miles away not easily accessible by public transport
- Difficult to argue that application is sustainable

**Mrs Anne Robinson (Planning Officer for the Monmouthshire and Gwent branch of the Welsh Historic Gardens Trust).**
- The significance of Llantarnam Abbey park was recognized by its registration as a grade II site in the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens in Wales.
- It was created in its entirety in 1836-7 by Reginal Blewitt but lies within a much more ancient medieval monastic site. The park and garden formed a 19th century designed entity of historic significance in terms of layout, planning and survival – although the park has been severely compromised by the new road.
- The registered historic parks were protected within the planning system in that there was a national policy for the protection of historic parks and gardens and their settings.
There was also a policy in the local plan for the protection of registered historic parks and gardens. These policies were significant because they were a material consideration that the planning committee had to take into account when reaching its decision.

The main objection concerned the proposed T junction from Newport Road into the site. The WHGT wished to reiterate that this proposal would adversely affect this registered historic park.

‘Observations’ concerned the layout and style of the proposed development, the need for landscaping the site and the need for a management plan for the buffer zone along the drive to the Abbey. Should development take place they urged that it be designed in a way that was sympathetic to the character of the Park, as stated in the letter of 18th December 2014.

Mr Paul Williams (Community Councillor)

- Concentrated on 2 aspects – historical importance of the land and the letter to the minister calling in the decision;
- Within the LDP its stated that the historic nature of the site should be recognised and protected;
- Torfaen was recognised as a ‘black hole’ in that so little archaeological research or surveys have been carried out – we don’t even know what may be under our own ground. That was why a desktop survey would indicate that there was no archaeology at the site;
- Acknowledged amateur archaeologist and professional findings show that there was significant, iron, bronze age, roman, medieval and post medieval archaeology on this site which was evidenced at the local museum;
- The comments by the planning inspector that there was no archaeology features there, had been driven by desktop surveys
- 2014 was the 20th anniversary of the reconstruction of the Folly – think how many events we should have organised to have inspired our young people to learn about local history;
- In 2015 we would be commemorating the 70th anniversary of VE day – on the site of the proposed development many brave men spent the final few weeks of their lives before going off to D-Day to take part in the Victory in Europe campaign – this site should be the focal point of our history
- The call in of the application to the minister was specific – there needs to be a strategic review of impact of residential houses along the M4 motorway – there was significant cross party support within the assembly that this review should take place

Cllr David Daniels (Ward Councillor)

- Road infrastructure – the report and the views of the local authority’s Highway Officer contrasted the views of Newport City Council who objected to the application on highways grounds and the detrimental impact the proposal would have on the highway infrastructure in the
Malpas ward. How do officers reconcile this difference?

- Archaeology - there was significant concern about the impact on the heritage of the registered park ground and the archaeology contained. Every effort should be made to preserve the heritage of the grounds – condition 41 of the application elaborates on this but can officers detail how this would proceed in the event that significant archaeology was uncovered at the site?

- Also what measures would be taken to preserve the boundary wall and can assurances be given that any section of the wall removed would be restored as much as possible once the development was completed?

- Affordable housing – whilst commending the officers for securing S106 agreement, the percentage of affordable accommodation was disappointing. It was regrettable that officers should have to choose between improving highways infrastructure or affordable housing in the most expensive area of Torfaen;

- Concerns that expensive developments would always put a squeeze on affordable housing being delivered on similar sites, which put pressure on achieving affordable housing targets in an area of Torfaen that needed it the most;

- Impact on school numbers – the report states that it would not have significant impact on nearby school numbers, however have officers taken into consideration the impact of this development and that on the site of Llantarnam secondary school would have on the local primary school?

- The access to Malthouse Lane – The re-routing of Malthouse Lane has caused significant concerns amongst local residents who currently rely on that access to Newport Road. That junction already has dangers relating to visibility. What alternative access has been considered by officers?

- Could officers please ensure that residents are consulted at every stage of the process?

Mr Gareth Williams (Agent for Applicant)

- The site was allocated in the adopted Local Development Plan – the planning application before the committee was in full accordance with that allocation;

- The plan covered a wider area than the previous plan;

- The area that was of most interest was Malthouse north area, which was in the previous plan. Planning permission was granted in 2010 so still had live consent associated with that land so the principle of development was already established both in the LDP and the council has made several decisions over a period of time dating back to 2000;

- Redrow had worked very closely with officers to prepare this planning application;

- The concerns of residents were recognised but most of the matters raised were matters of principle that were addressed through the LDP process and the inspector in his report made it very clear that he supported the allocation and had taken into account the impact on the
• Recognised the sensitivity of the site and the conditions laid out in relation to the need for a development brief – the client would continue to work officers to make sure that a scheme was produced that reflected the concerns raised;
• Redrow were a leading house builder who had an excellent reputation – with the last scheme being built in New Inn;
• The concerns expressed by Glamorgan & Gwent Archaeology Trust and CADW could be addressed by condition;
• This was one of 5 strategic sites in the LDP and if objected to, members were objecting to the whole scheme of the LDP
• This application represented approx. 10% of the housing allocated within Torfaen LDP;
• There was provision for industrial land and a neighbourhood centre and the transport improvements.

The Chair thanked the speakers for their contributions

3.9 Officers responded to the issues raised by the objectors and the applicant, as well as to questions and comments raised by members of the committee as follows (main points):
• The PP assured Cllr Daniels that there were conditions attached to the application to ensure that any assets uncovered would be properly recorded and protected. She set out to the committee the conditions as set out by GGAT;
• In response to Cllr Williams comments relating to the American Army base, GGAT have commented on the significance of this archaeological asset and how the direct impact of this development would be severe, however this was not sufficient reason for the application to be refused;
• PP (AW) confirmed that consideration of the impact of the application on education had been taken into account. He confirmed that there was current capacity in Llantarnam primary school, and that a new 315 capacity school was proposed to be built in the area that would provide further capacity;
• PP (RM) confirmed that the LDP as adopted by the Council had been subject to widespread consultation as part of that development process. When the plan went through Council, the Llantarnam site was widely discussed at that time – a number of questions were raised at the time and were answered. There was also a session which was held on 25th April 2013 which dealt with this particular site. A number of aspects were raised, however the inspector considered the plan as a whole and allocation was a major part of that. A summary of views were detailed at the time however it was deemed that it was sustainable site that would deliver allocation in line with the plan
• GLT,&HD commented that there were a number of issues regarding highways – IHT guidelines refer to distances from facilities to bus stops with 400m being desirable, within 800m was acceptable and within 1200m was a preferred maximum. He confirmed there were bus stops within those ranges. The Service 15 bus that travelled to Newport runs every half hour
and also goes the other direction to Pontypool every hour. The X3 service goes to Cardiff, therefore this site was served by public transport. There was always the opportunity to increase provision but that was a decision for the commercial operator.

- With regard to the condition of Newport Road the GL,T&HD advised the committee that the road was the former 4042 trunk road and that traffic levels had significantly reduced since the by-pass and the new road were built. He confirmed that the road was wide enough and capable of taking the current level or traffic and that projected with the development. He reminded the committee that the developer was providing improvements which would cater for the increased traffic. There were footways along the existing Newport Road and the street lighting was adequate.

- With regard to the objections raised by Newport City Council, the GLT&HD explained that as an authority we had to demonstrate that this development would prove demonstrable harm, however he was of the opinion that the developer had put in place adequate mitigation measures in terms of the improvements to Woodlands roundabout and Crown roundabout. Welsh Government had not objected on highway grounds and neither had the independent consultants.

- With regard to the wall the HofDM drew member’s attention to condition 40 which required that any re-instatement was carried out properly as well as being detailed in the development brief which would safeguard that.

3.10 In response to questions relating to Welsh Water, the HofDM reminded members that as a principle of development, this would have been covered in the LDP process and Welsh Water would have been consulted. He stressed that the authority was advising the applicant to contact Welsh Water and would assume that they have already done so.

3.11 The PP assured members that a full environmental impact assessment had been carried out and conditions had been put in place accordingly.

3.12 The HSTL informed the committee that the percentage of affordable housing requirement was 30% for this sub market area however that was dependant on viability. Housing work closely with developers to determine an appropriate percentage of affordable housing gain which ensures the site is viable to proceed, the LA have a viability toolkit available to them to verify costs of the scheme and determine if affordable housing is achievable. The intermediate element of the affordable housing depends on the affordability of each applicant and being able to raise a mortgage for typically 70% of the open market value of a property. Initially the open market values of the properties on this site indicated that they would not be affordable for Torfaen residents registered to the Help2Own scheme this is why initially discussion took place around an off site contribution to allow applicants to purchase more affordable homes within the sub market area, however having now discussed this with the RSL they have ensured a they will review the product by offering a variable equity share making the purchase more affordable..
3.13 In respect of the proposed shopping area, the HofDM confirmed that we would accept A1 class shops, if the developer wanted to alter this then they would have to submit a new application and the planning committee would need to determine this.

3.14 In response to the request for consultation with local residents throughout the development process, the HofDM confirmed that we would do this a matter of course. He assured members that in most cases, as a local authority we exceeded the requirement for consultation.

3.15 **THE COMMITTEE APPROVED** the application (all in favour), subject to the conditions listed in the report.

3.16 **THE COMMITTEE approved the recommendation**

4 **PLANNING APPLICATION – 14/P/00474**

*Development consists of the provision of 31 new gypsy traveller pitches.*

4.1 The CO,PPP declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application and left the meeting at this point.

4.2 The PP detailed late correspondences that had been received – Firstly from Cwmynyscoy Neighbourhood Action Group, which stated they were satisfied with the documents and had no further comments and because we were in further discussions with the footballers regarding a replacement pitch they were satisfied with that part of the proposal. Secondly from the coal authority (Pg 96) their original objection was two-fold, one that when you build over coal resources you should consider the prime extraction of coal and that wasn’t done at the time of application. The second part of their objection was that it was their policy not to build over mine entries and/or mine shafts and these were both in the application area. They were sent further mining information and their letter does not comment any further with regard to prior extraction. They were still maintaining their policy objection with regard to building over mine entries or shafts – this matter has been dealt with within the report.

4.3 The Planning Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner setting out the contents of the report and detailing the proposed application. The full officer presentation can be seen at [http://www.torfaen.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/159556](http://www.torfaen.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/159556)

- Development consisted of the provision of 31 new gypsy traveller pitches;
- The site was located just outside the urban boundary;
- The site was adjacent to the current Shepherds Hill site;
- An old changing room was proposed to be demolished;
- The proposal was for 31 pitches in 3 phases;
- As part of the plan a replacement playing field had been allocated;
An objection was received from a gentleman living in a caravan adjacent to the site, who was concerned with overlooking – the original application contained a boundary of 3m this has now been increased to 10m as well as including additional landscaping;

Principal of development – the local authority has a statutory responsibility to provide appropriate provision for gypsies and travellers in its local plan;

Mineral matters and site remediation – will not prejudice coal, coal safeguarding/ pre-extraction considerations have all been taken into account

Recommending a precautionary approach to the airshaft, that if not found the applicant re-enforce the ground to an acceptable level. National policy was more flexible with regard to building over airshafts so once assessed the site and if satisfied the risk was acceptable level then can proceed;

The loss of playing field was justified by site allocation and viability – the Fields in Trust association had accepted this. The developer had shown that the cost of providing the recreational site would make the development unviable;

Highways and access – Lower Race has deficiencies, a satisfactory vehicular access can be provided which made the development acceptable

Residual and visual amenity – the site had been designed in accordance with Welsh Government Design guidance but there was a need for further landscaping and control of parking and the number of caravans on the site;

Site was S106 compliant – however the council could not enter into an agreement with itself. It was however proposed to provide a playground in the development. There was a recommendation for further design details to be provided as well as investigating the lighting being proposed to ensure it would not disrupt the bat community that was in the area.

4.4. In response to a member question, the PP confirmed that there would be no further street lighting on the footpath that was proposed to link Shepherds Hill up to Coleg Gwent. He stated that the current level of street lighting in that area was acceptable and that was consistent with most roads in a rural area.

4.5 The following objector spoke (with the key issues they raised listed and available to view in full on the webcast at the above address):

Mr Jack Hanbury (Pontypool Park Estate)

Two interests – 1 as land owners of the surrounding area, and 2 as a neighbour.

The Shepherds Hill site was gifted to the people of Pontypool in 1920 for recreational uses. There were various issues relating to that gift that caused concern;
• Applicant was the Council – he appreciated that the authority have a difficult statutory obligation;
• He shared great sympathies and concerns with local residents;
• These concerns related to the management of the current Shepherds Hill site – the council may have created a nuisance to its neighbours by failing to contain the current site – it was continually covered in litter and there were broken fences lying on the ground. The council had even allowed someone to build on their own land.
• Fencing covenants were still in place – and therefore the authority had not met its common law or statutory law obligation in terms of restrictive covenants – those covenant were re-enforced when the Shepherds Hill site was built
• If this application was approved there needed to be a condition included to guarantee that the authority would meet the future management commitments of the site

Neil Howell (Head of Housing & Business Support) Speaking on behalf of Applicant

• The local authority had statutory duties to make provision for the gypsy/travellers community within the borough;
• A Gypsy/ Traveller needs assessment was carried out as part of the LDP process which identified the need for provision of additional pitches. There were concerns of overcrowding on the current site, there was also a need identified to address health and safety issues due to mining subsistence at site;
• 1st phase allows for natural expansion based on existing community on site. Gypsy/ traveller community already well established on site;
• The proposed new Housing Act will be introduced in April this year and would require local authorities to carry out further gypsy traveller needs assessments;
• Planning approval will allow the local authority to access Welsh Government funding and without planning permission the authority would not be able to apply for this funding;
• The inspector concluded the site was suitable for allocation within the LDP;
• It was hoped to provide recreational facilities on the site however costs have proved prohibitive;
• He could not take responsibility for the management of the site over the last 40 years however confirmed that a Gypsy Traveller Community Liaison Manager had been appointed who spends a lot of time on site with community. He acknowledge that there had been issues with noise, rubbish and fencing;
• Had been successful in securing WG funding to improve fencing and drainage on site

4.6 The PP assured the committee that with regards to the management of
the site, condition 11-19 sets out requirements that the site and its facilities would be maintained with agreed maintenance schedules and timetables. Written assurance from housing service that the area would be maintained.

4.7 Members raised concerns relating to:
- The risk of subsidence in the area;
- The cost of making the land suitable for developing;
- Flooding on the Race Road;
- Concerns for people walking on the Race Road and the lack of traffic control and street lighting;
- Health and safety issues;
- The disruption caused at the Shepherds Hill site;
- The field has not been used in more than 25 years since subsidence was caused simply by people playing sport.

4.8 The PP drew member’s attention to page 92 of the report which deals with ‘Land instability and Subsidence’. He commented that as a planner, based on national policy and on the amount of work that was going into making the site safe and the grouting he considered the proposals to be acceptable. He confirmed that the council now had a management regime in place and that a lot of the issues detailed were as a result of gypsy/travellers camping on the site, and that with this new provision there should be less unauthorised camping.

4.9 The GLT&HM commented that he was also concerned regarding the highway layout but again stressed that in order to object to the application he would have to be able to prove demonstrable harm which he was unable to do. He confirmed that there was no accident record for the area that would clearly demonstrate demonstrable harm. He also commented that in rural areas you will always find walkways and footpaths that are unlit.

4.10 The issue of drainage was raised and the potential for this increasing the developing costs significantly. The PP commented that the total cost allocated was £3.7m and there was contingency built into that. He reminded the committee that the site was allocated in the LDP and the inspector was fully aware of all the issue which were taken into account.

4.11 In response to a member question, the PP informed the committee that a risk assessment was provided but he was not sure as to why Natural Resource Wales had not seen it. Their concern was due to there still being data collated so issues still needed finalising.

4.12 Again concerns were raised regarding the instability of the site. The PP commented that the comment referred to was a caveat the local authority used. He confirmed they were satisfied with the remedial work planned and that the site would be safe to an acceptable level.

4.13 Concerns were expressed that residents walk on the road instead of the footpath, and that by not lighting the area this may act as further
discouragement for them to do so. It was suggested that officers investigate the possibility of using low level lighting to encourage people to use the footways.

4.14 It was agreed that a condition be added to the application asking that before any development takes place a review be conducted in order to try and ensure that there is low level lighting rather than high level lighting to assist pedestrians, subject to a further report back to this committee in due course. The HofDM commented that this could be added but there would be a need to assess feasibility based on other reports from ecology due to the wildlife in the area.

4.15 The amendment was moved. The committee voted 8 in favour, 1 against and the amendment was carried.

4.16 The HofDM reminded the committee that with regard to the land instability issue – condition 25 was quite comprehensive in that prior to do anything the applicant must address all issues dealt with under that condition.

4.17 The committee voted on the recommendation which included the motion as amended. The committee voted 8 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention. The recommendation as amended was carried.

4.18 THE COMMITTEE approved the recommendation

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

5.1 THE COMMITTEE NOTED that its next meeting was scheduled for 10 February 2015.

Signed ……………………………………………………………… Chair Date……………………………………

Minutes produced by Rebecca Fahey-Jones