



# East Cambridgeshire District Council

## **Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee**

Held at The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE at 2:00pm on  
Wednesday 7 August 2024

### **Present:**

Cllr Chika Akinwale  
Cllr David Brown  
Cllr Lavinia Edwards  
Cllr Martin Goodearl  
Cllr Keith Horgan (substitute for Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith)  
Cllr Bill Hunt (Chair)  
Cllr James Lay  
Cllr Ross Trent  
Cllr Mary Wade (substitute for Cllr John Trapp)  
Cllr Christine Whelan  
Cllr Gareth Wilson

### **Officers:**

Maggie Camp – Director, Legal  
Toni Hylton – Planning Team Leader  
Leah Mickleborough – Interim Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Jasmine Moffat – Planning Assistant  
David Morren – Interim Planning Manager  
Cameron Overton – Trainee Democratic Services Officer  
Andrew Phillips – Planning Team Leader  
Angela Tyrrell - Senior Legal Assistant

### **In attendance:**

Cllr Alan Sharp (Local Member, Agenda Item 5)

Andrew Ignaski (Applicant, Agenda Item 6)  
Kate Wood (Agent, Agenda Item 6)  
Kim Bartlett (Applicant, Agenda Item 5)

1 other member of the public

Melanie Wright – Communications Officer

Lucy Flintham – Office Team Leader, Development Services  
Sarah Parisi – Senior Support Officer

**17. Apologies and Substitutions.**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Christine Ambrose-Smith and John Trapp. Cllr Mary Wade gave apologies for arriving late.

Cllr Keith Horgan was attending as substitute for Cllr Christine Ambrose-Smith. Cllr Mary Wade was attending as substitute for Cllr John Trapp

**18. Declarations of Interest.**

No declarations of interest were made.

**19. Minutes.**

The committee received the Minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024. It was noted that on the second paragraph of page 7, the minutes should read Alastair Morbey, and not Richard Morbey.

Subject to this amendment, it was resolved unanimously:

That the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chair.

**20. Chair's Announcements.**

The Chair announced that due to significant interest in the meeting to be held at 2pm on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> August, the allotted public speaking time for groups would be increased from 5 minutes to 10 minutes.

**21. 24/00479/FUL - 48 Mill Lane, Stetchworth, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 9TR**

Cllr Mary Wade arrived at 14:04, at the start of this item.

Jasmine Moffat, Planning Assistant, presented a report (Z45, previously circulated) recommending refusal of an application seeking full planning permission to carry out the building of a single storey extension, detached cart lodge and any other associated works.

The Planning Officer presented Members with slides showing the location, outlining the proposal and associated photos. The Planning Officer informed members that the work to be undertaken was outside of the policy defined development envelope.

The main considerations for this application were deemed to be:

- **Principle of Development** – The site is located outside of the development envelope. Officers felt that the principle of development had already been established as the proposal is of a minor nature and within an established residential curtilage. However, officers considered that the proposal was not compliant with GROWTH2, as it did not satisfy other policies of the local plan including HOU8, and if it were approved, would have an adverse impact onto the character of the countryside.
- **Design and Character** – With regards to design and character, officers considered there to be fundamental concerns with the design of the

proposal, with the proposal introducing unnecessary, unjustified harm and inappropriate form of development to the site. In the view of the officers, the most critical flaw of the design was the proposition being forward to the principal elevation, concealing the host dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal of the cart lodge was also noted to be poorly located, of an excessive scale, and obstructive to the rural country views. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to policies ENV1, ENV2 and HOU8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

- **Residential Amenity** – Concern had been raised by neighbouring occupiers with regards to the proposed cart lodge preventing natural lighting and outlook from their kitchen/dining area at 46 Mill Lane. However, due to the positioning of the windows and fence, officers considered the proposed cart lodge would not significantly alter or worsen the existing situation. With regards to the single storey extension, by virtue of the structures single story nature and proximity to neighbouring dwellings, this aspect of the proposal was not considered to cause any detrimental effects of the residential amenity to the nearby occupiers.
- **Highways** – The application proposed a new access, parking and turning area. Planning history shows that the proposed access had already been found acceptable and approved in 2018 under 18/00774/FUL. However, with regards to the proposed material, insufficient evidence was provided, therefore, it was not possible for officers to make a full assessment of the proposal. The Highways Officers raised no objections to the proposal.
- **Ecology and Sustainability** – Concerns were raised by The Council's ecologist that existing cladding on the host dwelling, which would need to be removed to facilitate the erection of the single storey extension, may be a habitat for bats. Therefore, further investigation is required, but was not pursued at this time due to the recommendation for refusal. Additionally, no sustainability measures had been put forward in this application – while this weighed against the application, it was not a reason for refusal.

In summary, the officer recommended that the application be refused on grounds of unacceptable, poor-quality design (contrary to policies ENV1, ENV2, HOU8 and GROWTH2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan), and failure to present supporting evidence with regards to existing ecology of site, contrary to ENV7 of the local plan.

The Chair invited the reading of a statement sent in by Chrissey Stokes (Neighbour) to be read out by Cameron Overton, Democratic Services:

“We wish to object to the siting of the cart lodge. From studying the plans, it appears the cart lodge will be sited directly in front of two windows in our kitchen/dining/living space, at a distance of some 2-3 meters. This room is 33ft long and includes the kitchen, a separate table area for eating, plus a settee and TV. We are both retired and the room is in constant use each day. The two windows in question are on our side wall and play a big part in the amount of light entering the room, with each window being 5ft x 3ft 6ins. They face the boundary fence with the footpath. The distance of the windows from the boundary fence is 3ft 4in and the width of the footpath, fence to fence, is a further 3ft 4”. Currently our fence obscures half of each window but still gives us a view of trees and sky, whereas the rear of the proposed cart lodge,

because of its size, height (pitched roof) and close proximity to our windows will completely block any light or view. As mentioned, our kitchen/dining/living space is a much-used habitable space and we believe that under the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 as amended in 2023 ENV2 we are justified in objecting. The siting of the cart lodge would have a significant detrimental effect to the room and ourselves due to loss of light and view. We would also like to mention that under a previous planning application - 18/0074/FUL and 21/0693/VAR - the parking spaces relating to 48 Mill Lane, 2 cars and a horsebox, were positioned nearer the road and would not have obstructed our light or view. If the cart lodge were to be built in line with that application, we would have no objection. We have previously sent you a copy of the proposed plan noting the position of our windows, a copy of the prior application along with relevant photos. The case officer also visited our property and took some photos. We trust you will give our comments, photographs and amended plans showing the position of our windows due consideration before reaching any decision.”

The Chair stated that as the objectors were not present at the meeting, the Members were unable to ask questions and so moved on to inviting the Applicant, Kim Bartlett to make her statement:

“Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today, allowing us to evidence the work we’ve undertaken on this proposal. We initially engaged with the planning team with pre-application to get as much advice and consideration as possible to make a formal application. The pre-app letter provides little specifics in terms of scale or footprint reduction, leaving for our interpretation the comments, therefore we proceeded with a revised scheme which made the following changes: reduce the footprint by 10sqm, reduce the ridge height to the lowest possible for the extension, reduce the scale and decorative features of glazing on the extension and reduce the height of the garage. The front elevation has no ground floor window to serve a family room, therefore the main body of extension projecting from this section would do little to detract from important original features of this property. The design has ensured that the main ridge of the extension follows the orientation and character of the original dwelling and keeps the same height of the porch we have ensured the front elevation has interest with fenestration, but this does not compete with the original property. We accept the extension is partially to the front of the property and therefore notable in the street scene. But this is a stop end of a small lane which already has developments and all the timber and brick work etc not only reflects the three properties currently being built within that area, my stable block and interestingly enough The Old Mill opposite. It is a single storey extension which takes its design from the original building and ensures it is uninterrupted from the street scene. In particular when approaching from Moor Lane will be secondary to the view of the original house. The pre-app letter raised no objections to the partial extending to the front. However, the committee report considered there is no significant reason to warrant an extension forward to the principal elevation contrary to policy – through extending from the front elevation, the original building form is disrupted, creating a visually jarring asymmetrical building form and concealing the host dwelling. This firm stance and objection to the front extension was not illustrated at the pre-app submission, leading us to

proceed with the design proposed. No request was made at pre-app stage to provide a significant reasoning for seeking to extend the front of our property. We cannot identify which policy this is a requirement from. This is unreasonable in my opinion, given the dwelling is not a heritage asset and the impact to the listed building is stated as neutral by the officer. Regardless, we would advise the committee that the extension is best placed to suit our need and its purpose on the existing farm. While the officer may suggest for this to be to the side, the floor area in design sort would still be required. Ultimately, what has been proposed is what we deem necessary for how I live and how I work on the farm and including my staff. And the way we use the property with the layout presented, it would be much better for the business and for my daily life. The garage has also been included for the reason for refusal (for reasons previously mentioned). Whereas the pre-app letter advised that the 'design is considered to be reserved and appropriate for the site, however the scale of the garage is excessive at 6 meters, this should be scaled down to help the outbuilding remain more discreet within the site, more proportionate to its function.' Therefore, the location was not deemed to be a concern, and the main issue was the ridge height. We therefore reduced the height of the garage from 6 meters to 4.2m and thought we had overcome the officers' concerns. Therefore, to be presented with further issues and fundamental principles after paying for pre-app advice, is frustrating to say the least. With regards to the second reason for refusal the opportunity for this investigation into the cladding was not supplied given the officer's decision to recommend for refusal without a mandate. Therefore, we feel this reason for refusal based on insufficient information is unfair, as the opportunity for us to address this was not given. We are happy to support a precondition for investigation on the cladding prior to any form of works on site linked to extension and it is noted that there are separate legislative protections from planning system under the wildlife act. A further condition would secure the additional nest boxes the ecologist would like to see within the design. We recognise the importance of protecting habitats and I would not wish to see any harm from the extension, outbuilding, or indeed my existing home."

The Chair then invited questions to the applicant.

Cllr James Lay asked why the cart lodge was not designed to go alongside the road entrance/up against the property. The applicant explained that access through Mill Lane was safer. They believed the location was sufficiently distant from the neighbour's property, as there was already a 6ft fence there, so it would not cause any extra loss of light.

The applicant confirmed that they owned all the land surrounding the house when asked by Cllr Keith Horgan; Cllr Horgan expressed his confusion about why the applicant chose to build in front of the land they own instead of behind it. The applicant clarified that they avoided building on the other land where livestock was kept to maintain their view of the back area. Additionally, building in front would provide easy access for both the applicant and staff, preventing the need to track mud through the house.

The Chair invited Ward Cllr Alan Sharp to address the Council:

“I called this in, and I speak before it today because I felt it warranted consideration by the planning committee. I think it’s a subjective decision in terms of how much the extension distorts the main house, or has an effect on it, and therefore it is a question of whether the applicant has changed the design enough to satisfy the planning officer. Obviously, at the moment, they haven’t. It’s proposed to be an extension to be used by staff as well, for coming in off the fields and using that. So, it’s not a totally residential application. As has been said, the principle of development is established already. I’m slightly confused about comments about harm to the countryside, knowing that area quite well, and certainly in the report it said that materials have been sympathetically selected to match the existing agricultural nature side. I personally also had concerns about the proximity to the cart lodge. I’ve certainly spoken to those two people, by chance I did meet them a few weeks ago. But certainly, the officer in their report is saying that because of the 6ft fence being there, that this is not necessarily an issue, so I would accept that. We are then saying that there is reason for sufficient evidence with regards to the existing ecology and that the lack of ecology wouldn’t play a part in the decision, yet we’ve got it listed as a reason for refusal, so I’m slightly confused there. I do feel, and this is probably one of the major reasons I’ve bought it in, I do feel the new system hasn’t helped this application because there was a pre-app. The Applicant has then gone away and made some changes, obviously not enough to satisfy the officer and I understand where Jasmine [Planning Officer] is coming from. But I think that if we’d been under the old system, and I understand totally that we needed to stop the continual amendments that had been going on, that with some sensible discussion we would have gotten to a satisfactory situation, but obviously we haven’t been able to on this.”

In response to a question from Cllr Lay, Cllr Sharp explained that as a member of the Stetchworth Parish Council, he could confirm this application had been discussed with the Parish Council and there were no objections.

The Chair invited comments from the Interim Planning Manager.

The Interim Planning Manager clarified that it was a residential dwelling being discussed and the applicant had completed a household application form. He reminded Members that conditions relating to the Applicant’s business should not be considered.

The Interim Planning Officer added that the view was not a material consideration for this application and that ecology would need to be submitted before a determination. The Council would not be looking to secure this by condition because of the necessity to eliminate any potential impact to the bats.

The Chair invited questions to the Planning Officers from Members.

Cllr Martin Goodearl asked if the other new buildings nearby were within the development envelope, to which the Interim Planning Manager stated that they were not and were on what was regarded as ‘previously developed land’.

Cllr Goodearl asked why the applicant did not receive a full disclosure of what was acceptable at the pre-application stage. The Interim Planning Manager

explained that pre-application discussions were confidential, and the applicant had received an extensive report outlining what was and was not acceptable. He reminded Members that the purpose of the pre-application process was to give guidance on policies and areas that may need to work on, but not to aid in design work.

Cllr Goodearl asked if there was evidence of bats in the area or if the recommendation was based on the possibility of their presence, the Interim Planning Manager explained that bats were a protected species and therefore the Council must conduct studies to ensure it meets its legal obligations.

Cllr Akinwale asked if it was possible to add the condition to undertake a survey to the decision. The Interim Planning Manager clarified that this information was necessary prior to determination and could not be conditioned after consent was given. If Members wanted to approve the application, it would need to be deferred in order for an investigation to be carried out.

Cllr Mary Wade asked for clarification that the two options on this application were to either refuse or defer, pending on the investigation on bats. The Interim Planning Manager confirmed this to be the case.

Cllr James Lay asked questions relating to the scale and whether it was unusual to allow such a large sized extension to be added to a property. The Interim Planning Officer informed Members that there was no fixed rule on this matter and that the Officer was not against the principle of an extension, but in this case, the size and location was not appropriate due to it being forward to the front elevation.

Cllr Keith Horgan enquired about the involvement of the ecology officer during the pre-application stage. It was confirmed that having an ecology officer provide feedback on a proposed dwelling was unusual and the Council did not envisage the need for it at the pre-application stage. If this was the only requirement for approval, however, the applicant would have had extra to conduct a study, but that was not the case.

The Chair invited the Councillors to debate the application.

Cllr Keith Horgan concurred with Cllr Sharp's previous assertion that the new system was vague, pointing to the advice to make the development smaller, but not how much smaller it should be made. The Interim Planning Manager clarified that the pre-application advice service was not a new part of the process, but rather the introduction of a negotiation protocol was.

Cllr James Lay explained that the development was not overtly noticeable and present on a site that had been a livery yard for 30 or 40 years. As such, increasing the size of the property in relation to the size of the land it sits on was not unreasonable. Therefore, he proposed that the application be approved.

Cllr Chika Akinwale indicated that she was inclined to defer the application to allow for consideration of the ecology issues, which was supported by Cllr Horgan.

The Chair drew attention to the fact that this application was outside of the development envelope and extensions should be subservient, not dominant. He emphasised that the pre-application process was an advisory one and raised concern the application was for a domestic extension when the applicant had referenced its use by workers. Therefore, the Chair proposed the officer's recommendation for refusal.

Cllr Wade sought confirmation that Members were only able to decide on refusal or deferring, and that approval, as suggested by Cllr Lay's proposal, would not be possible with this application.

The Interim Planning Manager informed members that if they were minded to approve the application, any proposals could be delegated to the Interim Planning Manager to give authority to approve the application subject to the successful resolution of the ecology-related matters.

Cllr Brown seconded the Chair's proposal to refuse the application.

Cllr Akinwale then proposed that the application be approved, with the Interim Planning Manager being given delegated authority to approve the application, subject to the resolution of the ecology issues. This was seconded by Cllr Lay.

Cllr Goodearl raised concern that rejecting the application because it was outside of the development envelope would set a precedent. The Chair disagree with this by stating that he was in support of the officer's recommendation and that this was one of the points raised.

Cllr Wilson clarified with the Interim Planning Manager that if the application were to be refused, the applicant would have the option to reapply.

The Chair indicated as his proposal had been the first to be validly seconded, he would invite the vote on this first. If it was unsuccessful, he would then invite a vote on the proposal of Cllr Akinwale.

It was resolved with 6 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 2 abstentions:

That planning application ref 24/00479/FUL be **REFUSED** on the grounds set out in report Z45

*A short break was taken from 15:00 until 15:03*

**22. 23/00237/HYBM – White Hall Warehouse, Lynne Road, Littleport, CB7 4TB**

Toni Hylton, Planning Team Leader presented a report (Z46, previously circulated) recommending approval of a hybrid application for outline planning permission including details for erection of up to 4,527sqm of commercial floor space falling within use classes E, B2 and B8; and full planning permission for construction of access and erection of two warehouse buildings (B8) totalling 3,730sqm.

The Planning Team Leader presented Members with slides detailing the location of the proposal, site itself and related photographs. The Planning



Team Leader explained that this was being presented to committee due to the size of the development being larger than what the constitution allows under the scheme of delegation.

The main considerations for this application were:

- **Principle of Development** – In terms of the principle of development, the policies being looked at were GROWTH2, EMP2 and EMP3. It is in a rural location outside of the development envelope, but between built form on its immediate boundaries. The scale of the development was keeping with its surroundings, being of a comparable size to other buildings already existing on the site. The site had access from the A10 and good road connections as the A10 is a major route from London toward Kings Lynn, and the local highways authority had not raised any objections. The business was operational but looking to extend. There was a lack of other suitable sites, as well as a lack of other suitable buildings where they currently operate and would want to stay. They own the land, so the lack of suitable buildings may not apply. There is no access by cycle way or footpath but did have good access via the road.
- **Design and Character** – In terms of design and character, there was a significant drop from the road down to the site. The design was in keeping with existing character of the warehouse, which has an agricultural appearance. Some signage and lighting may be required; however, advertising consent would be required under separate legislation.
- **Residential Amenity** – In terms of residential amenity, there was a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a large garage nearby, with a buffer zone around the site proposed. It was considered that this would address any concerns with regards to noise and light and the officer confirmed loss of view was not a material consideration. No objections had been received by the Parish Council, though the Council had received one letter of objection regarding light pollution, noise, local traffic, loss of trees and loss of view. The officer addressed each concern raised.
- **Highways, Access and Movement** – The local highways authority had considered the access acceptable, however, had requested conditions with regards to details of the final access. The site provided adequate parking and conditions relating to gate location and cycle parking could be applied.
- **Biodiversity and Trees** – In terms of biodiversity, a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal was submitted, including a walkover survey, and it was concluded that there were no habitats of significant value present. It was recommended to apply conditions to ensure a 10% increase to biodiversity of the site, as well as soft and hard landscaping.
- **Flood Risk and Drainage** – The site was within flood risk zone two and three and several amendments had been made in the planning process to address flood risk. All the issues had been addressed and the latest plan was agreed by the Environment Agency, LLFA and IDB.
- **Energy and Sustainability** – Due to the size proposed, an energy and sustainability condition would be required.

In summary, Members were recommended to approve application subject to conditions outlined in Appendix 1 of the report.

The Chair invited agent Kate Wood to address the committee:

“Thank you, Chairman and Members. I am Kate Wood, I’m the agent for this application and I’m accompanied by the applicant – Andrew Ignaski – to help with any queries you may have.

I’m glad you were able to view the site this morning. We’re grateful for the help from the planning officer to work towards this recommendation of approval. We’ve been encouraged by The Council’s positive approach to economic development, whereby opportunities for new job creation within the district are provided, as well as the expansion of existing businesses like this being supported by The Council. We were pleased that the Parish Council also supports the application. The application looks to maximise the opportunities for employment development on the site given that the space is in the same ownership and is available, as well as the necessary expansion of the warehouse space for this art storage business.

We’ve spent time addressing points raised by the IDB to ensure surface water drainage will be well managed and is limited to the current level of runoff to the adjacent ditch by the provision of onsite water storage and controlled runoff. Additionally, the access arrangements have been changed and we are now proposing, as you will have seen on the plans, a 90-degree access from the A10 rather than the awkward angled access that’s currently on the site. And so, actually, the development will improve highway safety and will enable lorries associated with the development to safely access the site, without holding up the flow of traffic on the A10.

The proposed layout of the site retains an undeveloped area next to the dwellings located to be on the southern boundary. This is going to be planted up as an ecological enhancement area and the significant landscape and habitat improvements over the existing, bare, site will settle the development into its surroundings in terms of visual and residential amenity, and you have seen that the site is much lower than the road, which itself is much lower than the bank of the river. So, it will sit well in the landscape and views back towards it. As noted by the planning officers report, the development will be set down around four metres from the level of the road and can be well screened by existing and additional landscaping. It will not be out of character with the A10, as noted in paragraph 7.3.4 of the report, which notes there are pockets of development and then vast expanses of open fields along the A10, and this will be one such pocket. The proposed conditions are welcomed and accepted, including the suggested construction Environmental Management plan. I just note that the flood risk assessment in condition one needs to be version two. Otherwise, yes, the development will provide great opportunities for employment expansion and development within the district, and we commend the proposals to you. Thank you.”

The Chair requested that the Applicant and Agent stay seated so that they may be asked questions by the Members.

The Chair pointed out that while he understood the insurance implications, it would have been helpful if Members had been able to see the site in its entirety. The applicant stated that they were a bonded warehouse, and they

were also a regulated agent and thus it would have been very difficult to do so with security obligations.

Cllr David Brown enquired as to how many people were currently employed and how many more will be as a result of the development. The applicant explained that there were 17 people currently employed and that there would be a significant increase in employment, but that it was difficult to be precise as to the number. The Agent added that part of the application was an outline form for further employment development but could not suggest figures as the reserve matters application had not gone through.

The Applicant suggested that he would expect more than double the number of current employees when asked a follow-up question by the Chair.

Cllr Chika Akinwale asked if the number of new parking spaces will be enough to facilitate the number of new employees, and whether there will be electric vehicles (EV) charging points, as well as disability spaces. The Agent confirmed that there will be enough spaces and that both EV charging points and disability spaces will be available.

Cllr Akinwale followed up by asking about the security of bicycle parking, to which the Agent responded that it was now standard practice for enclosed cycle parking to be within view of the office and that this was what would be present.

Cllr James Lay commended the present crating and asked if this was done on site, to which the Applicant confirmed it was. Cllr Lay then followed by asking if they could agree to sufficient solar panelling. The Agent explained that condition 17 required that there would be renewable energy measures and that it would be assessed prior to commencement.

The Applicant explained that there would be skilled labour, relating to conservation and condition of what was stored, as well as warehousing which was the 'backbone' of their operations when asked by Cllr Gareth Wilson.

The Chair invited comments from the officers.

The Interim Planning Manager stated that there was no comment or point of clarity to be given but suggested that if changes were required to the wording of the conditions, that these could be delegated to himself.

The Chair then invited questions to the officers.

Cllr Brown requested clarification that the only reason this application had been presented at committee was because of the significant size of the development. The Interim Planning Officer confirmed this to be the case, per the constitution requirements.

Cllr James Lay asked if there was any proportion of industrial roof which should be covered by solar panels. The Interim Planning Manager stated that there was no specific policy, as this was evaluated on a case-by-case basis, to ascertain what was appropriate.

Cllr Martin Goodearl queried as to why the one complaint received was not read out before the committee. The Interim Planning Manager stated that it

was mentioned in the Officer’s report and presentation, and that action had been taken to mitigate with the implementation of a buffer zone around the development. It was further clarified that officers only read out representations to the planning committee in full where the individual would have attended the committee to speak but was unable to do so.

Cllr Wilson asked what the orientation of the proposed warehouses were. The Interim Planning Officer showed that they are front facing towards the road (A10).

Cllr Keith Horgan drew attention to section 7.5.2 on the ecological impact stating there were ‘no habitats of significant value’ but that a 10% increase to biodiversity was desired, then asked why there was no baseline study of the field done. The Interim Planning Officer confirmed that a preliminary ecological study was undertaken and that a condition of a 10% increase to biodiversity was recommended as the application was received in January 2024, before the requirements for biodiversity net gain on site became mandatory.

The Chair invited Members to debate.

Cllr Goodearl (Ward Councillor) stated that he was in favour of the development and pleased by the increase in employment it would bring and the overall operation of the business. He therefore proposed approval of the application, subject to any changes to the wording of the conditions being delegated to the Interim Planning Manager. This was seconded by Cllr David Brown.

Cllr Lay suggested that he was in favour of the unit size and that when further applications came forward on the site that they were of a reasonably large size, as opposed to smaller units.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the application ref 23/00237/HYBM be **APPROVED**, with authority delegated to the Interim Planning Manager to determine the wording of the conditions detailed in Appendix 1 of the Officer’s report

**23. Planning Performance – June 2024**

David Morren, Interim Planning Manager, presented the report (previously circulated) summarising the performance of the Planning Department in June 2024.

It was resolved unanimously that the Planning Performance Report for June 2024 be noted.

The meeting was concluded at 15:42

Chairman.....

Date.....

