

COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS AND OFFICERS' RESPONSE – PLANNING COMMITTEE 4 FEBRUARY 2021

Item and application	Question	Response
ITEM 2.4 20/505438/FULL 2 Little Kennaways Stalisfield Road	Cllr Simmons <p>1. Ospringe Parish Council say that the length, width and height of the building have all been increased, the applicant's agent says that the parish council is factually incorrect. Who is right?</p> <p>2. There seems to be some concern about possible future uses for the Agricultural Barn. Can conditions be placed for the building to be for the sole use of the applicant? Also, can an Agricultural use condition be applied for use as housing for sheep and storage for hay and farm machinery? (see appendix 2 paragraph 11)</p> <p>3. This is a part retrospective application. In the 2018 appeal decision the inspector said (para 2) "Construction work has begun....." and in (para 17) "As it is not clear whether the development has commenced....." So what part is retrospective and what part is not?</p>	<p>1) I can confirm that the building has increased 1.2m in depth and is 0.58m longer than approved at the appeal in 2018. The ridge height is the same as approved at the appeal (6.3m). To that extent the height of the building has not increased as the Parish Council suggest, but the other dimensions are larger.</p> <p>2) This is an agricultural barn and therefore any other use would require planning permission. As such additional conditions in this regard are not required. Also it would not be appropriate to restrict the barn to a personal permission.</p> <p>3) This is a retrospective application for the whole building as it has been built and completed. The application is for the entire building as it does not accord with any previous planning permission, but as its already built there is no need for a condition to specify what drawings the building must be built to.</p>

	<p>4. In the 2018 appeal decision the inspector suggested that a number of conditions were necessary to ensure that the development be carried out in accordance with approved plans. Why do the proposed conditions only cover landscaping and not materials? Do the proposed conditions meet the need for enhanced mitigation through screening to the south-east, as the inspector suggested? See para. 13</p>	<p>4) Some of the conditions the Inspector included in 2018 are not relevant now, ie 1) the time limit to commence development (as it has already started, and been completed) 2) requirement to comply with approved plans (as the building is already built) 3) to approve the materials (as it is already completed and they are on the building-and are acceptable). I have included a condition to require approval of the landscaping details so we can assess that requisite screening is provided and this is inline with the Inspectors comments in 2018.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------