

<p><b>12 January 2017</b></p> <p><b>Planning Applications Committee</b></p> <p><b><u>Update</u></b></p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>App no. and site address</b>	<b>Report Recommendation</b>
4 Page 15	PRB DESIGN CODES	Approve subject to amendments being received.
<p><b><u>UPDATE</u></b></p> <p><b>Recommendation changed to APPROVE.</b></p> <p>The change to the recommendation reflects the fact that revised Design Codes, in line with the advice of the Urban Design Officer, have been received. The revised codes are those provided in the agenda papers.</p>		
5 Page 107	16/0920- Lynwood, Heath Rise, Camberley	Approve
<p>No updates for this item.</p>		
6 Page 135	16/0925 – By Pass Nursery, Blackstroud Lane East	Approve
<p><b><u>UPDATE</u></b></p> <p>A member site visit was undertaken on the 5th January 2017. The following were in attendance, Cllr E Hawkins, Cllr S Gadhum, Cllr R Perry and the case officer Mr N Praine.</p> <p><b><u>ADDITIONAL INFORMATIVE</u></b></p> <p>In respect of waste, the applicant is encouraged to break up any hardstanding and waste for removal in an efficient way to ensure minimal vehicular movements when removing waste from site. Additionally the applicant is encouraged to explore recycling and reclaim facilities when removing waste from site. Waste materials must not be burnt on site, the applicant is also reminded of Environmental Health legislation and could be fined up to £20,000 for on-site burning.</p>		
7 Page 155	16/0951 – 3 Blackthorn Drive, Lightwater	Approve
<p><b><u>UPDATE</u></b></p> <p>Just to point out that paragraph 4.2 should have also drawn attention to the proposed flue on the rear elevation which is different to the previous application, however it is not considered that this would cause any harm to character or amenity and as such does not change any conclusions within the report.</p>		

**UPDATE**

An email with attachments has been received from the agent for the application. This email provides 3 plan attachments which seek to demonstrate that the current application is smaller than that which has already been approved.

In this regard it is noted that the approved development has a larger floor area than that which is currently proposed. However officers do not object to the proposal on the basis of a floor space increase per se, rather it is the configuration of the development and the proposed two storey development in close proximity to the shared boundary with no.179 which is, specifically, of concern.