

Meeting PLANNING AND RIGHTS OF WAY COMMITTEE

Date Tuesday 27 July 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**

Bruce Laughton for Tom Smith

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Pete Barker – Chief Executive's Department  
Rachel Clack – Chief Executive's Department  
Sally Gill – Place Department  
Trish Hennessy – Place Department  
Rebecca Kirkland – Place Department  
Joel Marshall – Place Department  
Jonathan Smith – Place Department  
Debbie Wragg – Place Department

**1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 22 JUNE 2021 AND 29 JUNE 2021**

The minutes of the meetings, having been circulated to all Members, were taken as read and were confirmed, and were signed by the Chair

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tom Smith.

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

Councillor Moxon declared a private, pecuniary interest in Item 8, Improvement to Leen Valley Golf Club, Wigwam Lane, Hucknall, and undertook to leave the meeting during consideration and voting on this item.

Councillor Fielding declared an interest in Item 7, Variation of Conditions on Land at Springs Road, Misson as she had lobbied government regarding cross-border consultation on such applications, which did not preclude her from speaking or voting on that item.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING OF MEMBERS**

Councillor Ogle declared that he had been lobbied regarding Item 7, Variation of Conditions on Land at Springs Road, Misson, which did not preclude him from speaking or voting on that item.

### **CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Given the number of speakers present at the meeting Committee agreed that the order of items be changed as follows:

5. (unchanged) Annual Report by Trading Standards
6. (was 7) Variation of Conditions on Land at Springs Road, Mission
7. (was 8) Improvements to Leen Valley Golf Club
8. (was 6) Review of NCC's Pre-application Planning Advice Charging Schedule
9. (unchanged) Development Management Progress Report

### **5. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LICENSING WORK CARRIED OUT BY THE TRADING STANDARDS AND COMMUNITIES SERVICE**

Ms Hennessy introduced the report which updated Committee on the work carried out by the Trading Standards and Communities Service.

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

- Ms Hennessy agreed to confirm whether there had been an increase in fireworks licence applications during the latest reporting period.

*(After the meeting Ms Hennessy wrote to members confirming that there had actually been a decrease in such applications - 51 explosives licences were issued in the previous reporting period, whereas 36 licences were issued during the latest reporting period.)*

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

### **RESOLVED 2021/008**

- 1) That the appropriate use of the media to highlight the results of the fireworks safety inspections programme for the coming licensing period (October/November 2021) be approved.
- 2) That a further annual update report be submitted to the meeting of the Committee in June 2022.

### **UPDATED NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

At this point in the meeting Mr Smith informed members that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had been updated on 20 July 2021, which was after the papers for this meeting had been published. Mr Smith explained that this meant that the reports concerning the Land at Springs Road, Misson and the Leen Valley Golf Club contained references to the 2019 version of the NPPF. Mr Smith confirmed to Committee that officers had reviewed the changes to the NPPF and that they did not materially affect the Recommendations in either report.

### **6. VARIATION OF CONDITIONS ON LAND AT SPRINGS ROAD, MISSON**

Mr Smith introduced the report which considered two planning applications seeking a three-year extension to the time limited permissions at the Misson Springs exploratory shale gas site.

Mr Smith informed members that the first application sought a variation to the original Condition 4 in order to extend the timescales for the evaluation and restoration stages at the well site for a further three years until November 2023. Mr Smith explained that the original permission also included scope for a second, horizontally drilled well, but this application clarifies that this horizontal well will not now be drilled as part of this proposal.

Mr Smith informed members that the second application sought to vary the original Condition 6 of the planning permission in order to retain a series of associated groundwater monitoring boreholes, again for an additional three years and to fall in line with the extended life being sought for the wider well site.

The following points of clarification were then addressed:

- No work could commence on site until all of the conditions had been met and the extended permission would expire in November 2023 regardless.
- Mr May, representing Frack Free Misson, questioned the explanation given of the moratorium stating that it does not stop shale gas development but introduces a presumption against ministerial consent for associated hydraulic fracturing. Mr Smith responded by quoting from paragraph 180 of the report:

*“The Government continues to recognise the importance of natural gas as a source of secure and affordable energy as we aim to reach net zero emissions by 2050. The Committee on Climate Change predict that we will still be consuming almost 70% of the gas we consume today in 2050 under our net zero target as significant reductions across building, industry and power are offset by demand for gas to produce hydrogen. It is therefore critical that the UK continues to have good access to natural gas from both domestic and international markets.”*

*“On the basis of the current scientific evidence, Government is confirming today that it will take a presumption against issuing any further Hydraulic Fracturing Consents. This position, an effective moratorium, will be maintained until compelling new evidence is provided which addresses the concerns around the prediction and management of induced seismicity. While future applications for Hydraulic Fracturing Consent will be considered on their own merits by the Secretary of State, in accordance with the law, the shale gas industry should take the Government’s position into account when considering new developments.”*

Mr Marshall stated that this announcement made it clear to the industry that it was not to bring forward any more proposals and that the applicant in this case had recognised that by mothballing the site and not drilling a second borehole.

Following Mr Smith’s introduction, Mr Dennis May from Frack Free Misson was then given the opportunity to speak and **a summary** of that speech is set out below:

- It is disingenuous for the applicant to reason that the moratorium prevented or is preventing the previously permitted exploratory works from being carried out at Misson. The drilling rig was withdrawn from the site some 7 months before the moratorium came into effect. That was a commercial decision.
- It is inaccurate to claim that restoring the site will sterilise the mineral resources, that protocol does not apply to hydrocarbons, least of all shale gas.
- The so called ‘pressing need’ for shale gas exploration cited in the application is outdated and has been rendered null and void by subsequent government reports.
- The pursuance of shale gas, one of the most polluting means of fossil fuel extraction, is incompatible with climate targets and therefore unsustainable.
- Is the well site still needed?
- There are no significant end users of low grade geothermal energy within 2km of the site

- Last September the relevant government minister stated that fracking is 'extremely unlikely to happen in England'
- With regards to the moratorium, all attempts and assurances regarding seismic controls have proved ineffective resulting in 100% failure rate. The Oil and Gas Authority (OGA) state that even 'research proposed' is inconsistent with government policy aims.
- One industry source stated that the lifting of the moratorium would be a 'political rather than a scientific' decision, yet the government stipulates the latter. Others have stated that fracking is 'commercially unviable' unless permitted seismic limits are raised, deeming that their business objectives should take priority over community safety.
- This is not a unique position, this industry sells itself on the back of 'gold standard regulations' whilst at the same time regarding such measures, especially the planning regime, as a burden from which it should be exempt. There is an increasing catalogue of non-compliance and regulatory failings.
- Perhaps the question should be rephrased: 'Is it a reasonable prospect that planning permission would be granted for the intended activities?' which, if permitted, would incur noise levels well in excess of the limit for the SSSI. Fracking pumps are every loud. Transposing modelling from sites in Lancashire indicates that noise levels at the SSSI boundary would be 4 times greater than the limit prescribed by Natural England.
- Permitting this application will only delay the inevitable. This site will never be suitable for noisy industry.
- The temporary nature of the original development was cited as a mitigation against harm to the SSSI. It proved not to be the case.
- Previous noise controls have demonstrably failed and a relevant planning condition was treated with contempt by the applicant.
- In the original decision the benefits of development were considered to outweigh the harm. That situation is now reversed.
- Your refusal of permission will be in line with current government policy, paragraph 80 of the NPPF and remove a proven threat to a nationally significant wildlife reserve.
- Councillors, this application is nothing more than a cynical attempt to manipulate the planning system in order to prop up a failed industry. You have adequate reason, justification and a duty to our communities to refuse this application.

There were no questions.

Ms Janice Bradley from the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I am the head of Nature Recovery (North) for the Trust and I am a professional ecologist with over 30 years' experience of evaluating impacts of development on biodiversity.
- NWT greatly welcomed that NCC declared a Climate Emergency in May this year and made a commitment that all committees of the council will be expected to ensure that the decisions they make adhere to this principle. This application is an effective test of that principle.
- This application to delay the restoration of the well site makes clear that the intent behind the delay is to enable the applicant to apply to frack in the area should the Government moratorium be lifted. Thus the proposal to delay the restoration cannot be separated from the reason behind it – they are indivisible.
- This exploratory drilling site lies within an area of particular ecological sensitivity, being in proximity to several SSSIs and LWS which are dependent on good air quality, a stable noise environment, and continued surface, sub-surface and groundwater flows, for the conservation of their features of ecological importance. In addition the site is within 125m of our Misson Training Ground SSSI (Misson Carr Nature Reserve) which hosts a rich assemblage of rare species.
- NWT strongly object to this application to extend the restoration period because we consider that permitting this extension would, by definition, mean that this Committee is accepting that a fracking application might be brought forward, and so is fundamentally contradictory to the stated Government, and NCC, aims to tackle the causes of climate change. It cannot be acceptable that the extraction of a new fossil fuel would be permitted in Nottinghamshire in the face of the climate emergency.
- The committee report provides a carefully worded case that demonstrates the difficulty of balancing rapidly emerging government statements and policy, versus the planning system that lags behind those changes. But fundamentally, since this permission was originally granted, the world has moved on. There is now a moratorium against fracking and the UK has signed up to more stringent CO2 emission reduction targets, indeed this changed context is clearly acknowledged in the Officer's report.
- This is fundamentally the wrong place for an industrial fossil fuel operation, adjacent to the last remnant of nationally important fen habitat in Nottinghamshire, occupied by three of the rarest breeding species in the County, which are also sensitive to noise and disturbance. The fen habitat is vulnerable to degradation from the nitrogen-rich emissions that would be produced by the operation.
- During construction of the well site in 2018 the applicant was not able to meet the noise limits which had been set in agreement with Natural England.

- In the 2018 breeding season during which construction and drilling were underway, surveys of the breeding long eared owls indicated that they moved eastwards from the site that they had used for many years.
- The report argues that delaying restoration would be no more harmful than restoring the site now, that is not true. Delaying restoration by a further 3 years would mean that an even greater disturbance would be experienced by those birds that have recolonised the SSSI. In accordance with our legal obligations we have carried out extensive habitat management in the last 12 months and have secured funds to further improve the condition of the SSSI. Any further delay would affect our ability to improve the hydrological conditions of the site and neither Natural England nor NCC's Ecologist took this into account.

There were no questions.

Mr Ard Battye, a director from the applicant IGas, was then given the opportunity to speak and **a summary** of that speech is set out below:

- The applications before you today, in line with planning policy, are to vary 2 conditions of our existing planning permissions in order to extend the operational period of the site at Springs Road for a further 3 years and additionally retain the groundwater monitoring boreholes associated with the site.
- We believe this site remains of national importance. The trend of increasingly importing oil and gas on super-tankers from overseas, generating 4 times the emissions of our own indigenous resource before it reaches the UK continues.
- Despite COVID-19 induced reductions in UK gas demand in 2020, imports of Liquefied Natural Gas increased by 5% from 2019 and represented a near record 42% of total gas imports.
- In volume terms, the UK imported nearly 55 times as much Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from shale fields of the USA in 2020 compared to 2017.
- We believe there is a huge opportunity to reduce the UK's global carbon footprint through domestic production with UK shale gas we move closer to 2050.
- UK shale gas generates one quarter of the pre combustion emissions LNG creates.
- The Committee on Climate Change recently identified a shortfall in the supply of oil and gas that our own resources could address. In June the Committee stated that the North Sea would be unlikely to be able to meet the future demand for oil and gas and that a new additional supply would be needed.
- We are looking to retain the option for a relatively short time to allow us to work with regulators and government towards a safe and responsible lifting of the moratorium.
- It will also give us time to consider alternative development at the site. We acquired a geothermal development business in 2020. We are going through a process of looking at all of our wells and the subsurface information we possess

to better understand the geothermal potential across all of our areas of operations including our site at Springs Road.

- During the entire operation at Misson we have upheld our HSE, environmental, planning and community responsibilities and will continue to do so. This will include routine maintenance such as regularly inspecting the well head and conducting well integrity tests.
- We support the officer's report before you today and hope that members support their officer's recommendations and grant approval.

The following point of clarification was then addressed by officers:

- In terms of iGas fulfilling all of its on-site responsibilities: the site has been subject to intense scrutiny and NCC's enforcement team have visited many times. There have been some breaches of conditions that have been resolved and all complaints have been investigated. NCC are satisfied that all operations on site are being carried out satisfactorily. The Environment Agency have confirmed that they have no concerns about the site.

Councillor Matthew Curtis from Misson Parish Council was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- iGas have made it clear that their prime reason for seeking the extension is to reactivate the site and apply to drill and frack – should the current moratorium on fracking be lifted. When the original application was granted, those objecting to the plans were given the reassurance that this was for a temporary exploratory well site that did not include fracking. This 3 year extension not only challenges the concept of temporary but also therefore brings the prospect of fracking on this site a step closer.
- iGas are also on record as saying that the limitations on the site at Springs Road make it unsuitable for large scale production, the inference being that they would, at some time, require a new site in the area that could accommodate the number of wells to optimise production.
- The fact that iGas waited until almost the last minute to seek this extension has also not gone without notice. We note that the construction industry has managed to function throughout the pandemic and feel it is somewhat disingenuous for them to leave it this late to make a response. There is no reason this application could not have been made at a time when they could have undertaken the work within the time specified in the planning permission.
- This is not the first time that the conduct of iGas has been found wanting; there was an unexplained delay to the completion of the construction phase of the site during 2017 followed by an application to have the deadline extended beyond the start of the 2018 bird breeding season. Apart from creating a significant volume of work for all those participating in the consequent consultation it demonstrates either a lack of competence or a general lack of respect for the planning process on the part of iGas. This time NCC would appear to be under no obligation to grant permission and we feel that the application should be rejected and not reward them for their non-compliance.



- Since the threat of shale gas development was first raised in 2014 the lives of many local residents have been blighted, first by the uncertainty of what the enterprise might entail, then by the sheer effort involved making their concerns understood. Many of us have worked very hard to articulate these concerns and engage with a complex and highly technical planning process, and since permission was granted, each new phase of the development has brought new challenges which have impacted upon our daily lives. Specifically, the secrecy and intimidation encountered during the initial seismic surveys, the influx of protestors squatting on private land near the site, a massive police presence, ad hoc road closures, court injunctions threatening members of the local community and on site security making the area look like a prison. These are all things that we have had to contend with over the past six years and quite frankly, we have had enough. Extending the planning permission for another three years, whilst no doubt conferring a financial benefit on iGas, does nothing for the local community other than giving us another three years of anxiety.

There were no questions.

The local County Council member, Councillor Tracey Taylor, was then given the opportunity to speak and **a summary** of that speech is set out below:

- This has been a significant site during my term as a county councillor and I have attended the liaison meetings throughout that time.
- I have no view on the industry, I want to focus on the application.
- I think it might be useful to state the chronology relating to the site:
  - 2014/15 – possibility of fracking first raised
  - October 2016 – test drilling agreed
  - May 2017 – Section 106 agreement signed
  - November / December 2018 – construction phase
  - May 2019 – test drilling ceased
  - November 2019 – moratorium, no work carried out since then
- The results of the core sampling analysis were positive, iGas made this known publicly and would no doubt proceed if allowed.
- At the end of 2020 the site should have been restored, but now iGas want to delay this, no works have been undertaken in the meantime as the assumption has been that work could be carried out in the future.
- The decision whether to keep the site mothballed or not, as the moratorium may or may not remain in place, is a decision that needs to be taken on valid planning grounds.

- The officer's report states that there is no indication that the moratorium will be lifted in the short term, but that it may be lifted some time in the future. We need to look at the conditions today.
- Permission is being sought to extend the timescales until 2023. What happens after that? If an extension is granted we do not want any operations to be given permission to start after 2023.
- I do not want the absence of comment from other communities to be construed as tacit consent, these communities are concerned with blight.
- The impact of the mothballed site is a daily reminder that it may become a live site in future.
- Is it appropriate to put the needs of a community before a commercial concern to save money? The moratorium could be lifted, iGas could apply again for permission that could be granted – the issue would be the cost of restoration now compared to the cost of doing so in the future.
- The decision should be made on the situation as it is today, not what might be in the future. The needs of the residents should be considered, not the issue of commercial advantage.

There were no questions.

Following the speeches and Mr Smith's introduction, Members debated the item and highlighted the following:

- This application is not about approving fracking, the recommendation in the report is to delay restoration. There is a moratorium in place which is convenient in that it allows the problem of deciding on fracking to be avoided, but the problem does not go away for the residents. There is no evidence to suggest that the moratorium will be lifted in the near future. There is no reason why the enforcement of restoration should not go ahead now.
- The area is blighted at the moment, the SSSi should be restored now. If the situation changes then it can be reassessed in the future.
- This is effectively a form of land-banking which is not good for communities.
- Restoration should be enforced now and if the moratorium is lifted the applicant can re-apply for permission.
- Applications for the extensions of permissions are not unprecedented, they have been granted for gravel extraction for example, though they do blight the communities affected.
- Members are usually aware of all of the issues when dealing with gravel extraction, ie there is usually knowledge about the likelihood of the required

material becoming available. There is no such certainty here, the authority has no control about when the moratorium may be lifted.

- Acknowledge that voting against officers' recommendations may have consequences for the Authority. The applicant may appeal and there will be a cost to the Authority.
- The moratorium should be indefinite.
- Officers acknowledge the uncertainty caused by the moratorium. Significant work will be required to remove the hardcore and containers from the site and a short time extension to 2023 may lessen the overall degree of disruption, depending on what happens to the moratorium.
- Officers understand the blight issue but they have visited the site and it is quiet at the moment with no drilling and no protesters present.
- Reasons for voting against a recommendation must be based on material planning considerations.

The meeting was adjourned at this point to allow officers to prepare written reasons for members who were minded to refuse permission in this case and for those reasons to be agreed before any vote was taken.

At the resumption of the meeting the Chair read out the following statement containing those reasons:

Given the present uncertainty surrounding the Government's moratorium on fracking, the proposed development would lead to the retention of the site in its present condition until November 2023 which is considered to be an unacceptable length of time, adversely impacting on the amenity of the local community and the local environment contrary to Policy DM1:Protecting Local Amenity of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. These impacts are considered to outweigh the benefits of retaining the site in its present condition for this period of time. It is therefore considered that the application be refused to allow for the site's timely restoration in accordance with the NPPF.

The Committee then moved to the vote and the Chair declared that the motion had been lost.

### **RESOLVED 2021/009**

That the granting of section 73 planning permission under applications 1/20/01695/CDM (Proposal 1) and 1/21/00157/CDM (Proposal 2) be refused.

After the meeting, and in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair, the following wording for the statement of reasons was agreed:

'Given the ongoing uncertainty surrounding the Government's moratorium on hydraulic fracturing originally enacted in 2019, the proposal would lead to the retention of the site and its associated boreholes in their present condition until

November 2023 which is considered to be an unacceptable length of time, continuing to adversely impact the amenity of the local community and the sensitive local environment contrary to policies DM1 (Protecting Local Amenity) and MP12 (Oil and Gas) of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. These impacts are considered to outweigh the benefits of retaining the site in its present condition for this period of time, after considering all relevant material considerations. It is therefore considered that the application be refused to allow for the site's timely restoration in accordance with paragraphs 211 (e) and 215 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

## **7. IMPROVEMENTS TO LEEN VALLEY GOLF CLUB, WIGWAM LANE, HUCKNALL**

Councillor Moxon left the meeting at this point and did not return until after the debate and voting on this item had taken place.

Mr Smith introduced the report which considered a planning application to utilise imported inert soils to re-profile and re-landscape land relating to the existing golf course at Leen Valley Golf Club, as well as providing additional recreational facilities comprising an adventure golf putting facility and a toboggan run. Mr Smith informed members that the key issues related to the application's compliance with both waste management and Green Belt policy, residential amenity impacts, and the magnitude of the environmental impacts associated with the construction phase particularly in relation to lorry movements, noise, ecology and landscape.

Mr Smith informed Committee that the only change required to the papers circulated was an amendment to Condition 11 which referred to the 2019 version of the NPPF rather than the 2021 version.

There were no questions.

Following Mr Smith's introduction, Mr David Weller was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I am a golf course architect representing the applicant, Leen Valley Golf Club
- We were asked to look at 3 aspects of the club namely:
  - The driving range outfield
  - The provision of an adventure golf course
  - The provision of a summer toboggan run
- The current outfield was constructed poorly with imported soil on what was a former slag heap.
- The grading works direct the golfers towards the adjacent highway
- There is little in the way of sub-surface drainage and only a thin layer of topsoil which results in mud in winter and bare patches in summer

- This poor condition makes it difficult to collect balls and makes for an unappealing target area for customers
- The outfield lacks any visual target areas with some sections of the outfield not visible from the bays
- Not surprisingly this aspect of the business has been in decline and it is proposed to address the situation with a re-modelling scheme requiring importation of soil
- The re-shaping would have a number of benefits:
  - The outfield would be re-aligned to encourage golfers to hit farther away from the road
  - The severe slopes would be removed and with the addition of well shaped target greens the outfield would both be more appealing to customers and easier to maintain
  - The installation of subsoil drainage and appropriate shaping will greatly improve the ease of maintenance and therefore the look of the outfield throughout the year
  - It will also form part of a water recycling system where excess rainfall can be collected by a combination of the outfield shape and drainage pipes and transferred to the new water storage lagoon for use in the irrigation of the course at later date
  - Improved surface and drainage will also allow the use of robotic grass cutters and ball pickers which the industry is moving rapidly towards
  - The soils required for the works will be sourced from Environment Agency approved soils, this is primarily due to the nature of the existing course where, because of its history as a slag heap, no soil can be sourced from on-site.
- In addition to the range improvements the operator wishes to add the option of adventure golf to the facilities
- Adventure Golf is an ideal, complementary activity and the design will be landscaped-based with rocks, undulations, water and planting
- The theme elements will focus on local history and heritage
- Adventure Golf is very inclusive and can be enjoyed by all ages thereby broadening the customer base of the club
- The same can be said for the proposed summer tobogganing which will also have a wide appeal, though especially to the young
- The new features will hopefully bring in visitors who will also use other facilities at the club

- The applicant is keen to greatly enhance the facilities available at the club
- The proposals will result in an outfield less prone to flooding, more attractive to customers and enjoyed all year round
- Many golf courses are now successfully broadening the appeal of their facilities by introducing new leisure features and Leen Valley is keen to move forward also
- One of the products of Covid has been an increased interest in golf. Speaking to other operators they have seen a huge increase in players and memberships. Leen Valley would very much like to build on this renewed interest, I therefore hope that Committee can support this application.

There were no questions.

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

**RESOLVED 2021/010**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

**8. REVIEW OF NCC'S PRE APPLICATION PLANNING ADVICE CHARGING SCHEDULE**

Mr Smith introduced the report which informed Members of the proposal to update the County Council's pre-application planning advice service and included a request to approve a proposed increase in fee levels.

Following Mr Smith's introduction, Members highlighted the following:

- Charges should be increased annually linked to RPI
- Reviewing charges every 4 years is not often enough
- An annual report to Committee is not required
- A report will be brought to Committee if any fundamental review is necessary
- The Chair and Vice Chair should agree with officers how to proceed in future

The Chair agreed to an alteration to the original motion to include a recommendation that the Chair and Vice Chair liaise with officers to agree a way forward

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

**RESOLVED 2021/011**

1. That Members approve the revised fee schedule for the pre-application advice service as set out in the report, to come into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2021

2. That the Chair and Vice Chair liaise with officers to agree a revised way forward in future.

## **9. DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS MANAGEMENT REPORT**

Mrs Gill introduced the report, stating that it was the usual report brought regularly to Committee detailing the applications received, determined and scheduled.

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

### **RESOLVED 2021/012**

That the contents of the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.07pm

**CHAIR**