

# Erratum

## LA01/2023/0417/F

### 1.0 Update

- 1.1 Bullet Point 3 of the Executive Summary to the Committee report reads:

“The proposal is considered to be contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY4 of PPS21.”

This should state the following:

“The proposal is considered to be contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS.”

- 1.2 Paragraph 8.10 of the Committee report reads:

“The agent argues that while the buildings are of no architectural merit in terms of their style etc., the buildings meet criteria K in terms of architectural interest in that the buildings have group value when considered with the other buildings on the site. Additionally, it is argued that the buildings are of historical interest in terms of their authenticity and age.”

This should state the following:

“The agent argues that while the buildings are of no special architectural merit in terms of their style etc., the buildings meet criteria K in terms of architectural interest in that the buildings have group value when considered with the other buildings on the site. Additionally, it is argued that the buildings are of historical interest in terms of their authenticity and age.”

## **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.