

Lancashire County Council

Development Control Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 7th June, 2023 at 10.30 am in
Committee Room 'B' - The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston**

Present:

County Councillor Matthew Maxwell-Scott (Chair)

County Councillors

B Yates	M Pattison
J Berry	E Pope
S Clarke	P Rigby
M Dad BEM JP	A Schofield
A Hindle	D Westley
S Holgate	

1. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

Permanent replacement

County Councillor Westley replaced County Councillor S Rigby on the Committee.

Temporary replacement

County Councillor Schofield replaced County Councillor Kay at this meeting.

2. Appointment of Chair and Deputy Chair

Committee noted the appointment by the County Council on 25 May 2023 of County Councillors Maxwell-Scott and Yates as Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee, respectively, for 2023/24.

The Chair expressed his thanks to the former Deputy Chair, County Councillor Paul Rigby, for his invaluable support over the past two years.

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

No pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests were disclosed.



4. Constitution, Membership and Terms of Reference of the Committee

A report was presented on the Constitution, Membership and Terms of Reference of the Development Control Committee.

Resolved: That the Constitution, Membership and Terms of Reference of the Development Control Committee be noted.

5. Minutes of the last meeting held on 26 April 2023

Resolved: That the minutes of the last meeting held on 26 April 2023 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

6. Update Sheet

The Update Sheet was circulated prior to the meeting (copy attached).

7. Fylde Borough: application number LCC/2023/0002 Variation of condition 2 of planning permission LCC/2014/0096 to allow the date of final restoration of the site to be postponed until 30 June 2025. Preston New Road Exploration Site, Off Preston New Road, Little Plumpton, Westby with Plumptons

A report was presented on an application for a variation of condition 2 of planning permission LCC/2014/0096, to allow the date of final restoration of the Preston New Road Exploration Site, Off Preston New Road, Little Plumpton, Westby with Plumptons, to be postponed until 30th June 2025.

The report included the views of Fylde Borough Council, Westby Parish Council, the Environment Agency, LCC Highways Development Control, the North Sea Transition Authority, Health and Safety Executive and United Utilities. No observations had been received from Weeton-with-Preese Parish Council or Kirkham Town Council.

County Councillor John Singleton had raised an objection on behalf of residents in the Fylde West division stating that these residents had been most affected by multiple earth tremors recorded near the application site.

Eighty four representations (including those from the Preston New Road Liaison Committee established as a condition of the planning permission), the Preston New Road Action Group and the Roseacre Awareness Group, had been received objecting to the application, in addition to two letters of representation from Mark Menzies – MP for Fylde and objections from Friends of the Earth.

Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Sheet which included corrections to pages 15 and 17 of the agenda which should have stated that 5 January 2017 was the commencement of the development at the site. Therefore under condition 2 of the original planning permission, the date for completion of restoration was 5 April 2023. The Update Sheet also provided a replacement condition 1 referring to time limits.



The Development Management Officer presented a Powerpoint presentation showing a location plan of the application site and the nearest houses and air photographs of the site showing the site access and road, gas flare, soil storage mound, perimeter acoustic and security fencing and well heads.

It was reported that the Restoration timeline provided in the Committee report and presentation was a sequential process and that various works must be completed before the next stage could commence; it was not possible to proceed directly to the restoration stage. The three options when the suspension notice expired at the end of June 2023 were as follows:

- (a) Agree a plan to reuse one or both wells;
- (b) Agree a plan to bring one or both wells into production;
- (c) To require one or both wells to be plugged and abandoned.

This application had been made on the basis of option (c) being followed.

Ms Susan Holliday, Preston New Road Action Group, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

In January 2022, Cuadrilla wrote to Lancashire County Council confirming their intention to decommission by April 2023. This was put on hold when they were given more time to plug the wells. If they expected to be able to restore in 12 months last year, why do they now need two years? Also, condition 6E states that the schedule for site restoration should not be greater than 12 months; Cuadrilla appears to be padding out the schedule to restore, for example to allow sufficient time to complete desktop research. Desktop research could be done alongside any decommissioning tasks and should not impact the timescales. Cuadrilla could have applied for an extension 12 months ago when the North Sea Transition Authority allowed them to keep the wells unplugged; they did not. Lack of planning on their part, or a hope that the government may change their stance should not be a reason to grant an extension now.

Cuadrilla use work that has been agreed with the NSTA as justification for the delay in commencing the restoration of the site. However, the NSTA responded to Lancashire County Council as a consultee in February and had no comment to make on the application. Surely if they wanted the wells to remain open, they would have said so.

One of the grounds for refusal by Lancashire County Council in 2015 was landscape. Although this decision was overturned by the government, the fact remains that the site has been, and remains a blot on the landscape. Landscape was discussed in much detail in the public inquiry and in the inspectors report, it was noted in paragraph 12.65 that Cuadrilla gave assurances that, at the end of the first phase, all tall structures would be removed and the only structure that would appear above the fence would be the very occasional appearance of the servicing rig. However, the flare stacks installed five years ago have always been visible above the fence and one is still there to this day. The remaining flare stack should have been removed long ago to deliver on these assurances. Also condition 6D states that all plant and equipment should be removed on completion of the final 90 day flow testing phase;



this condition has therefore also been breached. According to condition 2 of the consent, work should have completed in April this year, so Cuadrilla has, in my opinion, already breached conditions 2, 6D and 6E. They've made little effort to abide with their commitments on landscaping and they're now trying to get a plan agreed that is double the length of time to that agreed in the original planning permission.

This application should therefore be refused - if Lancashire County Council grants this application, it will send a clear message to Cuadrilla that planning conditions can be ignored with impunity. I have copies of all the documents that I mentioned if anybody wants to look at them,

Mr John Powney, Ribble Estuary Against Fracking, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

I'm here today representing the local community group, Ribble Estuary Against Fracking; we believe this application should be refused.

The applicant has a provable track record of being unable to work within the conditions set by this council. As an example, in August 2017, your committee members voted to refuse planning application 0064, an application by Cuadrilla for extra time to plug in and abandon the Becconsall site near Southport; material reasons for that refusal bear relevance to this application. I'd like to remind councillors of the timelines and reasons for your refusal of that application. In July 2010, planning permission was granted with the site to be restored by 2012. In September 2012, Cuadrilla asked to vary the condition for site restoration till March 2014, another time extension in 2013 asks for further time until September 2014. This is followed by yet another application with time extension for another three years. However, in 2015, Cuadrilla announce that it has no plans to develop the site and confirm they will restore the site in 2016; no work was carried out in 2016. The deadline is again extended to October 2017. In August 2017, Cuadrilla apply again for more time, but this time you voted against the recommendation of your Planning officer for the Becconsall site and refuse the additional time requested by Cuadrilla for material planning reasons which were (i) the postponements of the completion of the site restoration until 31st of October 2018 would result in the unnecessary retention of an industrial site in the countryside, thereby having unacceptable impacts on landscape and the openness of the green belt, contrary to policy GN3 of the West Lancashire borough local plan and paragraph 79 to 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework and (ii) the delay in completing the restoration of the site would prevent best and most versatile land restored to an agricultural use at the earliest opportunity, contrary to policy EC2 of the West Lancashire borough local plan. Cuadrilla did not appeal and the site was restored to green belt status.

For this application, LCC has policies that will procure the same outcome, but it has been recommended for approval by your officer. He references policy DM2 for this reason. However, DM2 states that our proposals will appropriately make a positive contribution to the local and wider community, make a positive contribution to biodiversity, make a positive contribution to residential amenity and make a positive contribution to reduction of carbon emissions. This application makes no positive contribution to those four relevant considerations.



This application is not acceptable in terms of policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste local plan. This application is not acceptable in terms of policy GD4, GD7 and ENV1 of the Fylde local plan. All of these policies are in conflict if there are any further delays to site restoration.

Dr Francis Rugman, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

I am a Wrea Green resident and retired consultant clinical haematologist. Unfortunately, the proposed prolonged postponement of restoration means there is a potential return to fracking at Little Plumpton. I must emphasise the overwhelming evidence against such a decision, particularly the health risk faced by those living near this fracking site. Peer review research consistently links fracking to detrimental health effects. These include exacerbation of asthma, increased mortality in the frail and elderly, strokes, heart attacks, adverse birth outcomes, birth defects, vasculitis, rashes, chronic rhinosinusitis, migraine, fatigue and understandably increased anxiety. Carcinogenic substances including benzene, volatile organic compounds and radionuclides have been detected in the air and water near fracking sites. The prestigious and notable 2022 Yale University Study reaffirms the association between fracking and childhood leukaemia, with increased leukaemia risk observed in children living within two kilometres of these sites.

The original US controls on distances between fracking sites and residential properties were established before we fully understood all of these health impacts. However, the revised 2020 state of Colorado legislation now requires a minimum distance of 610 metres between fracking sites and homes, due to emissions causing headaches, respiratory issues, skin and eye irritation. But in Little Plumpton, 20 people in 10 households live within 610 metres of the Cuadrilla site; their health concerns are valid. In the light of these facts, I firmly advocate for plugging both wells now, ensuring safety and restoring the site to farmland - we must prioritise the health and wellbeing of our residents.

Let us consider this overwhelming evidence and make the right choice to safeguard our community.

Mr Christopher Holliday (resident), addressed the Committee and made the following points:

I live 500 meters from the site. Cuadrilla have already breached conditions regarding site restoration - condition 2 is obvious as it should have been done by 5th of April this year. Cuadrilla had known this since they were granted planning permission, blatantly ignored it and by holding off applying for an extension until now, they have already gained themselves an extra 12 months. They've played the system and this is not for the first time. Condition 6E was intended to bring forward site restoration 12 months after completion of initial flow testing, in the event that the extended flow testing was not going to take place; it hasn't. The condition was predicated on there being a clear end to initial flow testing, which is detailed in section 4.8 of Cuadrilla's original planning statement as something that will run for up to 90 days and as a relatively short initial flow test period. It was on this definition that planning



permission was granted, and condition 6E was based, so how did this relatively short period of time eventually run for over 800 days?

In November 2019, Cuadrilla stated that they had completed the gas flow test. This test was entirely consistent with the initial flow test documented in their planning application. However, they went on to say that they were moving onto an extended pressure buildup test; this was not documented at all in their planning application and had no time frame associated with it. Only when prompted by local residents nine months later did an LCC planning officer email Cuadrilla to tell them that he didn't know if initial flow testing was still being conducted or not, and to ask them their interpretation of condition 6E. Their reply - Cuadrilla installed downhole gauges in the PNR2 well at the end of last year to monitor and record downhole conditions and pressures in the well. This is fundamental data for ascertaining well flow potential, which forms an integral part of the initial flow test. As these remain downhole, the initial flow test is continuing and condition 6E does not apply at this stage of development. So this process, which was so fundamental to such an integral part of the initial flow test, wasn't included in the original planning application and it was never mentioned for their first well at PNR. LCC planners did not challenge this new process nor its effect on the timescales of initial flow testing, despite it being fundamental to various planning conditions.

One of Cuadrilla's few successes is turning initial flow testing into an open ended process to prevent condition 6E being triggered, otherwise they would have been required to complete site restoration by November 2020 – that is 2 ½ years ago. Cuadrilla have successfully played your planning officers and they've won. Planning officers have not understood or challenged changes affecting time conditions and local residents have been let down.

Please don't let Cuadrilla win again with further procrastination and delays.

Mr Geza Tarjanyi, Frack Free Fylde, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

First of all, I would like to know what's happened to the fracking fluid that was on site. There's the containers on your photograph which didn't show any of the containers with the fracking fluid; have Cuadrilla disposed of that in a field again like they did at Preesall Farm? I would like the Planning Committee to ascertain where that fracking fluid has gone.

Officers responded that the fracking fluids had been disposed of via authorised treatment processes.

Frack Free Fylde is a local group which was set up after my home was damaged in Lytham by the 1st earthquakes triggered by Cuadrilla, as a first attempt at fracking at Preesall Farm on April 1st, 2011.

In 2015, I could not be prouder of Lancashire County Council Planning Committee who listened to the evidence provided by our experts and locals, and voted to turn down Cuadrilla's fracking at Preston New Road. This was overruled by a pro fracking government who ignored the genuine fears of locals and the wider community. They



knew the danger this toxic industry would have on them and their environment. The evidence provided at the time was collected from the people in Canada, USA and Australia, who had children suffering health effects, including nose bleeds and underweight babies. Many thousands of cases are documented in the Pennsylvania list of the harmed and the report can be found at medact.org. You listened and stopped depleted uranium being used in the perforation guns. You listened and closed the fracking sites that had been passed by one planning officer, before the community had even heard of fracking. Besides that, Preesall Farm, Grange Road, Annas Road, Banks near Southport were all turned back into fields because you listened to the evidence and the local people.

I now ask you to honour those who fought hard and some who are no longer with us due to their efforts at Preston New Road. Then Greg Clark and Sajid Javid allow Cuadrilla to build the biggest fracking site in the world at Little Plumpton near Blackpool. First the chair of Preston New Road Action Group, Pat Davis, who fought through pain I can only imagine to put together the most professional presentation, had come off her painkillers and medication so she could concentrate on the work needed to be done to win. Please honour her. Christine Steele, who camped in a damp tent at the side of a busy road day after day monitoring many condition breaches by Cuadrilla at the site, on the cold road with severe pain in her shoulder. She had pain killers for her shoulder, and eventually she had a heart attack - with that, please honour her. A man I only know as Brad who, unknown to me, was dying of cancer and who gave his last months of his life supporting us down at Preston New Road.

Cuadrilla are being paid every day; they fill out the original agreement to have the site put back to a field and disrespect the evidence that's been presented of the earthquakes and breach of many planning regulations - all documented and will be provided at future judicial review if needed. I request you to honour the heroes of Preston New Road and turn down this application.

The legal officer read out a written representation from County Councillor John Singleton:

As a Lancashire County Councillor, I represent people in the Fylde West Division and, as such, I now wish to raise an objection to this application. Fylde West residents have been the most affected by multiple earth tremors recorded near the Preston New Road site at Westby-with-Plumptions and deserve to be heard on this issue.

The method of gas extraction by hydraulic fracturing previously resulted in a moratorium on fracking. His Majesty's Government's position is clear; this method of gas exploration through fracking cannot be conducted safely within the Industries' Regulatory Framework.

Application LCC/2023/0002 requests an extension to the decommissioning operations of 24 months. In my opinion, this demonstrates a disregard for planning laws. The company was only too well aware of the terms of the original fracking application, including the decommission dates. There has been sufficient time to achieve the planning conditions outlined in the original planning consent in restoring



this land to open countryside. This should have been completed in a timely manner. This has not been done. It may be said they wait and hope for another potentially disastrous turnaround on the moratorium which in my view will not happen.

In my opinion, failing to comply with the planning decommissioning dates may be seen as an intentional breach of the conditions associated with the original fracking application. The suspension order issued by the North Sea Decommissioning Authority to plug and cap the wells at the Preston New Road site has absolutely no bearing on this breach of the planning application before Lancashire County Council. The applicant fully understood the terms of the planning consent including the decommissioning dates. In my opinion, the company should have acted long before now with the decommissioning procedure.

The people of Fylde have had enough of the threat of fracking and I call on the officers and the Planning Committee to enforce the terms of the original application, which were clearly set out when permission was granted, and refuse this application under LCC/2023/0002 to extend the decommissioning date by 24 months to the Preston New Road site.

In conclusion, I can see no grounds to grant an extension. I reiterate, this application should be refused.

Committee were informed that, should they be minded to refuse the application, an enforcement notice would be served to achieve restoration within a requested timescale which would need to be reasonable and bear in mind the timescales set out in the restoration timeline table; otherwise, the decision could be appealed.

It was reported that the Environment Agency required around 8 months or longer to review a permit surrender application which was what was being seen in other aspects of waste and minerals development across the county. A number of technical checks were required to make sure the site was safe in the long term.

The Committee were informed that, should they be minded to approve the application, they could request the Chief Executive to write to the Environment Agency to ask if the permit surrender process could be expedited, given the sensitivity of the site and its use.

The Development Management Officer answered questions from Committee.

County Councillor Holgate was concerned that Cuadrilla were asking to forego the original condition 2 and increase the timescale by a further 15-24 months. Although County Councillor Holgate appreciated that the timescale for restoration may not be much different, if the application was refused, it would enable the county council to supervise enforcement and hold Cuadrilla to timescales.

County Councillor Pope was concerned that if Committee refused the application, Cuadrilla would appeal the decision which would extend the matter further. If Committee approved the application, County Councillor Pope asked whether a condition could be included whereby, at each of the stages, if Cuadrilla did not conform, then the matter be referred back to Committee to consider enforcement.



Committee were informed that, although the county council could monitor works on the site and raise any progress issues, the well decommissioning and groundwater monitoring was the responsibility of other agencies so it would be difficult for the county council to control these through planning permissions. However, a condition could be included which required the applicant to submit 6 monthly monitoring reports to be considered by Committee.

After a discussion, it was Proposed and Seconded:

"That planning permission be Refused due to the visual impact of the site being affected for a longer period and to enable the county council to properly supervise enforcement and ensure timescales are met".

Upon being put to the Vote, the Motion was Lost.

It was therefore Proposed and Seconded:

"That planning permission be approved, subject to an additional condition requiring the applicant to submit 6 monthly monitoring reports to be considered by Committee".

It was therefore:

Resolved: That planning permission be **granted** subject to:

- (i) conditions controlling time limits, working programme, highway matters, environmental controls, restoration and aftercare, as set out in the Committee report.
- (ii) the change to condition 1 as follows:

'The decommissioning works required by condition 11a) shall be completed by not later than a period of 18 months from the date of this planning permission. The soil treatment and replacement works required by condition 11 b) and c) shall be completed within a period of 2 years from the date of this planning permission.'

Reason : In order to secure the satisfactory restoration of the site within an acceptable timescale and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

- (iii) the following additional condition:

14. A report shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority by not later than 7th December 2023 and at six monthly intervals thereafter until the date of completion of restoration describing the works that have taken place over the previous six month period to progress the plugging and abandonment of the boreholes and restoration of the site. As well as physical works on the exploration site, the report shall also contain details of the actions that have



taken place to gain regulatory approval from the North Sea Transition Authority, Environment Agency and Health and Safety Executive for the plugging and abandonment of the boreholes and surrender of the environmental permit.

Reason : In order to allow monitoring of the progress of the site towards the authorised restoration date and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

8. West Lancashire Borough: application number LCC/2022/0066 Construction of four control kiosks and associated landscaping. Mere Brow Wastewater Treatment Works, Mere Brow Lane, Tarleton

A report was presented on an application for the construction of four control kiosks and associated landscaping at Mere Brow Wastewater Treatment Works, Mere Brow Lane, Tarleton.

The report included the views of West Lancashire Borough Council, the Environment Agency and Tarleton Parish Council. No representations had been received.

The Development Management Officer presented a Powerpoint presentation showing a location plan and diagram of the application site, an air photograph of the application site and nearest houses, a comparison diagram of the kiosk locations of permission LCC/2022/0015 with the current application, and photographs of the view from Mere Brow Lane and the access road to the waste water treatment works.

A query was raised in relation to the comments from Tarleton Parish Council stating that the proposed kiosks would be 9 metres high. It was confirmed to Committee that the kiosks would be 4 metres high and that the base level of the buildings would be set at a level of around 5 metres above ordnance datum.

Resolved: That planning permission be **granted**, subject to conditions controlling time limits, working programme and landscaping, as set out in the Committee report.

9. Wyre Borough: application number LCC/2023/0005 Variation of condition 8 of planning permission LCC/2016/0084 to allow the permitted number of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) leaving the site to increase from two per day to six per day. Foggs Farm, Hobbs Lane, Claughton-On-Brock

County Councillor Paul Rigby joined the meeting at this point. This item was considered prior to Item 8.

A report was presented on an application for a variation of condition 8 of planning permission LCC/2016/0084 at Foggs Farm, Hobbs Lane, Claughton-On-Brock, to allow the permitted number of HGVs leaving the site to increase from 2 to 6 per day.

The report included the views of LCC Highways Development Control. No observations had been received from Wyre Borough Council or Claughton Parish Council. One representation objecting to the application had been received.



Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Sheet which included an additional clause to condition 6 proposing that the provisions of this condition would not apply to tractors and trailers.

The Development Management Officer presented a Powerpoint presentation showing a location plan, air photograph of the application site and the buildings used for production of bedding materials, and photographs of Hobbs Lane, the site entrance onto Hobbs Lane, the site building and drying plant.

The Development Management Officer answered questions from Committee.

County Councillor Berry expressed concern in relation to the increase in vehicle movements from a road safety perspective, including the unlimited movement of farm vehicles and trailers on a single track road. In addition, County Councillor Berry asked that a condition be included in relation to wheel washing as the road surface was very muddy.

County Councillor Schofield referred to the comments from Highways detailed in the Committee report and considered that their request to impose a condition to manage HGV movements to no more than two within any hour should be included in the planning permission.

In relation to Committee's concerns about stones, mud and debris being transferred onto the highway, the Development Management Officer suggested that an additional condition could be included stating that measures would be taken to avoid any mud or debris being tracked out of the site entrance.

After a discussion, it was Proposed and Seconded:

"That the Recommendation in the report and Update Sheet be accepted, subject to an additional condition being imposed to manage HGV movements to no more than two leaving the site in any 60 minute period".

Upon being put to the vote, the Amendment was Carried.

It was further Proposed and Seconded:

"That the Recommendation in the report and Update Sheet be accepted, subject to an additional condition being imposed to manage HGV movements to no more than two leaving the site in any 60 minute period and subject to the installation of wheel cleaning facilities".

Upon being put to the Vote, the Amendment was Lost.

It was further Proposed and Seconded:

"That the Recommendation in the report and Update Sheet be approved, subject to an additional condition being imposed to manage HGV movements to no more than two leaving the site in any 60 minute period, and subject to



an additional general condition stating that measures will be taken to avoid mud or debris being tracked out of the site entrance".

Upon being put to the Vote, the Motion was Carried.

Resolved: That planning permission be **granted** subject to:

- (i) conditions controlling working programme, highway matters, ecology, landscaping and storage locations, as set out in the Committee report.
- (ii) the following addition to condition 6, as set out in the Update Sheet:

The provisions of this condition shall not apply to exports from the site transported using agricultural tractors and trailers or to the importation of biomass for use as fuel for the drying equipment.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and local amenity and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and policy CDMP1 of the Wyre Borough Local Plan.

- (iii) An additional condition 11:

11. Measures shall be taken at all times during the duration of the development to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud, dust or other deleterious materials on the surface of Hobbs Lane.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

- (iv) An additional condition 12:

12. No more than 2 HGVs shall leave the site in any 60 minute period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

10. Chorley Council: application number LCC/2023/0007 Proposed 2.4 metre high mesh fence to front boundary of school to replace existing hoop top fence. Gillibrand Primary School, Grosvenor Road, Chorley

A report was presented on an application for a proposed 2.4 metre high mesh fence to the front boundary of Gillibrand County Primary School, Grosvenor Road, Chorley, to replace the existing hoop top fence.

The application had been submitted as the school were experiencing issues with vandalism and unauthorised access. The new fencing was required in order to provide a higher degree of security.

The report included the views of Chorley Council and LCC Highways. Three representations objecting to the application had been received.



The Development Management Officer presented a Powerpoint presentation showing a site location plan and aerial view of the application site, location of the proposed fencing, car park and vehicular entrance, elevations and photographs of the existing fencing and the boundary with 4 Grosvenor Road.

The Development Management Officer answered questions from Committee.

Resolved: That planning permission be **granted** subject to conditions controlling approved plans and tree protection, as set out in the Committee report.

11. Planning decisions taken by the Head of Planning and Environment in accordance with the County Council's Scheme of Delegation

It was reported that, since the last meeting of the Development Control Committee on 26 April 2023, nine planning applications had been granted planning permission by the Head of Environment, in accordance with the county council's Scheme of Delegation.

Resolved: That the report be taken account of.

12. Urgent Business

There were no items of Urgent Business.

13. Date of Next Meeting

Resolved: That the next meeting of the Committee be held on Wednesday 19th July 2023 at 10.30am in Committee Room B – The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston.

H MacAndrew
Director of Law and Governance

County Hall
Preston

