



Minutes of meeting held 25 February 2026

1. Welcome and Apologies

KS welcomed attendees, including Lewis Allison and Alison Raynsford, Ward Councillors. Apologies were received from Penny Tarrant, Joan Jackson, Judy Tottey, Mary Brinsley and Peter, Hilary Kolinsky and Lynne Sears.

2. Minutes and Matters Arising

Parking at West Hoe – AR and PCC Officers inspected the parking and were able to issue 2 Enforcements, but the rest of the parking was legitimate and there was no evidence of mass abuse of the parking. This item to be set aside for the time being. Members are encouraged to voice concerns if the situation changes.

Bowling club – LA advised that a meeting was held with Bowling Club members, at which they expressed their concerns with parking costs, now that the Register Office is under private ownership. Members were invited to consider other transport and parking strategies for visiting the Bowling Club. The Bowling Club is subsidised by PCC and the premises are owned by PCC.

The crash involving a dumper truck and car near the Quality Inn –LA has heard from Morgan Sindall that none of their vehicles have been involved in accidents. Vehicle routes have been resolved.

Motorbike noise – A member has reported a noisy vehicle to D&C Police, and found the online process relatively long and complex. AR to enquire whether this can be simplified.

Action: AR

Peirson House –Councillors still awaiting a response re the crumbling steps/pavement.

Action: AR/LA

Reminder for PT to invite Richard Poynter Head Gardener to a future meeting, with KS, to present information on historic Hoe Gardeners, and the Potting Shed.

Action: PT/KS

No further matters arising, accuracy of minutes proposed MW and seconded Jacki Berry

3. Councillors' report

LA requested to enquire with PCC about missing public seating. Some benches, particularly by the little ships in West Hoe have been removed, some were damaged and needed maintenance. It was suggested that 'they did not belong to PCC' but not known who does own this area.

LA and AR to follow up to ascertain ownership

There is some concern among members, that benches that are removed for mending, do not always return, and that if the damage is too severe, replacements are not forthcoming.

Benches were noted to be missing from the Anchor Garden, near Maritimo's and in the Peace Garden.

It was noted that PCC were offering the opportunity to buy memorial plaques which could be placed in the Peace Garden. Members expressed concerns about the number and variety of items being put in the Peace Garden, which are not always in keeping with the original ethos - monetising plaques being one concern. Over-cluttering the Peace Garden is also a concern.

A member suggested that rather than installing the recent Ebb and Flow statues in the Peace Garden, that they might be better placed at Devils Point, as that is a vantage viewing point for naval families.

Action: AR/LA to enquire about the siting of the installation.

Action: AR to investigate benches removed from Hoe shelters

It was noted that 20 large trees have been planted along Citadel Rd, as mitigation for trees lost due to MoD activities on Lambhay. Many more are due to be planted.

4. Planning Applications

Thanks to Martin for all the work and effort in what was a pretty long list of properties to consider, which can be found at the end of these notes.

Questions raised and discussed at the Feb 2026 meeting:

There was discussion on the materials that are acceptable for Planning Approval on listed buildings. It was felt that sometimes there is a lack of consistency, and that frequent changes of Historic Environment Officers may impact this. A clearer set of general guidelines from PCC would be welcomed.

HNF to invite Historic Environment Officers to speak at a meeting.

Action: PT/KS

5. Neighbourhood Plan and Consultation

Following the submission of the NP, an update was received on 18 Feb, from PCC Planning Office.

The Planning Officer has stated:

Regulation 16 Consultation:

'The HNF Plan draft documents have been submitted to us and are currently with our web team and we will be able to go ahead as soon as this is all ready, which should be in the next couple of weeks. The Consultation period will last 6 weeks, and hard copies will be printed to go into the Central Library, and we will be sending out emails to statutory consultees and anyone who has signed up for planning notifications.

We will also print out site notices and display these at lamppost locations around the Hoe and each notice will provide details of the consultation, including how representations can be submitted, along with our contact information for anyone interested in accessing the documents.

As soon as we have finalised the start of the consultation, we will fill in the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service application form and they will send us the details of 3

potential examiners, based on the specialisms we have specified. We will discuss with the Forum who they want to appoint. This should be all in place before the end of the six-week consultation. On completion of the consultation period, we will send all the responses to the Examiner, noting that the examination is usually undertaken by written representations, rather than in person, but there is the possibility that they will request an in-person hearing, and if this is the case it would affect the timings.

We had a discussion with our colleagues in Cornwall who are very experienced in the process, and they said that Examiners take on average around 2 months to consider the Plan.'

Site Notices:

Further to this, details of where the site notices will be put have been received, as below:

Cody Beavan, Planning Officer Strategic Planning Team at PCC wrote:

'As part of the Regulation 16 consultation for the Hoe Neighbourhood Plan, we are required to display site notices within the designated neighbourhood area to inform members of the public about the consultation. The notices will be displayed from the date the consultation commences and will remain in place for the full six-week consultation period.

Each notice will provide details of the consultation, including how representations can be submitted, along with our contact information for anyone requiring assistance in accessing the documents.

I have attached a map showing the proposed locations for the site notices. We have aimed to achieve a good distribution across the area, focusing on locations with high pedestrian footfall. However, placement is limited to suitable existing lampposts.

I would be grateful if you could review the proposed locations and let me know whether you consider any amendments necessary. If we do not hear from you, we will assume you are content with the proposed locations and will proceed accordingly.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

T +441752398943 **E** cody.beavan@plymouth.gov.uk

Action: AR to find out the exact rules on campaigning for the HNP.

After some discussion, it was decided that Jacki would put the PDF of the Plan on the HNF website.

Action: JB



6. Register Office

The Planning application for the Register Office has met with significant concerns from Historic England, PCC Historic Environment Officer, HNF, and Ward Councillors, as detailed in the Planning Report. There are queries on the materials, lack of detail, respect for the heritage of the site, and right to light, among others.

LA has called-in the development to Council.

HNF has submitted an objection and suggested conditions. | members were encouraged to also submit comments or support the HNF response as it only counts as 'one' objection. Deadline is midnight tonight

7. AOB

- PT has sent a letter to Star Pubs, the owner of The Walrus, concerning anti-social behaviour. It was questioned whether PCC actually owns the leasehold on the building. AR to enquire.

Action: AR

- AR commented that Costcutter is having issues with shoplifting. Any information is welcome.
- KS told the meeting of research she has been doing on the history of The Hoe gardens. A potting shed was commissioned and constructed in 1915, which is still standing, but much dilapidated. It is within the Depot on the Hoe. KS, Richard Poynter and the Gardening Group, would like to work on a funding bid. Work has been done on prepping an Asset of Community Value proposal, and similar work will be done on getting the shed listed as a Building at Risk. The Councillors voiced their support for this project, and felt it would be a positive contribution.
- Members noted that there is a flashing neon sign at the Rivage. LA to enquire whether it needs Planning Permission.

Action: LA

- A broken table tennis table has been removed from West Hoe Park. Will this be replaced?

Action: AR to enquire.

- There has been a £200 donation from Suzanne Sparrow's family, for a tree to be planted on the Hoe, with a plaque to their mother. This will take place on Thursday 5 March 10.00 am on the Hoe. Members welcome to attend
'Suzanne Sparrow 1925-present.

Suzanne joined the Royal Navy during WW2 operating patrol boats. In 1978 she started on a new career path, one fuelled by determination and vision, setting up the Suzanne Sparrow Language School. She was conscious of the need for a learning establishment where international students would feel at home. Suzanne created a highly successful business and became the first woman to head the Plymouth Chamber of Commerce housed on Lockyer Street where she helped break down the pre-existing 'old boys network' style of operation. She was awarded an Honorary Doctorate of Education from the University of Plymouth'.

- Parking Permits – There was discussion around the capacity for parking permits in the locality, and the number of permits each household can apply for. This and other considerations around parking permits, is being considered by PCC.
- Tarmac and Potholes – pothole in Grand Hotel Rd and queries re some pavements in Conservation area replaced with tarmac instead of the original stone eg Leigham Street. AR asked for images to be sent to her.
- A member asked whether a mirror attached to a post would be possible at the junction with Mulgrave St and Athenaeum St, as it is a hazardous junction. LA has asked Highways Officer re other locations in the city and been told that this would not be possible unless evidence that number of accidents have occurred there

For links to PCC web sites regarding Planning and Licensing please see the addendum at the end of this report.

LICENSING APPLICATIONS

None

~~~~~

**PLEASE NOTE:**

PCC have made it clear in recent planning applications that residents feedback of objections via HNF objection letters, usually after discussion at a monthly meeting, are not seen as significant if they are not supported by residents' personal public objections.

Therefore, if you wish the HNF to object to a planning application then please take the time to follow that up with a personal objection.

See Addendum A at the end of this report for how to submit an objection, or a supporting comment, to the PCC planning department.

~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)

26/00236/FUL - Land at Hoe Road (public bench between Maritimo and Pier One Cafes)

Temporary External Artwork, Beryl Cook's 'Hips and Chips' figures.

Consultation with various bodies in Plymouth has been undertaken, including Plymouth City Council, the planning committee, and Plymouth Waterfront Partnership, to gain better input through a collaborative approach to the overall proposal. Discussions have covered the overall design, location, access, future events on or near the proposals, existing planting and use, planning process, build and on-site proposals and management, timescales, maintenance, and overall legalities—all of which have been considered, discussed, and agreed.

Proposed Timeline:

24 January 2026 – Exhibition at The Box opened to the public

23 March 2026 – Installation of figure at proposed location

31 May 2026 – Exhibition closes

22 July 2026 – Installed figures are removed and restoration of site complete



Comments by 24th Mar

~~~~~

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

**26/00190/LBC - 33 Grand Parade**

As a result of flooding, the partial replacement of ceilings due to damage and partial collapse in two rooms.

**Comments by 10<sup>th</sup> Mar**

**25/01516/LBC + 25/01515/FUL - Duke of Cornwall Hotel, 13 Millbay Road**

Removal and replacement of existing enclosed fire escape staircase and associated structures, various alterations and repairs to the roof, render, rainwater goods and windows, internal alterations and associated works.

Full drawings and images now submitted for further assessment regarding works to: Fire Escape Staircase, Ensuite Façade, Rainwater and Drainage Goods, Roof Water Tank Removal, Flat Roof Formation and Incidental Repairs, Window Repairs, Slate Repairs– Rear Elevation Pitched Roof

**Comments by 10<sup>th</sup> Mar**

**26/00144/LBC - Flats 1, 5, 8, 9 & 11, 5 - 6 Elliot Terrace**

Internal repair works to a number of flats following previous water ingress. This application was previously discussed as a Pre-application at the Jan HNF meeting.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**

**26/00140/FUL - Flat 15 to 53, Holyrood Court Holyrood Place**

New uPVC windows. "Replacement of existing brown uPVC and aluminium windows with new white uPVC windows and associated works."

The site is a part 4-storey, part 5-storey building consisting of 20 self-contained residential apartments belonging to the Holyrood Court, Willow Tree Housing Partnership. The current fenestration consists of a mixture of brown uPVC and aluminium windows with a combination of opening arrangements. The windows are in poor condition and have become difficult to maintain.

The proposals will also improve the buildings thermal and energy performance; these are significant benefits of the proposal. It should be noted that uPVC windows are already fitted to other houses in the street, but we recognise that the flats are in a Conservation Area close to many Listed Buildings.

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

The building is a modern block of flats designed to reflect the appearance of the surrounding historic buildings. The applicant proposes to remove and replace all the existing windows.

In principle, there is no objection to removing the existing windows but the proposed replacements are not acceptable because they are all of a top hung design whilst the existing windows on the main elevations are all of a vertical sliding sash design.

From a heritage view replacing these vertical sliding sashes with top hung design windows does not maintain the contribution of this modern building to the heritage assets, so my recommendation would be not to support this proposal.

However, if the applicant were to amend the proposal so that existing vertical sliding sash windows were replaced with vertical sliding sash windows of the same appearance with a change of colour and material, then the proposal may be supportable, depending on submitted details.

There is also a reference to "associated works" but it is not clear what these are, so clarification is needed from the applicant on that point so that they can be defined for any consent.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

**26/00030/LBC & 26/00029/FUL - 24 Lockyer Street**

Change of use of ground/lower ground floors from night club to commercial unit (Class E)

Change of use of first floor from tattoo parlour to 2-bed flat (Class C3)  
Change of use of second/third floors from manager's accommodation to 6-bed HMO (Class C4) (part retrospective).

The proposals seek to make better usage of this centrally located property. The external alterations are minimal, the materials will be matching the existing vernacular and will cause minimal impact to any surrounding properties.

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

The agent wrongly states that the Listing does not include the interior of the Listed Building. He also says that the only alterations are two windows - the proposed plans show that internal alterations are proposed. The applicant needs to submit full details of all proposals and sufficient information to understand the potential impact on the significance of any heritage asset affected by the proposal. There is insufficient information on this application, so recommendation is not to support.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**  
~~~~~

26/00021/LBC & 26/00020/FUL - Lower Ground Floor Flat, 2A The Esplanade (Grade II*)

Replacement of basement front door

The applicant wishes to replace the existing red painted timber door with an olive green painted timber door to the entrance of the property. The style of the door is the same as the existing, however it is proposed to incorporate glass to the top four panels to allow light into the property. The scale and visual appearance will be unchanged and will be in keeping within the conservation area and listed status of the property. The existing door being replaced is in a poor condition and as such the new proposed door will provide better weather proofing and thermal efficiency. This improvement therefore will protect the internal and external fabric of the property. In addition, draught proofing, sound insulation and security measures will all be improved.

Comments by 3rd Mar
~~~~~

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)**

**25/01212/LBC - Flat 2, 216 Citadel Road**

Installation of extractor fan unit and associated works.

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

In principle, we have no objection to the proposal as ventilation is essential in buildings of this period, and the intervention will benefit the property as a whole, not solely the room in question. The proposed pipe work will be concealed beneath the floorboards and will tie into existing plumbing.

Given the extent of historic alterations already present within the building, we do not consider the introduction of a bath in this area to cause harm to its significance. The majority of the proposed works are also reversible.

On this basis, we consider the proposals to be broadly compliant with the relevant policies and not harmful to the special interest of the listed building.

The only matter I would question is whether any assessment was undertaken regarding the floor joists' ability to support the weight of the bath. Any structural interventions to the flooring would require Listed Building Consent, although it is possible that the landlord or contractor was satisfied that no such works were necessary.

**Awaiting decision**  
~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)

25/01448/LBC - 3 Elliot Terrace

Repairs to existing roof including new roof covering and insulation and associated gutter and lead works

Replacement of flat roof covering to the rear of the property. The flat roof will include an increase in the height, due to meeting the building regulations Part L. The existing roof will remain in place and the new covering will be installed over it to increase insulation values.

PCC Historic Environment Officer

In principle we have no objections to the works outlined. It is clear from the images provided that replacement and repair would be of benefit to the building. The works are seen to be acceptable subject to conditions that more information regarding the materials to be used be issued.

Awaiting **decision**

~~~~~

**25/01654/FUL - Plymouth Register Office, 49 Lockyer Street**

Demolition of existing building and construction of residential development with commercial (use class E) on ground floor and associated works. This application was discussed at the Jan meeting.

**Historic England**

We have concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We recommend that further information is provided and that the design is amended to address our heritage concerns. Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice.

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

Given the inadequacies within the submitted information and the likelihood of harm to multiple designated heritage assets, the Historic Environment Team advises that the proposal is unacceptable without amendment. We would welcome the opportunity to review further iterations once the issues highlighted above have been addressed.

**HNF Response**

The Hoe Neighbourhood Forum, whilst supporting development of the site with a scheme that is broadly congruent with our own site feasibility study, OBJECTS to this planning application on the grounds of insufficient detail to meet the requirements of both the JLP and our emerging neighbourhood plan policies. Specifically:

1. We support the Historic England position that there is the potential for harm to the Conservation Area and we support their call for more details on materials to be used as well as further information to support their justification for such a high building within the Conservation Area. We agree there is a lack of critical contextual analysis for how the building sits within its neighbourhood. We share their concerns about the potential harm to the setting of the Grade I and II assets in the immediate vicinity. We share their concerns about some of the proposed materials being used and would like more information to be produced for experts to decide on its suitability for such an iconic location. (We draw your attention to the Hoe Neighbourhood Plan policies H1, H2, H4 in connection with the above.)
2. We support the Historic Environment Officer's comments in connection with the suitability of the GRC cladding. We agree with the comment that there is a lack of detailed and comprehensive views of the building's setting within the landscape and its impact on important views within the Conservation Area. (Hoe Neighbourhood plan policy H3, view 2)
3. We support the Natural Environment Officer's comments about the excessive number of mature trees proposed for felling, the risk of Root Protection Areas not being properly adhered to and thus the risk of harm to trees proposed to remain. Also, the mitigation planting numbers quoted in the report as being 87 should be mandated and should be within the Hoe Forum area. The Biodiversity Net Gain calculations should be validated by an independent body to ensure they are correct, especially in light of the wanton destruction of habitat caused by the applicants during bird nesting season last year, for which an enforcement notice is awaited. (Hoe Neighbourhood draft plan policy BG2)
4. There is a regrettable lack of affordable housing and variety of housing type, as outlined in our draft policy HS1

5. With reference to the applicant's Daylight and Sunlight report we have serious concerns that the effect on some of the existing homes around the new development does not meet the recommendations of the Building Research Establishment Guide."

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)**

**25/01654/FUL - Plymouth Register Office, 49 Lockyer Street (Continued)**

**Councillor Allison Lewis Comments - Planning Committee Councillor Call In**

This application raises fundamental and material planning concerns regarding the deliverability of the proposed development and the justification for departing from adopted policy requirements, particularly in relation to affordable housing provision.

Given the scale of the proposal, the prominence of the site, and the extent of policy departure being sought, the application clearly warrants full scrutiny.

The applicant seeks to provide no affordable housing on viability grounds. However, the submitted Financial Viability Assessment concludes that the scheme remains substantially unviable even after the removal of affordable housing contributions and other planning obligations. This presents a significant and unusual position whereby policy flexibility is being sought, but the applicant's own evidence indicates that removing policy requirements does not enable delivery of the scheme. In these circumstances, it is unclear what planning benefit is secured by granting permission or how the proposal represents a realistically deliverable form of development.

Planning policy allows for flexibility in obligations where doing so would enable development to proceed. However, where the applicant's own viability evidence indicates that the scheme would remain unviable even without affordable housing or S106 contributions, the justification for departing from policy becomes fundamentally unclear. Granting permission in such circumstances risks approving a scheme that delivers no affordable housing and potentially no development at all. Given the scale of the development, the prominence of the site within a conservation area, the significant departure from adopted affordable housing policy, the applicant's own conclusion that the scheme remains unviable even without policy requirements, and the presence of unresolved consultee concerns, it is appropriate that this application be determined by Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers.

For the application to revert to a delegated decision would require clarity over how the applicant proposes to progress the scheme and any strategy to ensure that the application as proposed can be made viable.

**Other Comments**

There have been supporting and objecting comments submitted by the following people, Community Connections, Plymouth Tree People, and two public comments, which cover similar issues as stated in the responses above.

**Awaiting decision**

~~~~~

26/00003/LBC & 26/00002/FUL - 71 Citadel Road

Change of use of hotel (Class C1) to 12-bed HMO (Sui Generis) and associated works (part retrospective)

For reference: This terrace, Nos 59-73 are all Grade II listed and No.71 was formally The Retreat Guest House.

One public objection on the grounds that there are already a number of HMOs, Hostels, AirBnB and subdivided houses in the area. Concern regarding parking, bins and further impingement on the quality of the neighbourhood.

Awaiting decision

~~~~~

**25/01639/FUL - Rivage Apartments, Hoe Road**

Removal and replacement of existing combustible cladding and external wall elements with new non-combustible and associated works.

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

The applicant has now submitted amended proposed drawings which contain annotations and legends that confirm that the proposed replacement materials maintain the existing external appearance of the building. As the proposal will sustain the contribution of the building as an element within the Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby Listed Building, as well as within the Registered Park and Garden, recommendation is to support this amended proposal.

**Awaiting decision**

~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)

25/01485/LBC - Apartment 18, First Floor, The Grand - 24 Elliot Street

Replacement windows, Air Source Heat Pump to rear elevation and associated interior works.

The applicant proposes to remove and replace the window sashes and timber screen panelling along the front façade of Flat 18 and install replacement double glazed units. Also proposed is the addition of a heat pump to the rear of the building and two replacement windows.

PCC Historic Environment Officer

The proposed air source heat pump would require the addition of a rectangular metal or plastic box type addition onto the rear wall of the building at first floor level. This would add an anomalous feature high on the rear elevation of the Listed Building which would not be sympathetic to the style, traditional materials or appearance of the building and would also be in clear view from the public street to the rear of the building. The purposes of the heat pump is to provide underfloor heating for the solarium but the benefit from such a heating system would be limited in comparison to the harm to the Listed Building.

Also proposed is the removal and replacement of the existing windows along the front elevation of the applicant's Flat, which is one of the individual properties into which the former Grand Hotel has been subdivided.

The applicant describes the windows and screen as not being original to the building, which dates from c1870, but as early additions dating from the early 1900s they are historic features which have formed part of the Listed Building for most of its existence. The two rear windows, the subject of this proposal appear to be original windows of the building, and their retention and repair were described in the 2009 repair post fire renovation schedule.

The existing windows, timber screen of panels and pilasters, and the two rear windows of Flat 18 all appear to be historic features of the Listed Building and are features which contribute positively to its architectural and historic interest as well as to its significance. They are elements of the continuous balustrade across the first floor of the front façade of the building so are also important, highly visible features which contribute to the aesthetic value of the building. For the same reasons these features make a positive contribution to the historic and aesthetic values of the Conservation Area as well as to its character and appearance.

For the above reasons the proposed removal of these features from the Listed Building is considered to be harmful to its character and significance. The condition of the windows and timber screen is not such that they are irreparable so there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm to a heritage asset. The removal of these features is also considered to be harmful to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area.

Recommendation is not to support this proposal.

Applicant

Has agreed to remove the ASHP from the application and to amend the application to repair of the window woodwork rather than replacement but would like consent to fit heritage Ultra Clear slimline double glazing, which would guarantee visual consistency with the rest of the building. This would be in-line with Historic England's Advice Note 18 section 81 on the use of double glazing in a listed property where the glass is not original. They have added that the PCC Historic Environment Officer was happy with the sample of glass we showed them.

Regards the internal timber cladding and modern gypsum plaster - we would like to replace this where necessary.

The Grand (Plymouth) Management Company

Supports the replacement windows, as long as they are in keeping with and maintain the general character of this Grade 2 listed building.

Awaiting Decision

~~~~~

**25/01465/LBC - 67 Citadel Road**

**25/01466/LBC - 69 Citadel Road**

Both applications are for the replacement of a single rear door in each property.

**Granted**

~~~~~

ADDENDUM A

Planning – Viewing applications

You can view any of the planning applications listed below by visiting

<https://planning.plymouth.gov.uk>

and searching using the planning application number or address shown below.

~~~~~

~~~~~

Planning - Commenting on applications

Comments can be submitted to Plymouth City Council by the methods below. Please include your name, address and the application number and clearly state if you 'Object' or 'Support' the application

1. Email to: planningconsents@plymouth.gov.uk
2. By post to: Strategic PCC Planning and Infrastructure, Floor 2, Ballard House, West Hoe Road, Plymouth, PL1 3BJ
3. PCC Public Access Portal – You will need to have, or set up, a personal account for PCC access

~~~~~

~~~~~

Planning – Reporting unauthorised developments:

<https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/report-alleged-unauthorised-development>

~~~~~

~~~~~

Licensing - Commenting on applications

<https://licensing.plymouth.gov.uk/1/WcaHome>

~~~~~

~~~~~

Report Noise Issues (businesses or neighbours)

<https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/noise>

~~~~~

**Next Meeting: The next meeting to be confirmed.**