

Meeting PLANNING AND RIGHTS OF WAY COMMITTEE

Date Tuesday 22 June 2021 (commencing at 10.30am)

**Membership**

Persons absent are marked with `A`

**COUNCILLORS**

Richard Butler (Chair)  
Sybil Fielding (Vice-Chair)

Andre Camilleri	John Ogle
Robert Corden	Philip Owen
Jim Creamer	Tom Smith - A
Paul Henshaw	Roger Upton
Andy Meakin	Daniel Williamson
Nigel Moxon	

**SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Tracey Taylor for Tom Smith

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Pete Barker – Chief Executive’s Department  
Rachel Clack – Chief Executive’s Department  
Sally Gill – Place Department  
Mike Hankin – Place Department  
Rebecca Kirkland – Place Department  
Matthew Neal – Place Department  
Jonathan Smith – Place Department

**1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

That the appointment by Full Council on 27 May 2021 of Councillor Richard Butler as Chairman, and Councillor Sybil Fielding as Vice Chairman of the Committee for the 2021-22 municipal year be noted.

**2. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP**

That the Committee membership and terms of reference be noted.

### **3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE HELD ON 5 JANUARY 2021**

The last meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee held on 5 January 2021 was attended by Councillors Creamer, Fielding and Henshaw.

The minutes of the meeting, having been circulated to all Members, were taken as read and were confirmed, subject to the following amendment, and were signed by the Chair:-

- Sally Gill is the Group Manager for Planning in the Place Department and not the Chief Executive's Department as stated.

### **4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tom Smith.

### **5. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **6. DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING OF MEMBERS**

Members confirmed that they had been contacted in various ways regarding Item 7, EMERGE, Energy from Waste Facility, Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station.

Mr Smith informed Committee that the presentation would include reference to all late representations.

Labour members of the Committee confirmed they would approach the decision making process impartially after the Rushcliffe Labour Group had campaigned against the development in the recent local government elections. Ms Clack stated that the integrity of members was not being questioned and emphasised the importance of ensuring that the decisions of the Committee were robust.

### **7. EMERGE, ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY, RATCLIFFE ON SOAR POWER STATION**

Mr Hankin introduced the report which included the consideration of the following key issues:

- I. The processing capacity of the facility in relation to the amount of residual waste requiring treatment within Nottinghamshire and the surrounding area where it is identified that there are shortfalls in residual waste processing capacity which the EMERGE facility would assist in addressing;
- II. Compliance with the waste hierarchy where it is concluded that the EMERGE facility would assist in managing waste at a higher level in the waste hierarchy and assist in the diversion of waste from landfill disposal;

- III. The efficiency of the process, its level of carbon emissions and the extent to which the development would contribute towards the UK Government's commitment to bring all greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050 which is a target which local authorities are being encouraged to work towards where it is concluded that the EMERGE facility would contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions when compared to the current alternative of landfill disposal of residual waste, but acknowledging that potential future changes in waste collection arrangements have the potential to affect waste composition which may erode some of these benefits in the medium to longer term;
- IV. The production of 'low carbon' energy from the process which is strongly supported by national and local planning and energy policy;
- V. The suitability of the site for the development in the context of planning policy where it is concluded that there is planning policy support for the redevelopment the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site which is a previously developed (brownfield) site.
- VI. The site lies within the Green Belt and has been treated as inappropriate development in the context of Green Belt policy. Very special circumstances have been demonstrated to support a grant of planning permission.
- VII. Consideration of the environmental effects of the development where it is noted that there would be some visual and heritage impacts but in other respects the site benefits from good transport links with direct access to the A453 dual carriageway and significant environmental effects are not anticipated to local landscape character, air quality and public health, noise and vibration, dust, litter, ecology, odour, ground contamination, drainage and flood risk, or socio-economic effects.

Following Mr Hankin's introductory remarks, Mr Smith informed Committee of the late representations received, detailed below, and provided the Officer responses:

#### Email from Friends of the Earth dated 17 June 2021

- There will be significant CO2 emissions, it is not a low carbon facility
- There are other alternatives to landfill should permission be refused
- There are references to CHP and carbon capture but no firm commitments
- It is unfortunate that the Bill will not be passed before this application is considered
- The calling in of the application by the Secretary of State is supported

#### Officers' Response

- Paragraphs 310 – 357 of the report cover the points raised in respect of climate change
- Paragraph 315 confirms that the facility is regarded as a low carbon energy source
- Paragraph 333 of the report confirms that biogenic waste, which makes up around 60% of the expected waste stream, is classed as climate change neutral

- Paragraph 253 confirms that the level of recycling rates in Nottinghamshire is below the Waste Core Strategy target set of 70% by 2025
- Paragraph 252 states that waste projected to be disposed into landfill may be better managed within a recovery facility
- Paragraph 334 states that the DEFRA Energy from Waste guide confirms that when calculating the net level of carbon emissions of an energy recovery facility it is appropriate to deduct from the gross carbon output the carbon emissions that are displaced by producing the equivalent energy output at an alternative generating facility. A gas fired power station is regarded as a reasonable comparator as this is the most likely technology to be used if a new power station were to be built today.
- Paragraph 384 details how energy from waste is non-intermittent, unlike many other sources of renewable energy such as wind power or solar.
- Paragraph 346 confirms that there is no legislative requirement for this development to be 'Carbon Capture Ready'
- Mr Smith informed members that officers were satisfied that the applicants had accounted for comparators and that the proposals were consistent with the DEFRA Energy From Waste Guide where energy from waste was regarded as a preferable alternative to the use of landfill

#### Correspondence from United Kingdom Without Incineration Network (UKWIN)

- The claim that special circumstances apply in respect of the Green Belt is unsupportable
- The arguments from UKWIN and the Wildlife Trust have not been taken into account
- Incineration is not a low carbon option for planning purposes
- It is inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- There is legal precedent to refuse planning permission on climate change grounds
- Climate change benefits have been given limited weight

#### Officers' Response

- Paragraphs 412 – 433 of the report cover the majority of the points raised
- Paragraphs 436 – 438 of the report incorporates consideration of Green belt very special circumstances
- In terms of the issues raised by the Wildlife Trust, these have been considered in the report, but the county ecologist and Natural England have not objected to the application and planning officers therefore consider that the appropriate weight has been attached to ecological concerns in the overall planning decision
- Paragraphs 310 – 357 of the report assess greenhouse gas emissions and the effects on climate change. The development can be considered as a low carbon facility using DEFRA's definition.

#### Email from 'Stop Ratcliffe Incinerator Campaign'

- The email copies and pastes large sections of the late representation from UKWIN which has been covered in the response to that organisation above.

#### Email from Councillor Carys Thomas, Rushcliffe Borough Council

- Have British Gypsum been consulted over the proposed development as the site overlies deposits and workings?
- The safeguarding area for the application site relates to underground gypsum extraction. British Gypsum have confirmed that they have no objections to the application as it has no impact on current or foreseeable operational areas for gypsum extraction. On that basis, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Policy SP7 of the Minerals Local Plan and Policy 42 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 insofar as no important mineral reserves would be sterilised as a result of the proposed development.
- Is the site in a mineral safeguarding area?
- Will granting planning permission sterilise future mineral extraction?

#### Officers' Response

- The site is in a mineral safeguarding area
- The applicant has contacted British Gypsum who have raised no objection to the development as there are no plans for mineral extraction at the moment therefore no sterilisation of minerals will take place

#### Email from Councillor Carys Thomas, Rushcliffe Borough Council to Councillor Barney, copied to Councillors Upton, Adair and Butler

- Details speech given by Councillor Thomas to Rushcliffe Borough Council
- The speech refers to lack of carbon capture, the market for the heat generated, the development is not a low carbon solution, the site would be better located nearer to a centre of population, would be better as part of a more holistic site where incineration would be a last resort, need for more HGVs is questioned, lacks strong commitment to use rail for transportation.
- Councillor Thomas moved a motion to oppose the development but the motion was defeated and Rushcliffe Borough Council have raised no objections to the application.

#### Officers' Response

- The issues of carbon capture, the processing of residual waste and the issue of a low carbon development have all been covered in previous responses

- The need for the site has been covered in paragraphs 246 – 309 of the report and in the presentation, including the managing of waste from outside of the county
- Rail could be used in future for the transport of waste and the retention of the rail head is recommended to be secured through a legal agreement as part of the planning decision so that it would be available in the future should contracts be secured which allow for waste to be transported in that way.
- The suggestion of a more holistic site is acknowledged as being a perfectly valid one, but Committee can only consider what has been submitted for approval. The whole site is owned by the applicant and this application is integral to the wider development of the site, though those plans have not yet been made public.

#### Email from Councillor Mike Edwards, Nottingham City Council

- Queries the possible use of heat generated by the plant to be used by the Fairham Pastures estate given the distance from the site and the cost that would be involved
- Suggests investigating further the use of the steam generated by the turbines
- Reference is made to the Free Port and the possible use of the site to house a nuclear fusion facility

#### Officers' Response

- The issue of the Free Port and Nuclear Fusion option are not considered material to this application
- Paragraphs 323 – 331 refer to the generation of heat and identify a number of options but there will be no immediate requirement for this on completion of the development

#### Email from County Councillor Penny Gowland

- The application does not fit in with the County Council's commitment to carbon neutrality
- The problem of methane being generated by landfill sites should be overcome by improved engineering
- The authority should concentrate on handling waste its own waste, and not waste from outside the County
- An alternative energy recovery method than incineration should be used

#### Officers' Response

- All the issues raised have been covered in previous responses

### Email from Chris Ward

- Approval would lock the authority into a 20 year commitment
- The facility would divert attention from recycling/re-using
- Approval would promote the idea that plastic is sustainable as it can be used to generate energy
- Concerns are raised that the facility would pollute the atmosphere

### Officers' Response

- Recycling rates are dealt with in the report
- Pollution will be addressed by the Environment Agency as part of the permit application process

### Email from John Coles, Barton in Fabis Parish Council

- Requests that any HGV routing agreement forbids access to the old A453, now known as Green Street, and which runs parallel to the new A453

### Officers' Response

- This is considered a reasonable request and will be incorporated into any permission should it be granted

The following point of clarification was then addressed:

- A Biodiversity Net Gain calculation carried out indicates that the net biodiversity gain of the scheme would exceed the government target of 10% . Officers have visited the site – it is not an ecologically important site, covered in tarmac and concrete, with very little vegetation and surrounded by electric fencing. If the detailed landscaping scheme were to be implemented the site would have less impact than at present.

Following Mr Hankin's introduction, Dr Monica Pallis was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- Thank you for your commitment in declaring a climate emergency unanimously
- When humans emit 355 billion tonnes more of CO2 emissions there is a 50% risk of reaching the 1.5 degrees of global heating which will wreak such devastating effects on future generations. 40 billion tonnes of CO2 is what human activities emit annually at the moment. 355 divided by 40 is less than 9 years before we reach 1.5 degrees. Everything you do as politicians to help stop these emissions matters.

- You have been told in your officers' report that EMERGE is a low carbon facility. You might conclude that you will be doing the right thing in giving approval. Why then did the Climate Change Committee say in December 2020 that the emissions from existing and planned energy from waste facilities are becoming so overwhelming that 'a substantial fraction of the plant pipeline will have to remain unbuilt, utilisation rates will have to fall, or else carbon capture and storage (CCS) will need to be installed from mid/late-2020s.' Why did the country's leading experts say that if this is a low carbon option? Because the understanding of the climate emergency and its solutions are changing so rapidly that council strategies haven't caught up. These are material considerations for planning purposes.
- UKWIN sent you documents from independent experts adjudicating on other energy from waste proposals. These have consistently reported that comparing emissions from incineration with those from landfill is an inappropriate measure because it does not reflect the real options for the next 20-30 years. For example, the treatment of choice for biodegradable waste is sorting and biostabilisation, which also produces sustainable soil enrichers, and landfill emissions will not even be a consideration. Your administration badly needs a sustainable waste strategy for climate emergency before accepting the backward looking waste figures used in the report.
- If you are not ready to reject the application, I am begging you to delay the decision and get independent expert help to adjudicate on carbon emissions. Planning Permission can be refused on climate grounds as UKWIN have informed you, and there are sufficient arguments from objectors that EMERGE will have serious adverse climate change impacts for independent appraisal to be commissioned. Please don't rush such a huge decision.

Ms Jen Walker was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- The vague promises made are frustrating.
- The development promises to provide 45 jobs, this is a pitiful amount for such a development. I would ask for more clarity, are these jobs skilled or just for people sweeping up?
- CHP is very expensive. It is used in Nottingham as St Anns was being developed and residents were obliged to use the system, that obligation still exists today.
- Where will the rubbish come from to feed the plant? Rushcliffe Borough Council either recycles or incinerates 95% of its waste already, only 5% goes into landfill.
- Where will the residual waste be buried? The plant will burn and dispose of petroleum based products that are essential resources. In future landfill will be mined to access these resources.

- Would you buy a car without brakes now and drive it round with the promise brakes would be provided in the future? A long term approach is needed not short term thinking.
- You have acknowledged that there is a climate emergency and have committed to net zero emissions, but this plant will not provide that. It has been shown that recycling reduces where incineration is an option.
- Wildlife will not be protected by this site.
- Future generations need to be protected. You cannot claim that you have made this decision in ignorance. I beg you to call the decision in.

The following point of clarification was then addressed:

- The ash produced as part of the process is used to produce building blocks. The filters used in the air cleaning go to landfill.

Mr Stephen Platt was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I also want to congratulate the councillors for declaring a climate emergency unanimously, and that means all of the councillors here voted for the declaration and that is a good first step. Today is the first decision resulting from that declaration.
- The climate emergency is already happening, it is no longer just a warning from scientists. There are forest fires in California, Australia and Saddleworth Moor. There are floods in Nottinghamshire, around Britain and around the world. Food production is falling. Ice is melting at the poles and in glaciers. A headline in the Guardian newspaper (21/8/20) stated that the Greenland ice sheet lost a million tonnes per minute in 2019.
- Prince William's television programme said that sea levels would rise by 2 metres by the end of the century. What will happen to Hull, Grimsby, London, Norfolk and Kings Lynn?
- Faced with this emergency you have a decision to make and you should heed the advice of the Committee on Climate change, a body set up to advise the government on the climate and how to reach zero emissions by 2050.
- The Climate Change Committee says 'Achieving significant reductions in the waste sector requires a step change towards a circular economy, moving away from landfill and incineration (and the associated methane and fossil CO2 emissions) and towards a reduction in waste arisings and collection of separated valuable resources for re-use and recycling.'
- In 2019, 53 UK incinerators emitted 13.3 million tonnes of CO2 of which 6.6 million tonnes were from fossil sources such as plastic.

- The Climate Change Committee says no more emissions from landfill and incineration. Let's have less waste and that waste should be re-used and recycled.

The following point of clarification was then addressed:

- On the effect of the Council's declaration, Mr Smith drew Committee's attention to paragraph 349 of the report which stated that given the short time since the declaration had been made it had not been possible to develop any measures designed to achieve carbon neutrality, but that the declaration had reinforced the importance which the Council attaches to mitigating climate change and reducing carbon emissions.

Dr Andy Read, the applicant's Redevelopment Manager, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- This development will be on the Ratcliffe site which will lose its coal operation at some point in the future.
  - We have been collaborating closely with NCC, Rushcliffe BC and other local stakeholders on how to redevelop the wider site and contribute to local sustainable economic growth.
  - Our vision for Ratcliffe is for developments that create high value jobs based on modern industrial and manufacturing uses served by an on-site energy hub.
  - This energy hub would enable electricity and heat to be shared by businesses across the site. In planning for a low carbon future we see this energy hub as an enabler to attract to the site new investors that have high energy demand. We can only deliver this vision step by step, and the first step has to be a stand-alone as the following steps cannot be guaranteed.
  - We believe the EMERGE centre proposal under discussion today successfully delivers that stand-alone first step:
    - it meets an existing need in that there is not enough waste treatment capacity in the local region, nor indeed in the UK as a whole
    - it will give a boost to the local economy
    - it has pathways to reach net zero carbon and indeed net-negative climate emissions given the right future policy support from Government
    - by being capable of supplying heat in the future as well as power, it can be the anchor project for the energy hub, helping to attract modern industry, manufacturing and high quality jobs to the site
- We also believe that we have delivered a high quality application where the local concerns have been heard and are addressed. As a result we

have no objections from statutory consultees. We have reached agreement with NCC's officers on all of the proposed planning conditions including, for example, to keep lorries off local roads, and to maintain good community liaison during construction.

- I commend Mr Hankin's report to you and I am delighted that he agrees with us that this is a planning application that should be approved.

The following points of clarification was then addressed:

- The air filtration process is a standard industrial process regulated by the Environment Agency and continuously monitored. There is an obligation on the applicant to measure the emissions and report any deviations and this has been undertaken at the existing plant for many years.
- In terms of the supply of residual waste, all calculations have taken into account the volumes processed at the Eastcroft and Sheffield plants, with the assumption that these plants will continue into the future. Given this, the figures indicate that there will still be sufficient residual waste available to be processed by the new facility.

Councillor Matt Barney, the local member, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- As ward member I share the serious concerns expressed by my resident and Parish Councils in respect of this application. We surround the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site in the ward of Leake and Ruddington and will be most affected both by the construction and operation of this facility. If planning permission is granted there will be a very significant increase in road haulage movements to construct and then supply the plant with waste to incinerate. I have expressed these concerns to officers. As such, I acknowledge the recent amendments to the application that now stipulate all HGV traffic associated with both the construction and operation of the site will be restricted to accessing the A453 via Junction 24 M1 roundabout to the south west and from Silverdale roundabout on the A52 in the north east. However, I would like to seek further clarification on how this will be actively enforced and what penalties might be placed upon any hauliers found to be in breach of these planning conditions. Parish Councils have raised strong objections to the proposals, not least with respect to the hugely increased HGV traffic associated with the development. It will be utterly unacceptable to residents for this condition not to be actively and rigorously enforced and I would like to understand the mechanism to achieve this.
- I am personally delighted that Notts County Council have in recent days declared a climate emergency with the serious obligation this brings. I have weighed this application considering the inescapable fact that this plant will produce and emit CO<sub>2</sub>. Having studied carefully the evidence before us, I acknowledge that this site claims to deliver a net carbon gain of more than 100 tonnes per annum as opposed to putting the same waste to landfill. If the modelling is to be relied upon then I accept this gain.

However, considering the climate disaster that we face, I feel strongly that the applicant should be forced to adopt carbon capture measures at this site. I am informed that at present there are no legislative grounds to achieve this. However, as national government policy changes to enforce carbon capture, I would expect this to be retrospectively mandated. I would also strongly prefer NCC to continue and accelerate its significant efforts to recycle even greater proportions of waste so that the need for it to be incinerated or put to landfill is further reduced. I know that my colleagues across parties share this aspiration and will continue to press for this.

- I acknowledge that as the existing coal fired power station is decommissioned, if this plant is granted planning permission, that it will enable jobs, that might otherwise be lost in our ward to be retained. I also acknowledge that as things stand today this proposal will harness power from waste that otherwise would end up in landfill. Power and heat derived from this site therefore would reduce the need to produce the same power and heat from other, potential fossil fuel sources.
- Again, I am highly concerned by the increase in HGV movements that will transpire in my ward and express in the strongest terms that if this proposal is given approval then we will be closely monitoring any breaches of the stipulated HGV access routes and will seek strong penalties for any such perpetrators.

The following point of clarification was then addressed:

- It is important to view the movement of HGVs in the context of the location of the site which lies on the recently improved A453 and which provides very good access to the site, it is not down a country lane. Lorry drivers will use this route, though there is a Section 106 agreement in place and if NCC becomes aware of breaches there is the option of prosecution through the courts, though this would be a last resort and the authority would work with the applicant to ensure the restrictions were adhered to. Routeing agreements are common at mineral sites and the companies involved enforce the measures themselves. The process would involve the escalation of warnings, the imposition of sanctions, drivers ultimately could be banned from accessing the site and as a last resort the authority could prosecute, though this has not happened to date.

Following Mr Hankin's introductory remarks Members then debated the item and the following comments and questions were responded to: -

- The existing rail head will be retained as part of the planning permission.
- If this application is not approved then residual waste from Nottinghamshire will have to be exported out of the County, Nottinghamshire County Council does not send significant amounts of residual municipal waste to landfill, but large quantities do get incinerated outside of Nottinghamshire

- There is no legal basis at the moment that would allow the authority to condition carbon neutrality at this site.
- The recommendations of the Climate Change Committee will advise the government and inform the decision on future government policy and legislation, but the Climate Change Committee's recommendations are not enshrined in UK law and the Authority is required to make its decision in line with existing rules.
- The assumption is that net zero will be mandated by 2050. It will be possible to retro-fit carbon capture equipment at the site and it is reasonable to assume that greater pollution control will be required in the future. If the plant does not meet these stricter criteria it will have to close.
- It is believed that there is no operational energy recovery facilities utilising carbon capture equipment in the UK at the moment, though there is some on the continent. If it were to be used now it would result in a trading disadvantage. The application does not propose the fitting of such equipment and the authority can only determine the application as it is.
- The ecological report was carried out by professionals and reviewed by NCC officers and Natural England. There are bats in the woodlands but the site is not an important one ecologically and the conditions do require mitigation measures to be taken.
- In respect of the possible release of toxins in the air, paragraph 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'the focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes)' In this case, and in addition to the conditions imposed by the planning permission, a waste permit will also required.

The Chairman considered it would be helpful for committee to receive legal advice on the implications of the Council's Declaration of a Climate Emergency on the decision making for this application. The legal adviser, Mrs Clack, reminded Members of the requirement to determine applications in accordance with the policies in the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Mrs Clack informed members that case law showed that climate change mitigation was capable of being a material consideration, however, the Council's Climate Emergency Declaration required the implementation of further measures to achieve its goals, which in a planning context, would require the formulation of policy. Mrs Clack stated that the planning officer had considered the Declaration in assessing the planning balance but had concluded in reaching his recommendation that it did not, on its own, outweigh the policies in the newly adopted Minerals Local Plan.

On a motion by the Chair, seconded by the Vice-Chair, it was: -

**RESOLVED 2021/003**

1. That subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 and the Secretary of State deciding not to call in the application for his own determination, the Corporate Director – Place be instructed to enter into a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the retention of the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station railhead and connecting rail link to the mainline railway for the duration of the operational life of the EMERGE facility and to regulate lorry routing.
2. That subject to the completion of the legal agreement and within three months of receiving notification from the Secretary of State that he does not wish to call in the planning application for determination, or another date which may be agreed by the Team Manager Development Management in consultation with the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, the Corporate Director – Place be authorised to grant planning permission for the above development subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report. In the event that the legal agreement is not signed before the 22 September 2021, or within any subsequent extension of decision time agreed with the Waste Planning Authority, the Corporate Director – Place be authorised to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the development fails to provide for the measures identified in the Heads of Terms of the Section 106 legal agreement within a reasonable period of time.

**8. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRESS REPORT**

Mrs Gill introduced the report, stating that it was the usual report brought regularly to Committee detailing the applications received, determined and scheduled. Mrs Gill drew members' attention to page 239 of the report which detailed the reports which are due to come to future meetings and reminded members that the next meeting of the committee was scheduled in one week's time on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

Mrs Gill informed members that the development referred to on page 24 of the report should have been to Private Road No 3 and not 4 as stated.

Mr Smith confirmed that new members to the Council had been consulted on the relevant applications and Mrs Gill confirmed that as the schedule dated back to January 2021 the references to former members was valid.

On a motion by the Chair, seconded by the Vice-Chair, it was: -

**RESOLVED 2021/004**

That the contents of the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.00pm

**CHAIR**