

# Minutes of a meeting of the Planning - Oxford City Planning Committee on Tuesday 19 March 2024

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Committee members present:

Councillor Clarkson (Chair)	Councillor Altaf-Khan
Councillor Chapman	Councillor Corais (for Councillor Hollingsworth)
Councillor Douglas (for Councillor Railton)	Councillor Fouweather
Councillor Malik	Councillor Mundy
Councillor Rehman	Councillor Upton

## Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Felicity Byrne, Principal Planning Officer  
Sarah De La Coze, Principal Planning Officer  
Andrew Murdoch, Development Management Service Manager  
Sally Fleming, Planning Lawyer  
Robert Fowler, Development Management Team Leader (West)  
Mike Kemp, Principal Planning Officer  
Emma Lund, Committee and Member Services Officer

## Apologies:

Councillors Hollingsworth, Kerr and Railton sent apologies.

Substitutes are shown above.

## 68. Declarations of interest

### General

**Councillor Upton** declared that as a member and trustee of the Oxford Preservation Trust she had taken no part in that organisation's discussions regarding any of the applications before the Committee. Councillor Upton stated that she was approaching the applications with an open mind, would listen to all the arguments and weigh up all the relevant facts before coming to a decision on them.

### 23/02114/FUL

**Councillor Clarkson** declared that she lived in the area close to the John Radcliffe Hospital. However, it was not sufficiently close as to be affected by the application, and she would approach the application with an open mind.

**Councillor Malik** declared that he also lived in the area close to the John Radcliffe Hospital. However, it was not sufficiently close as to be affected by the application and he would approach the application with an open mind.

**Councillor Rehman** declared that he also lived in the area close to the John Radcliffe Hospital. However, it was not sufficiently close as to be affected by the application, and he would approach the application with an open mind.

**Councillor Chapman** declared that the application site was within his ward; however, he had not had any conversations regarding the application and was approaching it with an open mind.

**Councillor Douglas** declared that he held an honorary contract as a Locum Consultant Physician with the Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. [Note: this did not constitute an interest as the contract was non-remunerated and Councillor Douglas would not be using the new building in the future]. Having arrived at the meeting after the start of the officer's presentation Councillor Douglas did not participate in the debate or vote on this application.

### **23/02506/CT3**

**Councillor Upton** declared that she had been involved in various discussions relating to funding for the bridge. Although she believed that she would be able to approach the application with an open mind and assess it impartially against Local Plan policies, in order to avoid any perception of pre-determination Councillor Upton stated that she would leave the room whilst the application was considered and would not participate in determining it.

**Councillor Chapman** declared that he was a member of the Cabinet and also a member of the Shareholder and Joint Venture Group, which had a tangential interest in the application. Whilst he believed that he would be able to consider the application with an open mind, Councillor Chapman stated that due to the risk of the public perception of pre-determination he would leave the room whilst the application was considered and would not participate in determining it.

**Councillor Mundy** declared that he had been in contact with a member of the public with regard to the application; however, he had not formed an opinion and would be approaching the application with an open mind.

### **23/01198/FUL**

**Councillor Corais** declared that he had made a representation on the application and would therefore not participate in determining it and would leave the room whilst it was considered.

**Councillor Douglas** declared that he had submitted an objection in respect of the application and would therefore not participate in determining it and would leave the room whilst the application was considered.

### **23/00516/FUL**

**Councillor Malik** declared that he had been involved in fundraising following natural disasters and this had involved visiting Oxford's mosques. However, he was not a member of Madina Mosque and was approaching the application with an open mind.

## **69. 23/02114/FUL: John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Oxford OX3 9DU**

The Committee considered an application (23/02114/FUL) for erection of a modular theatre building including associated infrastructure, landscaping and parking at John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Oxford.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation and highlighted the following:

- The proposal represented an extension to the hospital of approximately 14,000 sqm of floor space over five levels and would connect to the Childrens' Hospital and the Eye Wing via a link corridor. The building would be of a modular construction, providing 7 new operating theatres in order to meet current demand and provide future capacity.
- The proposal would help to meet the need for surgery in Oxford and Oxfordshire, as well as the wider South East Integrated Care System region. It would also provide approximately 174 new full-time jobs for staff.
- Officers advised that a late representation had been received from the Oxford Preservation Trust and the comments arising had already been covered in the report. Officers considered that there would be some additional harm to views arising from the increase to visual distraction, resulting in a high level of less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. However, it was considered that the very significant benefits of the proposal in terms of providing much needed theatre accommodation outweighed the harm in this instance.
- 16 visitor car parking spaces would be retained on site and 121 visitor spaces would be re-provided within existing car parks. This would involve the displacement of existing staff car parking spaces, resulting in a reduction of staff car parking provision. The Trust was undertaking a Framework Transport Strategy for the whole site in recognition of the impact of the hospital on traffic generation and congestion in the wider Headington area; this would include measures to help reduce the need for staff to travel to the site by car and encourage a shift to more sustainable modes of transport.
- The Highways Authority had raised no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions securing the Framework Transport Strategy; a travel plan; a car park management plan; cycle parking securing the 35 spaces needed; and a contribution of approx. £170,000 towards the Eastern Arc bus route.
- A satisfactory Landscape Plan and tree canopy cover assessment had now been received. The latter had satisfactorily demonstrated that the tree canopy cover lost would be replaced over 25 years. A biodiversity net gain had also been demonstrated through a scheme of 11 trees to be provided elsewhere in the hospital grounds: this met the minimum of 5% required by the Local Plan policy and also the 10% required by the Environment Act 2021 (although that percentage was not legally required for this application) and this could be secured via a S106 agreement. As such, officers amended their recommendation so as to remove reference to these issues.
- The development would include a drainage strategy and sustainable drainage. This would include attenuation of the water from the car park, resulting in a betterment of the current situation. Officers were satisfied that there would be no increased flood risk elsewhere off-site.
- There would be no adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity due to nature of the development, topography, and distance from other properties.

- The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report, subject to conditions and the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement. As a satisfactory Landscape Plan and tree canopy cover assessment had now been received and the biodiversity net gain had been demonstrated, references to these could now be removed from the recommendations.

Mark Pott of Headington Heritage spoke against the application.

Mr Colin Nnadi and Dr Ruth Webster of Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers and representatives of the applicant. The Committee's discussions included, but were not limited to:

- The hospital was a very valued facility, both for Oxford residents and those who travelled from other parts of the country to benefit from its facilities. However, Committee Members expressed the view that there was a need for an overarching masterplan to have oversight of broader issues such as transport and traffic congestion which were not addressed within individual planning applications.
- Whilst the proposal to encourage staff to use sustainable transport and the investment in the Eastern Arc bus route was welcome, there remained significant concern about traffic issues and congestion at the site.
- It was considered that the public benefit of the proposal would be significant in terms of reducing waiting lists and improving the quality of life for the patients who would benefit from the treatment provided. This outweighed the inconvenience which some people may face from potentially higher traffic levels and parking in the Controlled Parking Zone. The proposal was also fully compliant with planning policies.

On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote the Committee agreed with the officers' recommendation (as amended to remove reference to the Landscape Plan and tree canopy cover assessment and the demonstration of biodiversity net gain) to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the conditions set out in the report and a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report.

Note: Councillor Douglas had arrived at the meeting after the commencement of the officer's presentation and therefore did not participate in determining the application.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of the report and grant planning permission subject to:
  - the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under section.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended heads of terms which were set out in the report; and

2. **delegate authority** to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to:
- finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary; and
  - finalise the recommended legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers as set out in this report, including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms set out in this report (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Head of Planning Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary; and
  - complete the section 106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.

## **70. 23/02506/CT3: South Side, Oxpens Road, Oxford OX1 1RX**

Councillors Upton and Chapman left the room for this item and did not participate in determining the application.

The Committee considered an application (23/02506/CT3) for construction of a pedestrian / cycle bridge across the River Thames from Grandpont Nature Park to Oxpens Meadows at South Side, Oxpens Road, Oxford.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation, provided updates, and highlighted the following:

- Since publication of the report, three additional objections had been received. Most of the issues raised had already been addressed in the committee report; however, in relation to those not included in the report the Planning Officer responded as set out below.
- Officers had assessed the impact of the bridge on the local area and had found it to be acceptable. The bridge had been designed to minimise its impact on the site and this was set out in the report. Natural England had commented on the application and stated that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact.
- The report set out that the other bridges located close to the application site had been looked at but had not been deemed to fulfil the requirements of the proposed bridge for various reasons, including needing extensive works to allow them to be suitable for use by cyclists.
- The proposed upgrades to the tow path would be designed to enable it to be suitable for use as a cycle route. The County Council would be the lead authority in determining whether it would be designated as a main cycle way.
- The issue of bottlenecks under the Railway Bridge had been considered in the committee report, which set out that research showed that cyclists adjusted their speed depending on the density of pedestrians. The County Council had been consulted on the application and had raised no objection to the shared use of the path or bridge.

- Officers had screened the development and did not consider it to be EIA development.
- Officers agreed with the sequential and exception test set out in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.
- Officers considered the development as essential infrastructure. This type of development was acceptable in flood zone 3b. Notwithstanding this, the sequential and the exception test would still need to be met.
- Policy SP1 and SP2 set out that a new cycle and pedestrian bridge over the river should be delivered in this location to link and enhance routes to the city centre. The aspiration for a new bridge over a watercourse would in itself be required to cross an area of high risk to flooding. The Local Plan and West End SPD set out that this area should be the location for the bridge. Officers therefore considered the sequential test had been met.
- Paragraph 170 of the NPPF set out that “To pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Both elements of the exception test should be satisfied for development to be allocated or permitted.”

The application set out that the application would bring with it wider sustainability benefits by providing a route which improved cycle and pedestrian connectivity to the city centre as well as surrounding allocated sites. In addition, the application was supported with an FRA that demonstrated that the development would not increase flood risk. Officers therefore considered that the exception test had been met.

- Site notices had been put up surrounding the development site in November. An advert also had also been placed in a newspaper in November advertising the development.
- Officers had been aware of recent tree removal works; however, these did not require consent from the Council as the trees were not located in a Conservation Area nor were they subject to a Tree Preservation Order.
- Two further SUDs conditions as suggested by the County Council would be added to the list of conditions listed in the report. These would require details to be submitted relating to surface water drainage.
- The application sought permission for a new cycle and pedestrian bridge over the Thames from Grandpont to Oxpens Meadow. The bridge would have a steel structure and a span of 98.90m with a river span of 23.39m. The bridge would have a deck width of 3.5m.

- In addition, the proposal sought to improve the adjoining footpath. On the north side the bridge would link to the existing footpath leading up to Oxpens Road. On the south side the pathworks would seek to improve the gradient of the path inside of the application boundary. The footpaths would also be widened.
- The bridge had been designed to respond to its setting. It would feature a slender deck and curved soffits to maximise the transparency of the bridge on the site. Asymmetrical structural waves in the design had been designed to direct and guide views. The bridge would be constructed of steel, with concrete piers. Officers considered that the bridge responded positively to the character and topography of the site and context.
- With regard to impact on neighbouring amenity, the development was not considered to have an unacceptable impact due to the separation distance between the site and neighbouring properties.
- The bridge has been designed to comply with the National Guidance on design infrastructure CD 353 Design Criteria for Bridges.
- No technical objections have been received to the application.
- Officers considered the application to be acceptable in terms of principle, design, impact on neighbouring amenity, highways, trees, biodiversity and the other issues set out in the report and recommended approval subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement to secure Biodiversity Net Gain offsetting.

Dan Glazebrook, Deborah Glass Woodin, Jo Newson and Councillor Lois Muddiman spoke against the application.

Paul Comerford (agent) and Councillor Anna Railton spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers. The Committee's discussions and comments included, but were not limited to:

- The need for the bridge was not evident. Another bridge existed in close proximity to the development site which could be improved, albeit with associated financial cost.
- The availability of funding from the Oxfordshire Growth Deal did not justify the impact which the proposal would have on the natural environment and views in the area.
- Trees had been removed at the site before planning permission had been received. Officers clarified that consent from the Council had not been required for the tree removal and this was not a planning matter. The Forestry Commission would be responsible for taking enforcement action for any work which had been carried out without an appropriate licence.
- The principle of a bridge crossing at the site in order to provide a crossing which improved pedestrian and cycle links to support active and sustainable travel was an aspiration which had been included in the Local Plan for some time and was

underpinned by Local Plan policies. The Local Plan was a document which had been approved by Full Council and had undergone an examination in public.

- Funding considerations were not material to the application, as the principle of development was set out in the Local Plan.

A proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application on the grounds that it did not comply with Policy RE2 as it was not an efficient use of resources to deliver sustainable growth because a nearby bridge already existed which could be used to fulfil the same function. On being put to the vote the proposal fell.

A proposal to approve the application was moved and seconded. On being put to the vote the Committee agreed with the officers' recommendation to approve the application subject to the required planning conditions set out in the report and a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of the report and the two additional SUDs conditions suggested by the County Council and grant planning permission subject to:
  - the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended heads of terms which were set out in the report; and
2. **delegate authority** to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to:
  - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report and the two additional SUDs conditions including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary; and
  - finalise the recommended legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers as set out in the report, including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary; and
  - complete the section 106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.

## **71. 23/01198/FUL: Unit 1, Ozone Leisure Park, Grenoble Road, Oxford**

Councillors Douglas and Corais left the room for this item and did not participate in determining the application.

The Committee considered an application (23/01198/FUL) for the demolition of existing Bingo Unit (Sui Generis, Classes E (b), (d), (e), (f), and (g) (i, ii or iii)); development of a new part-four/part-five storey (plus roof plant) building comprising laboratory and office space (Use Class E(g)) and a ground floor level commercial unit (Use Class E(a) or



E(b)) with associated access road, public realm, hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking, EV charging, service yard, site infrastructure and associated works at Unit 1, Ozone Leisure Park, Grenoble Road, Oxford.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation and highlighted the following:

- Since publication of the report the Environment Agency had formally lifted their objection to the development, subject to three recommended conditions. These were (i) that the development was carried out in accordance with the revised Flood Risk Assessment; (ii) there was no raising of the ground levels within the 1% annual exceedance probability flood extent and (iii) a requirement that no development took place within a 10m buffer zone of the Littlemore Brook. Officers had agreed these and advised that these conditions should be attached to any permission in the event that Members were minded to approve the application.
- A correction was required to the CIL payment figure in the report, to reflect that the building had not been in continuous occupation for at least 6 of the last 36 months. The revised CIL liability would be £345,247.11.
- The proposal involved the demolition of a unit previously occupied by a bingo hall attached to the Ozone leisure complex located at the Kassam Stadium site, and construction of a new five storey building housing 10,929 sqm of lab and office space. The new building would be detached from the adjacent buildings in the Ozone leisure complex: the service road to the north would be removed and replaced by a new pedestrian and cycle access route between Minchery Lane and the Kassam Stadium, opening up a new route through the site and improving connectivity and permeability of movement. Service access would be provided to the eastern side of the building where it adjoined the retained Ozone buildings.
- Significant weight had been given to the fact that the existing building could be re-used for the proposed use under previously granted planning permission. Therefore, the community use of the site as a bingo hall could not be afforded significant protection. Officers considered that this was a significant fallback position which represented a material justification to depart from Policy V7 of the Local Plan.
- The site was not currently allocated for employment use in the Local Plan; however, it did adjoin the Oxford Science Park which was allocated, and the site lay within the Cowley Branch Line area of change. Policy AOC7 promoted the development of high density employment uses within the Cowley Branch Line area of change.
- The Ozone leisure complex had been allocated in the emerging Local Plan and the site policy allowed for commercial uses, albeit that that policy was afforded limited weight at the current time.
- There was significant demand for additional life sciences use in the city, and the proposal would assist in meeting this demand by providing an expected 438 jobs as well as significant economic benefits. The applicant had agreed to produce a community employment and procurement plan which would secure local employment and local services and supplies during the operational and construction phases of the development. This would be secured via a S106 agreement.

- The landscaping plan included new permeable paving to replace the service road; new areas of public realm; new planting; and biodiversity net gain which significantly exceeded the Council's 5% policy (15.72% in terms of habitat units, 9.6% in terms of river units).
- No increase in parking was proposed: a car park management would be needed in order to ensure that staff did not park within the existing wider parking associated with the Kassam Stadium. A financial contribution was sought towards the Eastern Arc bus service and the Cowley Branch Line in order to promote sustainable travel to the site.
- The proposed materials for the building were a mix of limestone with bronze-coloured aluminium cladding which were considered to be appropriate and of a high standard. The building would exceed the 40% carbon reduction requirements outlined in the Local Plan.
- It was considered that the proposals would involve a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* listed Priory by virtue of the introduction of a building of a substantial scale which would further detract, alongside the existing buildings, from the setting of the Priory. It had also been identified that there would be a low level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the Central Conservation Area by reason of the slight encroachment of the building and visual impact on views from St Mary's Tower across the city. However, in both instances whilst great weight had been given to the conservation of these designated heritage assets it was considered that the levels of harm caused would be outweighed by the very significant public benefits of the development as outlined in the report.
- Officers recommended approval of the application for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the relevant conditions and the matters to be secured by legal agreement.

Raoul Veevers (agent) spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers. The Committee's discussions included, but were not limited to:

- A Committee Member highlighted concern about the loss of the leisure facility, the potential effect on the leisure complex of the incremental loss of Class E facilities, and noted that the Kassam Stadium site was likely to involve re-development for housing in the future. Whilst there was currently a shortage of lab and research space, other developments were coming forward to meet this need.
- Another Committee Member commented that Oxford was one of few cities making a net positive contribution to the life sciences economy. The location of the building near to the Science Park was appropriate.
- The building was well-designed in terms of appearance, construction and efficiency.

On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote the Committee agreed with the officers' recommendation to approve the planning application for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the conditions set out in the report and the three conditions

required by the Environment Agency and a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of the report and the three conditions required by the Environment Agency and grant planning permission subject to:
  - the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended heads of terms which were set out in the report; and
2. **delegate authority** to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to:
  - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary; and
  - finalise the recommended legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers as set out in the report, including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms set out in the report (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary; and
  - complete the section 106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.

## **72. 23/00516/FUL: The Annexe, Madina Mosque, 2 Stanley Road, Oxford OX4 1QZ**

The Committee considered an application (23/00516/FUL) for demolition of existing building; erection of a three storey building to create a community hall (Use Class F2(b)) and 2 x 2 bed flats (Use Class C3); and provision of bin and bike store at The Annexe, Madina Mosque, 2 Stanley Road, Oxford.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation and highlighted the following:

- The proposal sought the demolition of the existing annexe and replacement with a three storey building adjoining the rear of the mosque. It would be constructed from red brick to match the existing and would incorporate an asymmetrical pitched roof with rooflights so that the upper floor was partially set within the roof space.
- The proposed replacement annexe would provide a new community hall at ground floor level and 2 x two-bedroomed flats at the first and second floor levels, accessed externally from a replacement metal staircase which would also continue to provide a fire escape from the main mosque building at the rear.
- A number of late objections to the proposal had been received. These had mainly related to amenity, parking and highway safety considerations which were covered in the officer report.

- The officer recommendation was to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Michael Scholar of the Iffley Road Residents' Association spoke against the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers and the applicant. The Committee's discussions included, but were not limited to:

- The first floor and second floor windows would be a distance of approximately 12m from the boundary with no. 4 Stanley Road which is considered acceptable in planning terms, compared with a current distance of approximately 14m. The ground floor would have a shorter distance to the boundary (approximately 10m) as the building was larger at the ground floor than at the first and second floors. However, as the ground floor looked towards the existing boundary treatments there was not considered to be any issue with overlooking.
- The main mosque building contained existing flats at the upper floors which were used as houses in multiple occupancy (HMOs). The proposal for the additional two flats which formed part of this application were not considered to comprise over-occupation of the premises, as they related to two different parts of the application site.
- In terms of cycle storage, the application would include six Sheffield stands for the dwellings, and a further six for the community hall; this would require clarification within conditions 8 and 9.
- A Committee Member commented that the existing situation appeared to be having a serious impact on neighbours arising from parking issues and questioned whether the new community hall would result in an increase in parking on the surrounding roads. The applicant responded that it was not expected that this would be the case as the majority of users would be from the immediate community who lived within a walking distance of 20 minutes from the mosque. Officers clarified that the Highway Authority had raised no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions.
- Whilst the application was considered to be acceptable on planning grounds, a Committee Member commented that the applicant had a social responsibility to ensure that expansion of the facilities at the mosque did not give rise to a deterioration in community relationships arising from issues relating to road use in the surrounding narrow streets.

On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote the Committee agreed with the officers' recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of the report and grant planning permission; and
2. **delegate authority** to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such

refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary.

### **73. Minutes**

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2024 as a true and accurate record.

### **74. Forthcoming applications**

The Committee noted the list of forthcoming applications.

### **75. Dates of future meetings**

The Committee noted the dates of future meetings.

**The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 9.48 pm**

**Chair .....**

**Date: Tuesday 23 April 2024**

*When decisions take effect:*

*Cabinet: after the call-in and review period has expired*

*Planning Committees: after the call-in and review period has expired and the formal decision notice is issued*

*All other committees: immediately.*

*Details are in the Council's Constitution.*