

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL
AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL AND EAST)

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East)** held in **Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham** on **Tuesday 8 May 2018** at **1.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor P Taylor (Chairman)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors J Blakey (substitute for I Cochrane), G Bleasdale, D Brown, J Clark, K Corrigan, D Freeman, S Iveson, P Jopling, J Maitland (substitute for A Laing) and O Temple

Also Present:

Councillor F Tinsley

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors I Cochrane, M Davinson, A Laing, R Manchester and J Robinson.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor J Blakey substituted for Councillor I Cochrane and Councillor J Maitland substituted for Councillor A Laing.

3 Minutes

The Committee Services Officer noted a typographical error, the agenda referring to minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2018 which should have read 10 April 2018. The Chairman noted the minutes were from the last meeting of the Committee held on 10 April 2018 and they were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of Interest submitted.

5 Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central & East Durham)

a DM/18/00298/FPA - Damson House, Dragon Lane, Gilesgate, Durham

The Senior Planning Officer, Graham Blakey gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The Senior Planning Officer advised that Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting. The application was for demolition of existing buildings and construction of discount foodstore (Class A1), non food retail unit (Class A1) with external garden centre, provision of associated access, customer car parking, landscaping and associated works, subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

The Senior Planning Officer noted the position of the proposed Lidl and The Range stores on site plans, highlighting pedestrian links to the nearby bus stops. Members noted a number of photographs showing the site from various approaches.

The Committee learned there had been late representation in terms of the link road from Sherburn Road north to the site, with residents being concerned as regards the level of traffic.

The Senior Planning Officer noted in terms of representations, limited objections had been received from internal and statutory consultees and they had been satisfied, subject to conditions. He added that the Highways Section had noted that the routes in the area were saturated and they had suggested a relief road and access to the site from Damson Way, a single access. In relation to drainage, the Drainage Officer had noted a required run off rate of 9 litres per second, with the proposed development only achieving a rate of 51.9 litres per second. It was added that accordingly there would be opportunity to incorporate prevention, source control and site control measures in accordance with the Council's SuDs Adoption Guide 2016.

Members were informed of late representations from Indigo Planning on behalf of the owners of the Mono Containers site, objections in respect of highway safety and access proposals. It was added that there had been 2 letters of support from residents; however, they had highlighted the potential impact of traffic and as regards future plans. The Senior Planning Officer noted that the Applicant had made modifications to the application following comments received, in an attempt to address some of the issues raised, including those from Indigo Planning with a single point of access from Damson Way.

The Senior Planning Officer noted that City of Durham Local Plan Policy S8, relating to retail warehousing outlets, was judged to be out-of-date due to the evidence base and accordingly NPPF Paragraph 14 would be used in terms of a balance test looking at the impact of the development against the benefits of delivering the development.

It was noted that in considering all the objections and issues raised, the Officer recommendation was for approval subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and asked Mr S Neale, from Indigo Planning to speak in objection to the application.

Mr S Neale explained he was a Director at Indigo Planning and represented Standard Life, owners of the former Mono Containers site. He added he was accompanied by Mr David Hunter-Yeats, from WSP Highways Consultants. He noted that in relation to the permission at the Mono site, £1.3million of highways works had been secured by a Section 278 Agreement. He added that his client did not object to the development as such, rather the proposed access arrangement. Members were asked to recall the proposal from a Public Inquiry in 2003 in terms of a filter lane for traffic turning left in to Damson Way from the north and Mr S Neale added that the development could generate 70% more trips and lead to 57 vehicle queues along Dragon Lane. He noted the recommendation for a financial contribution in terms of highways, a relief road; however, Mr S Neale noted the potential of vehicles using the car parks as a "rat run" at busy times. He added that it was felt the financial contribution was not suitable in this case and asked that conditions were added in terms of the highways elements as proposed by Indigo Planning.

The Chairman thanked Mr S Neale and asked Mr D Harris, a local resident, to speak in objection to the application.

Mr D Harris thanked the Chairman and Committee for the opportunity to speak and explained he lived in West Sherburn. Mr D Harris noted he supported the development at the site, however, he could not accept the impact that would come from traffic associated with the development as it would affect his daily life. He explained that he felt he had not received correct information from Planning in terms of the proposed relief road and asked that this be removed from the agenda. Mr D Harris added that the Highways Development Manager, Mr J McGargill had noted he would be willing to speak to him as regards highways issues after the Committee meeting, and accordingly he asked that the application be rejected, or conditionally approved until discussions as regards highways issues and his concerns had been understood.

The Chairman thanked Mr D Harris and asked Mr G Elliott, local resident to speak in objection to the application.

Mr G Elliott noted he was a resident of nearby bungalows at Damson Way and he had looked at the information as given by the Planning Department and while Planners had noted the application adhered to the NPPF he felt there was negative impact in terms of environment, social and the economy. He added that a calculation as regards the number of vehicles showed 4,200 vehicles and asked had a survey been carried out looking at the impact of pollution from vehicles. Mr G Elliott noted that this did not appear to take into account delivery vehicles and asked if it did include such could he receive a copy. In respect of the social aspect, he noted the loss of manufacturing jobs and the increase in retail at Dragonville.

In terms of Economy, Mr G Elliott noted that the impact of retail would be felt by Durham City, adding there already were a number of vacant shops in the City. He concluded by making a reference to how similar out-of-town developments at Bishop Auckland had led to Bondgate being effectively defunct.

The Chairman thanked the speakers for their comments and asked the Highways Development Manager to respond to the issues raised.

The Highways Development Manager explained that in considering the application, it had been noted that the network in the area suffered queues and delays at peak times. He noted the modelling carried out in relation to both the Mono and Kier sites and the decision of the Public Inquiry in 2003. The Highways Development Manager added that a parallel road to Dragon Lane, from the Durham City Retail park to the A181 would be suitable mitigation to address traffic impacts from this development.. Members noted that funding had been secured via the Council's Capital Programme to deliver the relief road, however, the scheme had not been fully costed and there is an estimated shortfall of £500,000. There would be a need for a reasonable contribution from the developer to contribute to this shortfall. The Highways Development Manager noted that in terms of the Kier and Alexage sites there was not a left turn filter at the dragon Lane signals as it was felt that the redistribution of traffic via a relief road would mean the omission would be acceptable. He added that the transport consultant for Standard Life had noted a left turn entrance from Dragon Lane to the site would be of benefit; however the concern was that this option would be to create a "rat run" via the Alexage development car park for vehicles wishing to avoid queuing at the traffic signals. Accordingly, the Highways Development felt that a relief road was the best option to deal with the issues at this area.

The Chairman asked Mr J Williams, from ID Planning to speak in support of the application.

Mr J Williams noted he was Director with ID Planning, representing the applicant in respect of this planning application. He noted he was accompanied by Mr P Owen from Optima, Highways Consultants for the applicant.

Mr J Williams explained that the site was a brownfield site, with good public transport links. He noted that regeneration of the site would have both social and economic benefits in terms of physical development of a derelict site, around 110 new employment opportunities and the applicant agreeing to maximise the take up of these opportunities locally and has done similarly with other Local Authorities previously.

Mr J Williams noted that the Council's Planning Department had confirmed that there had been no suitable sequentially preference sites and therefore the development would not negatively impact on the city centre and local area. He noted an extant permission in place, albeit without food use. Members were informed that both companies that wish to occupy the site, Lidl and The Range, were both committed to the site and to be open by Summer 2019. Mr J Williams noted that the design for both stores was modern, in keeping with other development in the area and would feature landscaping to improve the frontage.

Mr J Williams noted positive discussions with the Council's Highways Department, with the recommendation for approval out in the report, subject to conditions and the financial contribution in terms of a relief road, a road which would have benefits for the wider area. He noted that the owner of the former Mono Containers site had suggested some access amendments and that work had been ongoing in terms of these and the applicant agreed to the realignment and agreed that a second access was not necessarily of benefit as it may lead to a "rat run" being created. He also noted signage as regards no right-hand turn.

Mr J Williams noted the proposal would have economic benefits in terms of the 110 jobs created, adding the NPPF gave significant weight to the economic benefits of schemes. He concluded by respectfully asking that the Committee support the Officer's recommendation and approves the application.

The Chairman thanked Mr J Williams and asked the Senior Planning Officer if there were any issues he wish to clarify.

The Senior Planning Officer noted that in terms of the economic impact of the development on the city, colleagues from the Spatial Policy Team had looked thoroughly at the application and had been satisfied that the food aspect in addition to the extant permission were acceptable and therefore the application was recommended for approval. He added that in relation to the junction at Sunderland Road was an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and that a relief road would redistribute vehicles and therefore there would be wider benefits in relation to environmental health.

The Chairman thanked the Officer and asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor K Corrigan referred to the points raised by Belmont Parish Council, as set out starting at page 22 of the report, and asked for a response to those issues. It was noted that Officers would come back, after referring to the agenda pack.

Councillor D Freeman noted that the application seemed to be an improvement of a brownfield site, although he acknowledged that there were issues in terms of the existing traffic problems. He asked if a relief road was to be build, when would it be completed, as he felt that if more development was in place before the relief road then there could be gridlock before the needed road was completed.

The Highways Development Manager noted an application for the road would be made in September 2018, with funding secured and it being not unrealistic that the road could be in place by 2020. He added in terms of the comments from Belmont Parish Council, he noted the area was very busy, though in general vehicles would remain on main roads, not residential areas. He added in terms of parking concerns, residents parking would be provided and there would be plenty of parking provided for customers within the development site, and cycle parking was dealt with by condition.

The Senior Planning Officer noted that in relation to the concerns raised by Belmont Parish Council, there would be a Construction Management Plan, with Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) being directed via this, there were conditions relating to noise levels, and also there was a dust management plan.

Councillor J Blakey asked if the aerial plan indicating the new relief road could be shown on the projector screens, the Senior Planning Officer brought the plan up on the screen. The Highways Development Manager explained the proposed link road would go from Renny's Lane down to Damson Way, and also there would be a triangular arrangement at the junction with the A181, south of Damson Way. Councillor J Blakey noted she was familiar with the area and noted a lot of speeding traffic and asked if there would be new limits to address this. The Highways Development Manager noted there was a 30mph limit in place currently and therefore there was no further issue in this regard.

The Chairman noted that speakers and members of the public may not debate across the floor of the Council Chamber and that they should place their trust in the elected Members of the Committee to determine the application.

Councillor P Jopling noted that traffic was extremely bad in the area and her worry was the time-lag in delivery of a relief road in comparison to the development and asked if there was any way to condition that the road was in place first. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the recommendation as set out in the report was for a financial contribution towards a relief road, with the previous comments from the Highways Development Manager describing how this would be delivered. He added the condition was as regards securing a financial contribution, not in proposing timescales. Councillor P Jopling noted a desire for the businesses to be in place Summer 2019; however the road may not be for a year after that. The Highways Development Manager noted there was not a programme of works at this point, with funding being drawn together, reiterating that approval would be sought in September 2018.

The Chairman understood the disappointment of Members in terms of the funding and the programme relating to the relief road, however, he noted that was not what was before Members for determination, rather the application as set out within the agenda papers.

The Solicitor - Planning And Development, Clare Cuskin noted that the details of the relief road were separate from the application, with the Highways Section having acknowledged the need for a relief road. She noted that while it may be possible to condition as regards the road, she did not recommend this as she felt that an appeal as regards removal of such a condition would be likely to be successful.

Councillor D Brown noted he had attended the site visit and felt that the sooner the site was tidied up and brought back into use the better, providing benefits for the immediate area and the wider Durham City area. He understood the issues in relation to traffic, however, he felt that the application should be approved and moved the Officer's recommendations as set out in the report.

Councillor D Freeman seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions detailed in the Officer's report to the Committee.

b DM/18/00608/FPA - Former Phillips Components Ltd, Belmont Industrial Estate, Durham, DH1 1TH

The Senior Planning Officer, Graham Blakey gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for the erection of a three-storey office and training centre (Use Class B1 / D1) with access, car parking, delivery / service bay and was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted on photographs and elevation drawings how the proposed development mirrored the nearby Wear House and Severn House in terms of design and noted there was an extant permission for a two-storey building, with this application looking to increase this to three-storeys and to include the associated additional car parking required. He added that access and all other arrangements were as per the previous permission.

The Committee noted no objections from the statutory and internal consultees, other than the Coal Authority noting concern as regards a mineshaft on site, and while it was felt this was not under the site of the building and had previously been remediated, they suggested a condition be required in terms of a risk assessment to be carried out.

The Senior Planning Officer noted that the use classes of B1 and B8 were established and the Training Centre as Class D1 was felt to also be an acceptable use. It was noted that the City of Durham Local Plan Policy did not generally permit the latter use class, however it was considered to represent a similar planning use and therefore the application was proposed for approval, subject to conditions.

Councillor K Corrigan moved that the application be approved; she was seconded by Councillor J Blakey.

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions detailed in the Officer's report to the Committee.

c DM/18/00225/FPA - Land to the north of Hackworth Road, North West Industrial Estate, Peterlee, SR8 2JQ

The Principal Planning Officer, Claire Teasdale gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for a gas fuelled capacity mechanism embedded generation plant to support the National Grid and was recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to a site plan on the projector screen, highlighting a nearby solar farm, the B1283, the A19 and the North West Industrial Estate. She also noted the nearby residential properties included: Moor House Farm, Calf Close Farm and Calf Close Farm, Cow Close Farm and Home Lea.

Members were referred to a new access running north to south, and connections to the gas pipeline and the electricity grid. Photographs were displayed showing the existing access, and views of the site. The Principal Planning Officer explained the site layout, consisting of 40 gas generator sets and transformer equipment, sub-station, switch gear and welfare area. It was explained that the proposed CCTV poles would be 6 metres high, as set out in the application. It was explained that it was envisaged that the development would take 8-10 months to complete and that an engineer would attend the site daily once in operation.

The Principal Planning Officer noted a change in the conditions, with trees as set in the report being replaced with hedgerows. Members noted a 4 metre high acoustic fence in addition to a 2.4 metre high security fence, and were referred to elevations showing the maximum height of flues at approximately 7 metres.

The Committee were informed that there had been no objections from statutory or internal consultees, subject to the conditions as set out within the report. The Principal Planning Officer explained that there had been 4 letters of objection, 2 received since the report had been produced, with 2 speakers in attendance at Committee. It was noted the objections had been summarised within the report, and an issue had also been raised in relation to notification.

The Principal Planning Officer noted the report set out the relevant policies from paragraph 49 onwards, with Easington District Local Plan (EDLP) Policies being 1, General Principles and Development, and 3, Protection of the Countryside being felt to be out-of-date and therefore NPPF Paragraph 14 would apply. It was added that Officers felt that the landscape harm and small loss of agricultural land did not outweigh the benefits of the development. The Principal Planning Officer noted the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions, reiterating that Conditions should now refer to hedgerows rather than tree belts as previously mentioned.

The Chairman thanked the Principal Planning Officer and asked Mrs N Wilson to speak in objection to the application.

Mrs N Wilson noted she appealed to the Committee to have careful consideration of the impact of the application on the agricultural businesses and reported that residents had many concerns. She added that issues as regards a new access route had been raised with the Case Officer and noted no consultation as regards this. Mrs N Wilson noted the proposed access was on a blind bend and would contribute to congestion. She added that there would be negative impact in terms of noise, exhaust pollution, visual impact and impact upon livestock.

Mrs N Wilson referred to Paragraph 64 of the Committee Report, which stated that EDLP Policies 1 and 35 required that an application safeguard visual amenity and have no serious adverse impact on the amenity of people and existing adjacent land in terms of privacy, intrusion, noise and other pollutants and traffic generation. She added that the NPPF and EDLP protected agricultural land, with the application site having been classified as Grade 3a. Mrs N Wilson noted the report at Paragraph 54 was incorrect, the land having always been used as arable land, not for use by horses. She added that the application was not comparable to the nearby solar farm, that development not creating noise. Mrs N Wilson noted to stick to conservation at the site, grazing of sheep nearby and to secure wildlife for future generations.

The Chairman thanked Mrs N Wilson and asked Ms J Wood to speak in objection to the application.

Ms J Wood noted she lived at Holme Lea, off Durham Lane and that her main concern was the proposed access arrangements. She noted the point of access that was adopted adding it was not very well maintained. She added that there had been a number of assumptions as regards potential noise levels and asked if there was noise at night and it was at an unacceptable level what recourse did residents have? She concluded by seconding the comments from Mrs N Wilson in relation to refusal of the application.

The Chairman thanked Ms J Wood and asked Mr B Atkinson, the Applicant to speak in support of the application.

Mr B Atkinson thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak on behalf of Enso Energy Limited, a highly experienced developer providing energy using a range of techniques to supply to the grid and businesses. He added the business was an advocate of sustainable energy and also supported Government policies with the application being, whilst relatively small, a way to help balance demand at peak times.

Mr B Atkinson noted that the site was chosen as it met all the critical parameters, with good access to the electricity grid and gas pipeline and provided minimum environmental impact and was sufficiently removed from residential receptors. He added that the application had been assessed and Officers had deemed it acceptable against local and national policies. Mr B Atkinson noted the construction and operational phases offered economic benefit locally and that the location meant that power from the facility would be used locally first in periods of peak demand. Accordingly, Mr B Atkinson asked that the Committee agree with the Officer's recommendation and approve the application.

The Chairman thanked Mr B Atkinson for his comments and asked if the Principal Planning Officer could speak in relation to the points raised.

The Principal Planning Officer noted that in relation to highways issues raised by the objectors, those had been considered by the Highways Section and the proposed access had been deemed suitable with details of access arrangements to be provided for through condition. In relation to the period of construction, a construction management plan would set out further details of how this process would be managed. It was stated that once operational there would be an engineer visiting the site daily. It was reiterated that the impact on the environment and visual impact had been considered. The Principal Planning Officer noted that there was a small loss of Grade 3a agricultural land and this had been considered within the planning balance. It was noted that in terms of sound levels, Condition 5 of the report would be required to be adhered to which would limit noise levels during 23.00 – 07.00 hours; else it would be an issue for Planning to take action on.

The Chairman thanked the Principal Planning Officer and asked Members for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Maitland asked if the proposed site layout could be shown on the projector screen, and then asked as regards the gas containers, their locations and sizes. The Principal Planning Officer noted their proposed locations on the site plan and explained they would be 3 metres wide, 12 metres in length and 4 metres high.

Councillor J Clark noted the application was along a route she often used in travelling back from Durham City to the coast. She added the development would be an eyesore on the field, and that you would not wish to see this while travelling to the Durham Heritage Coast. Councillor J Clark noted that if it was located on the nearby industrial estate would be more suitable and suggested this option be explored. She added that the loss of Grade 3a agricultural land was not appropriate.

Councillor J Blakey noted she appreciated the comments of Councillor J Clark and noted the report mentioned employment adding there were a number of industrial sites within the Peterlee area. She noted she agreed with Councillor J Clark in that the proposed site was not the right site for this application.

Councillor O Temple noted reference to the application supporting renewable energy and asked for further explanation of this and also asked as regards how biodiversity would be enhanced by the application as he could not see how this would be the case unless very obliquely. The Principal Planning Officer noted that the proposal would support the national grid at times of peak demand and represented support to solar and wind turbines when they could not cope with demand. In reference to the site selection, the Principal Planning Officer noted the applicant chose the site due to the relatively short distances to existing gas and electricity connections. It was reiterated that the loss of Grade 3a agricultural land had been considered, however, it was noted it was a small area of land. In terms of the increase to biodiversity, this included the planting of new native hedgerows and bat and bird boxes along the fencing at the site.

Councillor O Temple noted he had experienced problems in his area as regards noise issues and understood local objections that had been raised.

He added that if the equipment was not run at night how could it be said it was supporting solar power. Councillor O Temple noted that application fell outside of EDLP Policies 1 and 3, which Officers had noted were out-of-date. He noted that in other cases, Local Plan policies were referred to be Officers as relevant. Councillor O Temple noted he was minded not to support the application.

Councillor P Jopling noted that she felt the same as other those Members that had spoken, in that the site may offer convenience for the applicant, however, she felt it may set a precedent in terms of such development on arable land and that brownfield sites should be looked at first.

Councillor S Iveson asked as regards ownership of the land. The Principal Planning Officer noted there was agreement from the landowner for the applicant to use the land. The Chairman noted the Applicant wished to clarify and allowed him to speak. Mr B Atkinson noted issues of commercial sensitivity, however, explained the land was owned by a local farmer and the land would be occupied under leasehold.

Councillor J Clark asked for clarification in terms of the removal of a condition as mentioned by the Officer. The Principal Planning Officer noted reference to Conditions 11 and 12, with the replacement of "tree belt" with "hedgerow", and the removal of the compound and restoration of the site was still set out at Condition 12. Councillor J Clark reiterated she felt the nearby industrial estate would be more suitable and felt this area must also have access to the gas and electricity supplies.

Councillor O Temple moved that the application be refused as it was contrary to EDLP Policy 1 in that agricultural land was not protected. Councillor D Freeman seconded Councillor O Temple and added he agreed with Councillor J Clark in that the nearby industrial estate would be more suitable, with the report at Paragraph 79 stating that the applicant had not demonstrated the need to locate at this site.

The Solicitor - Planning And Development noted that her advice to Committee was that she would be nervous as regards a refusal solely based upon the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. She noted Members had mentioned issues in terms of landscape character. The Solicitor - Planning And Development added that the need and ability to locate elsewhere was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor O Temple added that further to the application being contrary to EDLP Policy 1, that it was also contrary to EDLP Policy 3 in relation to protection of the countryside.

RESOLVED

That the application be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the countryside location of the development would create adverse impacts in terms of unacceptable visual amenity and loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, and these are such that they would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in the context of Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and accordingly, the proposals are considered contrary to Policies 1 and 3 of the Easington District Local Plan and Part 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 Planning Development Management Performance Summary 2017/18

The Chairman asked the Team Leader - Central and East, Alan Dobie to give an update on Planning Development Management Performance 2017/18 (for copy see file of minutes).

The Team Leader - Central and East noted that the report was presented to Committee for information, and asked Members to note the headline figures relating to performance. He explained that performance figures were all above Government targets. Members noted the number of planning appeals that were successful for each Committee and it was added that if Government thought too often decisions of a Committee were being overturned at the Planning Inspectorate, then Government could ask developers to apply directly to the Planning Inspectorate. The Team Leader - Central and East noted that it was important for the Committee to ensure that any decision for refusal of an application was grounded, with solid reasons for refusal.

The Committee noted performance of Durham County Council against other comparable Local Authorities and the national average and the Council was noted as performing well. In reference to enforcement, Members noted responses in time to the three priority levels, and were informed of the impact of management changes in terms of the Central and East Team, as regards some not being signed off in time.

The Chairman thanked the Team Leader - Central and East and asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor O Temple asked as regards the report noting "appeals allowed", did this mean appeals that were successful against decisions made by Committee, or did it include those determined under delegated powers in addition. The Team Leader - Central and East noted that the numbers did include both Committee and Delegated Decisions. Councillor J Maitland agreed that it would be useful to have the numbers in terms of Delegated and Committee decisions. The Team Leader agreed to report back to the Committee on this.

RESOLVED

That the report and presentation be noted.