

APPENDIX A

The Committee considered the report and the urgent update report of the Head of Planning and Development.

Mr Osborne addressed the meeting in person on behalf of the applicant.

Contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development, the Committee was minded in principle to approve the application subject to appropriate conditions and, in this connection, requested that a full list of proposed conditions be submitted to the next meeting to enable a final decision to be made.

In making this decision, the Committee, on balance, considered that the proposed scheme interpreted the historic form of the farm buildings on the site in a successful manner and that the enclosure provided by the surrounding woodland enabled the larger scale of development proposed without harmful impact on the wider countryside. Further, the Committee was cognisant of the views of the Council's Conservation Officer of which they were generally supportive.

It was suggested that the proposed conditions should cover, inter alia, materials, integral niches for wildlife, external lighting (potentially use of red filters to reduce harm to wildlife), renewables (a sensitive approach given the historic nature of the building), landscaping (taking cues from a traditional Low Weald farm settlement and incorporating a specimen Black Poplar tree) and removal of permitted development rights.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee is minded in principle to approve this application subject to appropriate conditions and that a full list of proposed conditions be submitted to the next meeting to enable a final decision to be made.
2. That the list of proposed conditions should cover, inter alia, materials, integral niches for wildlife, external lighting (potentially use of red filters to reduce harm to wildlife), renewables (a sensitive approach given the historic nature of the building), landscaping (taking cues from a traditional Low Weald farm settlement and incorporating a specimen Black Poplar tree) and removal of permitted development rights.

Voting: 11 – For 1 – Against 0 - Abstentions