

Planning Committee

Tel: 01507 601111 Ext. 613421

Lynda.Eastwood@e-lindsey.gov.uk

Thursday, 28 September 2023

To All Members of the Planning
Committee,
Internal and External Circulation and
Press

Dear Councillor,

Re: Planning Committee Agenda - Thursday, 5th October, 2023

Further to the compilation of the above Planning Committee Agenda, please find enclosed the following reports which was detailed to follow on your Agenda:

Agenda Item 3. Minutes: (Pages 1 - 18)

To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 September 2023.

Please accept my apologies for any inconvenience caused.

Yours sincerely,

L. Eastwood

Lynda Eastwood
Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is left intentionally blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 7th September, 2023 at 10.30 am.

PRESENT

Councillor Stephen Eyre (Chairman)

Councillors Richard Cunnington, Dick Edginton, David Hall, Sam Kemp, Terry Knowles, Steve McMillan, Daniel McNally, Kate Marnoch, and Ruchira Yarsley.

Councillor Terry Taylor attended the Meeting as a Substitute.
Councillor Terry Aldridge attended the Meeting as an Observer.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrew Booth	- Development Management Lead Officer
Michelle Walker	- Deputy Development Manager
Graeme Hyde	- Senior Planning Officer
Jane Baker	- Senior Planning Officer
Chris Panton	- Senior Planning Officer
Colin Horton	- Arboricultural Officer
Angela Simmonds	- Legal Advisor
Ann Good	- Democratic Services Manager
Lynda Eastwood	- Democratic Services Officer

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sid Dennis and Neil Jones.

It was noted that, in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, notice had been given that Councillor Terry Taylor had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Alex Hall for this Meeting only.

12. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY):

At this point in the Meeting, Members were invited to disclose any relevant interests. The following interests were disclosed:

- Councillor David Hall asked it be noted that, in relation to Item 9, he would be leaving the Meeting due to having an interest.
- Councillor Stephen Eyre asked it be noted that in relation to Item 8 he was Ward Member, however would remain in the Meeting to speak on that item.
- Councillor Terry Taylor asked it be noted that he would be speaking on Item 14 as Ward Member.
- Councillor Daniel McNally asked it be noted that he was a member of the Wolds AONB Committee, however had had no involvement in relation to Item 8.

- Councillors Stephen Eyre and Dick Edginton asked it be noted that they were Members of the Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board.

13. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 August 2023 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

14. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Councillor Terry Aldridge advised Members that the next Meeting of Planning Policy Committee would be held on Thursday 14 September 2023 at 6.30pm and there were a number of housing topic areas that needed decisions to provide direction for the Local Plan review on the Agenda that were very relevant.

15. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER: OLD BOLINGBROKE 2023 (18.07)

Members received a report from Colin Horton, Arboricultural Officer which enabled them to consider whether a temporary Tree Preservation Order (TPO) made to protect three trees at Hall Farm, West Keal Road, Old Bolingbroke be made permanent.

The Arboricultural Officer referred Members of the Committee to the presentation which displayed the plan and images of the trees.

The Arboricultural Officer recommended to Committee that the TPO should be made permanent.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval.

Upon being put to the vote in line with the officer recommendation that the TPO be confirmed (made permanent), Members voted as follows:

Vote: 11 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

RESOLVED:

That the Old Bolingbroke 2023 (18.07) Tree Preservation Order be confirmed without modification.

16. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER: UTTERBY 2023 (192.05)

Members received a report from Colin Horton, Arboricultural Officer which enabled them to consider whether a temporary Tree Preservation Order (TPO) made to protect six trees in the church yard of St Andrew's Church, Church Lane, Utterby be made permanent.

The Arboricultural Officer referred Members of the Committee to the presentation which displayed the plan and images of the trees

The Arboricultural Officer recommended to Committee that the TPO should be made permanent.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval.

Upon being put to the vote in line with the officer recommendation that the TPO be confirmed (made permanent), Members voted as follows:

Vote: 11 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

RESOLVED:

That the Old Bolingbroke 2022 (105.33) Tree Preservation Order be confirmed without modification.

17. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER: WOODHALL SPA 2023 (215.27)

Members received a report from Colin Horton, Arboricultural Officer which enabled them to consider whether a temporary Tree Preservation Order (TPO) made to protect one Beech tree in the highway verge outside 51 Tor-O-Moor Road, Woodhall Spa, be confirmed (made permanent).

The Arboricultural Officer referred Members of the Committee to the presentation which displayed the plan and an image of the tree.

The Arboricultural Officer recommended to Committee that the TPO should be made permanent.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval.

Upon being put to the vote in line with the officer recommendation that the TPO be confirmed (made permanent), Members voted as follows:

Vote: 11 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

RESOLVED:

That the Woodhall Spa 2023 (215.27) Tree Preservation Order be confirmed without modification.

N.B. Having declared an interest for the following item, Councillor Stephen Eyre left the Meeting at 10.44am.

COUNCILLOR DANIEL MCNALLY, VICE-CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR

18. N/199/01327/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Change of use of land for the siting of 18 no. static caravans (increase of

6 from that approved under N/199/02050/18), minor alterations to the pond and internal road, provision of bin storage area, erection of pumphouse and water storage tank and CCTV columns (works already started).

Location: MISTY MEADOW HOLIDAY PARK, HANBY LANE, WELTON LE MARSH, PE23 5TH

Applicant: A.E. Hewison Limited

Members received an application for full Planning Permission – change of use of land for the siting of 18 no. static caravans (increase of 6 from that approved under N/199/02050/18), minor alterations to the pond and internal road, provision of bin storage area, erection of pumphouse and water storage tank and CCTV columns (works already started) at Misty Meadow Holiday Park, Hanby Lane, Welton Le Marsh, PE23 5TH.

The application was subject to a call-in request by Councillor Eyre due to the level of local concern. Furthermore, the application may be considered as a departure from the East Lindsey Local Plan and was recommended for approval.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of the Development in this Location;
- Impact of the Development on the Character of the Area Including the Adjacent AONB;
- Impact on amenity;
- Flood Risk and Drainage;
- Impact on ecology and wildlife.

Members were referred to the additional information contained in the supplementary agenda, pages 1 to 3 refer.

Michelle Walker, Deputy Development Manager, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 37 to 38 of the report refer.

Mr Robert Doughty spoke in support of the application.

Dr Peter Kirby spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Mark Williams, Welton Le Marsh Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Stephen Eyre spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member addressed Mr Kirby and asked him to explain the consultation period which was referred to during his speech.

Mr Kirby advised that the consultation period was first advertised on 23/8/23 and was due to end on 20/9/23, as advertised in the press and on the planning portal. He further advised that recent amendments were only advertised two weeks previously and were in relation to the onsite water supply. He commented that the Environment Agency and Environmental Health Team may not be aware of the amendments, therefore had not had time to submit comments.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

The Legal Representative advised Members on the consultation period process, page 49 of the Report refers.

Following which it was proposed that the item was deferred to the November Meeting to allow time to obtain further information. No seconder was received.

It was further proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of having a negative impact on the area, that it went against Local Plan policy and that the density was far greater than originally stated.

The application was seconded for refusal.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for refusal against officer recommendation was carried.

Vote: 9 in favour 0 against 1 abstention

RESOLVED:

N.B. Councillor Stephen Eyre returned to the Meeting at 11:14am

N.B. Councillor David Hall left the Meeting at 11:15am.

19. N/105/00213/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of 9no. dwellings on the site of the existing buildings which are to be demolished.

Location: 55 EASTFIELD ROAD, LOUTH, LN11 7AL

Applicant: Widespace Properties Ltd

Members received an application for full Planning Permission - Erection of 9no. dwellings on the site of the existing buildings which were to be

demolished at 55 Eastfield Road, Louth, LN11 7AL.

The proposal had led to firm views from the Town Council and Heritage consultees about the potential loss of the frontage building which was a non-designated heritage asset, and its facade in particular which were at odds with the views of the applicant's agent, therefore it was appropriate that it be considered at Planning Committee.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- The Principle of residential development in this location;
- Impact on the character of the area;
- Impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties;
- Heritage Matters.

Members were referred to the additional information contained in the supplementary agenda, pages 3 to 5 refer.

Chris Panton, Senior Planning Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 55 to 56 of the report refer.

Councillor Sue Crew, Louth Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Rosalind Jackson spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether there had been any discussions before the planning application was raised with regards to the site being tidied. Councillor Sue Crew responded that it had not been discussed previously by the Town Council.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried whether there was any car parking at the front of the building on Eastgate. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the front would be closed in, therefore no parking would be available at the front of the building. However, parking for the units would be located in the proposed central area of the site.
- A Member further queried whether a contaminated land survey had been completed with regards to the gas works. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that a survey had not yet been undertaken but was included in the additional conditions.
- A Member enquired what the current use of the building was and whether the condition around having a contractor in place was robust. It was further queried whether there were any financial

contributions being made relating to health and education. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the redevelopment condition was robust. The Development Management Lead Officer advised that certain developments required financial contributions as mitigation, however this development was below the threshold. Members were further advised that the site was currently disused and assumed that the parked cars belonged to local residents.

- A Member queried whether the Committee had the power to request repair against replacement costings and if so, whether it would then have the power to defer.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that they would be able to request costings if Committee considered the loss of the asset required more justification and advised that they would need to make a balanced decision.

- A Member commented that the design of the new building would be an improvement.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with the officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was carried.

Vote: 9 in favour 0 against 1 abstention

RESOLVED:

That full planning permission be approved, subject to the following conditions:

The Committee broke for lunch at 11:42am and reconvened at 1.00pm.

N.B. Councillor Sam Kemp left the Meeting at 11.42am.

N.B. Councillor David Hall returned to the Meeting at 1.00pm.

N.B. Councillor Terry Taylor left the Meeting at 1:00pm.

20. S/165/01205/23:

Application Type: Outline Planning Permission

Proposal: Outline erection of 2no. dwellings (with means of access to be considered).

Location: LAND ADJACENT TO 34, MASONIC LANE, SPILSBY

Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Young

Members received an application for Outline Planning Permission - Outline erection of 2no. dwellings (with means of access to be considered at land adjacent to 34 Masonic Lane, Spilsby.

This application sought permission for a revised scheme following a previous proposal, which was dismissed at appeal. Both this application and the previous application generated significant local objection and given that the recommendation was to approve the application, it was considered appropriate for Committee consideration.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle;
- Access/highway implications/Third Party Residential Amenity;
- Biodiversity;
- Drainage;
- Contamination.

Graeme Hyde, Senior Planning Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 81 to 82 of the report refer.

Mr Andrew Clover spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

No comments or questions were received.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried whether the site was in open countryside. The Senior Planning Officer advised that it was in the open fields, however as part of the policy context of SP3, developments were permitted on the edge of settlements. Therefore, there was no objection in principle, however there was an impact on the character of the area.
- A Member made an observation that the private access road would have a negative impact on the neighbours. The Senior Planning Officer was in agreement with this and highlighted that this was one of the main considerations.
- A Member queried whether there was a reason why Jacks Lane was not considered as an access road. The Senior Planning Officer responded that neither route was easy and there was a need to assess whether the access from Masonic Lane was suitable or not.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval in line with officer recommendation.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for refusal against officer recommendation on the basis of the property being located in open countryside, the size of the access road and amenities to the neighbours.

Upon being put to the vote for refusal, against officer recommendation, Members voted as follows:

Vote: 2 in favour 6 against 1 abstention

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was agreed.

Vote: 6 in favour 2 against 1 abstention

RESOLVED:

That outline planning permission be approved, subject to the following conditions:

N.B. Councillor Terry Taylor returned to the Meeting at 1:18pm.

N.B. Councillor Terry Knowles left the Meeting at 1:24pm.

21. N/105/2401/22:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of a dwelling.

Location: 21 ST MARYS LANE, LOUTH, LN11 0DU

Applicant: Mr. S. Clarke

Members received an application for full Planning Permission – erection of a dwelling at 21 St Marys Lane, Louth, LN11 0DU.

The application related to a sensitive site in Louth and was subject to a call-in request by Councillor Andrew Leonard on the following basis:

The site, off St Mary's Lane in Louth, was adjacent to the River Lud and as such was deemed to be in Flood Zone 3 and as such should not be developed. However, it was considered that the following important factors should be taken into consideration:

- There had been no review of flood risk in Louth following the successful creation and operation of the £10m Flood Scheme to the west of the town. Flood waters coming off the Wolds, which caused the tragic 1920 flood, were now stored and water was then allowed to flow from the storage reservoirs at a rate overseen by the Environment Agency. Since the scheme came into operation, there

had been no reports of riverine flooding in this area of Louth. Despite requests the flood maps had not been updated to take into account the changes the scheme has brought about.

- The applicant has, however, taken into account the proximity of the river in the design of the property, elevating the dwelling accordingly.
- The site was located in central Louth and was sustainable, being close to all the facilities of the town by foot.
- The owner of the site had agreed to enable the build of toilet facilities at the adjacent Louth Lawn Tennis Club at his own expense. This would be linked into the new drainage system at his property. The tennis club could not afford to provide this necessary facility and was not eligible for grant aid from the LLTA as it only had two courts, with the starting point for grant aid requiring a club to have at least three courts. This facility would enhance health and wellbeing in the town, the club having members of all ages and abilities.

The main planning issues in this case were considered to be:

- The Principle of the Development in this Location in Terms of Sustainability;
- Impact of the development on the character of the area, the Conservation area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings;
- Flood Risk and drainage;
- Impact on neighbour amenity;
- Highway Safety.

Members were referred to the additional information contained in the supplementary agenda, pages 5 to 6 refer.

Andrew Booth, Development Management Lead Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 99 to 100 of the report refer.

Mr Steve Clarke spoke in support of the application.

Mr Thomas Atkins spoke in objection to the application.

A written note was read out on behalf of Councillor Sue Crew, Louth Town Council.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

No comments or questions were received.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member requested clarity on the sequential tests and an explanation on the difference of opinion expressed by speakers with regards to trees and the flood risk element.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised that some of the trees would be removed which would have an impact on the character of the area, however considered that the impact was acceptable. With regards to flood risk, the officer felt the sequential test had been passed. The scheme was looking at one additional dwelling and associated improvements for the tennis club and as no other sites could deliver that, it was considered appropriate from a sequential point of view.

- A Member raised a concern with regards to the sequential tests and the exceptions test and queried whether the tennis club had the space for a toilet. It was further commented that there were two or three other tennis courts in Louth and queried why it was assumed that tennis players would visit this club and not the others.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised that he had received supporting documents indicating that the club would be well used and pointed out that the tennis club would be amending its constitution to allow other people to play on their courts, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

- A Member queried whether a condition could be added to state that the improvements had to be provided. The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that there was a pre-commencement condition which confirmed arrangements and timescales for the improvements.
- A Member raised a concern with regards to the impact on the local neighbours with cars, noise and from people in general. The Development Management Lead Officer pointed out that it was not possible for the club to be used in a more intensive manner than it was at the moment.
- A Member queried whether the tennis club had the land for a toilet or whether it was just the funds that it was lacking. The Development Management Lead Officer advised that there was a clubhouse on site and the facility would be provided within it.
- A Member queried whether the Committee could refuse the application on the grounds that the sequential tests had not been undertaken.

As this point in the meeting, the Legal Representative provided advice to Members with regards to the sequential and exceptions tests not being completed.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for refusal against officer recommendation on the basis of the sequential and exceptions tests not being completed.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval in line with officer recommendation.

Upon being put to the vote for refusal, against officer recommendation, Members voted as follows:

Vote: 2 in favour 6 against 1 abstention

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was agreed.

Vote: 6 in favour 2 against 1 abstention

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with the officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was agreed.

RESOLVED:

That full planning permission be approved, subject to the following conditions:

22. S/183/01210/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of 2no. two storey dwellings and construction of a vehicular access, existing agricultural buildings to be demolished.

Location: MILL FARM, LEAGATE ROAD, GIPSEY BRIDGE, BOSTON, PE22 7DA

Applicant: Mr. M. Hall

Members received an application for full Planning Permission - Erection of 2no. two storey dwellings and construction of a vehicular access, existing agricultural buildings to be demolished at Mill Farm, Leagate Road, Gipse Bridge, Boston, PE22 7DA.

The application was referred to Planning Committee because the applicant was a close relative of a District Councillor (Councillor Alex Hall).

The main planning issues in this case were considered to be:

- Principle of development when considering local and national policy;

- Fallback position;
- Impact on character of area;
- Impact on neighbours;
- Flood risk.

Members were referred to the additional information contained in the supplementary agenda, pages 6 to 9 refer.

Jane Baker, Senior Planning Officer detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 117 to 118 of the report refer.

Mr Giles Crust spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

No comments or questions were received.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

A Member commented that the site was in open countryside. Following which, the application was proposed for refusal.

- A Member queried whether the Class Q approved building had permission for three buildings to be built within it.

The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that one building had a Class Q permission for a conversion to one dwelling. A class Q permission for converting it to three dwellings was possible, but not confirmed.

- A Member further queried whether a new dwelling would be more efficient and environmentally friendly than a Class Q conversion. The Legal Representative advised that this would not be an instant fallback position.
- A Member queried that if this was considered as new dwellings being built and not as a Class Q conversion, whether new buildings would be permitted as the development was in the open countryside.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised that the open countryside policies would apply and were restrictive on new developments other than in certain exceptional locations.

- A Member queried what the term 'marketed for' referred to. The Senior Planning Officer explained that one of the criteria of policy SP16 was to evidence that a site could not be developed for a business, leisure or commercial use and to do that, a site would be marketed and put up for sale for a period of 12 months and advertised for sale as business, leisure or commercial use.

Following the 12 months, if there had been no interest and it had not been sold, then that would provide evidence that the site could not be developed for those uses.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for refusal in line with officer recommendation.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval, contrary to officer recommendation. Further to a discussion that ensued, no valid reasons for approval were received.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for refusal in line with the officer recommendation was carried.

Vote: 4 in favour 3 against 1 abstention

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

23. S/039/00184/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Change of use of land to provide an extension to the existing caravan site for the siting of 100no. static caravans, excavation of land to provide 5no. ponds, construction of internal access roads and associated landscaping.

Location: BELVEDERE LAKES CARAVAN PARK, LOW ROAD, CROFT, PE24 4RQ

Applicant: Mr. N. Cooper

Members received an application for full planning permission for the Change of use of land to provide an extension to the existing caravan site for the siting of 100no. static caravans, excavation of land to provide 5no. ponds, construction of internal access roads and associated landscaping at Belvedere Lakes Caravan Park, Low Road, Croft, PE24 4RQ.

The application was referred to Planning Committee for reasons of transparency in decision making because the landowner was a district councillor (Councillor Sid Dennis).

The main planning issues in this case were considered to be:

- Principle of development;
- Impact on character of area;
- Impact on neighbour amenities;
- Flood risk;

- Impact on wildlife;
- Contamination;
- Highway and footpath matters;
- Drainage.

Members were referred to the additional information contained in the supplementary agenda, page 9 refers.

Members were advised of further correspondence received with regards to the application.

Jane Baker, Senior Planning Officer detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 129 to 130 of the report refer.

Mr Neil Cooper spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

No comments or questions were received.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried what 'infill' was and what evidence was there.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that 'infill' was when the land had been filled in and soil brought in from elsewhere.

- A Member raised a query with regards to the bus stop. The Senior Planning Officer advised that it was part of Condition 14 and that Lincolnshire Highways had requested the condition.
- A Member referred to the late information that was received regarding the use of the land and asked whether it had changed the officer's recommendation. The Senior Planning Officer responded that it had not resulted in a change to the recommendation as it was down to the contamination, not the agricultural land.

The Legal Representative advised that the conditions were not unreasonable and that they were standard conditions. It was also pointed out that there were mechanisms in place where conditions could be varied or be removed in the future.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval, with the current conditions.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with the officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was carried.

Vote: 9 in favour 0 against 0 abstention

RESOLVED:

That full planning permission be approved, subject to the following conditions:

N.B. Councillor Terry Taylor and Councillor Richard Cunnington left the Meeting at 2:40pm.

N.B. Councillor Terry Taylor and Councillor Cunnington returned to the Meeting at 2:44pm.

24. S/168/00595/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Extensions to existing dwelling to provide additional living accommodation and erection of a detached double garage.

Location: SHENZI, FEN ROAD, STICKFORD, BOSTON, PE22 8EX

Applicant: RH Developments Ltd

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission - Extensions to existing dwelling to provide additional living accommodation and erection of a detached double garage at Shenzi, Fen Road, Stickford, Boston, PE22 8EX.

Councillor Terry Taylor requested that the application be considered by the Planning Committee in response to concerns of the Parish Council, heritage issues and anticipated local interest.

The main planning issues in this case were considered to be:

- Impact of the proposal upon the historic fabric of the granary building considered to be a non-designated heritage asset;
- Impact of the proposal upon nearby residential amenity;
- Impact of the proposal upon the character of the area.

Andrew Booth, Development Management Lead Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, page 149 of the report refers.

Councillor John Howlett, Stickford Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Terry Taylor spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- When asked whether it was the same builder carrying out the work, Mr Howlett confirmed that it was therefore was likely to be the same problems that they had encountered with the builder before.
- A Member queried what the granary was being used for at the current time. Mr Howlett advised that it was empty, however the applicant had been seen carrying out work there.
- A Member queried whether the Parish Council had an issue with the change of appearance or the use of the granary. Mr Howlett explained that the Parish Council had an issue with both aspects.

Mr Howlett further commented that the Parish Council would like to retain heritage properties in the village.

N.B. Councillor Terry Taylor left the Meeting at 2:54pm.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried whether it was possible to add a condition with regards to on-site working times. The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that it was and pointed out that construction management plans were included on bigger developments, but it was sometimes possible to include them on smaller developments too.
- A Member queried whether there was a reason why the new houses were so different in appearance to the other houses. The Development Management Lead Officer pointed out that it didn't necessarily follow that all houses should have same appearance as their neighbouring properties.
- A Member concurred with the previous comment and considered different designs of housing could enhance an area.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval, with the additional condition of on-site working times.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with the officer recommendation, subject to conditions and the additional condition, was agreed.

Vote: 7 in favour 0 against 1 abstention

RESOLVED:

That full planning permission be approved, subject to the following conditions:

25. APPEALS DECIDED:

The Appeals Decided were noted.

26. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

27. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 5 October 2023.

The Meeting closed at 3.00 pm.