

Planning Committee Update – May 2022

Agenda Item	Application Reference	Additional Info Received/Updates to Committee
5	21/01535/FUL	<p>An additional statement was received from the agent to confirm the farm is operated as one unit and the accounts have been provided.</p> <p>There are no settlements closely related to the site and the applicant needs to be on site within sight and sound of his equipment, produce and livestock. The agent searched on Rightmove on 22nd April and the only available property within Mepal that is likely to be of a suitable size is £650,000 but this has no outbuildings or land to accommodate.</p> <p>The statement confirms the staffing levels for the existing business.</p>

6	21/01721/FUL	<p>The applicant has sent additional information that they wish for Members attention to be drawn to as indicated below –</p> <p><i>“ Please see attached photos of properties within sight of mine which have benefitted from extensions no smaller than my application. The first is 164 High Street. It has a large extension to the left side which is on two stories and the whole extension actually extends into a previous side access and now blocks and vehicular access to the side leaving a rather redundant looking garage building behind it. I am not sure how far the extension envelopes the rear but to my view the appearance of this when viewed from the side eg walking along high street towards the centre I can see the side extension and upper in a similar way that people could see with our proposed scheme. Looking at the context of 164 it almost creates a comparable dwelling 40% of the size of the main residence which hopefully comes across in the photos</i></p> <p><i>The other photos show 180 High Street which is directly opposite. This really appears to be an extra dwelling in the terrace if one didn’t know otherwise. This was built when the 2015 local plan was in existence and im not sure why the same policy didn’t apply that renders ours unacceptable and if it was an appeal decision but this extension is almost the same size as the original dwelling. It seem inconsistent that building an extension equivalent almost to the host dwelling would be acceptable but us having only a rear extension not protruding from the original footprint is not.”</i></p>
---	--------------	---







