

Planning Committee
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Lerwick
Tuesday 5 June 2018 at 2pm

Present:

M Bell	S Coutts
E Macdonald	D Sandison
C Smith	T Smith

Apologies:

A Manson	D Simpson
G Smith	

In Attendance (Officers):

I McDiarmid, Executive Manager – Planning
J Holden, Team Leader – Development Management
C Gair, Traffic Engineer
Y Goudie, Planning Officer
D Hunter, Planning Officer
P Sutherland, Solicitor
L Adamson, Committee Officer

Chair

Mr T Smith, Chair of the Planning Committee, presided.

Circular

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

Declarations of Interest

None.

05/18 **Minutes**

The Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 10 April 2018 on the motion of Mr Sandison, seconded by Ms Macdonald.

Local Review under Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) to be considered by the Planning Committee sitting as Local Review Body:

The Chair advised that for the following item on the agenda the Planning Committee will be sitting as the Local Review Body (LRB), and will follow the guidance as provided in Section 4 of the covering report. The process will take the form of a Hearing, where the Planning Officer who handled the case will make a presentation on matters to be considered. Thereafter persons entitled to make representations can address the Hearing. Further to that, the applicant/agent will then be given the opportunity to present their case, and all will be restricted to a time limit of five minutes. Members can ask questions after each presentation, and when questions are completed, Members will debate the proceedings and make a decision.

The Chair advised that the decision of the LRB is full and final. Should the appellant be

aggrieved by the decision, the only recourse is to the Court of Session in respect of the handling by the LRB.

The Chair advised that the LRB would be given the opportunity to decide if a Site Visit is required to determine the application.

06/18 **Local Review Ref: 2017/213/PPF - LR32 - Change of Use of Land, Excavation to form car parking, turning and platform with access to public road and to construct general purpose storage shed Class 6: North Strom, Stromfirth, Weisdale.**

The Committee considered a report by the Team Leader – Development Management [RECORD Appendix 1] for a decision following a Local Review.

In response to a question from the Chair, the LRB unanimously agreed that a site visit was not necessary to determine the application.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer who dealt with the application to make a presentation to the LRB.

The Planning Officer (D Hunter) gave a presentation which illustrated the following:

- Application site
- Aerial views
- Site Plan
- Site Plan – Cross Sections
- Elevations of the proposed building
- Reasons for Refusal
- The Appeal Summary
- Responses to Appeal Summary - Open Crofting Land
 - Other Development Precedents
 - Goods Vehicles
- Key Issues

The Planning Officer advised on the application site and the proposals for the building to be 24 metres x 6 metres, which would require excavation of 5.2 metres into the hillside. He outlined the reason for refusal of the application, being the inappropriate location for industrial development, namely that “Business and industrial developments should be located in sites with Development Potential for industry, industrial areas, brownfield sites or within settlements unless a sufficient justification has been provided for the use of an alternative site. The proposal is located on greenfield open crofting land which is not within a settlement and while justification has been provided for the location it does not provide sufficient material weight for the choice of location for the development. The proposed development is contrary to LDP Policies GP1, GP2, EP1 and ED2.

In referring to the Appeal Summary slide, the Planning Officer advised on the following points:

1. Not greenfield open crofting land because it is decrofted and had permission for a dwellinghouse (2009/187/PCO).

2. Planning Permission granted for a salmon hatchery in Stromfirth Valley. Permission granted for vehicle repair workshop at Brunt Hamarsland at Girlsta which is served by a poorer quality road.
3. Willing to accept planning conditions requiring rigid goods vehicles only.

In responding to the point raised above at No. 1, in terms of Open Crofting Land, the Planning Officer referred to section ED1 "Support for Business and Industry" in the LDP 2014, which includes the statement, "Residentially compatible development will be encouraged within settlements throughout Shetland in order to contribute to the development of strong, healthy, vibrant and sustainable rural communities", and to Section ED2, "The Council will support proposals for retail and commercial business developments that promote employment opportunities, community benefits, rural diversification and tourism related ventures and contribute to the viability of existing settlements where they comply with General Policies, and do not conflict with residential amenity". The Planning Officer also referred the draft Supplementary Guidance SGED1 Industrial areas and Sites with Development Potential, highlighting the statement that, The development of new, or extensions to existing, business and industrial enterprises in Classes 4, 5 and 6 will be supported within the defined industrial areas, sites with development potential for business and industry and brownfield sites where the proposal meets all relevant policies set out within the Plan and corresponding Supplementary Guidance. He advised that the applicant had been asked to provide a justification for the proposed site at Stromfirth, and to refer the specific policies and guidance. He said that the applicant advised that having considered sites with development potential within the LDP, these were however considered to be too expensive, not central enough, sites already developed or no sites listed. The Planning Officer advised that there had been no consideration of other industrial sites, brownfield sites or sites within settlements, and no reference given to industrial policies or guidance.

In referring to the draft Supplementary Guidance SGED3, "Business and Industry Proposals in the Open Countryside", the Planning Officer advised that "proposals for the development of new, or extensions to existing business and industrial development in the open countryside will only be permitted where, the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed development cannot be located within a defined industrial area, a site with industrial development potential of an existing settlement; the possibility of re-using suitable existing redundant buildings and brownfield sites has been considered and proven to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority to be impracticable, the criteria for development outlined in SGED2 can be fully met, and if appropriate, restoration proposals which enhance biodiversity are agreed at the application stage." The Planning Officer stated that the Planning Service consider that these points have not been addressed, and therefore the application was refused.

Referring to the second point raised in the Appeal Summary, the Planning Officer advised that there have been other buildings approved in the area however each application has to be considered on its own merits. In that regard, he advised that the salmon hatchery requires a rural location, and that the Workshop at Brunt Hamarsland was for agricultural use only. Referring to the third part of the Appeal Summary, the Planning Officer advised on the applicant's willingness to accept planning conditions requiring rigid goods vehicles only. He reported however that such a requirement had not formed part of the Planning Service' reason for refusal. He added however, that should the application be granted the LRB may wish to consider if such a condition would be appropriate.

In concluding his presentation, the Planning Officer advised on the options open to the LRB, namely to either uphold the appeal and grant the application, or support the recommendation to refuse the application.

The Chair thanked the Planning Officer for his presentation, and welcomed questions from Members.

During the discussion, clarity was sought from the Planning Officer on his definition of a settlement, and for further explanation as to why Stromfirth is not considered to be a settlement. The Planning Officer said that in Shetland a settlement is difficult to define, however in referring to the application, he advised that there are three houses at a distance of 234m, 347m and 355m from the proposed development site, which he would not consider to be a cluster development nor a settlement. In response to further questions, the Planning Officer said he would not define Stromfirth as any type of area, but added that each case is dealt with on a case by case basis. In responding to a question regarding designated industrial sites within the area, the Planning Officer advised that there are specific sites identified by landowners in the Local Plan for industrial use, however he advised that it is for the applicant to identify appropriate sites and that such proposals would be considered.

In response to a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that Supplementary Guidance Business and Industry was still a draft document. It was however a material consideration when determining applications.

In referring to the industrial sites in the central mainland, the Chair sought clarity on the status of the industrial units at Tingwall Airport. The Planning Officer confirmed there were a number of industrial units at Tingwall Airport, and advised that any applications for proposed development at the units could be looked at separately.

The Chair thanked the Planning Officer.

There had been no representation on this application, and the Chair invited the applicant/agent to address the meeting.

Mr A Miller advised that he was the voluntary Chairperson of Shetland Heatwise Ltd., a community business that had been established 25 years ago, providing energy efficiency solutions to housing throughout Shetland. He advised that the proposed shed would make Shetland Heatwise more efficient as materials are currently being stored within a number of containers. He reported that the site identified at Stromfirth had planning permission for a house, there is LEADER funding for the project, which is seen as a spend to save for Shetland Heatwise as it will be cheaper and more money can be spent on insulating homes.

Mr K Rennie, Manager, Shetland Heatwise, advised that the proposed shed would improve efficiency as the company would be able to buy in and store more material. He advised that their previous store had to be pulled down and they have had to store materials in various containers in Lerwick. The proposed site at Stromfirth would be affordable for Shetland Heatwise and it fits into the plans for LEADER funding, and the proposed shed would be similar to the agricultural shed in the area. Mr Rennie advised that he lived in the community of Stromfirth, which he said was very much a community, and there have been no objections from local people and the community has been very encouraging. Mr Rennie advised that they would look to have a tidy site. They propose to develop some small scale renewables, and the site would be ideal as there is an old house nearby which they could renovate as an energy

efficiency project. He added that there was a lot of potential for the company in saving energy. Mr Rennie advised that there would be less travelling time for staff, and not the hustle and bustle to drive to Lerwick, and the location of the store would improve efficiency as more work could be done.

The Chair thanked Mr Rennie, and invited questions from Members.

In referring to the potential sites listed in the LDP which had been investigated by Shetland Heatwise at page 23 of the agenda pack, Ms Macdonald suggested that the use of an industrial site in the North Mainland could reduce travel time when staff are working in the North Isles. Mr Rennie explained that a store in the North Mainland would result in an increased amount of travelling when work is not in the North Mainland or in the North Isles, and that is where the smaller percentage of their work takes place. He added that when there are projects in the North Isles, the workforce would tend to stay in the North isles.

In noting that Shetland Heatwise had investigated a number of sites with development potential for industry, Mr Coutts asked whether any alternative sites had been investigated in any industrial areas, brownfield sites or within settlements, as was the hierarchy indicated for industrial developments in the Planning Service's reason for refusal, and during the presentation. Mr Rennie stated that they have struggled to find alternative sites. He reported that the sites in Lerwick were over budget and there were no potential sites in Tingwall. In response to a question, Mr Rennie advised that he was not aware of any other sites, he said that no sites have been advertised in the local paper, and that the site at Stromfirth was the first possible site for the shed.

In response to questions, Mr Rennie advised that the proposal was for a portal frame shed in the valley, which he said would not take away from the local scenery, they would keep the site tidy and there would be no impact on amenity. He advised that while the amount of traffic through the valley can be severe, the proposed development would not add more to the road traffic, as the location of the shed would be very central for the workforce.

In referring to the industrial area at Tingwall airport, the Chair questioned how much investigation had been carried out by Shetland Heatwise regarding and around that area, and whether the landowner for the area had been approached. Mr Miller advised that Shetland Heatwise had investigated the list of sites with development potential from the Council's Plan, but no sites were available in Tingwall. Mr Rennie advised from a discussion with a builder from the industrial area in Tingwall that there were no sites available at this time.

The Chair thanked Mr Miller and Mr Rennie for the information provided.

During debate, Mr Sandison advised that having read the report and justification for the proposal, he had been drawn to the question of what would be an appropriate site for the development and what sites are available in this area and in the central mainland. He said that the applicant has looked at alternative sites but no potential sites have been identified or are suitable. Mr Sandison advised of his concern regarding the Planning Service's definition of a settlement, where he said that he would identify Stromfirth as being a settlement, as it is well defined with houses and is part of a rural community. Mr Sandison said that he supports rural development and to keep business in rural communities. Mr Sandison added that he sees more

positives than negatives in regard to the proposed development, and this is an established company with proposals to enhance their own community.

Ms Macdonald said that while she agreed with Mr Sandison's comments, she questioned whether the applicant had fully explored other options for alternative sites. Mr Coutts referred to the lack of justification provided by the applicant for the shed to be located in the particular location in Stromfirth. He said that while he appreciated that finding alternatives sites was a challenge, there was no evidence that industrial and brownfield sites have been explored, or options for a site at Tingwall airport. Mr Sandison commented that the Tingwall airport area was not a designated site for development, and he was uncertain how developments had taken place in that area, as it is in his opinion contrary to Policy. Mr Coutts said that the crux of the matter was that the applicant has rightly focused on sites with development potential, but there is no evidence that the applicant has looked at brownfield sites or industrial sites. The Chair advised on the fact that there are no designated sites in the immediate central mainland area, and in that regard he was uncertain what people can do if they want to start up in industry in the central mainland.

In responding to a request for clarity on planning policy, the Executive Manager – Planning advised on the sequential process when there are no sites for development potential in an area, that other areas of industrial development, for example Tingwall airport, would be considered and then brownfield sites, then settlements. He said that there is no evidence to demonstrate that the applicant went through all the steps to establish the proposed site would be the only location for the shed. He added that Policy clearly allows for industrial development in areas that are not in sites with development potential, on industrial areas, brownfield sites or settlements, however proposals have to be justified, and for this application the Planning Service consider that appropriate justification has not been provided.

In referring to the section in the Supplementary Guidance, Development and Industry, on LDP Policy ED1, Mr Sandison highlighted the following statement, "Areas for business and industrial uses have been identified through the LDP process and are contained within Supplementary Guidance – Business and Industry. Residentially compatible development will be encouraged within settlements throughout Shetland in order to contribute to the development of strong, healthy, vibrant and sustainable rural communities." Mr Sandison stated therefore that the issue was whether Stromfirth is considered to be a settlement, and he said he was happy to contend that Stromfirth is defined as a settlement, referring to the number of agricultural buildings and other developments in the area. He said that as all other sites have been ruled out, he considered the proposal to be an entirely appropriate development. Mr Sandison moved that the Local Review Board approve the application. The Chair advised that he agreed with Mr Sandison's stance, and added that having lived in a rural area all his life he would consider Stromfirth to be a settlement. The Chair advised on his concern at the lack of industrial sites in the central mainland, which he said was an issue that the Council will need to get addressed through the Planning Service. Mr C Smith seconded Mr Sandison's motion.

In reply to a comment from the Chair, Mr Sandison agreed to include in his motion for approval of the application, a condition raised by the Roads Service, that a weight restriction be applied on the roads for delivery of materials. This received the consent of his seconder.

The Executive Manager – Planning reminded the LRB of the opportunity at this stage to establish any further conditions to approval of the application.

Mr Coutts advised of his concern regarding approval of the application, where he said he was still not convinced sufficient evidence has been provided that alternative sites for the shed within brownfield and industrial areas have been explored. In that regard, Mr Coutts said that to ensure adherence with Policy, he moved as an amendment to support the officers' recommendation, to refuse the application. Mr Bell seconded.

Following summing up, voting took place by a show of hands, and the result was as follows:

Amendment (Mr Coutts) 3
Motion (Mr Sandison) 3

The Chair used his casting vote in favour of the motion. The motion therefore was the decision of the Local Review Board.

Decision:

The Local Review Body agreed to uphold the appeal and **APPROVE** the planning permission for the development, subject to a condition raised by the Roads Service, that a weight restriction be applied on the roads for delivery of materials.

07/18 2018/040/PPF – To retain existing emergency helicopter landing site on a permanent basis (Retrospective Application)

The Committee considered a report by the Planning Officer, Development Management [RECORD Appendix 2], which presented an application for full planning permission to retain the emergency helicopter landing site at South Lochside, Lerwick, on a permanent basis.

The Chair advised that the application would take the form of a Hearing, and he explained to those present the process that would be followed.

The Team Leader – Development Management gave a presentation to the Committee, which illustrated the following:

- Location Plan
- Site Plan
- Location of objector properties
- Key Issues

The Team Leader advised on the proposal that the helicopter landing site at South Lochside, Lerwick, is retained on a permanent basis, and that it is still to be used for emergency helicopter use only. He reported that emergency landings have operated now for two years and it is evidenced by the supporting information submitted with the application that the frequency of landings at the landing site has averaged 1.6 a month. Amenity impact experienced by the nearest residential properties and recreational users has been kept to a minimum by non-emergency landings being made at Sumburgh Airport and at Tingwall Airport.

He said that when taking into account the provisions of Policy GP2 of the Shetland

Local Development Plan (LDP) 2014, which aims to ensure that development will not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding natural or built environment, the evidence now provided as a result of the monitoring shows that at the time of the landings, noise levels equivalent to those of a statutory noise nuisance are likely to occur. Aviation noise however is excluded from statutory nuisance. Whilst the provision of the infrastructure at the landing site directs the focus of landings, it is however accepted that the pilot has the right to land at this location irrespective of the landing pad being in place.

The Team Leader said that it is considered that the restriction of the site for 'emergency' use only and the demonstrated frequency of that use, an average of less than 2 per month, and the proposal to continue limiting the use of the site only in 'emergency' situations, allows the proposal to be considered as being an acceptable departure from Policy GP2 of the LDP 2014.

The Team Leader advised that it is considered that the adverse impact on amenity of the surrounding area in terms of noise arising from the resultant short term events of an emergency helicopter landing and taking off, is offset by the important benefits the facility brings in compliance with Community Facilities Policy CF1 of the LDP 2014. Accordingly, it is recommended that the application is approved subject to the conditions set down in the Report of Handling attached as Appendix 1 to the Report.

The Chair invited a representative of the residents in the area, who had made representation, to address the meeting.

Mrs P Leask advised that the main concern of the residents is about the vibration and noise from the helicopter when landing. She said that the windows in their homes shake and the vibration can be felt throughout their properties. The noise is deafening, and it is quite a horrendous noise. She said that while the neighbours have nothing against the helicopter landing, as they do a fantastic job, it is the noise from the helicopters that is the issue. Mrs Leask said that the helicopter can stand for an hour, and the noise can be constant throughout that time, and it is difficult to get back to sleep. Mrs Leask said that no one from the Council or emergency services has come to experience how loud the noise levels can be in the middle of the night. Mrs Leask referred to an instance when the helicopter landed in the early hours of the morning, when the patient walked from the helicopter unaided, where she said that the landing site was meant to be for emergency situations only.

In commenting that the helicopter landing site had been in place for a few years now, Mrs Leask questioned whether there would be any compromise to the nearby residents, where she suggested triple grazing might lessen the noise. She also advised on the smell of aviation fuel from the helicopter.

During her address, Mrs Leask advised that she owns her home, and she is worried about devaluation of her property.

Mrs Leask questioned whether there should be fire cover when helicopters land as it is a big aircraft, and Lochside is a busy road during the day, and drivers tend to be watching the helicopter land rather than watching the road. She said that other sites should be been looked at for the landing site as there are three schools in the area, a health centre, hospital and supermarket, and there is now the new school and halls of residence, so there has to be another site that would not be so highly populated.

The Chair thanked Mrs Leask for the information provided, and he welcomed questions from Members.

Mr Bell referred to Mrs Leask's comments on the reduction in property value, and questioned whether there was any evidence in that regard. Mrs Leask advised that no one has tried to sell their properties. The Executive Manager – Planning clarified that devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration, and therefore cannot be taken into account when making a planning decision.

In response to a question from Mr Bell, Mrs Leask confirmed that the residents had no issues with the landing site being used in emergency situations. However, she advised that residents would be happier if some consideration could be given to lessen the noise by triple glazing the windows. She added that the helicopter staff do a super job, and no one is objecting to the work they do, but it is a highly populated area, and in days of bad weather landings can be a frightening experience.

Mr Sandison referred to Mrs Leask's comments that there had been no officials from the Council or emergency services to see for themselves the disturbance from the helicopter landing during the night. Mrs Leask said that there had been no representation as far as she and the other residents she had spoken to were aware. She added that the helicopter lands 60 metres from her house, so the noise and vibration can be horrendous.

In responding to a question regarding the noise assessment reports, the Team Leader clarified that a report had been produced in compliance with the Planning decision, and it had been that report that the Environmental Health Service had based their comments on.

The Chair thanked Mrs Leask.

The Chair then invited the applicant, or a representative of the applicant to address the meeting.

Mr M Naylor, Captain of the Coastguard Helicopter, advised that he has been based in Shetland for 13 years so has seen the various transformations of the landing site and environs to arrive at the situation today. He said that Shetland is very lucky, in that it is one of the 10 bases that has an all-weather search and rescue helicopter. The fact that it is all weather means that as a crew of four there is a need to manage risk while managing the helicopter. He explained that when a call is received, there is three minutes to get all in place and the paramedic on-board. He said that in very bad weather it has to be life and limb if the crew feel they have to go. He said that they receive information from a third source, and they need to launch on that information. He explained that when a casualty has to be landed in Shetland we need a team on the ground to help the casualty and a further care team to relay the casualty to the hospital. Therefore, when they take off they need to have a good idea then of where they will be landing, and an early decision on whether to use the emergency landing site has to be made based on that initial information. He said therefore that when an initial decision has been made to use the emergency landing site it is very difficult to change to another location, which can mean landing at the Clickimin site when the casualty is not as critical as initially led to believe. He added that in instances when a casualty can walk from the helicopter, the casualty can still not be very well, and it is for that reason that a paramedic accompanies the crew on the helicopter. He stated that a fully trained paramedic is hugely important as it gives the casualty the best possible means of survival.

Captain Naylor said that the Clickimin landing site is a fantastic place, and rather than landing at Tingwall airport, it shortens the journey for casualties in need of hospital treatment.

Referring to the points made by the representative of the objectors, Captain Naylor advised that every time the helicopter lands at Clickimin a discussion takes place on what can be done to mitigate noise and vibration, however it is not always possible to switch off the blades; the engines are wound back to idle, and all is done to try to fully mitigate the noise. In referring to the comments made that the helicopter engine continues to run when the helicopter lands during the night, he advised that this is to ensure proper communication in case another emergency situation arises. He gave reassurance that each landing is discussed to try to mitigate noise and vibration. Captain Naylor acknowledged that there is a smell from the aviation fuel, however he advised that it is only for a short while, and that 1.6 landings in a month was not considered significant. Regarding the comments that the helicopter landing can distract drivers, Captain Naylor advised the road will be closed wherever possible, however that is now always possible. Mr Naylor concluded by advising that from a pilot prospective, the Clickimin landing site offers the best possible care for a casualty.

In response to a question, Mr P Smith, Ambulance Service, confirmed that alternatives sites for the helicopter landing site were explored before the landing site was built at the overspill car park at Clickimin, and again when the landing site moved to South Lochside.

The Chair thanked Captain Naylor and Mr P Smith, for the information provided.

Mr Bell referred to the previous decision by the Committee for the helicopter landing site to be at South Lochside, and at that time the Committee had listened to the concerns of the residents, and he had moved the recommendation for temporary permission to be granted. He said that there had been some concern prior to the temporary approval that there would be a greater amount of helicopter movements, albeit at that time the North Sea was at its busiest. He stated that the number of helicopter landings have reduced to less than two a month. Mr Bell advised on the need to regard the helicopter as a vital asset, and the landing site as a vital community asset. He said that offshore workers and Shetland residents are landed at the site from time to time, and therefore the whole community benefits from the landing site. Mr Bell advised from his discussions with many of the residents in and around the site, that they have no objection to the helicopter landing if it is an emergency.

Mr Bell said that the only people who can access the landing site are emergency personnel, and he fully accepted the account from Captain Naylor that should a casualty manage to walk from the helicopter does not mean the person is not critically ill.

Regarding the search for alternative sites, Mr Bell referred to when the landing site first had to be moved during 2003/04 and confirmed that there had been an extensive search for suitable landing sites at that time, however all apart from Clickimin had to be ruled out, either due to the helicopter approach or height above sea level in terms of visibility. Mr Bell also pointed out that living in a remote community surrounded by the sea, there is a need to put up with the disturbance caused from helicopter landings, and he advised that he has experience of the noise of the helicopters as he lives on the route of the approach. Mr Bell stated that the landing site is a vital community asset and that Shetland is only one of 10 communities with this vital asset.

He added that residents living near to the Aberdeen Royal Infirmary have to put with more landings than there is at Clickimin. Mr Bell commented that while he acknowledged the concerns, he said these have to be balanced against overall community benefit. Mr Bell moved that the Committee approve the recommendation in the report.

Mr C Smith commented that while the objectors who had made representation were residents within his constituency, he was in attendance as a member of the Committee. Mr C Smith said that he had sympathy with the residents in that the helicopters are very noisy; however, he confirmed the residents have no issues with the helicopter landing in an emergency situation. Referring to the recommendation of the Committee two years ago for temporary permission, Mr C Smith advised that noise assessments had been carried out and these were available to residents. He said that there has been mention of triple glazing, however he said that was not an issue for the Planning Committee, but a matter to raise with a Member of the Ward area. Mr C Smith said that he would be reasonably happy to second the motion, but would ask for conditions to be applied for the landings site to be used only in emergency situations, and for noise levels to continue to be made available to residents if these are requested.

In responding, Mr Bell said that he accepted the condition for the landing site to be used in emergency situations only, however he was not prepared to accept the proposal to continue to monitor noise levels. In that regard, he referred to the earlier advice from the Team Leader, that the noise levels have been monitored through the two-year period and the results are available. Mr Bell said that he would see no benefit to continue to monitor noise levels.

Mr Coutts seconded Mr Bell's motion.

Decision:

The Committee **APPROVED** the application, subject to the recommended conditions.

The meeting concluded at 3.30pm.

.....
Chair