



**REPORT of  
DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY, PERFORMANCE AND GOVERNANCE**

---

to  
**SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
05 AUGUST 2020**

**MEMBERS' UPDATE**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>20/00574/FUL</b>
<b>Location</b>	Land North West of Riversleigh, Nipsells Chase, Mayland
<b>Proposal</b>	Variation of condition 2 on approved planning permission 18/00280/FUL (Construction of an apple storage barn)
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr and Mrs Kenny and Sue Paton
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Anthony Cussen – Cussen Construction Consultants
<b>Target Decision Date</b>	12.08.2020
<b>Case Officer</b>	Devan Hearnah
<b>Parish</b>	Mayland
<b>Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council</b>	Councillor / Member of Staff

**3. SUMMARY**

**3.1 Proposal / brief overview, including any relevant background information**

- 3.1.5 The plans also show that the building would have a brick damp course up to a height of 0.8m with horizontal boarding above, as opposed to being finished entirely in horizontal boarding as previously approved. As this was not included in the reasons as to why the condition was being changed under section 5 of the Planning Application Form it was not previously considered as part of this application. However, since the submission of the application the materials have been approved under the terms of application 20/05040/DET. Given that the brick was considered acceptable as part of the discharge of conditions application it is not considered to have a significant bearing on the outcome of this application and does not require re-consultation. However, the impacts of the change from timber to brick on the character and appearance of the area are a material consideration and have been considered below.

**5.2 Design and Impact on the Character of the Area**

- 5.2.7 The addition of a brick damp course also contributes towards the building appearing more residential in nature than the previously approved design. However, as discussed in paragraph 5.2.6 of the original report, as the previously approved design was not reflective of its proposed function and resulted in a building that was more residential in appearance, it is not considered that the proposed brick when considered in

isolation or as a whole with the proposed alterations to the fenestration would materially alter the overall character of the building in comparison to what was previously approved.

## **5.6 Other Matters**

- 5.6.4 It is not considered that the addition of the brick would have an impact on any of the other material considerations.