

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Panel held on Thursday 19 December 2024 at 19:00

Present: Councillor Brown (Chair)

Councillors Ahmad, Kendrick, McLean and Trendall

Also Present: Councillor Eaton

Officers: E Verdegem (Team Leader - Development Management), L Alexander (Planning Officer), S Webb (Senior Planning Solicitor) and G Vincent (Democratic and Electoral Services Officer)

PP24 Chair's Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, and advised that the meeting would be published on the Council's YouTube Channel.

The Panel were advised that the applicant for Item 5a – application 24/01236/LBC had withdrawn the application, and as such the Panel would not consider it or make a decision on the application.

PP25 Apologies

None were received.

PP26 Disclosures of Interest

There were none.

PP27 Public Participation: Questions

There were none.

PP28 Planning Applications

There were no speakers registered.

PP29 24/01236/LBC - 1 Manor Farm Cottages

The application had been withdrawn by the Applicant following publication of the agenda, and as such the Panel did not consider or make a decision on it.

PP30 24/01703/FUL - 1-2 Heathfield Gateway

The application was introduced by the Team Leader – Development Management. The Panel were informed of the setting and area of the development.

Attention was drawn to the Update Paper, and the update to condition 4, with officers reiterating that the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions sets out in the main report and Update paper.

There were no speakers registered for this application.

A member sought clarification as to the number of shutter doors, as the diagram for the proposed development differed from that of the existing. Officers advised that the third shutter door depicted was for the next unit.

A member inquired as to what UCO stood for in section 7.19 of the main report, and was informed it stood for Use Class Order, the member suggested that it could be added to the glossary of terms provided to members.

A further question was asked by a member, who asked whether the parking spaces were booked by users as part of their booking for the business, and was told the spaces belonged to the unit, but there were not specific restrictions in place.

Subsequently, the Chair, seconded by Councillor McLean proposed the recommendation for debate that:

Permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in section 10.0 of the main report and the updated condition 4 set out in Section U5.0 of the Update Paper.

A member began the debate, stating that this was more a change of use rather than a loss of employment land, and that the amendment to ensure it's specific use was sensible. The member expressed their support for the application.

This was echoed by Chair, who stated that he supported the recommendation to approve.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion passed unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in section 10.0 of the main report and the updated condition 4 set out in Section U5.0 of the Update Paper.

PP31 PLN/2024/2370 - 43 Oxford Street

The item was introduced with a presentation from the Planning Officer, who advised members that the rear windows were not affected by article 4, and that the application was recommended for approval.

There were no speakers registered.

A member inquired whether the door would be the green as shown on the diagram and was told that the diagram was accurate.

Officers were asked when the paired doors of 43 and 45 became different styles, as they were no longer in keeping with each other. Officers advised that they did not have that information, as they could have changed at any time, but that the policy requirement was that they be in keeping with the character of the area, not just neighbouring properties.

Members sought clarification on the article 4 direction, as it stated that the material's used should be retained, whereas that had not occurred in this case. Officers advised that it was a balance, as residents needed to be able to heat their homes, and that the materials used for this development were already mixed. The officer stressed that the design and character being in keeping with the conservation area was considered more important than the material.

Several differences between the existing development and proposed development were identified by the Panel, and it was confirmed by officers that the article 4 direction did not insist on an identical development, but instead ensured that proposed developments would be in keeping with the character of the conservation area.

The Chair, seconded by Councillor McLean proposed the recommendation for debate that:

Permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in section 10.0 of the main report.

A member expressed their support for the application, stating that it was a good example of preserving the character of the area in a modern way and ensuring sufficient heat in the property.

A member echoed the above comments, commending the applicant on the application.

Further comments were made by a member, who expressed their sympathy for the applicant, and stated that development such as this should be encouraged.

The Chair summed up, expressing his support for the application and that it was a balance of preservation and keeping homes warm.

Upon being put to the vote, the application was approved unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in section 10.0 of the main report.

The meeting was closed at 19:22