

PLANNING COMMITTEE
27 May 2021

<i>Present: -</i>	Councillors Barton, Chuah, Davidson, Hazell, Lilley, Maclean, Mannion, G. Oxford and Warnes
<i>Substitutes: -</i>	Councillor G Oxford for Cllr B Oxford
<i>Also, in attendance:</i>	Councillor Dundas, Harris and Scott-Boutell

835 Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 April 2021 were approved as a correct record.

836 Land east of Plummers Road, Fordham

Councillor Davidson (by reason of acquaintance with the applicant) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

Councillor Maclean (by reason of acquaintance with the applicant) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Committee considered an Outline application for for the erection of 17 dwellings. A report setting out information about the application was before the committee.

The Committee members had been provided with films and photographs of the site taken by the Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

Annabel Cooper, the Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

The Planning Officer shared a presentation with members including plans, aerial views, photographs of the site and drawings to illustrate the outline application and reminded members that consideration was of the principles of the outline application at this stage.

She explained that the proposal was a departure from the Adopted Local Plan but was allocated in the Emerging Local Plan. The inspector's response to Section 2 of the Emerging Local Plan was awaited. The proposal was consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The site was situated opposite existing residential development with a narrow connecting path to existing affordable housing. A further footpath was planned including a connection to help lead pedestrians south, this was indicated in the plans.

There would be some loss of hedgerow and the Landscape Officer had had no objections as the hedge had not been deemed important under the Hedgerows' Regulations. Replanting of a hedge was proposed and this could be further explored and resolved at the Reserved Matters stage.

Access points to the development were along Plummers Road and Highways had made a technical assessment and had no objections.

In terms of archaeology, trial trenches had been dug and the view of archaeological consultant was that no further works at the site were necessary.

The Planning Officer stated that there would be 30% affordable housing and that the application would be subject to a contribution to the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS).

The Planning Officer considered the outline application appropriate and recommended approval with conditions.

Stephen Foster addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application expressing residents' concerns.

Mr Foster felt that the consultation referred to in paragraph 10 of the report had not been specific enough to this proposal so was not completely relevant. The scheme was ill thought out and no measurements had been provided for the outline consent requested.

He stated that the site was a greenfield one that was part of a working farm not an appropriate settlement site; it was outside SP1. The archaeological investigation had found evidence of the bronze age ring works and a pit and pottery from the Middle Ages.

He also highlighted that there were traffic problems in Plummers Road and that the pavement/footpath proposed would only cater for the southern end of the road

meaning pedestrians at the northern end of Plummers Road would need to step into the road.

Mr Foster, in conclusion, said that the target for new houses had already been met with the approval of 150 homes in Eight Ash Green.

Charlotte Powell, Arbora Design addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application

Ms Powell stressed that the applicant had worked with Colchester Borough Council's Policy Team and that the allocation in the Emerging Local Plan had been consulted on. As requested an archeological evaluation had been undertaken.

She explained that site fronted Plummers Road and access had been agreed by Highways. The proposed public footpath would increase connectivity in the village. The size and type of homes had been agreed with the Housing Team with the aim of 17 dwellings being delivered and occupied by 2023. More detail would be considered under reserved matters. The proposal was a small development in the village that would secure a legal agreement and RAMS payment.

Councillor Chapman submitted comments under the Have Your Say provisions which, with the consent of the Chairman, were read out by the Democratic Services Officer:

"I have been a Councillor for Fordham for nearly 20 years and one of the longstanding issues that both the County Councillor and I have regularly been challenged on is that of road safety for pedestrians along Plummers Road. A development some years ago had included a landscape path along some of it but, following much discussion with the Highway authority, it was clear that there was nothing they could offer to improve the situation along the remaining stretch of the road.

A desire by the Village Hall Committee to improve facilities was also apparent. So, following the call for sites for the new Borough Plan a few years ago, the Parish Council, County Councillor Anne Brown and myself met with the Borough Council's planners to see if a scheme could be developed to improve the footway and provide some S106 money to support the village hall. The present application is the result. Road safety is one of the major issues in most villages, and I have always worked to find ways and means to improve it. As Councillors on this Committee will appreciate, that isn't easy. So, an opportunity such as this prospective development will always be welcomed by me."

The first issue raised by the Committee was that of the footpath and a suggestion to site the footpath inside the hedge was made, so as to shield pedestrians from any fast flowing traffic as there was concern that pedestrians would be too close to the road . Pedestrian safety was a concern as was pollution. Resiting of the footpath would also mean that the hedge may be retained.

Secondly concern was expressed over the speed of traffic using the road and the issue of cars' access and egress: vehicles pulling out of the development needing good side splays and signage. It was acknowledged that any effect on visual splays had been considered from a Highways' perspective.

The lack of infrastructure in the village was also raised in particular in respect of oversubscribed schools, it would not be sufficient to support any additional residents.

The Committee had seen that only one trench had been dug but were assured by the Planning Officer that the Archeological Consultant/officer had overseen the activity and no further work was needed.

The Committee welcomed the provision of 30% affordable housing particularly as there would be 3 and 4 bedroom properties which were harder to find in the Social Housing sector.

The Committee recognised that the issues raised would be addressed at the reserved matters stage and suggested an addition to the informatives.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report with the addition of an informative about the footpath and boundary hedge.

837 Junction of Tollgate Road & Church Lane, Stanway

The Committee considered an application for prior notification of proposed development by telecommunications code systems operators. Cabinet and an 18-metre mast. A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

The Committee members had been provided with a short video of the site taken by the Principal Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

James Ryan, the Principal Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations. He reminded members that this was not a Planning Application as the development was Permitted Development and were it not to be

determined or to be deferred at the meeting it would gain deemed consent. The applicant had made their site selection and submitted this to be considered as is. Siting and appearance were the only matters the Committee could consider.

The Principal Planning Officer shared a presentation with members including plans, images and drawings to illustrate in particular the positioning and height of the mast which emerges from a rectangular cabinet.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the mast was of utilitarian design, located on Highway land with pedestrian clearance, 3.7 metres footway remained. Some residents supported this proposal given the benefits of the provision of 5G, others were against and a balance needed to be struck. He clarified that the mast was a long way from properties, there were relatively spacious grass banks and other sites were closer to dwellings. He pointed out that for installation on Highway land the Street Team in Essex County Council would have looked at the location.

Cllr Dundas attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee.

He explained that he had called the item in for the Committee to discuss, highlighting that as the planning report says this is a balanced decision which has submissions of both support and objection from nearby residents.

As many submissions point out good 5G coverage is vital for the long-term economic future of Stanway and the Lakelands area. With more people working from home advanced broadband, both wired and wireless is vital. There are currently several 4G bad patches in Stanway and no one wants to see that repeated with 5G.

The aerial map shown in the planning documents shows the area before recent building and the mast site proposed is close to a number of houses and close to the road so quite prominent in appearance.

The Lakelands area consists of a fairly large residential zone with a similarly large retail and industrial zone to the north. The mast would surely be more appropriate sited in the commercial area where, amongst many already utilitarian buildings where it would probably be almost unnoticeable.

He pointed out that on Page 10 of the Background planning papers the applicant shows a map of sites they have considered. Some, correctly, are identified as being even worse in terms of proximity to residential properties but there is one on the Western by-pass closer to the commercial areas which is discounted due to "insufficient pavement width". This implied, that there is no specific technical reason in terms of coverage why the mast needs to be on the of Church Lane and coverage could be obtained from siting it to the north of the the residential area.

All of the sites considered are on pavements adjoining the highway. There

had been no consideration to siting it on private land or even mounted on existing commercial buildings. He asked that the Committee enquire why this is the case? Whether this might be because of costs that the company do not want to pay (rent or land purchase) and whether landowners such as the Tollgate Partnership or British Land been approached?

People in Stanway are not being “NIMBYs” on this. They want good coverage and understand that means masts. They just want to be sure all alternatives which are a compromise between technical effectiveness and visual impact have been considered.

In summary Cllr Dundas stated that it was clear from the documents the mast could be sited almost 1Km away and still give coverage. There must be one site somewhere in amongst a large commercial development which includes several tall buildings which would work.

He urged the committee to question why only sites on the public highways have been considered and to be sure that the mast could not be sited in the commercial area before considering approval.

Cllr Scott-Boutell attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. She highlighted that the Parish Council had objected and there had been a number of residents who had also objected. Her concerns were around location and visual impact.

Cllr Scott-Boutell pointed out that indicators of the site had already been marked up on the street itself. The mast would be too prominent and close to a residential area if this site were to be used. She asked if officers had been provided with evidence to show why the mast could not be sited to the North at the nearby retail parks for example, alternative siting in a commercial area would be more appropriate.

In discussion, members felt the height of the mast, particularly in comparison to the streetlights was an issue, along with the proximity of the mast to residents' properties. It was suggested that the greensward behind the proposed site might in future be allocated for a Housing Development. Concern was expressed about EMF radar frequencies. In response the Senior Planning Officer informed members that that the applicant had provided a certificate that certified safety, and that the only issues that the Committee could consider were siting and design.

There was discussion around the design and how the mast tower might be painted to minimise its impact through camouflage. It was noted that the triangular design had been proposed to make the tower as slimline as possible. Siting near signage was raised but it was confirmed that this was a Highways issue.

Reference was also made by Committee members to the siting obstructing the footway for the visually impaired and pedestrians such as families with pushchairs.

RESOLVED (SIX voted FOR, THREE voted AGAINST) that the application for for prior notification of proposed development by telecommunications code systems operators be refused for the following reasons:-:

The proposal is unacceptable in term of its appearance. The mast is a stark and utilitarian structure that is proposed to be located in a wholly residential area. It is not proposed to be disguised or camouflaged in any way and is considerably taller than any of the other street furniture in the vicinity. It will be the dominant feature of this part of Lakelands and is therefore demonstrably harmful to the character of the area by reason of its alien character and industrialising effect in this suburban residential location.

The proposal is unacceptable in terms of its siting. The location proposed is highly prominent in the street scene and this results to further harm to the character of the area. The submitted justification for not using other sites of a more appropriate character able to host the mast without the adverse impacts identified and suitably distanced from residential dwellings has not been fully explored or justified. The proposed location will force pedestrians (and especially the visually impaired) onto the block paved area of the footway to the detriment of their efficient use of the footway at the expense of the siting of this telecommunications equipment which is not held to be reasonable. It also sits adjacent to a vacant piece of land that may be used for development in the future and this scheme would adversely impact upon the developable area.

The scheme therefore fails to accord with Adopted Development Policies Policy DP1 that requires design to take the opportunities available to it and to ensure development is well designed and does not harm the character of an area. It also fails to accord with the requirements of the NPPF 2019 that states at paragraph 113: "where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

838 P G Rix (Farms) Ltd, Lodge Farm, Boxted Road, Great Horkesley

Councillor Davidson (by reason of acquaintance with the applicant) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

Councillor Maclean (by reason of acquaintance with the applicant) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Committee considered a proposed agricultural steel portal framed grading building and relocation of existing gas tanks.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

The Committee members had been provided with photographs of the site taken by the Principal Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report following confirmation from the Essex County Council SUDs team that they have no objection to the application and including any conditions recommended by them;

In the event that the Essex County Council SUDs team object to the application, allow delegated authority to the Planning, Housing and Economic Growth Lead to seek amendments to address the objection and negotiate any related planning conditions as necessary;

In the event that the Essex County Council SUDs team objection to the application and their objection cannot be resolved, to refuse the application as per the Essex County Council recommendation.

839 Land opposite Magpie Chase, Stanway

Councillor Warnes (by reason of membership of the Board of Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

Councillor G. Oxford (by reason of the same architect working on the design of a Community Centre in Highwoods) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Committee considered the proposed construction of a new 2-storey community centre with associated parking and landscaping which was a resubmission of application 201365.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

The Committee members had been provided with a video of the site taken by the Senior Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

Lucy Mondon, the Principal Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations sharing a presentation with members including plans, aerial views, photographs of the site and drawings.

She explained that although the application was similar to the one approved in 2020 there were some changes beyond what could be dealt with as non material amendment. The Committee were able to see the approved scheme plans and the current proposal including floor plans. The mezzanine had been extended and rearranged, roof light added and fenestration amended. Planning considerations were outlined in the report and the applicant had submitted additional information which had been included in the amendment sheet but there had subsequently been no changes to the conditions proposed.

Roger Gilles addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application

Mr Gilles explained that the architects had been appointed in 2019 to design the Community Facility adjacent to the Country Park. Public consultation had taken place and feedback had been taken into account, including the requirements of Stanway Parish Council. Some revisions as outlined in the report were before the Committee, but they were not fundamental; there were measures to restrict noise, addition of offices and an outside area for possible sports use. The proposal promoted the use of existing land.

The Committee raised the issue of the number of car parking spaces provided and whether these would prove sufficient for large events as otherwise there may be an impact on residents living nearby. There was no bus layby /public transport adjacent to the proposed centre.

The Principal Planning Officer clarified that the parking provision was close to the SPD maximum standard of 25 spaces. Cycle spaces were provided.

Members suggested to ameliorate the situation at large events temporary parking might be provided on the Country Park.

The other concern of the Committee was the need for safe and adequate access across the road to make it safe to walk to the building. Traffic was fast moving on the bypass with no crossing points and whilst it was acknowledged that a toucan

crossing was being considered by Essex County Council the need to ensure that ECC were encouraged to provide this was stressed.

The Committee agreed that the Community Centre would be a good asset for Stanway.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report with the addition of an informative concerning the need for a crossing on the Western Bypass to encourage walking and cycling given the reduced parking available.

840 23 Creffield Road, Colchester

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of a chalet bungalow and the construction of two new dwellings.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

The Committee members had been provided with a film and photographs of the site taken by the Senior Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

Eleanor Moss, the Senior Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations sharing a presentation with members including plans, aerial views, photographs of the site and drawings.

She explained that the whole site was in a conservation area and the design of the proposed dwellings reflected those of the 19th century buildings in Creffield Road. Detailed elevations of the proposals were shown and it was confirmed that two lime trees would be retained in the scheme. Garden space was in compliance and samples would be required of building materials/bricks. The impact on neighbouring properties was acceptable.

Tim Oxtan addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application.

Mr Oxtan explained that he was a local resident, living almost directly opposite the site in question and represented only his wife and himself. They had lived in Creffield Road for almost 40 years and wished, as far as possible, to protect the amenity of the neighbourhood.

3 Creffield Road was one of two houses in the road with an intact garden; a haven for wildlife and a welcome contrast to the bleakness of front gardens converted into car parks.

In the front garden there was a magnificent magnolia tree which, when in full bloom, as it was last month, gives joy to the whole neighbourhood. The "Arboricultural Impact Assessment" categorises this tree as C1, meaning that it does not add significantly to the tree-based amenity or character of the surrounding area". This is manifestly untrue of the magnolia, which is in a healthy condition and should be allowed to stand.

Although an unremarkable chalet/bungalow, typical of its period, there are now not many bungalows close to the centre of Colchester. Surviving bungalows close to the town centre should be retained, as these are attractive to elderly folk who seldom use their cars, or do not have a car at all, and thus do not add to traffic congestion and pollution.

The two detached houses proposed by the applicant were, architecturally, equally unremarkable. Their bulk will reduce the amenity value of the garden around them, being detached, they have scarcely any space between them and the houses on either side, nos. 21 and 25.

When new homes are built, they should provide the highest possible standard of energy efficiency, ideally according to "Passivhaus" standards. Nothing in the application suggested that there was any intention to achieve this goal.

Mr. Oxton urged the Committee to reject the planning application, given that, for environmental and social reasons, it is good to preserve bungalows close to the town centre.

If, however, the Committee was minded to grant approval he suggested that the proposed two detached houses should be replaced by a pair of semi-detached houses, allowing more space between them and their neighbours on either side. He requested that the highest standards of construction be specified, to reduce impact on the climate.

Committee members had some concerns over overlooking and noted obscure glazing was required to the proposed second floor rear window.

The Committee also asked if the Magnolia tree could be retained or moved and reinstalled.

The Development Manger clarified that Magnolias do not move well and resent disturbance. A replacement tree would enable new residents to enjoy it for 40 – 50 years. A landscaping condition could secure this.

RESOLVED (EIGHT voted FOR, ONE abstained) that the application be approved subject to an informative concerning landscaping condition and the need for a robust magnolia replacement to form part of the proposals.

841 2 Gladstone Road, Colchester

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a Timber Shed to provide a separate collection / Rapid Testing Centre for Colchester Borough Council's COVID-19 Rapid Response Team designated to solely provide Care to COVID-19 positive individuals in communities from Tendering, Colchester to Chelmsford.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

The Committee members had been provided with photographs of the site taken by the Senior Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report (temporary permission).

842 Shrub End Depot (refuse), Shrub End Road, Colchester

The Committee considered the Installation of 4 no. Coniston 35 canopies.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

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

843 9 Mayberry Walk, Colchester

The Committee considered an application for a Lawful Development Certificate for existing use: residential dwelling converted to include 4 beds, 1 communal breakfast room, bathroom, WC, kitchen, and living room/dining room to be shared with 4 residents.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

Eleanor Moss, the Senior Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

She explained that a Certificate of Lawful Use was being sought to confirm the use of the property as a house in multiple occupation under use class C4, which allows for 3 – 6 non related people occupying the property at any one time. Consideration should be given to lawfulness of the existing use.

She pointed out that there had been no change to the footprint of the property and no changes to the exterior of the property. Two parking spaces were provided. She made clear that there was no requirement for the applicant to seek a Certificate of Lawfulness, but should an owner want to sell the property in the future this was useful. Permitted Development allowed for this change of use from a dwelling house to a house in multiple occupation (HMO).

Daniel Crellin addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application

Mr Crellin highlighted that the application was retrospective and that the property had materially changed and was a house in multiple occupation. He stated this should fall under development not permitted.

He queried the validity of the application which in Section 3 referred to 8 Mayberry Walk, and the report which in paragraph 17.1 referred to 11 Mayberry Walk.

He pointed out that the property was being run as a business and that there had been issues since the changes were made to accommodate multi occupation. Problems with drainage had ensued from the bathroom, a kitchen had been installed upstairs and he had concerns around safety, fearing a possible gas explosion. He sought assurance that Building Regulations had been followed.

Mr Crellin also reported that there had been a data breach in respect of the objection he had made which had been posted on the Council's website.

Cllr Harris attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee.

Cllr Harris first asked that steps be put in place to ensure General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) breaches do not happen again.

He explained that he had called the application in as many residents in Mayberry Walk and the Willows had concerns.

He said the Certificate of Lawfulness was retrospective but should be treated as a fresh application taking into consideration parking and health and wellbeing.

Cllr Harris pointed out that paragraph 17.1 mentioned 11 Mayberry Walk not number 9.

He noted that 8.3 stated that 4 occupants were acceptable, but would there be a guarantee that over 4 would not be permitted? He queried whether checks had been made and what may happen going forward in some years' time. Also, there was concern for the safety of the people in the house; 8.3 stated that a safety and management check was underway. Any decision should be deferred until this was complete.

Residents were concerned about overlooking from the upper storey.

He urged the Committee to listen to residents' concerns.

The Senior Planning Officer said that GDPR breach would be taken seriously and investigated. She also apologised for the typographical error in paragraph 17.1 concerning the address of the application site which was No.9 Mayberry Walk not No.11 as stated.

It was suggested that the GDPR breach should be declared to the Information Commissioner.

The Committee understood the concerns of the residents and that there may be management issues and antisocial behaviour issues which would affect the quality of life of residents. There were safety concerns, and it was proposed that a fire assessment should be made.

The Development Manager clarified that a change from a single family dwelling to an HMO was permitted, it was what the legislation states and up to 6 occupants were allowed. The Committee had no discretion; the request was for application of the legislation. Officers were respectful of the comments from local residents, but the areas of concern raised were not planning matters and were dealt with under other legislation. Referrals could be made to other services to investigate further.

The Committee acknowledged the legislative position but were empathetic to residents' and Ward Councillors' concerns.

RESOLVED (EIGHT voted FOR, ONE voted AGAINST) that the application be approved and that referrals be made by the Senior Planning Officer to Private Sector Housing, Building Control, and the Fire Service to ensure the safety of residents plus

an informative reminding of the need to comply with relevant legislation concerning HMOs.

844 Town Hall, High Street

The Committee considered the removal of existing wooden library shelving within the former court's law library room within the Town Hall. Existing boxing out above the shelving would be retained so as not to affect or alter the moulded plaster covering around the ceiling, meaning the existing sign would also be retained in-situ. Removal of the shelving would enable installation of new fixtures and fittings to the walls within the room to be carried out.

A report setting out information about the application was before the Committee.

The Committee members had been provided with photographs to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

Eirini Dimerouki, the Historic Buildings and Areas Officer, assisted the Committee in its deliberations, sharing a presentation with members including plans and photographs.

She explained that this had been the subject of a former application that had been first deferred then withdrawn. The proposal was now resubmitted with the aim of improving the functionality and availability of the room. Removal of the shelving was proposed and the books that had been stored there had been removed from the building and were no longer available. The historic sign would be retained and Historic England were satisfied.

Sir Bob Russell addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application

Sir Bob Russell firstly remarked that the Council was excluding residents by not providing paper copies of Agendas for the public as not everyone had access to digital devices.

He raised the issue of safeguards for the protection of Victorian buildings and that the Town Hall was Grade 1 listed. A valid case had not been made for the removal of the original fittings in the Law Library, there would be costs involved in doing this and this should not override the Grade 1 status of the building which should be protected.

The Committee concurred with Sir Bob, saying that they were the custodians of the town's heritage. The room should be restored to its original purpose with books located and reinstated or replaced. The room had a sense of history and was a heritage asset. One suggestion for its use that would be more appropriate was for wedding guests signing the register.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be refused as the Local Planning Authority has a duty to preserve this grade I listed building to maintain its external and internal integrity. The removal of the historic fittings as proposed would harm the special interest of the building and no justification has been provided as the proposed use is considered inappropriate and incompatible with the statutory aim of preserving the special historic features of the listed building.

845 Applications Determined in Accordance with Officer Scheme of Delegation

The Committee considered a report on those applications which had been determined under the interim arrangements since the last update which was provided at the meeting on 18th March 2021

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the applications which had been determined under the revised scheme of delegation (listed in the Appendix) be noted.