

Erratum

LA01/2023/0583/O

1.0 Update

1.1 Paragraph 1.1 of the Committee report reads:

“That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

This should state the following:

“That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

1.2 The last sentence within Paragraph 8.7 of the Committee report reads:

“The application site would not, when considered with the adjacent site (LA01/2023/0583/O), represent a small gap site capable of accommodating a maximum of two dwellings when respecting the other properties in the built-up frontage, and would therefore fail to comply with Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY8.”

This should state the following:

“The application site would not, when considered with the adjacent site (LA01/2023/0582/O), represent a small gap site capable of accommodating a maximum of two dwellings when respecting the

other properties in the built-up frontage, and would therefore fail to comply with Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY8.”

- 1.2 The second sentence within Paragraph 8.11 of the Committee report reads:

“The eastern boundary of the site is defined by a low level concrete wall some 1 metre in height while the southern boundary is delineated by post and wire fencing and sporadic fencing, most of which is likely to have to be removed to facilitate access, which will further open views into the site when passing the site frontage.”

This should state the following:

“The eastern boundary of the site is defined by a low level concrete wall some 1 metre in height while the southern boundary is delineated by post and wire fencing and sporadic hedgerow, most of which is likely to have to be removed to facilitate access, which will further open views into the site when passing the site frontage.”

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee agrees with the recommendation to refuse as outlined in paragraph 1.0 of the Planning Committee Report.