PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

Members of the Planning and Licensing Committee

are summoned to attend a Meeting at 7.30pm on

Monday 30 November 2026

at Loughton Town Council Chamber, 1 Buckingham Court, Rectory Lane, Loughton, IG10 2QZ

to transact the business shown in the agenda.

Liz Petyt Start
Town Clerk
24 November 2026

Membership:
Councillor C Davies (Chairman)
Councillor J Riley (Vice Chairman)

Councillors

W Dodd	K W Lee	R Minhas
C Ubah	Vacancy	

Note to Councillors:
If you are unable to attend the meeting,
please phone your apologies to the office on 020 8508 4200.

*Members of the public are welcome to appear in person at the meeting to make the case for or against a particular application. However, they **must have pre-registered to speak** by contacting the Council on 020 8508 4200 **no later than 3pm on the day of the meeting**. Speakers whether for or against will each have a maximum of 3 minutes to address the Committee. Under the Council's rules only those registered may speak during the meeting. (See also Appendix B of the Standing Orders for more information)*

AGENDA

1 Apologies

To RECEIVE any apologies for absence.

2 Declarations of interest

For Councillors to DECLARE any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest in any item on the Agenda.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

To CONFIRM the minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee held on 16 November 2026.

4 Public Representations

To hear any representations from members of the public who have registered a request to address the Committee in accordance with no 5, Appendix B, of the Standing Orders.

5 Matters for Report

To REPORT any further significant information on matters which have been previously discussed, in addition to those which may already be included on the Agenda.

5.1 Notices of Appeal

5.1.1 EPF/1392/26 – 26 Station Road, Loughton, IG10 4NX. Proposal: Certificate of Lawful Development to demonstrate implementation of consents previously granted - EPF/1224/03 - EPF/0011/25 - EPF/1478/25. (Appeal Ref: 6018352 – Min nos PL510.2 & PL570.7)

If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/detail/a0XTv000005L1pR

An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State in respect of the above site and will be determined on the basis of the appeal procedure set out above. The appeal is Against a Non Determination following the decision of Epping Forest District Council.

The Committee is asked if it wishes to comment further on the above appeal. The Planning Inspectorate requires all observations by 30 December 2026.

5.1.2 EPF/2116/25 – New Oak Lodge, England's Lane, Loughton, IG10 2NZ. Proposal: Erection of new dwellinghouse in replacement of previously approved dwelling under planning application: EPF/2969/15 with associated works to provide access, parking, and landscaping. The proposal will also include the refurbishment and repair of Grade II listed gates and piers. (Appeal Ref: 6018941 – Min nos PL396.1 & PL414.5)

If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/detail/a0XTv000005NnTN

An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State in respect of the above site and will be determined on the basis of the appeal procedure set out above. The appeal is Against a Refusal following the decision of Epping Forest District Council.

The Committee is asked if it wishes to comment further on the above appeal. The Planning Inspectorate requires all observations by 30 December 2026.

5.2 Appeal Decisions

5.2.1 EPF/2294/24 – Land and Garages on the North Side of Avondale. Proposal: Erection of two proposed dwellings. (Appeal Ref: 6005665 – Min no PL129.1 & 460.1)
The Planning Inspectorate has advised that the above appeal has been dismissed. See attached notice, pages 6 – 12.

6 Committee Priorities 2027/28
Members are asked to agree the Committee's Priorities for 2027/28, see page 13.

7 Planning Applications
To CONSIDER the planning applications received for the weeks 13 November and 20 November 2026.
Members are reminded that when raising an objection to an application, they should also consider whether to confirm in writing their intention to attend and speak at the Area Planning Committee A or B where the proposal was to be considered.

7.1 Full Planning Permission:

Application No: EPF/2137/26
Officer: Nicola Bickerstaff
Location: 236-238 First Floor And Second Floor, High Road, Loughton, IG10 1RB
Proposal: Change of use for first floor rear office, from Class E to Sui Generis and for a tattoo studio including piercings.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KW3Lp

Application No: EPF/2155/26
Officer: Nicola Bickerstaff
Location: 32 Church Hill, Loughton, IG10 1LA
Proposal: Proposed Installation of New Windows and Doors in Association with the Proposed Change of Use from Use Class E to Use Class C3.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KXqFe

Application No: EPF/2163/26
Officer: Suleman Uddin
Location: 179-181 High Road, Loughton, IG10 4LF
Proposal: Adaptation of existing kitchen extract system and reinstatement to original position.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans

https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KYRtV

7.2 Removal/variation of conditions - Section 73 TCPA

Application No: EPF/2146/26
Officer: Caroline Brown
Location: 27 Carroll Hill, Loughton, IG10 1NL
Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 Plan Numbers of EPF/1598/25 (Demolition of existing dwelling to create new 6 bedroom detached dwelling with dormers in roof to front and rear elevations).
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KX2if

7.3 Consent to display an advertisement Permission:
NO APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN LISTED UNDER THIS PERMISSION

7.4 Householder Planning Permission:

Application No: EPF/2010/26
Officer: Nicola Bickerstaff
Location: 28 Hillyfields, Loughton, IG10 2JS
Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension and a two storey rear extension, with a reduced width and reduced projection first-floor element.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KALqs

Application No: EPF/2152/26
Officer: Suleman Uddin
Location: 47 Traps Hill, Loughton, IG10 1TB
Proposal: Proposed ancillary use outbuilding.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KXVuL

Application No: EPF/2199/26
Officer: Suleman Uddin
Location: 131 Chequers Road, Loughton, IG10 3QF
Proposal: Erection of a single-storey rear and side extension and a two-storey side extension.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000Kbg82

7.5 Prior approval Part 3 Class MA: Commercial, Business and Service uses to Dwellinghouses

Application No: EPF/2159/26
Officer: Nicola Bickerstaff
Location: 32 Church Hill, Loughton, IG10 1LA
Proposal: Prior Approval for the Proposed Change of Use from Existing Commercial Use (Class E) to Residential Use (Class C3).
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KY5sz

7.6 Consent under Tree Preservation Orders
NO APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN LISTED UNDER THIS PERMISSION

7.7 Deemed Permission and Others – provided for information only: (Members are reminded that comments are not normally accepted on these applications).

Lawful Development Certificate Proposed:

Application No: EPF/2158/26
Officer: Klajdi Koci
Location: 3 Prescott Green, Loughton, IG10 2AQ
Proposal: Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed loft conversion with rear dormer and front roof lights.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KXzHJ

Application No: EPF/2160/26
Officer: Caroline Brown
Location: 9 Tewkesbury Close, Loughton, IG10 3NT
Proposal: Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed ground mounted Air Source Heat Pump.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KY98c

Application No: EPF/2173/26
Officer: Suleman Uddin
Location: 131 Chequers Road, Loughton, IG10 3QF
Proposal: Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and front roof lights.
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KZB3W

Approval of details reserved by a condition:

Application No: EPF/2196/26
Officer: Loredana Ciavucco
Location: 104 The Drive, Loughton, IG10 1HL
Proposal: Approval of Details Reserved by Condition 4 Types and Colours of External Finishes of EPF/1486/26 (New outbuilding/ garden room to be used as a home office).
If you are viewing this report in an electronic format, click on the link below to view related documents including plans
https://eppingforestdc.my.site.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0hTv00000KbLZp

8 Decisions

8.1 Decisions by Epping Forest District Council

No decision notices have been received.

9 Licensing Applications

To CONSIDER any licensing applications which have come to the officers' attention since the last meeting of the Committee. Members are reminded that reference must be made to at least one of the four licensing objectives to validate any objections, as detailed below:

1. The prevention of crime and disorder
2. Public safety
3. The prevention of public nuisance
4. The protection of children from harm

10 Enforcement and Compliance

10.1 To ADVISE the Committee of any updates to the reports previously received.

Liz Petyt Start
TOWN CLERK
24 November 2026

Agenda item 5.2

Appeal Decision – EPF/2294/24 – Land And Garages on the North Side of Avondale

Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2026

by S Hubbard BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2026

Land And Garages on the North Side of Avondale Close, Loughton IG10 3DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by James Howlett against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
- The application Ref is EPF/2294/24.
- The development proposed is described as the erection of proposed new dwellings.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr James Howlett against Epping Forest District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description in the banner header above is taken from the revised application form dated 11th November 2025 which was submitted prior to the determination of the application by the Council. This differs from that on the appeal form which refers to the erection of new flats, which was the description on the original application form. The description on the appeal form does not match the plans submitted with the appeal or the plans which the Council determined the application on the basis of, which show new dwellings. The description above also does not match that used on the Council's decision notice which uses a more precise description of the erection of two proposed dwellings. However, there is no evidence of an agreement to change the description by the appellant. Nevertheless, the plans make clear the proposal is for two new dwellings and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

4. On 17 August 2026, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Annex A, Paragraph 1 states that this version of the Framework applies to decision-making from the day of its publication, therefore references to the Framework in this decision are to the August 2026 version. I have sought the views of the main parties on the implications of the new Framework and have had regard to comments provided.

5. During the appeal a revised Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (October 2026) was submitted. This assessment utilised up-to-date modelling of fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding. The Council were given an opportunity to comment on the assessment and therefore I consider there is no procedural unfairness in accepting the revised assessment.

6. A unilateral undertaking has been submitted with the appeal which secures contributions which would aim to mitigate the harm from the proposed development on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation and therefore address the Council's fourth reason for refusal. The Council have had the opportunity to comment on this and therefore I consider there is no procedural unfairness in me accepting it.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

   i) Whether the proposal would be safe from flooding and in accordance with local and national planning policies on flood risk;

   ii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook;

   iii) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and

   iv) The effect of the proposal on the integrity of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation;

Reasons

Flood Risk

8. Policy DM15 of the adopted Epping Forest District Council Local Plan (EFLP) requires a sequential test to be applied to steer new developments to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.

9. According to the flood map plans submitted with the application and within the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (April 2025) (PFRA1) the site is partially within Flood Zone 2 with a medium probability of flooding. The revised Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (October 2026) (PFRA2) indicates that the site would not be within a 0.1% annual probability event, which is equivalent to Flood Zone 2, taking into account flood defences. However, Paragraph 24 of the Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk and Coastal Change (PPG) states that for the purposes of the sequential test, initially, the presence of existing flood management infrastructure should be ignored as the long-term funding, maintenance and renewal of this infrastructure is uncertain.

10. Policy F5 of the Framework makes clear that a sequential test is not required where no built development within the site boundary, including access and escape routes or other potentially vulnerable elements would be located on an area which would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future.

11. The Environment Agency Flood Zone Maps shown in both PFRA1 and PFRA2 show that approximately half the site is within Flood Zone 2, which would include the footprint of the buildings. Neither of the assessments demonstrate that the footprint of dwellings would be outside of the Flood Zone 2 area in the undefended scenario.

12. Furthermore, Policy F5 of the Framework and Paragraph 24 of the PPG state that the future flood risk, including climate change, should also be considered in the application of the sequential test. Neither PFRA1 or PFRA2 assess the extent of the 0.1% event with climate change for the lifetime of the development. Whilst the 0.1% event is not the 'design flood' event for fluvial flooding, there is nothing in the Framework or the PPG which states the sequential test should only be applied where a site is within the extent of the 'design flood' event. The Framework states that the test should be applied in areas known to be at risk, now or in the future. A 0.1% event is considered a medium probable event in the Framework and therefore it follows that the risk for this event for the lifetime of the development should be considered.

13. Consequently, it has not been demonstrated that the built development within the site boundary, including access and escape routes or other potentially vulnerable elements would be located on an area which would not be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future. Accordingly, a sequential test is required to demonstrate there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available in areas with a lower risk of flooding.

14. No sequential test assessment has been carried out by the appellant or the Council. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DM15 of the EFLP and Policy F5 of the Framework.

15. Policy DM15 of the EFLP also requires mitigation measures to mitigate flood risk and ensure safe access and egress for future users of a development. Policy F7 of the Framework, amongst other matters, states that development proposed in a location known to be at risk from any form of flooding, now or in the future, should be refused unless it is safe throughout its lifetime, safely manages residual risk with safe access and egress where appropriate and that the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient.

16. The lack of assessment of impacts of climate change for the lifetime of the proposed development for the 0.1% event means that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would be safe from flood risk. Paragraph 005 of the PPG makes clear that safe access and egress should be achieved for the 0.1% event with allowance for climate change. Furthermore, there is no assessment of residual risk from the failure of flood defences in the present day scenario.

17. Whilst the Council's drainage consultant raised no objection, this was on the basis of compliance with the sequential test and requiring a planning condition which, amongst other matters, required finished floor levels to be set out relative to modelled fluvial flood water depths, including a necessary allowance for climate change, and for details of emergency access and escape if any part of the development is below the estimated flood level. However, given the lack of information at present it is not possible to conclude whether suitable finished floor levels or safe access and egress could be practically achieved.

18. The Council referred to concerns relating to surface water flooding in the rear gardens of properties along Avondale Drive which is evidenced from local knowledge. However, both the PFRA1 and the PFRA2 indicate the risk of surface water flooding of the appeal site itself is very low now and in the future with climate change. Furthermore, the site is currently largely hardstanding and the Flood Risk Assessment (Paul Sampson Chartered Surveyors) indicates that the proposed development would result in a significant improvement to surface water drainage

due to an increase in permeable area and the provision of sustainable drainage systems which could be secured by condition.

19. The Council make reference to an appeal decision which they argue justifies a pragmatic approach to flood risk[1]. However, this appeal predates the latest version of the Framework, and it appears that the Inspector in that appeal had sufficient information to conclude that the flood risk could be mitigated. Accordingly, the appeal is not directly comparable and it is necessary to consider this appeal on its own merits.

20. In conclusion, for the reasons above, the proposal would conflict with Policy DM15 of the EFLP and Policies F5 and F7 of the Framework.

Living Conditions

21. The flank gable wall of the proposed development would face the rear elevations of Nos. 76 and 78 Avondale Drive and would be separated from their rear gardens by a passageway. The flank wall would occupy almost the entire width of the boundaries of both properties. The gardens of 76 and 78 Avondale Drive are shorter than their adjacent neighbours by virtue of single storey rear projections. The proximity and height of the flank wall, together with the length of the back gardens would mean the proposed development would materially change the outlook of these properties as observed from the living space at the rear of the properties. The rear gardens of these properties which sit slightly lower than the ground floors would also feel more enclosed. However, the lack of development to the front and back of the proposed development would still provide a degree of outlook to these properties. As such, whilst there would be harm to the outlook, the harm would be towards the lower end of spectrum.

22. The rear elevation of the two-storey element of the proposed development would only extend slightly beyond the rear elevation of Nos. 6 and 7 Avondale Close. The single storey element of the proposed development would extend approximately a third of the length of the rear garden to Nos. 6 and 7 Avondale Close. It would have a flat roof and would only appear marginally higher than the existing fence. As such it would result in a minimal change to the outlook from the rear windows of Nos. 6 and 7 and would therefore not have an overbearing impact.

23. Policy DM9 of the EFLP requires proposals to not result in over-bearing or an overly enclosed form of development which materially impacts on the outlook of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

24. In conclusion, the proposal would materially impact upon the outlook from 76 and 78 Avondale Drive and would harm the living conditions of the occupiers contrary to Policy DM9 of the EFLP. However, the harm would be at the lower-end of the spectrum.

25. *Character and Appearance*

Avondale Close is characterised by two storey residential properties arranged in blocks of four maisonettes. However, from the exterior they appear as semi-detached dwellings. All the properties on Avondale Close have gabled ends. There is also a single detached residential dwelling on the street. Properties along Avondale Drive have a different character comprising short rows of terraces with hipped roofs.

26. The proposed development would have a similar massing and height to the existing blocks of maisonettes on Avondale Close and would have a similar relationship in terms of spacing to Nos. 6,7,8,9 as the existing detached dwelling has to Nos. 2,3,4,5. Whilst the footprint would be larger at ground floor level, this would not be so excessive to detract from the character of the area.

27. Whilst the rear gardens would be smaller than those shared by the maisonettes next to the site, given the variation of garden sizes in the vicinity, this would not be harmful to the prevailing character. The development would extend no further than that of the terrace to the rear on Elmhurst Way and would therefore fit in with the prevailing grain. As such I consider the proposed development would not have a cramped appearance and would not appear incongruous or dominant.

28. Accordingly, I do not find any harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would accord with Policy DM9 of the EFLP in this regard which amongst other matters requires development to contribute to the character and amenity of the local area.

Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation

29. The Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is designated primarily for its beech forests, wet and dry heaths and populations of stag beetle.

30. The Epping Forest Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (2021) (SAMM) advises that recreational pressure can impact upon the integrity of the SAC and new residential development within the zone of influence would increase this pressure. The proposed development is within the zone of influence and therefore would contribute to these pressures. The SAMM provides a strategic approach to mitigating such effects of development through a package of measures including; physical management of paths, wayfinding, managing increased use of visitor hubs and ongoing visitor engagement. This package is funded through developer contributions.

31. The Epping Forest Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy (2020) (IAPMS) advises that traffic associated with new residential development in the district would be harmful to the health of qualifying features of the SAC. The IAPMS provides a strategic approach to mitigating such effects of development through a package of measures including electric vehicle charging points, awareness raising, introduction of a Clean Air Zone, highway works, road base pollution extraction and initiatives to support cycling and walking. This package is funded through developer contributions.

32. A unilateral undertaking (UU) has been submitted. The UU secures the requisite contributions towards the SAMM and IAPMS alongside a monitoring contribution. I am satisfied that these obligations meet the relevant tests set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Framework.

33. Whilst the UU is dated on the front it is not clearly dated on page 2. I am confident that this is an administrative error that could be rectified. With a correctly dated document the UU would be acceptable and would address the Council's reasons for refusal relating to impact on the SAC. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not found it necessary to go back to the parties to address this matter.

Other Matters

34. The Council has confirmed it cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing.

The amount of shortfall has not been identified by either the Council or the appellant. Nevertheless, the provision of two dwellings is a benefit of the scheme in this context which is afforded substantial weight in line with Policy HO7 of the Framework.

35. The proposed development would also represent an effective use of previously developed land which is underutilised. In line with Policy L2 of the Framework, I afford this benefit substantial weight.

36. Despite being a statutory requirement, there are environmental benefits from biodiversity net gain. Modest economic benefits would also arise from employment during construction and additional local spending from future occupants. However, given the small-scale nature of the development, I only afford these benefits limited weight.

37. Interested parties raised concerns about the impacts of the proposed development on sunlight, daylight and privacy and provision of parking. Concerns were also raised about the size of the gardens associated with the proposed dwellings. The Council did not identify any concerns with regard to the proposed development on these matters and I have observed and read nothing which would lead me to dispute this conclusion.

38. The Council's appeal statement introduces a new concern not raised in their reasons for refusal. This relates to a lack of a contribution of £716 per dwelling towards the Roding Valley Recreation Ground/Public Rights of Way infrastructure enhancement projects and associated conflict with Policy D1 of the EFLP. Whilst the executed UU now contains obligations to secure this contribution, no compelling evidence has been put forward as to why this particular contribution or the amount is justified. Accordingly, there is insufficient evidence that the obligation to secure the contribution would be necessary to make the development acceptable or that the contribution would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Therefore, it would fail to meet the relevant tests set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Framework and I do not therefore consider that it would be lawful to take it into account as a reason for granting planning permission.

Planning Balance

39. The conflict with Policies DM15 and DM9 identified above, means that the proposed development is in conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. Very substantial weight is afforded to this conflict, principally due to the failure to pass the sequential test and the failure to demonstrate that the development would be safe from flooding.

40. Policy S3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As the proposed development is within a settlement, Policy S4 applies.

41. Policy S4 states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework. Policy S4(2)(c) states that a failure to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances is a circumstance in which the benefits are likely to be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects. Policy F7 is one such policy and as explained above, I found that the proposed development would fail to comply with this policy. This conflict, together with the conflict with Policy F5 as described above is afforded very substantial weight. The harms associated with living conditions due to the impact on outlook is afforded moderate weight given the conclusions above about the level of harm.

42. Whilst substantial weight is given to the provision of new homes and the use of vacant and underutilised land, the harms described above significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

43. In conclusion, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hubbard

INSPECTOR

Agenda item 6
Committee Priorities 2027/28

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE – Priorities 2027/28		
Priority	**Main Function**	**Greater Detail (current position)**
	Current activities	
High	Planning and Licensing	Responding to applications
High	All other matters within the committee's	terms of reference
Medium	Design Award Scheme	Annual award presentation