

Minutes

Planning Committee

Thursday, 3 July 2025, 1.00 pm

**Council Chamber – South
Kesteven House, St. Peter’s Hill,
Grantham, NG31 6PZ**



**SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

Committee Members present

Councillor Charmaine Morgan (Chairman)

Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing

Councillor Pam Byrd

Councillor Patsy Ellis

Councillor Tim Harrison

Councillor Gloria Johnson

Councillor Mark Whittington

Councillor Paul Wood

Councillor Helen Crawford

Councillor Max Sawyer

Cabinet Members present

Councillor Richard Cleaver

Officers

Emma Whittaker (Assistant Director of Planning and Growth)

Phil Jordan (Development Management & Enforcement Manager)

Adam Murray (Principal Development Management Planner)

Miranda Beavers (Senior Development Management Planning Officer)

Alex McDonough (Assistant Development Management Planner)

Amy Pryde (Democratic Services Officer)

Paul Weeks (Legal Advisor)

10. Register of attendance and apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Bellamy, Sarah Trotter, Paul Fellows, Vanessa Smith and Penny Milnes.

Councillor Helen Crawford substituted for Councillor Sarah Trotter.

Councillor Max Sawyer substituted for Vanessa Smith.

11. Disclosure of interests

Councillor Mark Whittington declared an interest in application S25/0553, he therefore, would not participate in the debate or vote.

Cllr Tim Harrison declared an interest in application S25/0553, he therefore, would not participate in the debate or vote.

Councillor Charmaine Morgan declared that the applicant to application S25/0553 was a relative of a Councillor. All Members had been trained to retain their independence and were not pre-determined of the application.

Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing declared that he was the Ward Member for applications S25/0258, S25/0259 and S25/0296. He noted that he was not pre-determined and came to the Committee with an open mind.

Councillor Charmaine Morgan declared the following on behalf of the Committee:

‘South Kesteven District Council has a land interest in St Martins Park, Stamford, subject to legal agreement. This would not fetter the Committee’s discretion to make a decision as the Local Planning Authority and ownership was not a material planning consideration’.

12. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025 were proposed, seconded and **AGREED** as a correct record.

13. Application S25/0553

(Councilors Tim Harrison and Mark Whittington left the Chamber, due to their declarations of interest).

Proposal:	Dormer to side elevations of previous extension
Location:	The Conifers, School Lane, Old Somerby, Lincolnshire, NG33 4AQ
Recommendation:	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to REFUSE planning permission.

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Against	Linda Dodd
Applicant	Anita Selby

Together with:

- Provisions within South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036, Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Old Somerby Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Comments received from Old Somerby Parish.

- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways and SuDS).

During questions to Public Speakers, Members commented on the following:

- It was requested that the applicant provide more information on the unsuitability of their current bathroom arrangement. The applicant explained that there was a region of the bathroom currently inaccessible, rendering it difficult to include a shower.
- It was explained by an officer that the applicant could come with a revised application post-decision, then they had the opportunity to.
- The officer advised the applicant to seek advice from the officers before submitting a revised application.
- An officer confirmed that the issue was not necessarily one of the applicant overlooking, but the perception of being overlooked by the neighbours.
- The applicant stated they intended to submit amended plans.

During questions to officers and debate, Members commented on the following:

- A Member asked for clarification on whether the windows were able to open in the proposal, and it was confirmed that the windows were glazed and non-opening.
- A member commented that given the nature of the application being for a bathroom, it was likely that the applicants would return to request the windows to be opening.
- A member asked for confirmation that the agreement in the previous meeting for glazed windows to be installed on the ground floor had not been followed through, and if that required enforcement action. Confirmation was given that the officer was aware of the concerns and that they should have no bearing on the present discussion.
- Members considered the dormer windows would result in overlooking of the neighbours garden due to the pre existing extension running parallel to the garden.
- It was noted that prior permission for ground floor extension required obscure glazing to prevent overlooking. It had not been installed by the applicant. A request was made by the Chair for enforcement team to investigate the outstanding matter.

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **REFUSE** planning permission.

14. Application S25/0258

Proposal:

Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for a mixed-use development comprising light industrial units (Use Class E(g)), Offices (Use Class E(g)), convenience store (Use Class E(a)), café

(Use Class E(b)) and 23 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) pursuant to outline planning permission S20/2056

Location:

Land to the north of Barnack Road
Stamford

Recommendation:

To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT reserved matters consent, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Andrew Rowland, Senior Architect on behalf of Burghley Land Ltd
Mark Flood, Director, Insight Town Planning Ltd on behalf of Burghley Land Ltd
(both answering questions only)

Together with:

- Provisions within South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036, Stamford Neighbourhood Plan, Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and South Kesteven Local Plan Review 2021-2041.
- No comments received from Anglian Water.
- No comments received from Barnack Parish Council.
- No comments received from Environment Agency.
- No comments received from The Gardens Trust.
- No comments received from Historic England.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways & SuDS).
- Comments received from Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue.
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Police Crime Prevention Officer.
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.
- No comments received from Ministry of Defence – Defence Infrastructure Organisation.
- Comments received from Network Rail.
- Comments received from Peterborough City Council.
- Comments received from SKDC Conservation Officer.
- No comments received from SKDC Environmental Protection.
- Comments received from SKDC Urban Design Officer.
- No comments received from St. Martins Without Parish Council.
- Comments received from Stamford Civic Society.
- No comments received from Stamford Town Council.
- No comments received from Welland & Deepings Internal Drainage Board.
- No comments received from Wothorpe Parish Council.

During questions to Public Speakers, Members commented on the following:

- The provision, number and location of car parking was queried.

The Applicant clarified parking areas were to the back of the site and were broken down into smaller areas to incorporate landscaping and SuDS. Parking would reflect policy requirements.

- Whether traffic generation would be of the same density as the old factory.

Traffic generation was reflected at outline planning application in 2022. The Highway Authority had considered the net change and were satisfied with the uplift during certain hours of the day, with appropriate mitigations being put in place.

- Whether the computer-generated images were accurate in relation to design.

The Applicant confirmed their ability to deliver the proposal in line with the computer-generated images. Burghley had land ownership of the site and had strong opinions and input in terms of design quality.

- Concern was raised on energy conservations and solar panels and the provision of these.

A wide range of sustainability features were proposed for the site, including solar panels. With the area being architecturally sensitive, solar panels would be hidden, for example, through a valley double pitch roof. Air source heat pumps would also provide energy for the buildings.

- Whether there would be a provision for EV charging points.

The Principal Development Management Planner clarified further detail in terms of sustainability were covered by a separate condition on the outline permission and would be a separate decision. Condition 31 requires the development to meet certain sustainability criteria and energy performance specified at outline stage.

The Applicant confirmed all 3 applications would come forward as a phasing scheme for the site as a whole, which was covered by condition.

- Who would be responsible for all open spaces and greenery of the site.

The responsibility of open spaces was covered at outline permission and would be managed by a management company, with influence from Burghley Estate.

- Whether a management company would implement overhead charges to the businesses or residents of the site.

It was confirmed overhead charges to businesses and residents was expected.

- The level of public consultation that had taken place was queried.
- Concern was raised of the access to the railway, at the north of the site. It was queried whether any safety fences would be implemented for safety measures.

A reserve matters within the application was hard and soft landscaping, the detail of the applications included how the northern edge would be treated as a landscaping barrier.

Network rail had been consulted on all applications and their consultation response included the types of species required of them to efficiently screen the railway, the types of species due to be planted, had been verified by Network Rail. They also requested a form of fencing along the railway boundary, which would be dealt with separately.

- One Member queried whether a full visual impact assessment had taken place from key viewpoints within Stamford's Conservation Area, whether the size and scale of Barnack Road frontage adequately preserved Burghley House and lastly, whether the variation reflected Stamford's historic character.

Conditions had been agreed at the outline planning permission in terms of landscaping, land use and building heights permitted on site. The report highlighted liaison with the Council's Conservation Officer, Historic England and The Gardens Trust and all were in support of the scheme and had no concerns around the relationship with Burghley and the assets involved.

- Whether the level crossing had been upgraded in order to make it safer to cross. It was questioned if the road leading to Barnack Road not crossing had been completed yet.

The Principal Development Management Planner confirmed the railway crossing upgrade was secured through a S106 agreement, which included additional street trees, bus stops including the entire footpath being upgraded.

A Car parking specific document had been sent to Lincolnshire County Council (Highways). For the office and industrial area to the West of the site, the parking requirement was 218 and the site proposed provided 219 spaces.

- Whether comments from Peterborough City Council had been incorporated into the design as requested.

The Officer had noted the comments received from Peterborough City Council, however, the Council had their own expertise in terms of design quality, and they were satisfied with it.

- Clarification and more details were sought around the green lawn throughout the site.

The land use plan showed an area of land on the eastern part of the site and the northern soft landscaping buffer to the railway line. Green areas would be interweaved throughout the site to aid connectivity routes throughout.

- Clarification was sought around court parking and roads, as set out in the plans.

The plan differentiated court parking and roads within the site where traffic calming measures were proposed.

- Whether the Applicant could guarantee that nonindustrial units would not be replaced by housing in future.

The Assistant Director for Planning and Growth clarified there was no guarantee of future changes to the site. If the owners of the site wished to apply for a different use, a new application would need to be submitted and considered on its own merits.

Condition 17 removes the permitted development rights meaning the any change to the use of the site would require planning permission.

- Concern was raised from Lincolnshire County Council SuDS where they had stated drainage proposed was not the most appropriate form, however, was adequate.

It was highlighted that Lincolnshire County Council SuDS would have preferred to see more swales incorporated within the scheme, The difficulty in doing this meant more swales requires a bigger area of land which may impact the character of the area and historic location. However, the drainage solution was adequate to manage the level of water runoff required.

A member highlighted that whilst Building Regulations cover fire safety design those relating to the wider development are a matter for consideration of the planning committee.

During questions to the applicants agent it was confirmed fire hydrants would be provided in appropriate locations throughout the site.
All roads would be capable of taking a fire engine.

The Civic Society had requested all development to run concurrently. The Applicants agent confirmed this would be the case.

During questions to officers and debate, Members commented on the following:

- Some Members were satisfied with the application and pleased to see the master plan presented to them.

Councillor Tim Harrison raised the following concerns:

- That outline permission was for 1 application, which had recently been split into 3.
- That Officers mentioned a possible fracture in delivery of the project.

- That Stamford Civic Society would only be satisfied if the 3 sites be developed concurrently.
- That Lincolnshire County Council (SuDS) had state drainage would be adequate at present however, not for the future use as more swales would be preferred.

The Assistant Director for Planning and Growth confirmed that feedback from SuDS included factors around climate change, drainage and flooding. The comments from SuDS stated the scheme was adequate, however, Lincolnshire County Council had a preference of their ideal SuDS scheme. It was highlighted that Lincolnshire County Council would not be taking liability of SuDS for the scheme, if it was not adequate and fit for purpose.

A member commented whilst the Officer report stated Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust had no Comments, the online comment indicated the LWT reserved the ability to comment later.

Whilst members of the public had raised concerns regarding the use of employment land for the scheme it was pointed out that the application would provide a range of employment opportunities.

(Councillor Tim Harrison abstained from the vote, due to the advice received from Lincolnshire County Council in relation to SuDS).

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** reserved matters consent, subject to conditions:

Approved Plans

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:
 - a. Application Document Schedule (Dated 16 June 2025)

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.
Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

During Building Works

Design Quality and Visual Impact

Materials Sample

- 2) Before any works above foundation level of any building hereby permitted are begun, a detailed specification of the materials (including the colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

Before the Development is Operational

Design Quality and Visual Impact

Materials Implementation

- 3) No building forming part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied / brought into use, until that building has been completed in accordance with the approved external materials details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

15. Application S25/0259

Proposal:	Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 167 dwellings (Use Class C3) pursuant to outline planning permission S20/2056
Location:	Land to the north of Barnack Road, Stamford
Recommendation:	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT reserved matters consent, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Garry Goodwin, Group Planning & Design Director, Morris Homes
Mark Flood, Director, Insight Town Planning Ltd on behalf of Burghley Land Ltd
(both answering questions only)

Together with:

- Provisions within South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036, Stamford Neighbourhood Plan, Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and South Kesteven Local Plan Review 2021 – 2041.
- Comments received from Anglian Water.
- No comments received from Barnack Parish Council.
- No comments received from Gardens Trust.
- No comments received from Historic England.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways & SuDS).
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Crime Prevention Officer
- Comments received from Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

- No comments received from Ministry of Defence – Defence Infrastructure Organisation.
- No comments received from Network Rail.
- Comments received from Peterborough City Council.
- Comments received from SKDC Conservation Officer.
- No comments received from SKDC Environmental Protection Officer.
- Comments received from SKDC Principal Urban Design Officer
- No comments received from St Martins Without Parish Council.
- Comments received from Stamford Civic Society.
- Comments received from Stamford Town Council.
- No comments received from Wothorpe Parish Council

During questions to Public Speakers, Members commented on:

- The provision of parking was queried per dwelling.

The Applicant clarified the larger houses would have double garages and double car parking spaces in front of the garages. 3-bedroom properties would have a garage and two spaces in front of the garage. It was noted that the scheme had dedicated on street visitor parking.

- Whether the market houses and affordable houses were distinguishable by design.

The development would be designed first and then the allocation of affordable housing would take place. There would be no distinguished character between the affordable and private housing.

The S106 agreement that applied to scheme from outline planning permission secures 30% affordable housing across the site and requires a submission of the affordable housing scheme and layout.

- The provision and location of a play area was queried.

A play area would form part of the sites village green and would be overlooked by a perimeter of housing and surrounded by planting and a low natural stone wall. Sustainable drainage features (e.g. open swales) would sit around the edges of the area. Play equipment would be designed in coalition with Burghley Estate.

- Whether NHS and education money contributions had been agreed.
- Whether Fire and Rescue were satisfied of the roads on site in terms of access and manoeuvrability.

The Applicant had worked closely with Highways on the site. All roads within the plan were adopted including private drives. This meant refuse vehicles and emergency services could access all areas of the site. Fire and access would be dealt within the Building Control process and comply with certain documents.

It was clarified that houses highlighted in yellow on the plan were different tenures of affordable housing. It was noted that clustering of affordable housing had a limit of no more than 15, these certain details were covered by planning obligation. The mix in the western cluster of houses was a 50/50 ration of affordable and private housing and were all of the same design.

- Whether the attenuation area would be filled with water or dry unless a high amount of rain.

The attenuation would be mostly dry. All dwellings and parking courts would have a sustainable drainage feature. There would be minimal surface water from the scheme overall, however the attenuation would store water in the event of super storms.

- Clarification was sought around the plans for the biodiversity net gain area.

The surface water features were shallow in depth and were designed to be gradual in their grade. The landscaping scheme and BNG areas would form part of the management and be maintained.

A number of submissions had been made for ecological planting within the open spaces to increase BNG %, which would be an over provision.

- Whether the dwellings would have solar panels.
- Whether a substation or pumping station green box would be sited on the development.

The Applicant highlighted that sustainability credentials of the development met the building regulation requirements. There was no gas on site, all properties would be fitted with air source heat pumps, have mechanical vent heat recovery systems and ventilation control. Solar panels would be fitted if required under policy and all properties would be fitted with an EV charging point.

A substation was designed within the scheme, it would be sited one side of a garage unit and built out of stone.

The pumping station would be sited on the Northern Railway boundary and was included within the landscaping scheme.

During questions to the Applicants agent, it was confirmed fire hydrants would be provided in appropriate locations throughout the housing development.

The Applicants agent confirmed all roads would be capable of taking the weight of a fire engine.

During question to Officers and debate, Members commented on:

- Whether the mitigation measures were sufficient in terms of noise, vibrations and pollution from the railway. It was felt that the layout of the residential amenity was within close proximity to commercial uses.

The Principal Development Management Planner confirmed condition 26 and 29 of the outline planning permission required a noise mitigation scheme and lighting strategy.

- Members commented on the quality of design of the scheme.
- Members welcomed on the extensive use of renewable energy throughout the majority of the scheme.

(Councillor Tim Harrison abstained from the vote, due to the advice received from Lincolnshire County Council in relation to SuDS).

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** reserved matters consent, subject to conditions:

Approved Plans

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:
 - a. Application Document Schedule (Dated 16 June 2025)

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.
Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

During Building Works

Design Quality and Visual Impact

Materials Sample

- 5) Before any works above foundation level of any building hereby permitted are begun, a detailed specification of the materials (including the colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

Before the Development is Operational

Design Quality and Visual Impact

Materials Implementation

- 6) No building forming part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied / brought into use, until that building has been completed in accordance with the approved external materials details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

(The Committee had a 15-minute break).

16. Application S25/0296

Proposal:	Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 150 residential units (Use Class C2), together with ancillary care, communal and wellbeing facilities pursuant to outline planning permission S20/2056
Location:	Land to the north of Barnack Road, Stamford
Recommendation:	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT reserved matters consent, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Ellen Pearce, Head of Planning, Inspired Villages (Senior Living Stamford Ltd)
Mark Flood, Director, Insight Town Planning Ltd on behalf of Burghley Land Ltd
(both answering questions only)

Together with:

- Provisions within South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036, Stamford Neighbourhood Plan, Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and South Kesteven Local Plan Review 2021 – 2041.
- No comments received from Anglian Water.
- No comments received from Barnack Parish Council.
- No comments received from Environment Agency.
- No comments received from Gardens Trust.
- No comments received from Historic England.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways & SuDS).
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Crime Prevention Officer
- Comments received from Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.
- No comments received from Ministry of Defence – Defence Infrastructure Organisation.
- No comments received from Network Rail.
- Comments received from Peterborough City Council.

- Comments received from SKDC Conservation Officer.
- No comments received from SKDC Environmental Protection Officer.
- Comments received from SKDC Principal Urban Design Officer
- No comments received from St Martins Without Parish Council.
- Comments received from Stamford Civic Society.
- No comments received from Stamford Town Council.
- No comments received from Wothorpe Parish Council

During questions to Public Speakers, Members commented on:

- Whether there was any parking provision for the elderly residents and a storage facility for mobility scooters.

The Applicant confirmed there were 158 licensed car parking spaces for residents. The residents residing in the unit would be typically enter at 78 years old and bespoke parking data outlined only 70% of residents would arrive with a vehicle. Mobility scooters could be charged and stored within the cycle stores.

A village transport service would be facilitated to take residents where they wish to go within a certain radius, which could be pre-booked.

- Whether there was a proposal to have any health provisions on-site.

Residents would typically have a care package tailored to their own needs. The S106 agreement secured a healthcare contribution of a provision within two miles of the town centre of Stamford, which could include a digital consultation suite, new clinical administration room and expansion of new primary care facilities in Stamford.

- Whether the buildings would be designed in internal with a view to provide easy access for the elderly.

The proposed properties within the site were designed to be accessible and adaptable for aging communities.

- Whether the retired residents would have full use of the community room.

The community room would be open and accessible to any member of the public which would include classes for the elderly residents and wellness facilities.

- Clarification was sought around the age of the residents that would be residing within the proposed scheme.

The S106 agreement secures the occupants of the properties to be aged 55 or over who require a form of care.

- Whether the properties would be rented out or bought by the residents.

- Whether the Applicant (Inspire Villages) would deliver the car or whether this would be undertaken by another care company.

The Applicant confirmed the resident would have option to rent or purchase the property.

Inspired Villages worked in partnership with an agency in order to provide care to residents, however, residents had the opportunity to choose their own care provider.

- A query was raised on how the community clubhouse would be financed.

Residents would pay a service charge which would cover staffing measures, the fee would be non-profit making that would be put back into the village.

During question to Officers and debate, Members commented on:

- Whether the climate change provisions were similar to the rest of the site and whether the design of these particular properties would be distinguishable to other properties on the site and if there would be adequate signage and way finding.

It was clarified that although building materials would be similar, distinct character areas would distinguish each part of the scheme.

- Where there would be dedicated staff on the site 24 hours a day, due to the vulnerability of residents and how many.

The site would have a 24-hour response, where a member of staff is on the site each day, number of staff would vary throughout different periods. As the number of residents increase, so would the staff numbers. At day one, there would be 18 members of staff and would increase up to 25 staff members over time.

- Whether a provision for couriers or short-term parking had been considered.

Within the plan, a service and delivery area for commercial deliveries was proposed for the village.

- Clarification was sought whether any of the housing was affordable.

At outline stage, a financial viability exercise had taken place to assess the deliverability of the scheme as a whole. The exercise concluded that affordable housing would not be viable for the retirement village and did not require any affordable units within it.

- It was queried what work had been undertaken with the fire brigade, given the vulnerability of residents.

The Principal Development Management Planner clarified building regulations and requirements would be at the discretion of building control.

- Whether there would be any restrictions on pet ownership of residents.

Residents were able to bring any pets with them upon moving in.

- The location of the shop on site was queried.

A shop was located close by to the community clubhouse. Residents could access the shop via the village bus service or a 15-minute walk.

- Whether the provision of dropped kerbs would be implemented on site.

It was confirmed dropped kerbs would be implemented throughout the site to cater for mobility scooters. The site would also have traffic calmed areas where level access would be implemented.

- A member commented the application would bring further employment opportunity to the site.
- It was established the layout of the site meant the gym would be accessible to residents with minimal impact on their amenity.

(Councillor Tim Harrison abstained from the vote, due to the advice received from Lincolnshire County Council in relation to SuDS).

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** reserved matters consent, subject to conditions:

Approved Plans

7) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:

a. Application Document List (Dated 19 June 2025) (Revision D)

b.

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

During Building Works

Design Quality and Visual Impact

Materials Sample

8) Before any works above foundation level of any building hereby permitted are begun, a detailed specification of the materials (including the colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of

the development hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

Before the Development is Operational

Design Quality and Visual Impact

Materials Implementation

- 9) No building forming part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied / brought into use, until that building has been completed in accordance with the approved external materials details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

17. Any other business, which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, decides is urgent

There were none.

18. Close of meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting at 16:00.