

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD AT 8.00PM ON MONDAY 26<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2018 AT THE CIVIC HALL, POYNTON.

PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr L A Clarke

Cllrs: M Beanland, C Gorst, Mrs S Horsman, L Podmore and Mrs J Saunders

Officers in attendance:- Haf Barlow

102. Recording of meeting

The Deputy Clerk confirmed that the meeting is recorded for the purposes of minute taking and the recording is deleted when draft minutes are produced.

There were no other declarations of a recording of the meeting.

103. Questions from members of the public

Mrs Chisholm, a resident asked the Committee why it had recommended no objection to application 18/5270M, Hill Green Farm, Woodford Road, Poynton. The Committee had reviewed the application on the 5<sup>th</sup> November 2018 but the last date for submitting comments to Cheshire East was not until the 27<sup>th</sup> November 2018. Mrs Chisholm wondered whether the Committee had been in possession of all the facts. For example did they know that the application was retrospective. The Chair explained that the Committee had to base its decision on the plans and information on the Cheshire East website and any information it received from other interested parties. Mrs Chisholm raised a concern that the Planning Authority may give greater weight to Poynton's no objection than to her own objection. The Chair explained that the Local Authority did not always follow the recommendation of the Town Council and that the Town Council and interested parties' opinions are given the same weight by the Planning Authority.

Due to the number of planning applications received by the Town Council and the meeting schedule, it could not wait until the end of the consultation process before considering the matter. Planning applications need to be dealt with as they arise.

The Chair suggested that a clarification email could be sent to Cheshire East Council stating that the Town Council now understands that this is a retrospective application and that there have been a number of objections by neighbours and that Cheshire East Council is requested to review all comments before making a decision. A Councillor noted that any email would need to be sent before the end of the consultation deadline on the 27<sup>th</sup> November 2018.

**RESOLVED: That a clarification email is sent to Cheshire East Council in the terms set out above by the end of the consultation deadline (NC)**

104. Apologies for absence

Cllrs T Holbrook and I Hollingworth.

105. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests

Cllr Clarke declared an interest in planning application 18/5390M and left the meeting for this item.

It was proposed that the order of the agenda is amended to take the following items of business first: Item 11 (Application 17/6471M) (106 below), item 7 (107 below) and item 6 (108 below).

**RESOLVED: That the order of the agenda is amended as stated (NC)**

106. Planning applications received to date

Application No: 17/6471M

Location: Land off Hazelbadge Road, Poynton

Applicants Name: Mr Sean McBride

Proposal: Full planning application for 146 dwellings on land off Hazelbadge Road with associated access improvements, landscaping and public open access

Mr Ikoku, a resident spoke against the application:

The new documents lodged have tried to address some of the previous concerns raised by residents and the Town Council. There have clearly been discussions between Cheshire East Council officers and Persimmon Homes and Cheshire East Council officers have been involved in site visits.

In the Environmental Assessment report the remedial action requires removal of the top soil to a depth of 300mm and replaced with other soil that could be taken from other parts of the site. Part of the soil that they are suggesting should be removed is in the area where allotments are suggested but the study identifies lead, arsenic, and cyanide in the soil samples.

The access to the site including the junction with Chester Road have not been addressed. Does this mean that Cheshire East Council accept that the access is sufficient?

Members of the public cannot comment on the application at present, the date for receiving responses is still February 2018 and it is not possible to submit comments online. The Chair informed Mr Ikoku that comments could still be sent to Cheshire East Council and these will be posted to the website.

Mr Ikoku said that the document requires a considerable amount of faith for example in relation to the trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO), how can we be sure that trees with TPO's will not be destroyed on site as there is no way to identify them.

The Design and Access Statement contradicts the planning proposal which is for 146 dwellings as the Statement refers to 132 new homes.

The Statement refers to 'high quality development that respects the existing residential character of Poynton' but it is unclear what this means.

The Design and Access Statement claims that the site will respect Public Rights of Way but this is in conflict with what the Cheshire East Public Rights of Way officer has previously stated, that is, that it is the law that footpaths cannot be incorporated into development roads. The plans clearly

show that the footpath will be incorporated onto the development roads rather than a separate footpath.

Reference is made in the Design and Access Statement to improvements made to Hazelbadge Road for access including improved visibility and capacity but this will not be possible as the road cannot be widened and there is no vegetation to be cut down. The Chair noted that at present no plans had been submitted for improvements to the Chester Road, Hazelbadge Road junction.

Whilst the scale of the plans show the width and depth, they do not show the height of the proposed buildings and a number of the buildings are three storey.

The Chair and Vice Chair expressed concern that the amended plans did not address any of the concerns already raised regarding the application.

Cllr Lee Podmore made the following observations:

The Local Plan Site Specific Principles of Development states that improvements must be made to the junction of Hazelbadge Road and Chester Road, improved turning, access and parking facilities linked to Lower Park School. The plans show 10 parking spaces and a mini roundabout to the estate. No details are provided in the Design and Access Statement on the improvements to the junction of Hazelbadge Road and Chester Road. The original consultation suggested that parking bays would be created in the playing fields but these are no longer included in the application.

In addition, item F of the Local Plan Site Specific Principles of Development said that there should be noise mitigation at the south west boundary of the site but no detail is given in the amended plans.

Priority woodlands and habitats for local wildlife should also be retained. Cheshire Wildlife carried out a report for the Neighbourhood Plan and identified that the site had medium and high value habitat distinctiveness as well as wildlife corridors. The documentation does not address these issues and protected species are present on the site.

The Local Plan Site Specific Principles of Development also states that a flood risk assessment should be carried out. Parcel 5 is in flood risk zone 2 and it has been allocated for development. Whereas Cheshire East have stated that the Armcon site cannot be developed because it is in flood risk zone 2.

It was also recommended that a desk based archaeological survey should be carried out and this does not appear in the documents.

Despite recommendations that a preliminary risk assessment for contaminated land should be carried out, only a partial assessment to a small area of woodland to the south west of the site has been carried out. No risk assessment has been carried out to the remainder of the site. The risk assessment has identified high levels of lead, PAH compounds and even traces of asbestos. The risk assessment advises that operatives should wear appropriate protection equipment but what about the risk posed to the school children at Lower Park School.

The apartment blocks are too high and not in keeping with the area. The nearest three storey flats are off Chester Road and they have been constructed in a hollow and the ridgeline is only slightly higher than the adjacent houses. No dimensions for height are shown in the plans but if the plans are drawn to scale the buildings would be 11.5m high. The design would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area in which it is located, contrary to the principles contained

within the design guide which seeks to protect and enhance the key characteristics in the area. As a result of the scale and massing at the north of the site there would be loss of views across the field and towards the Church. This was identified as a positive contribution to Poynton in the Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 6.8 of the Design and Access Statement states that the flats are specifically there to terminate views.

The flats account for 31% of the development which is considerably greater than the need for 12% identified during the Neighbourhood Plan process. It also identified that three bedroom or less houses were the most preferred house type with 46% of people preferring this house type. This development has only 28% of three bedroom or less houses. It has 12% of five bedroom houses but the Neighbourhood Plan found no discernible requirement for this type of house.

The site will be over developed. The plans contain an area which is not allocated for development in the Local Plan. Has this green space been included in the density calculations? There are 44.33 units per hectare which has increased from the 37.82 units in the original submission. This is in excess of the 30 units per hectare that is common in Poynton and proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan as the maximum density permitted.

The Design and Access Statement includes a number of inaccuracies and omissions including:  
The number of units (132 in the Design and Access Statement but 134 on the plans)  
The number of apartments (36 apartments in the Design and Access Statement but 42 in the plans)  
No ridge height is given for the apartment blocks  
59% of the site retained as open space but this includes land that wasn't allocated by the Local Plan.

Mr Knight, the Town Council's planning consultant had drafted a detailed response on behalf of the Town Council to the original plans and is willing to prepare a further response to the amended plans.

Cllr Beanland noted that the Council is somewhat restricted as the site forms part of the Cheshire East Local Plan. If less houses were required to be built on the site, would the shortfall need to be built elsewhere in Poynton?

The Chairman commented that just because a site had been allocated in the Local Plan this did not mean that the Town Council could not object to an application put before it.

The Chairman noted that according to the latest Cheshire East Council flood maps a significant portion of the eastern side of the development is within a high-risk flood area. Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), development should not take place on high risk sites. Despite this being pointed out to the Inspector of the Cheshire East Local Plan the development has been allowed to proceed.

**RESOLVED: The committee agrees in principal to recommend rejection of the revised plans on the basis of the previous submission to Cheshire East Council and the points raised at this meeting. It is noted with concern that the issues identified have not been addressed by the revised plans and that the revised plans include no illustration of any improvement works proposed with the junction of Chester Road and Hazelbadge Road and that the Committee gives the Chairman, Vice Chairman and one other Member delegated powers to approve a detailed submission to Cheshire East (NC)**

The Chair reminded all interested parties that they should submit any comments they have on the development to Cheshire East.

The Deputy Clerk confirmed that she had been told by Cheshire East that a re-consultation would take place shortly and that the application was likely to go before the Strategic Planning Board in January.

Mr Ikoku asked for clarification regarding the previous submissions made by interested parties which have now been removed from the website. It is the Town Council's understanding that this has been done in order to comply with the GDPR regulation but all comments relating to the site would still be considered.

#### 107. To receive and consider the Poynton with Worth Neighbourhood Plan for submission to the Town Council for approval

Cllr Lee Podmore gave details to the background to the Neighbourhood Plan:

Following the original regulation 14 submission at the end of 2016 the plan was amended to take into account feedback received. The plan also needed to be amended to take into account the Cheshire East Local Plan which was emerging at the time of the first consultation and which has subsequently been adopted.

The consultation process by the Town Council has now ended. The Plan has been submitted to the Town Council (Regulation 15) and if adopted by Poynton Town Council it will be submitted to Cheshire East Council. The submission to Cheshire East is known as Regulation 16. Cheshire East will carry out their review and consultation of the plan and their comments will go to examination. This could be in writing or by hearing.

A series of meetings were held between the Town Council and Cheshire East during the process to try to push for a brownfield first approach. For example, putting forward sites such as Armcon for development (although technically in Adlington).

The Town Council evidenced the number of units demolished and constructed during the plan period which indicated that given the current rate, Poynton did not need to put forward any other sites for development. Unfortunately, Cheshire East Council did not agree with the figures provided by Town Council and removed land from the Green Belt. In addition, Cheshire East Council has insisted that the Town Council must accept a minimum of 200 additional units, over and above the strategic sites for the plan period.

Following the regulation 14 submission and consultation in 2016, the Steering Group together with a number of resident volunteers amended the plan to take into account not only feedback from both statutory consultees and residents, but also the Local Plan. Whilst the changes were to some extent minor (for example none of the site proposals have altered) the plan had changed sufficiently to warrant a new Regulation 14 submission.

The regulation 14 consultation was carried out at the beginning of the year and a further review of the plan was undertaken making amendments to ensure it complied with the NPPF, European law, Statutory Guidance, Cheshire East's Local Plan and planning law.

Minor amendments have been made to the plan to comply with legislation including the referencing to existing policies in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan which are specific to

Poynton. The main changes made have been to the Green Belt and Environment and the Housing sections:

- The majority of the policies have not changed fundamentally from the 2018 consultation.
- One of the comments back from residents was about the protection of grass verges and small green spaces on existing estates. Policy EGB 7 has been updated to reflect this concern
- Another comment was with regards to open spaces and protection of key views both of St George's Church and of open countryside which are both key assets to Poynton. A map has been included in Policy EGB15 to illustrate this.
- Poynton has to accommodate a minimum of 200 units over the plan period. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group believe that this could be accommodated with the demolition and construction of buildings at the current rate, under the NPPF sites must be developable and deliverable. As we don't know which sites might be developed, we are unable to demonstrate this.
- The sites proposed have not altered from the original 2016 consultation, with the exception of the land on the corner of Glastonbury Drive known as the Glastonbury Triangle. This is Green Belt land and has been allocated (as is allowed under the NPPF) by the group as safeguarded land, with the intention that if Cheshire East Council call to sites cannot meet the required development figures, this area of land has the least impact on the Green Belt. This should prevent Cheshire East Council from removing any other land from the Green Belt.
- Following extensive consultation with both residents and local estate agents the Neighbourhood Plan has tried to incorporate a mix of unit types. For example, the greatest need /request for house types in Poynton was 46% of people wanting house sizes of 3 bedrooms or less (excluding apartments). The least popular type of development was at 8% for sheltered/elderly accommodation.
- An additional policy, HOU28, which allows for the existing policies relating to Housing in the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan to be incorporated, including the retention of low-density housing in the Poynton Park area.

Cllr Mrs Saunders asked for clarification regarding policy EGB4 which refers to sites in the Green Belt. Cllr Podmore confirmed that the policy relates to the Glastonbury Triangle only. It was suggested that the policy wording is amended to reflect that the policy is in relation to only the Glastonbury Triangle.

Cllr Mrs Saunders also sought clarification in relation to policy HOU5 the definition of the rural settlement of Higher Poynton for planning purposes, as infilling was a very contentious issue in Higher Poynton. Cllr Podmore confirmed that the boundary had been drawn very tightly. Infilling is defined as a small plot for 1-2 houses. Cllr Saunders was concerned that there was a conflict between 'infill' and preserving the openness of the Green Belt and which would take precedence. John Knight confirmed that the development plan would take precedence, the Neighbourhood Plan would become part of the development plan if it was accepted at referendum and would be the first point of reference for deciding planning applications.

To alleviate concerns, Mr John Knight would review policy HOU5 and the map to ensure that it did not require further amendment.

The Chairman sought reassurance that the Town Council would not be committing itself in principal to any particular point of view on planning applications submitted for the allocated sites. Mr Knight confirmed that the Town Council would remain able to make a decision on any planning application on its merits, as it does now.

Councillors extended their thanks to Councillor Podmore, Mr Knight and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for their extensive work on the Neighbourhood Plan.

Mr Jolley, a resident made the following comments:

- He has written to Mr David Rutley, MP about this matter and the letter has been passed to the Town Council but no comment has been received.
- The Town Council should not be complacent about the amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- In its original format in 2016 the Neighbourhood Plan confirmed that Poynton residents did not want any more than 200 new houses in Poynton. The new Neighbourhood Plan is not community driven because the community does not want more than the 200 houses initially proposed. Residents were clear that they did not want more than 200 houses because the infrastructure within Poynton was not capable of supporting any further houses.
- The new Neighbourhood Plan is not the one the community drafted, it has been redrafted and fundamentally altered by the Steering Group headed by Poynton Town Council and the Planning Advisor Mr Knight in order to enable the development of the sites put forward in the original Neighbourhood Plan for 200 houses.
- Some Members were present at the Local Plan Inspection enquiry and will remember that the first question the Planning Inspector asked was: "Why did the first version of the Local Plan, which was dismissed on appeal, recommended no further housing in Poynton and now you are submitting a requirement for 650 new homes. This is rather an alarming difference that you are seeking to justify". Clearly the Inspector did not agree that those numbers were correct. None of the sites suggested by the Cheshire East Local Plan were included in the original version of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Town Councillors did speak against the inclusion of the three strategic sites in the Cheshire East Local Plan. The Inspector was asked by a Town Councillor whether he would refer to the Neighbourhood Plan in his summation and in particular the policies relating to brownfield sites and the housing numbers of 200 as opposed to 650 being proposed by Cheshire East Council. The Inspector replied that as long as the Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted in the correct manner and in time he would give that assurance.
- Has the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan been withdrawn or is it still an official document that has been submitted, of if it has been withdrawn, why?
- The current Neighbourhood Plan has been adjusted and aligned with the Cheshire East Council Local Plan. This is a consultation between certain members of the Town Council and Cheshire East Council over how many houses the town should have.

The Chair informed Mr Jolley that he was mistaken in his comments. It was Mr Pratt, the Local Plan Inspector, who accepted Cheshire East's submitted plans to increase the housing targets to 650 houses. The Neighbourhood Plan was only an early draft in 2016 and unfortunately the early draft has had to be amended to include these extra 450 houses. The Steering Group's only option was either to amend the Neighbourhood Plan or to abandon it altogether. It was not correct that the Town Council has tried to force additional houses on to Poynton.

Cllr Mrs Saunders explained that the four Cheshire East councillors representing Poynton all voted against the Local Plan and objected to the 650 houses in Poynton. Unfortunately, there are 81 councillors in Cheshire East and they were out voted, and the Local Plan was adopted. The Town Council has attempted to manage things the best way it can in order to preserve the Green Belt. The Town Council is committed to preserving the Green Belt as much as possible. The Town Council was left in an invidious position whereby it had to cope with the additional houses and the Town Council are unable to prevent the allocation of 650 houses for Poynton. The Town Council is continuing with its brownfield first policy and are trying to limit infill as much as possible. The Town Council is trying to preserve Poynton, as it is now.

Mr Jolley commented that it had been stated previously in the meeting that the Neighbourhood Plan document once accepted would take precedence, so why was the Neighbourhood Plan being amended to take into account the Cheshire East Local Plan?

The Chair explained that Cheshire East would not approve the Neighbourhood Plan if it diverged materially from the Local Plan. As a result of Inspector Pratt accepting the modifications to the Local Plan, he accepted the 650 houses. The Plan was adopted by Cheshire East Council and the Neighbourhood Plan has to conform with it.

Mr Jolley asked whether the council was aware that there had been a revision in housing requirements. The Chair explained that although the government regularly changes the way it assesses housing requirements, Cheshire East has not amended their housing requirements. As a minimum Poynton must provide 650 homes.

The Chair reiterated that it is not true that either Poynton Town Council or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group are trying to foist additional homes on Poynton. The Neighbourhood Plan is an attempt to mitigate and reduce the impact that new houses will have on Poynton. It will also help to control development in the town.

Cllr Podmore also pointed out that if the town has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan it will be entitled to additional Community Infrastructure Levy funding.

The Town Council had also consulted a barrister to see whether there might be grounds for challenging the Local Plan and taking legal action against Cheshire East. It was the barrister's view that the Local Plan did not have any legal defects and that the Plan could not be challenged.

Mr Jolley asked how the development at the Sports Ground could be deliverable when there is a covenant on the land? Mr Knight explained that covenants were not planning considerations. This would be a private legal matter for the Trustees of the Sports Club. Mr Jolley stated that the Sports Club wanted to move on to Green Belt land by a wildlife corridor. The Chair explained that the Macclesfield Local Plan from 2004 allocated the land at Glastonbury for sports development. Mr Jolley said that the land has been categorised as grade A Green Belt land. The Chair explained that in certain circumstances sports use could comply with Green Belt. The site has been carried over from the Macclesfield Local Plan to the current Cheshire East Local Plan and it is therefore unlikely to be removed.

At present the Chairman wasn't aware of any detailed plan submitted for the site by the Sports Club on Glastonbury.

**RESOLVED: That the Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to the full Town Council subject to a check being made to policy HOU5 as outlined earlier (NC)**

108. To receive and consider an email and press release from the Boars Head Appreciation Society

A representative from the Boars Head Appreciation Society explained that there has been concern in the local community surrounding the Boars Head about a change in the ownership of the Boars Head and a change of landlord. 700-800 people had signed an online petition. A letter has now been received from Punch Brewery which is in some degree reassuring, outlining the investment that they intend to make. The Society asked the Committee whether it would be prepared to

support the views of the local community and write to Punch Taverns outlining support for this traditional pub.

There has been little consultation between Punch Taverns and the local community which has led to concerns.

Punch Taverns have now confirmed that they are actively seeking a new landlord and intend to make investment that is sympathetic to the traditional aspect of the pub.

**RESOLVED: That the Clerk write to Punch Taverns to say that the Council would support keeping the Boars Head in its traditional form and that it is a much appreciated community facility (NC)**

109. Receive an update from the Deputy Clerk regarding the new access road on Woodford Road

The Deputy Clerk informed the Committee that the planning application for the new access road on Woodford Road has been received. On the Cheshire East website the application states that the application is Woodford Road in Wilmslow and not Woodford Road in Poynton. Cheshire East have been contacted and asked to correct these errors. The planning application would be included on the agenda for the next Planning and Environment Committee meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

**RESOLVED: That the update from the Deputy Clerk is received (NC)**

110. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2018

**RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Planning and Environment committee meeting held 5<sup>th</sup> November are approved (NC)**

111. Receive and consider the planning decisions made by Cheshire East Council

**RESOLVED: That the planning decisions list, dated 26<sup>th</sup> November, is received (NC)**

112. Planning applications received to date

Application No: 18/4865M

Location: Worth Cottage, Anson Road, Poynton SK12 1TD

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Turner

Proposal: Revised vehicular and pedestrian access

**RESOLVED: No objection (NC)**

Application No: 18/5364M

Location: 11, Balmoral Drive, Poynton SK12 1JN

Applicants Name: Mr Dean Picksley

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

**RESOLVED: No objection (NC)**

*Cllr Clarke declared an interest in this item and withdrew from the meeting  
Cllr Podmore acted as Chair for this item*

Application No: 18/5390M  
Location: 52A, Park Lane, Poynton, SK12 1RE  
Applicants Name: Mr G McHugh  
Proposal: Change of use from residential to office  
**RESOLVED: No objection (NC)**

*Cllr Clarke re-joined the meeting and continued to chair the meeting.*

Application No: 18/ 5445M  
Location: 10, Curzon Road, Poynton, SK12 1YE  
Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Sutton  
Proposal: Construction of single storey rear extension, side extension and porch  
**RESOLVED: No objection (5 for, 1 against)**

Application No: 18/5463M  
Location: 26, Clifford Road, Poynton, SK12 1HY  
Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Bell  
Proposal: Front dormer and roof alterations  
**RESOLVED: No objection (NC)**

Application No: 18/5464M  
Location: 22, Lyme Road, Poynton SK12 1TH  
Applicants Name: Mr Andrew Banks  
Proposal: The front of the link detached house has had plastic cladding removed and replaced with render. 2) White UPVC windows to the front of the property have been replaced with grey UPVC windows. 3) The flat roof on the garage has been replaced with a pitched roof.  
**RESOLVED: No objection (NC)**

Application No: 18/5686M  
Location: 22, Mallard Crescent, Poynton Sk12 1HT  
Applicants Name: Mr Terry Palmer  
Proposal: Double storey front extension.  
**RESOLVED: Recommend rejection on the basis that it is out of character with other similar houses in the area (NC)**

Application No 18/5694M  
Location: 20, Distaff Road, Poynton SK12 1HN  
Applicants Name: Mr Matthew Deacon  
Proposal: Double storey side/rear extension, garage construction and pitched roof addition to porch  
**RESOLVED: Recommend rejection on the basis of:**  
**R03RD – Cramped development. The proposal would by reason of scale, form and design result in a cramped and intrusive form of development out of keeping with the character of the existing properties in the immediate vicinity of the site**  
**RO5RD – Inadequate space around buildings. The proposal would provide inadequate space around and between buildings, particularly with regard to the provision of private open space**

**The Town Council cannot see how the garage can be accessed when there appears to be no vehicular access (NC)**

Application No:18/5730M  
Location: 4, Adlington Close, Poynton SK12 1XD  
Applicants Name: Mr G Smith  
Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension  
**RESOLVED: No objection (NC)**

112. To receive and consider a report from the Community Infrastructure Levy and s106 Task and Finish Group

Cllr Podmore confirmed that the application for funding for the play park had been completed. The operations manager was currently identifying other items that required funding. The deadline of 2019 no longer applied and the funding would be available until 2024.

Cllr Podmore thought that there might be £200,000 available from S106 funds. Cllr Beanland confirmed that not all the funds are available to the Town Council. According to Cheshire East Council some of the funds have already been spent and some funds are allocated to the Woodford footpaths over the former aerodrome site.

**RESOLVED: That the verbal report is received and that the Deputy Clerk speaks to the Operations Manager and asks him to pursue the money for the footpath work (NC)**

113. Consider and agree any communication messages arising from this meeting

The consultation on the Hazelbadge Road planning application

**RESOLVED: That the communication messages as stated are agreed (NC)**

Meeting end time: 9.45pm

Chair.....

Dated.....