

## **NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 2017**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Walshaw in the Chair

Councillors B Cleasby, C Dobson,  
R Grahame, S Hamilton, E Nash, J Procter,  
K Ritchie, C Towler, P Wadsworth and  
G Wilkinson

### **SITE VISITS**

The Panel site visits were undertaken on the morning of the panel and were attended by Councillors Walshaw, Hamilton, Nash, and Ritchie.

#### **37 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

#### **38 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

On this occasion there were no exempt items.

#### **39 Late Items**

There were no late items.

#### **40 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

#### **41 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr. S McKenna. Cllr. C Towler attended the Panel as substitute.

#### **42 Matters arising**

David Newbury, Group Manager provided the panel with an update on Minute 32 – 16/05185/FU Change of use of ground floor from Doctors surgery/pharmacy to public bar, two storey rear extension; beer garden area; external alterations including new doors and windows, condenser and extraction equipment to roof; new fencing and parking to rear at 39 Austhorpe Road, Cross Gates.

Members were informed that following last Panel an appeal had been lodged against the non-determination of the application. As a consequence of the

appeal the determination no longer rests with the Council but with the Planning Inspectorate.

It was noted that the appeal was yet to be validated by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore the timetable for the submission of the various appeal documents by relevant parties and the formal process of determining the appeal had not commenced.

Members were advised that the appeal was to be dealt with through an exchange of written submissions. It was the intention of the Planning Department, if the appeal timetable allowed to present a report to Panel to agree the reasons upon which the Council will contest the appeal if that was what Members wanted officers to do.

Members were also asked to consider reasons to contest the appeal in the event that the timetable did not allow for a report to be brought to the next Panel.

Members were asked to consider the following reasons:

- Harm to residential amenity including the opening hours of the beer garden and the public house
- Servicing arrangements would be harmful to highway and pedestrian safety

Members expressed their disappointment that Wetherspoon's had taken this approach to appeal for non-determination as Members were of the opinion that they were close to a resolution and were disappointed that Wetherspoon's had not negotiated further on points such as opening hours including the use of the beer garden and the management of servicing the public house.

**RESOLVED** – Members resolved to contest the appeal for the following reasons:

- Harm to residential amenity including the opening hours of the beer garden and the public house
- Servicing arrangements would be harmful to highway and pedestrian safety

Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5 Councillors E Nash, S Hamilton and C Dobson required it to be recorded that they had abstained to vote on the decision as resolved by the Panel.

It was noted that although Councillor Hamilton had not been in attendance at the meeting where the application was heard she had been in attendance at the pre application stage and at the site visit.

Councillor C Towler who was at Panel as a substitute did not take part in the voting as agreed by the Panel as she had not been present at the Panel when the application had been heard.

## 43 Minutes

**RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> August were approved as a correct record.

## 44 **17/02730/FU - 29 Co-housing dwellings and common house, 30 apartments for over 55s and four self-build plots with associated access and landscaping Former Site Of 79, Roundhay Road, LS7**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer application 17/02730/FU related to a mixed residential development including 29 co-housing flats and houses with an associated common house, 30 affordable flats for residents over the age of 55, and 4 self-build houses, on the site of now-demolished Council offices (formerly the Roundhay Barracks buildings) on Roundhay Road in Chapeltown.

Members were informed that since the report had been written it had come to light that the 5 bedroom house proposed as part of the co-housing development and referred to in paragraph 2.3 of the submitted report was to be rented as a house in multiple occupation (HMO). It was noted that the unit was to be rented to 5 unrelated individuals, rather than occupied as a family unit. Members were advised that in the particular circumstances of the application, and in view of the number and mix of units proposed, this would not have any material bearing on the recommendation in the report.

Members were asked to note the following:

- Only one of the 63 units proposed in total and still proposed to be in residential use;
- The incorporation of a shared house with individual rooms for rent contributes positively to the wider mix and range of housing available across the site;
- No material additional environmental or traffic impacts or no material change in number of people living there, and it's part of the co-housing scheme so residents would be required to sign up to the co-housing principles as part of their tenancy (including restrictions on car ownership), which are already proposed to be controlled by condition 5 set out in the submitted report.

Members were advised that the description of the application had been changed to reflect this minor change in agreement with the developer. In the context of the broader scheme and its particular location, and the very minimal nature of the change Members were informed that it was not necessary to re-advertise the change to the description.

Members had visited the site earlier in the day and photographs, plans and maps were displayed at the meeting.

Members were informed of the following:

- No access to the site from Roundhay Road;

- There was a tree preservation order on trees close to the proposed block for over 55's;
- The brick wall to the front of the site was to be retained;
- The co-housing block of 29 units would be at the front of the site;
- Common house with communal dining, laundry and meeting facilities located on the ground floor;
- 4 plots were to be sold to developers;
- The pedestrian route currently runs along-side the proposed over 55's block to be relocated through the middle of the site;
- 3 duplex houses to be located above the common house;

In relation to the submitted report the Panel were provided with a number of updates to matters referred to in the recommendation box as follows:

- Responses had now been received from;
  - Coal Authority – no objection
  - Yorkshire Water – no objection, subject to conditions, one of which echoed the FRM condition already recommended (CO2), and a further one requiring separate systems of foul and SW drainage, which is therefore recommended as an additional condition
  - Revised layout plan received which now addresses highway issues therefore no objections, subject to conditions already recommended in submitted report
  - Revised Travel Plan received and with Travelwise for comments. This would include provision for Travel Plan monitoring fee of £2,500

Members were also advised of a number of updates and clarification on the submitted report as follows:

- Paragraph 2.7 refers to 14 parking spaces being provided for the co-housing part of the development. There will actually be 19 spaces in total including 3 spaces specifically dedicated to the proposed car share club;
- Paragraph 2.12 refers to 15 parking spaces for over 55's flats, it is actually 16;
- Paragraph 2.14 refers to self-build being 3 bed units, they are all 4 bed units, as, referred to in paragraph 10.23;
- Paragraph 7.14 (Neighbourhoods and Housing Consultation) refers to noise report being requested and being considered by Environmental Studies Team. It was clarified that this report had now been received and reviewed by the Environmental Studies Team who have commented as set out in paragraph 7.13 of the submitted report.

A viability report had been attached to the submitted report and the District Valuer was in attendance at the meeting. However on this occasion there were no questions from the Panel on the viability report.

In response to Members questions the Panel were provided with the following information:

- There are currently no No Waiting at Any Time Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) in place close to the site on either Roundhay Road or Barrack Road, but it was not anticipated that future occupiers would park in this location due to the nature of the road when alternative provision was provided within the site. However, it was noted that existing restrictions to parking exist including at crossing points and bus stops. It was noted that if the proposal was granted that a TRO could be added to the conditions if Members were so minded to do so.
- It was noted that the area behind the proposed site was listed as proposed primary and secondary school provision.
- A tree survey had been submitted by the applicant and the small trees shown for removal were not of a sufficient high quality, the proposal is for trees to be planted to replace those removed. It was suggested that fastigate trees be used as these would mitigate leaf fall. It was noted that the co-operative would maintain the landscaped areas.
- The entrance would allow two way passing and the new internal layout complies with street design at 5.5 metres wide sufficient width for two cars to pass. It was clarified that the proposed footway widening along the access route would not be at the expense of the carriageway width.
- A car share scheme operating at a similar co-operative site in Bramley was said to work well. It was also noted that there was to be a large communal bike store and that each unit would have its own bike store.
- There would be electric charging points within the site.
- The co-operative scheme would operate communal recycling and composting.
- It was noted that the development would not be using the District Heating scheme but that the units would be energy efficient. The scheme was still undecided about the use of Photovoltaic Panels.

The Panel were of the opinion that the application had been well thought through.

**RESOLVED** – To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report and following the agreement of the Travel Plan.

Additional condition to be added in respect of separate systems of foul and surface water drainage to be provided.

**45      17/02540/FU - Demolition of existing house and erection of eight flats with basement car parking, landscaping and associated works at Heather Royd, Wigton Lane, Alwoodley, LS17 8SA**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer application 17/02540/FU sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling at Heather Royd, Wigton Lane, Alwoodley, and its replacement with a single building that would contain 8 flats.

Members were informed that the application had been brought to Plans Panel at the request of Cllr Dan Cohen for reasons set out at paragraph 1.1 of the submitted report.

Members were advised that this application differed from a previous application which had been refused due to a belt of trees of 6.5 m in height being along the boundary between the development site and High Ash Drive. The planting and retention of the trees being secured through a unilateral undertaking provided by the applicant.

The application includes the same access proposals and car parking as the previous application. This includes a widened access providing access to underground car parking for residents of the flats with additional parking spaces located within the site for visitors.

It was noted that the proposed building would be larger than that currently on the site and would be over three levels with some accommodation in the roof space. The building would have balconies and terraces which would overlook neighbouring properties.

Members were advised of the recent planning history, of the subsequent appeal and of the Planning Inspectors report which was attached to the submitted report.

The Panel was informed that the applicant had addressed some of the concerns highlighted in the Planning Inspector's report with a proposal for dense mature landscaping around the perimeter to address privacy concerns. The proposal was to plant trees of a sufficient height. The Officer explained that to do this the current building would need to be demolished and the trees craned in and in situ prior to the start of construction. It was noted that maintenance of the trees and landscaped areas would be undertaken by the management company.

A site visit had taken place earlier in the day and plans, maps and photographs were shown at the meeting.

Members were advised that should the application be granted a condition would be added for obscure glazing to be used to screen the side panel of the balconies.

Janine Nelson of 2 High Ash Drive was present at the meeting and addressed the Panel.

She thanked Cllr. Cohen for requesting that the application be heard at Plans Panel.

Ms Nelson said that she had not received notification of the meeting and only knew of it as a neighbour had informed her. She went on to say that the proposed development was first put forward about 5 years ago and had been

withdrawn 3 times with the last time going to appeal at that point she had believed that that was the end of the matter.

She highlighted her concerns in relation to the planting of trees as a screen for the following reasons:

- What type of trees were proposed;
- Many tree types drop their leaves and need clearing;
- The maintenance of the trees;
- What height the trees would grow to;
- Trees have the potential for their roots to damage properties.
- Trees would block out the light

Ms Nelson said that the overall size, mass and bulk would be overbearing and would impact on the enjoyment of the gardens at neighbouring properties.

The Chair asked Ms Nelson what would be her ideal barrier between the development and her property. Ms Nelson was of the opinion that no barrier would hide the fact that there would be a large building behind and would block out light. Ms Nelson explained to Members the direction of the sun on to her garden she said that a barrier of trees would block out the sky light in to her house.

Members were shown a slide which provided them with information on the direction of light into the neighbouring garden. Members were of the opinion that the use of trees as a barrier would not take light from the neighbouring garden.

Ms Nelson also had concerns in relation to loss of privacy due to proximity of the building line, and the proposed balconies and roof gardens.

Andy Rollinson the agent addressed the Panel he was of the view that the report was very comprehensive and addressed the matters raised by Ms Nelson. He said that he understood the concerns of the neighbours and that this scheme would bring some changes. He went on to say that the appeal had been dismissed on a single issue which the applicant had tried to address through discussions with planning officers and landscape officers to come to a solution to properly address matters.

He explained that the proposal was not just a few trees but was a proposal for substantial tree planting and landscaping which would be well maintained and went well beyond what would normally be imposed as part of the conditions. The wording of the condition had been agreed with the planners and legal officers. He said that officers were now satisfied that this barrier would be an appropriate solution and would provide proper screening and mitigate the loss of privacy.

He said that the current building is very close to the boundary whereas the proposed building would be significantly away from the boundary of neighbouring properties.

Mr Rollinson was of the view that the proposed barrier would not cause a loss of light on the long gardens of the neighbouring properties.

Chair asked Mr Rollinson what the barrier would look like in the winter months and was informed that the barrier would be a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees.

Councillor Nash made a suggestion of winter flowering cherry trees as they are full of blossom during the winter months and are fast growing whereas Holly is slow growing. It was noted that the landscape scheme had already been agreed with officers.

Members were advised that the application was the same as proposed earlier but with the addition of a barrier of trees with the unilateral undertaking by the Council that should the trees fail further trees would be planted to maintain the barrier between the development site and the neighbouring properties.

Members discussed at length the following issues:

- The type of trees to be planted;
- The maintenance of the trees;
- The density and height of the trees;
- The height and depth of the proposed building;
- Issues relating to the Inspectors report attached to the submitted report;
- Start and finish times of the construction workers;
- Proposed roof gardens;
- Light direction across development site and impact on neighbouring gardens;
- Whether the height and density of the trees would be oppressive to neighbours;
- Safety and privacy aspects of the balconies including height and use of obscured glass; and
- Members also discussed the points made in the Inspectors Report. It was the view of some Members that the report could be interpreted differently and seemed in conflict with some of the Council's policies.

Members were provided with information relating to their discussions throughout the meeting and included the following:

- Maintenance of proposed trees to be carried out by management company through imposed condition;
- The height of the trees proposed would be to a height of 6.5 metres at planting stage it was noted that some of the proposed trees could grow to a height of 9 or 10 metres;
- Should a tree fail it would be replaced and would be craned in over the roof of the development;



- The direction of light would not impact on neighbouring gardens, slides were shown;
- Overshadowing would affect the units on the development site;
- It was clarified that the roof terraces would be on all sides of the development;
- It was noted that the boundary from the proposed building to the nearest properties located on High Ash Drive and Alwoodley Gates was the same;
- Use of fastigate trees was suggested as these would not grow any higher than 6.5 metres.

During in comments Councillor Procter spoke of his astonishment and outrage at the application to build flats in this area where there were currently no flatted developments. He was of the view that the Inspectors Report could and should be interpreted differently.

Councillor Nash said that issues raised such as loss of view, better site or better use and change from previous scheme were none material matters and that Plans Panels across the city were being asked to consider a number of schemes such as this one. She went on to say that Members could do nothing but ensure that that building did not have adverse effects on other properties. She was of the view that all that could be done had been done.

**RESOLVED** – To grant planning permission subject to conditions set out in the submitted report with additional condition to deal with obscured glazing to the side panels of the balcony as discussed and to limit the times of construction to 08:00am to 17: 00.

Councillor Cleasby requested that the minutes duly showed that the Inspector's statement was in conflict with certain policies of the Council.

**46      17/01896/FU - Change of use from bank (A2) to a bar/restaurant (A3/A4)  
Yorkshire Bank, 53 - 55 Harrogate Road, Moortown, LS7 3PY**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer sought Members consideration on a change of use from bank (A2) to a bar/restaurant (A3/A4) at Yorkshire Bank, 53-55 Harrogate Road, Moortown, Leeds, LS7 3PY.

Members were advised of a change to condition 5 that delivery hours now recommended to only take place between the hours of 06:30 and 07:30.

The application was brought to Plans Panel at the request of Ward Members Councillor Jane Dowson, Councillor Mohammed Rafique and Councillor Eileen Taylor. There concerns were set out at 6.3 of the submitted report.

Members were informed that no operator had been provided by the developer.

Maps, plans and photographs were shown throughout the presentation.

Members noted that an application to English Heritage for the building to become listed had not been forthcoming as it was deemed not coherent enough to be listed and as long as there were no alterations to the outside of the building they had no objection in principle.

Members were informed that it was the aspiration of residents in Chapel Allerton to form a village square and as part of ongoing discussion with developers it had been agreed that a £5,000 contribution towards this scheme through the Section 106 should this proposal be granted. It was the view of officers that this was appropriate as it would create a sitting out area which would benefit the operator.

Members were informed that the change to delivery times was due to the fact that the shops next door had residential properties located above them.

Members were advised that the road at the side of the Yorkshire Bank was not an access road and had been secured as a seating area by Aldi as part of their application it is hoped that this seating area will amalgamate with the village square.

It was noted that an email from Ms Osbourne an objector due to speak at the Panel had been received by Panel Members prior to the meeting which included photographs of the interior of the building.

Ms Christine Osbourne addressed the panel setting out her objections to the building being developed as another bar restaurant.

Ms Osbourne provided Members with a brief overview of Chapel Allerton town centre highlighting the following points:

- The building had a dominant aspect within the town centre;
- The building is located within the Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) area
- 37 food and beverage outlets;
- 80% of the outlets in the area are café bars
- Some food outlets are struggling with a couple currently for sale including Nash's Fish and Chips and Siam Oriental; and
- Pubs in the area are constantly having to find new attractions for customers

Ms Osbourne thought that the views of the Ward Members should be considered.

Ms Osbourne was of the view that the building was an iconic landmark in the town centre. She said that English Heritage had only looked at the building from outside however there were many features inside the building which should be preserved.

Ms Osbourne provided Members with a brief history of the building saying that it had been built in 1935. Ms Osbourne said that although a change of use

would protect the outside of the building she also wanted to protect the interior particularly the domed glass roof.

Ms Osbourne was of the opinion that if a new bar restaurant was to open it could potentially lead to others in the area failing

Ms Osbourne said that a local group CANPLAN had proposed that alternative uses be sought especially in light of the bid for European City of Culture. CANPLAN had proposed that some of the items stored at the art gallery and Henry Moore Centre be displayed there. She said that over a five year period the Council could pay rent for the building which would be £300,000.

When asked what other residents would wish to see on this site Members were informed that they would like to see a small cinema or a community facility such as the Reginald Centre in Chapeltown.

Councillor Dobson said that she knew the building well and would also like to see the interior saved. She suggested that it could be used in a similar way to that of the old fire station at Gipton and asked if there was a local group to save and use this building. No group was suggested.

Ms Osbourne was asked to give her view on the new proposed delivery times. She said that people would drive onto the pavements if they could not park, this would crack the pavements which had only recently been replaced.

Mr Davies, Stoneacre Properties and Mr Singh, KD Properties attended the Panel.

Mr Singh reiterated the points of English Heritage as set out in the submitted report at paragraph 10.3. He said that that without this development the building would remain empty.

Members were informed that the prospective tenant did not wish to be made known at this stage. However, they were able to clarify that the tenant would not be applying for an alcohol licence and that the hours of opening would be not go past 8 or 9pm. The agent was unable to state the exact times that the tenant wanted at this stage.

Members were informed that the applicant would be willing to work with local people to save specific interior features and incorporate them into the new design within reason.

Members asked the agent if the operator would be willing to sign a unilateral undertaking that they would not seek an alcohol licence or late opening hours.

Members were informed by the Legal Officer that in terms of requesting a unilateral undertaking it would need to meet the statutory tests for planning purposes and that what had been suggested related to licensing. It would need to be clear what was licensing and what was planning as they are two separate elements to the process as to how the operator planned to operate

the building. It would therefore depend on what was being proposed could be secured in terms of planning purposes.

Members were informed by the agents that due to the date of the meeting no contract was currently in place, therefore they were unable to agree a unilateral undertaking with the Council in regards to opening hours or licence.

The agents clarified that they had only spoken with Councillor Taylor who had no direct objections and had left telephone messages with the other ward members but with no response.

Both Members and Officers had concerns about the lack of clarity from the applicant on who the operator was to be and the type of outlet proposed.

Members asked that more information be provided and the Chair suggested that this item be deferred for one cycle. Members voted on that proposal.

**RESOLVED** – To defer the application for one cycle to seek further information.

**47     16/07871/FU - Residential development comprising of 27 No. apartments and 15 No. dwelling houses Former Pub, Rathmell Road, Halton, LS15 0NZ**

Prior to the start of Item 10 Councillor John Procter declared that he knew Jerome O'Malley the applicant.

Members were requested to consider the report of the Chief Planning Officer on planning application 16/07871/FU for a residential development comprising of 27 flats and 15 houses with parking and green space at the former public house site, Rathmell Road, Halton.

Members were informed that the former public house was located in the inter-war housing development on Rathmell Road

It was noted that the application was brought to Panel as the proposal was a departure from the adopted development plan as housing was proposed on parts of the site that was formally designated as N1 Greenspace within the saved UDP (review).

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day and maps, plans and photographs were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were informed that the current building was in a dilapidated state and that there were issues of anti-social behaviour around the site.

The main access point would be located off Rathmell Road this would be unaltered so as not to be used as 'rat run' through the site. A public right of way through the site would remain.

The pre application had requested 72 properties however after discussions this had now been reduced to 42 with a proposal of 27 flats and 15 houses. All the houses would have parking to the rear of the property with sufficient parking for the flats and visitors.

The development would be a mix of 2, 3, and 4 bed properties, with one detached property and 2 affordable houses. All the dwellings complied with space standards policy.

Contributions had been secured and consultation with Ward Members was due to take place to discuss potential greenspace projects to land off Coronation Parade and or landscaping works to Beck Fields LNR to include signage, planting and access improvements and or as a contribution towards improving the linear POS to the rear of the development site in the way of funding towards access / path improvements, landscaping and signage.

Members were informed that specific details were still to be discussed.

**RESOLVED** - To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer as set out in the submitted report.

**48      17/01319/OT - Outline application for public house and associative car parking, landscaping and infrastructure Coal Road, LS14 1NW**

Members were asked to consider the outline application for a public house and associative car parking, landscaping and infrastructure on land at Coal Road, Whinmoor, LS14 1NW.

Members were informed that this was an application by Samuel Smith Brewery who had built similar pubs elsewhere on similar sized plots.

Members were advised that notwithstanding the indicative plan, the application was in outline with all matters reserved including access, layout and car parking.

Members were advised that there had been a lot of discussion with regard to the layout of the junction in this area. Outside of the planning process the highway authority had agreed that the priority junction would be removed and a mini roundabout reinstated. Officers advised that since the writing of this report the roundabout had now been implemented.

Members were also advised that although the application formed part of the wider East Leeds Extension housing allocations, this application did not form part of the Northern Quadrant planning application for 2000 dwellings, primary school and associated uses that surrounds the site and forms part of the ELE.

It was noted that concerns had been expressed about the siting of a public house adjacent to the land set aside for the proposed Northern Quadrant primary school. The Panel was informed that intervening land in front of the school was proposed for housing development.

The proposal indicatively shows 60 parking spaces with manager's accommodation above the pub.

Cllr. Peter Gruen had requested that the Panel consider the application with regards to concerns expressed by local residents about highway issues they were as follows:

- Interested in when a start on site might be planned as at present there were not sufficient houses close by for walking trade so car borne trade would be needed;
- The potential closure of Coal Road would affect the volume of traffic flows on Coal Road so timing was important
- Mini roundabout had been re-instated
- In view of additional development planned for the area, a signalled junction was not 'excessive'. A part contribution could be requested.
- Resident's concerns about noise should be valued and assurances were needed of detailed layout with the proviso that any outside facility should be positioned well away from existing properties

The Officer suggested that the Brewery may wait for the Northern Quadrant development to be completed before starting any building.

The Panel noted that the application would provide Section 106 contributions towards parks in the area.

It was noted that 1 further objection had been received with concerns raised as follows:

- Concern about the lack of consulting and notification;
- Increase in traffic, especially during the evening near to an accident black spot;
- Possibility of rowdy behaviour from patrons late at night;
- Traffic noise;
- Concerned Sam Smiths properties were not looked after and often appear run down very quickly; and
- Lack of parking

Members were advised that 2 more letters in support of the application had been received saying:

- Proposals were very similar to many other pubs and would boost the local economy
- Would serve the future housing proposals
- Relationship to future school buildings not a real concern.

In response to Members questions in relation to the access point the Highways Officer said that access could be off either Coal Road or Skelton Lane, however all reserved matters would be considered at the point of application. Members were also advised that the current applications for the Northern Quadrant and East Leeds Orbital Route would potentially improve conditions at the junction should these applications be approved.

The Chair was of the view that the access point would be better off Skelton Lane as there was large planting which would provide a buffer. He also suggested that the beer garden might be better located facing south.

Members were informed that the properties along Skelton Lane had large back gardens and were sheltered by trees.

Councillor Procter praised the Samuel Smith's application in this area as the land had been in the ownership of the brewery for a number of years.

**RESOLVED** – To grant permission subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report.

#### **49 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

To note that the next meeting of the North and East Plans Panel will be on Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017 at 1:30pm in the Civic Hall.