

Planning Committee

Thursday, 26 April 2018

Attendees: Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Helen Chuah, Councillor Pauline Hazell, Councillor Theresa Higgins, Councillor Brian Jarvis, Councillor Cyril Liddy, Councillor Derek Loveland, Councillor Chris Pearson
Substitutes: Councillor Peter Chillingworth (for Councillor Jackie Maclean)
Also Present:

569 Site Visits

Councillors Barton, Chillingworth, Chuah, Hazell, Higgins, Jarvis, Liddy and Loveland attended the site visits.

570 Urgent Items

The Chairman explained that she had agreed that three additional agenda items would be considered at the meeting as matters of urgency, because the applications had received no objections, were intended to be determined at an earlier meeting in April 2018 and the next meeting of the Committee will not take place for another four weeks.

571 Minutes of 29 March 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record.

572 173115 Fletchers Farmhouse, Rams Farm Road, Fordham

The Committee considered a planning application for the conversion of an agricultural barn to a swimming pool and changing facilities with associated parking and ancillary works at Fletchers Farmhouse, Rams Farm Road, Fordham, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because it had been called in by Councillor Chillingworth. The Committee had before it a report and an amendment sheet in which all information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

Benjy Firth, Planning Officer, presented the report and, together with Simon Cairns, Development Manager, assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

Tom Bradshaw addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. He explained that his family

had lived and worked in Fordham since 1937. The family currently operated a livery yard and riding stables and welcomed many local residents for riding lessons. The proposed swimming pool had received support from the local primary school which would help the school meet its legal obligations to ensure all pupils were able to swim at least 50 metres. He had also been approached by a local swimming club which had 314 under six year olds on a waiting list. The proposed pool would provide five new full-time jobs thus supporting the local economy. He considered the Council's objection to the proposal was based on case law which specifically related to the conversion of agricultural buildings to residential use which he did not consider relevant as the application was not being made under permitted development rights and there was no requirement for the development to constitute a conversion. The proposal sought to re-use an existing agricultural building under the farm diversification scheme. The building was currently used for the storage of agricultural machinery and was therefore not redundant but it was no longer generating income for the farm. It had originally been built to store bales of hay but was no longer fit for this purpose. The building would be of significantly more benefit to the farm as a swimming pool than as a store. He was not aware of any policies which prohibited the change of use of an agricultural building even if it had been erected under permitted development rights. Concerns about traffic had been raised but he had not received any request for additional information of predicted traffic generation and no objection had been raised by the Highways Authority. Criticism had been made in relation to the lack of consideration of alternative locations however no alternatives had been considered as the proposal had been considered as a rural diversification scheme to re-use an existing building.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the case law referred to in his report provided clarity on what was considered to be a conversion, not what type of conversion. It had been raised on the basis that different policy requirements would apply depending on whether the proposal was a new build or a re-build.

One member of the Committee was of the view that the proposal could provide considerable community benefit. The site was six miles from Colchester and there were several village communities in the area, as well schools and groups who would benefit from the proposal. He referred to the erection of the building under permitted development rights which, he considered, gave scope to allow a change of use. He was of the view that the building could not be considered redundant given the changing nature of the farming business and there were other uses the building could be put to, such as the storage of farm equipment. He was further of the view that the proposal should be considered as farm diversification which would provide income and jobs from something other than pure agriculture and, as such the re-use of the building should be encouraged. He did not consider that the proposal would constitute a new building, he referred to the lack of objections in relation to environmental and highways issues and he welcomed the proposal as a valuable addition to the community.

The Planning Officer confirmed that applications for farm diversification schemes

required the submission of a diversification plan showing how the diversification would contribute to the viability of the farm, whilst the Council's policies on community facilities required the submission of an analysis of need, both of which were missing from the application documents and, as such, the application was a premature one which lacked the required evidence base.

The Development Manager explained that the key consideration for the committee members was the sustainability of the location which was reflected in the Council's diversification policy. He explained that this policy also requires the submission of evidence that the proposed use shouldn't be better located in a more sustainable location. The proposed use would potentially give rise to considerable trip generation by private vehicles, given the interest from local schools would not sustain the use in its entirety and he therefore considered that the proposal was not located appropriately in terms of sustainability. This was a matter that the Committee members needed to weigh up against the public benefit of providing a community facility a location which was not served by sustainable modes of transport.

Other members of the Committee did not consider that the proposal would meet the requirements for agricultural diversification, especially given the potential short term nature of the contributions made from the diversification to the overall farm business. There was also concern that there would be a lack of adequate reason for the Committee to overturn the officer's recommendation, in this instance. Reference was also made to the prematurity of the application given no evidence of viability and need had been submitted in support of the application.

RESOLVED (SEVEN voted FOR, TWO voted AGAINST) that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

573 180478 2 Mede Way, Wivenhoe

The Committee considered a planning application for a proposed extension and alterations at 2 Mede Way, Wivenhoe, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because it had been called in by Councillor Cory. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

Eleanor Moss, Planning Officer, presented the report and, together with Simon Cairns, Development Manager, assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

Alan Thomas addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. He explained that he lived in the adjoining property to the application site. He considered that the conversion of a two bedroom bungalow into a family home was not in keeping with the locality. He explained that he and his wife had moved to the area attracted to the peace and quiet and the fact that the majority of residents were retired. He considered that the size of the

proposed extension would have a negative impact on his quality of life as the height of the proposal would restrict the light to his property.

Michael Bowler addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. He explained that the proposal satisfied all material planning considerations and, as such, was recommended for approval. He was of the view that the adjoining neighbours did not want the application to go ahead, despite the fact that they had already extended their own properties. Concerns had been expressed in relation to disruptive building works and the occupation of the property by a young family. The proposal had been demonstrated to have no overshadowing, parking or overlooking issues and he confirmed that concerns in relation to foul water and drainage would be addressed at the building regulations stage. He also referred to the applicants' fall-back position under the larger homes procedure. He asked the Committee members to endorse the planning officer's recommendation.

Councillor Cory attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. He had called in the application as he considered that the neighbour's concerns had not been taken fully into account. He made reference to the need for the adequate arrangements to be in place for planning officers' reports to be made accessible for residents who were without access to the internet. He considered there would be a small loss of light and amenity for the neighbours due to the height of the extension, which would project above the roof height. He was familiar with the area and was of the view that the proposed doubling of the footprint of the property would not suit the locality. He welcomed the fact that some of the neighbour's concerns had already been addressed within the proposal but he was of the view that some concerns remained outstanding. He also asked that the conditions proposed be sufficiently robust. He further referred to the introduction of a window which would overlook the neighbouring property and asked for a condition to be added to provide for either an obscure window or the extension of the fence to the front of the property. He further asked for advisory note ZT0, in relation to the safety of the land, to be fully satisfied prior to commencement of the construction work, given the neighbouring resident's current negative health issues and his concern that this should not be exacerbated.

The Planning Officer confirmed that it was not possible for the make-up of a household to be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of a planning application. The proposed extension would be six metres deep and three metres high which was not considered to be excessive, whilst there was also a realistic fall-back position under permitted development rights for an extension six metres deep and four metres high. In terms of impact upon light, this was considered to be marginal, with the tests in the Essex Design Guide having not been breached and, as such, it would not be possible to sustain a refusal of the application. No objections had been raised by the Contamination Officer which was why no recommendation for a contamination condition had been proposed. The extension proposed was to the rear of the property and, as such, any

negative impact on the character of the area would be marginal. The proposed new window could be inserted at any time under permitted development rights and she would not support a requirement for obscure glazing as the window would serve a bedroom and would not be appropriate. She invited the Committee members to consider the suggestion in relation to the extension to the fencing.

Members of the Committee, whilst sympathising with the residents current negative health issues, confirmed that they were unable to make decisions on the basis of emotional responses. Concern was expressed regarding comments relating to certain localities being restricted to an age of resident. Committee members also sought assurances that practices were in place to enable access to committee reports for those without access to the internet. It was considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on the street scene and, whilst acknowledging the likelihood of an impact on the neighbours, this was not considered to be significant. Acknowledgement was also given to the existence of a fall-back position for the applicants under permitted development rights. The suggestion to consider a condition to extend the fence to the front of the property in order to shield the view from the bedroom window was not supported on the grounds that there would be little to be gained.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Chillingworth here left the meeting.

574 172272 Land to the rear of Field House, Dyers Road, Stanway

The Committee considered a planning application for the creation of 35 two, three and four bedroom detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, plus associated roads, car parking, landscaping and public open space at land to the rear of Field House, Dyers Road, Stanway, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because it was a major application with objections and subject to Section 106 agreement. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

Alistair Day, Principal Planning Officer, presented the report and, together with Simon Cairns, Development Manager, assisted the Committee in its deliberations. He confirmed that the Highway Authority had raised no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions. He also recommended that the legal agreement be subject to a further condition providing for the public open space to remain in perpetuity with general access for the public.

Annette Oakley addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. She explained that she

was representing herself and five other residents of Grieves Court, Stanway and to ask the Committee to refuse the application or to refer it for further investigation. She referred to the woodland area to be developed which was one of few remaining in Stanway, housing a variety of wildlife, including bats and badgers which would be disturbed as a consequence of the development. She referred to the other considerable housing development proceeding in Stanway and considered it unnecessary for the woodland and wildlife to be disturbed for the sake of 35 extra houses. She understood that only 19 trees would be retained within the development and she had also received notification of a further development adjacent to the site currently being considered which would result in the loss of further trees. She asked whether Committee members had visited the area to see what the trees looked like. She considered Councillors should protect residents and the environment from unnecessary and unwanted development and not to approve what the Government dictated. She regretted the recent changes in Stanway and the persistent traffic problems due to extra traffic.

Michael Smith addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. He welcomed the report and explained that the scheme would deliver a high quality development, in accordance with the council's planning policies and the allocation of the site for residential use in the site allocations DPD. The scrub and undergrowth in the central part of the site would be cleared leaving two thirds of the land for redevelopment. The mature woodland would be retained with the benefit of an ongoing management regime to bring it back to full health and access would no longer be restricted. Across the scheme 120 trees would be retained and two large trees, the subject of TPOs, would form a focus for the extension to the existing public open space at Egremont Way. He confirmed that proposals to construct a cycle way to Egremont Way had been omitted in response to concerns raised by residents. Funding, as part of the planning obligations, would be available to improve the landscape within the existing open space as well as for affordable housing, a new community hall, improvements to existing open space, expansion of primary school provision, a footway to Dyers Road and new bus stops in Blackberry Road. The scheme complied with the council's policies in relation to development sizes, car parking and back to back distances. Care had also been taken to create appropriate distances between the new houses and existing housing to the north, to ensure views of the woodland are retained and there would be no overlooking. Arrangements had also been made to meet with ward councillors and residents to the north to agree the form of boundary enclosure should the application be approved. He concluded by confirming that the proposal was in accordance with planning policy, retained woodland area, addressed the concerns of local residents where possible, it delivered a wide range of community benefits, would be a high quality development and in-keeping with the surrounding area, as such, he asked the Committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Lesley Scott-Boutell attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. She thanked the developer and the officers involved in the

application for listening to concerns expressed by residents in relation to the cycleway cutting across the open space in Egremont Way which had been proposed in the original scheme and was now intended to be re-routed to Dyers Road. She was concerned about the impact of the development on existing residents occupying the properties to the north of the site. She was aware of concerns about a loss of amenity and a loss of outlook. She referred to the substantial changes in ground levels between the application site and the properties in Grieves Court. Many residents had lived in the locality for a number of years and were distressed by the potential loss of outlook. She asked for assurances that the boundary treatment to the northern boundary of the development be sited at the bottom of the slope to ensure residents' outlook is protected. She requested that the developers offer to meet with ward councillors and residents to discuss the boundary issue be maintained and she asked that the boundary issue be brought back to the committee for determination, should there be any disagreement. She also asked for confirmation regarding the trigger points to release funding to be included in the Section 106 obligations.

Councillor Jessica Scott-Boutell attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. She referred to the ecological and diversity aspects of the application and, in particular, the concerns expressed by the North East Essex Badger Group that the badger's foraging space would be curtailed. Residents were also concerned about the wildlife, given the area was recognised as having high ecological significance. There had been sightings of monk jack deer in the area but there was no mention of them in the ecological and biodiversity report. She asked that the green space in this and the adjacent site be given to the community in order to facilitate the wildlife. She welcomed the provision of bat roosting opportunities, bird boxes and reptile habitats and hedgehog holes in fences but remained concerned as to where the deer and badgers would go. She welcomed the non-standard conditions in relation to garages and the construction method statement but asked the committee to defer their consideration.

The Principal Planning Officer further confirmed that the site, in its entirety, was allocated for residential development and, as such, the principle of development of the site had been agreed in the Local Plan. He confirmed that the woodland block to the west of the site was being retained in its entirety, the trees of low value would be removed and the two high value oak trees in the centre of the site were being retained. Ecology was clearly important and the comments from the Badger Group had been acknowledged in the report. The Group had noted that the green corridor along the southern boundary tapered whilst the development of the site to the south would be coming forward in due course and, accordingly, had asked that the green link be strengthened as part of that application. The issue remaining was in relation to the translocation of reptiles, provision for which had been made in a proposed condition for adequate mitigation for reptiles. He doubted it would be practicable to position the boundary fence to the development at the bottom of the slope as this would create a potential for existing residents to overlook / look down into the rear gardens of the

proposed dwellings and would create an area of no man's land which would become unkempt and unmanaged. He confirmed that loss of outlook was not a material planning consideration, however, care had been taken to ensure that the plots adhered to the minimum back to back distances outlined in the Essex Design Guide. The recommendation was for the Section 106 agreement to be determined by officers. As the scheme was quite small, it had been proposed that the majority of the financial provision trigger points will be delivered at the occupation of about 20 units. The package of mitigation measures had been agreed by the Council's Development Team and, as such, had been considered to be appropriate.

Members of the Committee acknowledged the concerns of the neighbours in relation to the building of more and more homes and the continuing expansion of communities. Assurances were requested in relation to the robust nature of the archaeological conditions recommended, given the site was considered to have high potential for the existence of archaeological remains. In addition, further information was sought in relation to the proposed protection to be given to wildlife on the site, particularly the translocation of reptiles. Reference was also made to the proposed agreement in relation to the boundary treatment and whether any conditions had been included to provide for this. Concern was expressed in relation to that suggested positioning of a boundary fence at the bottom of the slope, given the topography of the land.

The Principal Planning Officer further commented that the Highway Authority comments had been delayed but it had been confirmed that they did not consider there would be any significant impacts in terms of highway capacity and highway safety. In relation to construction traffic, a condition had been recommended to provide for the submission of, and agreement to, a Construction Method Statement. The Council's Archaeology Officer had recommended a condition for ground investigation work but, subject, to satisfactory results, there were no grounds upon which to refuse the application.

Committee members referred to the area being zoned for housing and the principle of development was already established. The layout and design of the development was considered to be good, with generous sized gardens, it complied with parking standards and the provision of seven affordable houses was welcomed.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that, subject to the submission of an acceptable mitigation strategy for reptiles and the addition of an appropriately worded condition to provide for the implementation of the agreed ecological mitigation strategy, the Assistant Director Policy and Corporate be authorised to approve the planning application subject to the conditions set out in the report, as well as further conditions specified by the Highway Authority and a further clause in the Section 106 agreement providing for the public open space to remain in perpetuity with general access for the public and subject to the signing of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 within six months from the date of the Committee meeting, in the event that the legal agreement is not signed within six months, authority be delegated to the Assistant

Director Policy and Corporate to refuse the application, or otherwise to be authorised to complete the agreement to provide for the following:

- Affordable Housing: Shared Ownership – 1 two and 1 three-bed terraced house; Affordable Rent – 3 two-bed terraced houses and 2 three-beds (one terraced, one detached) and one unit designed to Part M4 (2) standard with a level access shower installed;
- Education - £133,707 Stanway Fiveways Primary School;
- Community Facilities - £60,000 contribution to hall on Western Approaches Road in Stanway;
- Open Space - £247,334.25 – towards Adult gym, Dog agility equipment, Egremont Way landscape improvements and provision of play equipment and landscape improvements at Stanway Country Park;
- Highways – bus stops on Blackberry Road;
- Footpath / cycleway link to boundary of the site to the south;
- All sums to be index linked.

575 180057 Garrison Area J2B, Circular Road North Colchester

The Committee considered a planning application for the Conversion of retained ex-Ministry of Defence buildings on Parcel J2B, Colchester Garrison, to two commercial units and 70 dwellings with minor demolition, forming of openings to allow adaptation of existing buildings at the Garrison Area J2B, Circular Road North, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because it was a major application with objections and subject to Section 106 agreement. The Committee had before it a report and an amendment sheet in which all information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the Assistant Director Policy and Corporate be authorised to approve the planning application subject to the conditions set out in the report, the amendment sheet, as well as an additional condition / informative (as appropriate) offering the redundant gates to a local organisation and subject to the signing of a linking legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 within six months from the date of the Committee meeting, in the event that the linking legal agreement is not signed within six months, authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Policy and Corporate to refuse the application, or otherwise to be authorised to complete the agreement.

576 180540 Hill House, Carters Hill, Boxted

The Committee considered a reserved matters application following outline approval 170997 for the erection of 36 residential dwellings, public open space, landscaping, new

access and highways, associated and ancillary development at Hill House, Carters Hill, Boxted, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because Councillor Chapman had called in the application. The Committee had before it a report and an amendment sheet in which all information was set out.

Mark Russell, Principal Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations. He explained that the site had been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, together with a reference to materials for the buildings proposed, including hand-made clay tiles, feather edge weatherboarding and other vernacular materials. He considered it reasonable to require the provision of clay tiles and wood weatherboarding but did not consider it reasonable to stipulate tiles to be hand-made. He also referred to trees rooted in the application site which were obscuring the pedestrian crossing adjacent to the site which the ward councillors had asked to be cleared.

Angela McLauchlan, on behalf of Boxted Parish Council, addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. She explained that the Parish Council objected to any street lighting in the development. The clearance of trees near the pedestrian crossing was welcomed but assurances were sought that there would be an ongoing maintenance commitment and who would be responsible for it. Concerns were expressed regarding parking on the green and asked about the provision of double kerbs on the verges to prevent parking, as well as planting or diamond fencing around the boundary of the green. She asked for more discretion in relation to the detailed allocation of the Section 106 funding contributions so that it could be used for community improvements. She asked for details of the transport plan to be made available and for more clarity on the latest recommendations.

Jennifer Carroll addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. She explained that Linton Homes were committed to designing well-built and high quality homes. She confirmed that the application concerned matters relating to appearance, layout, landscape and scale. The scheme was focussed on delivering a high quality and appropriately detailed and rural residential development with trees, open space and landscaping. Linton Homes had taken time to understand the area and hoped the application was a positive example of working with stakeholders and the council. Work had been undertaken with planning, urban design and landscape officers before the final scheme had been submitted as well as undertaking correspondence leading to the determination of the application, including discussions with the Highway Authority. The development provided a mix of family dwellings, generous open space areas and seven affordable units in accordance with the Section 106 agreement. Careful consideration had been given to the setting of Hill House and, as such, a buffer had been provided to separate the application site from that of Hill House, within which no development would be included. There would be meaningful landscape planting throughout the scheme, including a new

village green with footpath routes to open up the site to new and existing residents. She confirmed that there were no proposals to light any part of the development. She confirmed that the open space would be managed by a management company, whilst it was possible for the village green to be gifted to the Parish Council, if this was not acceptable it would revert to the responsibility of the management company.

Councillor Chapman attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. He explained that the application was the culmination of the Neighbourhood Plan and, as such, the development of the site was supported. He was disappointed that there had been no involvement of the local community within Linton Homes' consultations to date and suggested that an approach should have been made to either Borough or Parish Councillors and the local community as well as the planning officers and Highway Authority. He referred to the principle of dark skies regime and that this was supported by communities in the Dedham Vale and, as such, he hoped lighting would not be brought into the development. He asked for assurances regarding restrictions on construction vehicle deliveries during school drop off times, given the school's catchment across a lot of North Colchester.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that there were no proposed lights for the development however, the Highway Authority may consider lighting was necessary on the adopted highway. He confirmed that in order to facilitate tree clearance near the pedestrian crossing, access would need to be provided to the ditch. The transport plan and management company responsibilities were covered by outline conditions. The section 106 agreement had been completed at the outline application stage and, as such there was no longer discretion to vary the details.

Members of the Committee were supportive of the restriction of construction vehicle deliveries, in order to safeguard children walking to the local school and asked that discussions take place with the Highway Authority to seek their support for the adoption of dark sky principles in the area. Support was also given to the provision of appropriate measures, in-keeping with the locality, to deter parking on the village green in order to comply with the provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Development Manager explained that the existing condition covering a construction method statement had been discharged at the outline application stage of the development and, as such, an informative would be the most appropriate method to seek the restriction of the hours of construction vehicle deliveries. He further suggested adding a clause to the landscaping condition to provide a means for the enclosure of the village green.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and the amendment sheet as well as the addition of an informative requesting the restriction of the hours of construction vehicle deliveries between the usual school dropping off times and the addition of a clause to the landscaping condition

to provide for a means to suitably enclose the village green.

577 180555 40 Berechurch Road, Colchester

The Committee considered a planning application for two three bed bungalows on vacant land at the rear of 40 Berechurch Road, Colchester. The application had been referred to the committee because Councillor Chapman had called in the application. The Committee had before it a report in which all the information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

578 180102 Side wall of 44 St Johns Street, Colchester

The Committee considered a planning application for an interpretation panel containing general historical information and logos including friends of Colchester Roman Wall at the side wall of 44 St Johns Street, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was an Honorary Alderman. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

579 180104 Castle Park, High Street, Colchester

The Committee considered a planning application for an interpretation panel containing general historical information and logos including friends of Colchester Roman Wall at Castle Park, High Street, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was an Honorary Alderman. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

580 180106 Vineyard Street Car Park, Vineyard Street, Colchester

The Committee considered a planning application for an interpretation panel containing general historical information and logos including friends of Colchester Roman Wall at Vineyard Street Car Park, Vineyard Street, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was an Honorary Alderman. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.