

# Minutes of Previous Meetings

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

FRIDAY 10 JANUARY 2020 AT 10.00 AM

**PRESENT:** Councillor Tinnion (Chair), Councillors Birks, Mrs Bradley (as substitute for Councillor Patrick), Brown, Christian, Collier, Mrs Glendinning, Meller (as substitute for Councillor Tarbitt) Morton, Nedved, Rodgerson and Shepherd.

**OFFICERS:** Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services  
Corporate Director of Economic Development  
Development Manager  
Mr Allan – Flood Development Management Officer – Cumbria County Council  
Principal Planning Officer  
Planning Officer x 4  
Planning Landscapes and Compliance Enforcement Officer

ALSO

**PRESENT:** Councillor Allison (Ward Member) attended the meeting having registered a Right to Speak in respect of application 19/0193 – St. Michaels and All Angels Church, The Square, Dalston, Carlisle, CA5 7PJ.

### **DC.004/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillors Patrick and Tarbitt.

### **DC.005/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct the following declaration of interest was submitted:

Councillor Tinnion declared an interest in respect of agenda item A.3 – TPO 303 – Land at Hayton, Brampton. The interest related to predetermination.

### **DC.006/20 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

### **DC.007/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED 1) That the minutes of the meetings held on 9 October (site visits), 11 October, 20 November (site visits) and 22 November 2019 be signed by the Chairman.

2) That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 January 2020 (site visits) be approved.

### **DC.008/20 PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS IN RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services outlined, for the benefit of those members of the public present at the meeting, the procedure to be followed in dealing with rights to speak.

## **DC.009/20 CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT AND ADVERTISING**

1) That the applications referred to in the Schedule of Applications under A be approved/refused/deferred, subject to the conditions as set out in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

### **1. Erection of 1no. Dwelling, L/A rear of Walton Parish Church, Walton, Brampton, CA8 2DH (Application 19/0494).**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been deferred by Members at the 22 November 2019 meeting of the Committee.

Following the deferral discussions had taken place between Barron Wright Partnership drainage engineers and United Utilities which had confirmed that due to the clay nature of the soil a soakaway was not an option.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that he had spoken to United Utilities before the meeting and advised that, given the small size of the plot the consequent small volume of run-off it would generate, permission to connect to the sewer would be granted. It was further anticipated that some attenuation was able to be provided on-site, the details of which would need to be agreed with United Utilities and Building Control.

Slides were displayed on screen showing: proposed block and section plans; proposed elevation plans; drainage plan; drainage block plan; cross section plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

Additional conditions had been incorporated into the Consent requiring: a condition survey of the Village Green to be carried out prior to commencement and; the submission of details relating to the proposed retaining walls to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

The Principal Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member expressed disappointment that United Utilities had not responded in writing, he asked the Principal Planning Officer whether he was satisfied with the drainage proposals.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that he was satisfied with the drainage proposals, and in response to a further comment from the Member undertook to ensure that the drainage plan published on the Council's website was correctly titled.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation, which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

### **2. Erection of 4no. dwellings, Land to the rear of 44 Scotby Road, Scotby, Carlisle, CA4 8BD (Application 19/0493).**

The Development Manager submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 7 January 2020.

Slides were displayed on screen showing: block plan; location plan; floor plans; house type plans; junction plans; cross section; location plan; site plans; and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

Outline Planning Permission was granted in 2018 which approved the access point and restricted development of the site to one dwelling. Further to the granting of Consent, works were undertaken at the site, principally the removal of planting and shrubs, which had impacted on the appearance and feel of the area. The Development Manager displayed a number of slides on screen which illustrated the previous state of the site in order to assist Members in understanding the comments of some objectors who had raised the issue.

The matter of building in gardens was an issue raised by the proposed scheme and had been discussed in the report, the Development Manager reminded Members that local and national planning policy allowed such development,

During the Committee's site visit, the Parish Council noted that there was no condition relating to foul drainage contained in the permission. In the event of the application being approved, the Development Manager advised that it would be appropriate to incorporate such a condition.

In conclusion, the Development Manager recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the report, and the imposition of a further condition requiring the submission of details of the method of foul drainage to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Mr Brader (Objector) objected to the application in the following terms: there was no justification for the increase of proposed dwellings from 1 to 4; the scheme was not compliant with Local Plan policies HO 2 – Windfall Housing Development, HO 3 – Housing in Residential Gardens, and SP 6 – Good Design; vehicle lights using the access would disturb residents in adjacent properties.

Ms Howard (Agent) responded in the following terms: the scheme provided sustainable, high environmental standard development within a well contained site on brown field land; the principle of development was already accepted; plot 4 provided an end-stop feature to the development without being visually dominant; the applicant had agreed to provide an additional 1.2 metres of fencing to prevent light spill in the access area; additional planting would be provided at the site.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

In response to questions from Members the Development Manager advised that:

- The Phillip Morris Standard and Leonard Bernstein Principle were design standards for house builders;
- An energy efficiency rating of A meant that a property was towards the highest end of the scale;
- Although no hammerhead was included in the design of the development, hard surface parking areas were available for vehicles to carry out manoeuvres.

A Member expressed concerns that the steep gradient of the site down as it sloped towards the beck, which had been seen as very wet during the site visit, despite little earlier rainfall. He asked what the likelihood was of flooding occurring at the site.

The Development Manager confirmed that the beck did flood which had the potential to impact the lower levels of the site. A number of drainage methods were feasible including connecting into the existing sewer network which would require the use of pumping mechanisms. Discharge into the adjacent beck, following processing in a treatment plant was a further option, were that to

be implemented, outflow from the site would be restricted to existing levels, plus an allowance for Climate Change.

In relation to policy HO 6 – Other Housing in Open Countryside a Member questioned whether plots 3 and 4 were considered to be sited in open countryside.

The Development Manager responded that it was difficult to define garden and countryside in this case as the site was well contained within existing hedging, as such they were able to be considered the boundary. Conversely, the large size of the site contained a more formally structured garden area in proximity to existing dwelling, with a more open area on the slope running towards the beck. The judgement of whether the site was a garden or in open countryside was for Members' to determine. The Development Manager was of the view that the scheme did not extend beyond other development in the village, therefore it was not in open countryside.

The Committee discussed the matter and expressed particular concerns in relation to the location of the proposed dwelling on plot 4 which was some distance from the existing property. During the site visit the Committee observed the proximity of plot 4 to the beck and the less dense hedge and tree coverage in that area which had led a number of Members to consider that part of the development to be in open countryside.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that, given the nature of the discussion and Members concerns, the Committee may wish to consider deferring the application in order for Officers to discuss those matters with the applicant/agent.

A Member moved that the application be deferred in order for Officer to discuss the Committee's concerns regarding the proposed plot 4 development. The proposal was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That determination of the application be deferred in order for discussions to be held with the applicant/agent in relation to the Committee's concerns regarding the proposed Plot 4 and to await a further report on the application at a future meeting of the Committee.

**3. Erection of extension to provide Library, Function Room and Entrance; Conversion of existing Vestry to form new accessible toilet, office and kitchen and alterations to the existing WC to provide Vestry and accessible toilet, St. Michaels and All Angels Church, The Square, Dalston, Carlisle, CA5 7PJ (Application 19/0193).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan; site plan and elevation plans; revised ground floor plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The proposed extension was to be a multi-functional space providing an area for church related activities as well as the library facility. Part of the development was to be within the Root Protection Zone of the trees at the site, however, the extension was to be constructed from post and beam foundations which would limit any impact upon the tree roots.

The design of the extension and pallet of materials were sympathetic to the existing building and the style of buildings in the vicinity of the site which included a number of Listed Buildings.

The Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Councillor Allison (Ward Member) addressed the Committee and noted that the proposed scheme aimed to ensure that the church remained a working facility in the village. The proposal had wide community support and the design had been revised to ensure it was sympathetic to the existing building and to limit its wider visual impact.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A number of Members expressed concerns regarding the necessity of disturbing graves to accommodate the scheme. It was noted that the issue was a matter requiring Ecclesiastical Consent which would be considered by the appropriate organisation.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

#### **4. Erection of 1no. Dwelling, Land adjacent to Hillcrest, Milton, Brampton, CA8 1HS (Application 19/0184).**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan; block plan; proposed floor plans; proposed elevation plans; section plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

Following the granting of Outline Planning Permission in July 2018, it became apparent that the route of the foul water pipeline through the site was plotted incorrectly on the United Utilities' sewer maps. This had major implication for the siting of a dwelling at the site which effectively meant the only viable location was as per the current proposal.

The Principal Planning Officer noted that the location of the proposed dwelling was not ideal. However, taking into account the improved design, lowered levels and proposed boundary treatments he judged the proposal to be acceptable.

Condition 20 of the proposed permission was not required as it related to larger housing developments, as such it the Principal Planning Officer recommended that it be removed from any Consent granted.

The Principal Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to the imposition of conditions detailed in the report, with the exception of Condition 20 which was to be removed.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded at it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

#### **5. Erection of Dwellings, (Outline) Land adjacent to Fair Lea, Moorhouse, Carlisle, CA5 6EL (Application 19/0517).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan, proposed block plan, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

Burgh by Sands Parish Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds of: the site not being allocated for residential development in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 – 30 (Local Plan) and, the overall amount of development in the village. The Planning Officer reminded Members that policy allowed for the development of Windfall Sites, therefore the site not being allocated was not an appropriate reason to refuse the application.

In terms of the extent of development in the village, neither the National Planning Policy Framework nor the Local Plan imposed a limit on the percentage or proportional increase over the level of allocated development in the Local Plan. Any proposed development out with the allocated sites was required to pass the tests whether the scale and design of the proposed development would be appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the settlement. Those matters were fully discussed within the report and had been judged to be acceptable.

The submitted plans took into account highway issues and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties would not be prejudiced subject to the imposition of conditions. The means of foul and surface water drainage were able to be suitably addressed through the imposition of planning conditions. On that basis, the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

**6. Removal of condition 7 of previously approved application 19/0360 for the requirement to install a Package Treatment Plant to facilitate the increased number of pitches, Green Meadows Caravan Park, Blackford, Carlisle, CA6 4EA (Application 19/0670).**

The Development Manager submitted the report on the application and provided an overview of the determination of earlier applications which had culminated in the imposition of a condition requiring a new foul drainage biosystem to be fully operational prior to the occupation of the eleventh static holiday unit (condition originally attached to permission 17/0075). The site location plan was displayed on screen.

The applicant had subsequently commissioned a Civil Engineer to assess the drainage capacity of the existing foul drainage plant, the results of which were detailed in full at paragraph 6.8 of the report. The findings had been considered by the Council's Building Control's Business Development Manager who confirmed:

- the serviceability of the existing plant and the quality of its discharge had been adequately addressed;
- the capacity of the existing plant was sufficient to accommodate the increased number of caravans and tents.

Accordingly, the Development Manager advised that condition 7 imposed in planning approval 19/0360 was now unnecessary and could therefore be removed from the current permission. Furthermore, the Development Manager advised that condition 3 contained a reference to policy EC10 which was part of the Local Plan 2001 – 2016, which had been superseded and as such ought to be removed from the permission.

The Development Manager recommended that the application be approved subject to the imposition of conditions detailed in the report, with condition 7 being removed and condition 3 being amended to remove the reference to policy EC10.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the issue of an existing smell at the site, the Development Manager advised that the Council's Environmental Health team and the Environment Agency were investigating the matter.

A Member sought clarification on the reason for the removal of condition 7 imposed under application 19/0360.

The Development Manager explained the permitting process that the applicant would need to undertake with the Environment Agency negated the need for the condition. In the event of the drainage system not meeting the requirements of the Environment Agency permits, that organisation was able to require the applicant to install a foul drainage biosystem, therefore condition 7 was not necessary.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation and the proposal was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

**7. Conversion of rear of Church (existing extension) to 1no. dwelling including provision of external roof terrace, Old Methodist Church, Albert Street, Longtown, Carlisle, CA6 5SF (Application 19/0606).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan; site plan; elevation plans; section plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The Highway Authority had raised several issues in response to the consultation on the application that culminated in an objection. The first issue related to the pedestrian visibility splays: the Planning Officer noted that the existing access arrangements were to be retained by the proposed development.

The second matter related to the intensification of the use of the site and the resulting increase in parking demand. Were Members to consider that would occur as a result of the development, the Planning Officer advised that, it is a matter of judgement as to whether the displacement would have a negative effect on the surrounding highway network and parking facilities. On balance, given the scale and nature of the development, it was considered acceptable in this instance.

In terms of the remainder of the building, the applicant had confirmed that it was not their intention to allow the continued use of the building as a church. Were an alternative use to be sought, Planning Permission would be required, with any future application being considered on its merits.

The Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to the imposition of conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

**8. Variation of condition 2 (Approved Documents) of previously approved application 18/1088 (Erection of 24no. Dwellings and associated infrastructure) to amend the site layout and finished floor levels, Land adjacent to King Edward Fauld, Burgh by Sands, Carlisle, CA5 6AR (Application 19/0851).**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: site location plan; proposed site plan; drainage strategy plan, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

Further to the granting of Planning Consent in 2018, United Utilities had requested that the approved pumping station be replaced with a gravity system which would be more reliable and sustainable. In order for the new system to be incorporated, the finished floor levels of a number of properties within the development needed to be increased. Plots 14 to 16 lay to the rear of existing dwellings on King Edwards Fauld and the finished floor levels of those dwellings would be increased by between 0.75m and 1.05m.

The Principal Planning Officer considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on the occupiers of existing dwellings, accordingly, he recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member commented that a short time had elapsed since the determination of the original scheme and the current application. Whilst he understood that it was standard practice for the details of drainage systems to be submitted for approval following permission being granted, he considered that process to be unsatisfactory. Finished floor levels had been an issue for Members at the time of the earlier application and he was very concerned that a variation had been requested so quickly.

The Principal Planning Officer responded that the detail of the design had been required to evolve in response to a request from a Technical Consultee. The single storey nature of the dwellings and their orientation led the Principal Planning Officer to consider the proposal acceptable.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development added that whilst she appreciated the Members' point, the authority was dependent on United Utilities in drainage matters. The Council had written to United Utilities on the issue previously, however, the organisation considered the current arrangement acceptable.

A Member asked why the drainage system approved by the Committee had not been acceptable.

Mr Allan (Cumbria County Council) explained that a pumping station was considered the worst drainage option. Such systems required human input, whereas the system required by United Utilities would be self-maintaining.

In response to a further question from a Member regarding the surface water drainage arrangements, Mr Allan outlined the system which was to comprise a soakaway and attenuation mechanisms. In the event of flooding occurring at the management company for the development would be responsible for ensuring the necessary remedial action was taken.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes

**9. Demolition of Whitehorse Centre and erection of 5no. employment units and external compound area, Whitehorse Centre, Tyne Street, Carlisle, CA1 2NP (Application 19/0814).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan; block plan; existing elevations; proposed site plan; proposed elevation and floor plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The site lay just outside the Settle to Carlisle Railway Line Conservation Area, however, in recognition of the building's architectural and historic interest the applicant had submitted a 60 page document providing a photographic record of the building with a view to complying with condition 3. The Council's Historic Environment Officer had confirmed that more information would be required to satisfy this and as such, the Planning Officer advised that the condition should remain.

The redevelopment of the site would expand the range of employment facilities on land which was previously used for commercial purposes and was well related to buildings that were currently in commercial use. As such, the principle of development was supported by the NPPF and local planning policies.

The proposal had not raised any highway, biodiversity or drainage issues. Accordingly, the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

Members expressed disappointment that whilst objections to the application had been received on the grounds that the proposal necessitated the loss of a building of architectural and historical importance in the area, no interest in the building had been forthcoming prior to the submission of plans to demolish it. However, the Committee recognised the need for employment sites and welcomed the area being brought back into use.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

**10. Display of freestanding sign, Land adjacent to Hunters Crescent, Garlands Road, Carlisle (Application 19/0852).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan, plan showing the dimensions and design of the signage, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The Planning Officer highlighted the different nature of the housebuilder signs and the proposed directional sign, consequently he considered there was sufficient justification for the use of the directional sign. Condition 1 restricted the maximum duration of the display of the sign up, as up

until 2025, the proposal would not therefore have any permanent impact upon the amenity of the surrounding area.

The Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes

**11. Demolition of garage and erection of two storey side extension to provide garage/utility on the ground floor with en-suite bedroom above, 25 Caldew Drive, Carlisle, CA5 7NS (Application 19/0879).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application. Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan; elevation plans; floor plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members. The application was presented to Committee due to the applicant being an employee of Carlisle City Council.

The Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes

**DC.010/20 SCHEDULE B**

RESOLVED: That the items in Schedule B be noted.

**DC.011/20 CONSULTATION ON APPLICATION 19/9012/CTY – CARLISLE SOUTHERN LINK ROAD**

The Development Manager submitted report ED.01/20 which set out the proposed response of Carlisle City Council as Local Planning Authority on an application from Cumbria County Council for the construction of Carlisle Southern Link Road (CSLR).

Slides were displayed on screen showing: Stage 1 route options; site plan; layout plans, site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Supplementary Schedule which contained a series of drawings, in A3 format, related to the proposal. The full application was accompanied by a series of technical reports and an Environmental Impact Assessment. The Development Manager set out: how the route for road had been selected; the start and end points; the path of the route; the location and arrangement of roundabouts; the drainage infrastructure related to the road, and the location of the construction compounds.

The report detailed the main issues relating to the scheme with the City Council's proposed response contained in paragraph 5.1 of the report. The Development Manager explained that the matters identified in proposed response were those that the City Council would likely consider were it the determining authority, however, in this case it was acting as a consultee.

The Development Manager recommended that the observations set out in paragraph 5.1 of the report be submitted to Cumbria County Council' consultation on the application, and he invited the Committee to make observations and comments for inclusion in the City Council's submission.

The Committee welcomed and expressed their support for the proposed scheme. Members requested that the following points be added to the City Council's response:

- That consideration be given to the cycle path(s) on the M6 junction 42 roundabout;
- That those companies and organisations involved in delivering the scheme look to off-set the carbon emissions generated through their work;
- Paragraph 1.15 of the report stated that a Preferred Option for the St. Cuthbert's Garden Village had been selected.

The Development Manager noted the masterplanning work in respect of St. Cuthbert's Garden Village was ongoing, with a Preferred Option yet to be settled upon. The Garden Village would increase the volume of traffic on the CSLR, but until the final location of the settlement(s) was decided it was not known which junctions would require the greatest capacity.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED – That the observations set out in paragraph 5.1, of the report, and the issues set out above, be submitted to Cumbria County Council' consultation on the application.

#### **DC.012/20 TPO 303 – LAND AT HAYTON, BRAMPTON**

*Councillor Tinnion having declared an interest in relation to the item of business removed himself from his seat and took no part on the discussion nor determination of the matter.  
Councillor Mrs Glendinning assumed the role of Chair of the meeting.*

The Planning/Landscape Compliance and Enforcement Officer submitted report ED.02/20 which considered the confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 303 – Land at Hayton, Brampton, in light of objections received to the making of the Order.

Following a request from residents an assessment of trees was carried out with those being judged as meriting protection being comprised within Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 303. In response to the consultation on the making of the Order, two objections were received in relation to trees T1 and T5, details of which were set out in the report. The Planning/Landscapes Compliance and Enforcement Officer advised that whilst trees T1 and T5 were judged to be worthy of protection, government guidance stated that where good management was in place, an Order may not be expedient. Accordingly, the Officer recommended that the Order be modified to remove

It was noted that the title of the report differed slightly from that of the Tree Preservation Order which was TPO 303 – Land at Hayton Village, Carlisle. Furthermore, the Officer stated that the grid references relating to the location of a number of trees subject to the Order required amendment to ensure that there was no doubt which trees were protected.

The Planning/Landscape Compliance and Enforcement Officer recommended that Tree Preservation Order 303 – Land at Hayton Village, Carlisle be confirmed with the following modifications:

- a) That trees T1 and T5 be removed from the Order;

b) That the grid references of the remaining trees be amended.

Councillor Tinnion (Ward Member) addressed the Committee and stated that none of the trees subject to the Order required such protection for the following reasons: T1 was an ancient monument situated on the Village Green and was managed and maintained by Hayton Parish Council; the remaining trees were not under threat of development. On that basis he did not view the confirmation of the Order as expedient or necessary.

The Committee then gave consideration to the confirmation of the Order.

A Member sympathised with the request for the Order to be made and commented that Committee all too often saw trees removed from sites in order to facilitate development.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED – That Tree Preservation Order 303 – Land at Hayton Village, Carlisle be confirmed with the following modifications:

- a) That trees T1 and T5 be removed from the Order;
- b) That the grid references of the remaining trees be amended.

[The meeting closed at 12:45pm]