

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
 25 JULY 2022**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors Mrs C L E Vernon (Vice-Chairman), T R Ashton, I D Carrington,
 Mrs M J Overton MBE, N H Pepper, N Sear and T J N Smith

Councillors: attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Neil McBride (Head of Planning), Martha Rees (Solicitor), Marc Willis (Applications Manager)
 and Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer)

15 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Ashleigh-Morris, A M Austin, A M Hall
 and Mrs A M Newton MBE.

16 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATION
 COMMITTEE HELD ON 4 JULY 2022

Councillor Mrs M J Overton MBE wished her apologies for the previous meeting to be noted.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2022 be signed by the Chairman as a
 correct record.

18 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS

19 FOR CHANGE OF USE FROM USE CLASS B1/HAULAGE DEPOT TO END OF LIFE
 VEHICLES (ELV) DISMANTLING FACILITY AT V.W. BREAKERS UK LTD, THE OLD
 SMITHY, HIGHGATE, LEVERTON - V.W. BREAKERS UK LTD, (AGENT: DESIGN AND
 MANAGEMENT.CO.UK) - B/22/0201

The Committee considered a report which set out the request for planning permission
 sought by V.W. Breakers UK Ltd (Agent: Design and Management.co.uk) for a change of use

land and existing buildings from Use Class B1/haulage depot to end of life vehicles (ELV) dismantling facility at V.W. Breakers UK Ltd, The Old Smithy, Highgate, Leverton.

The Applications Manager guided members through the report and set out the main issues to be considered in determination of the application. In terms of consultation responses, the Committee was advised that concerns had been raised by Boston Borough Council, an objection had been received from Leverton Parish Council and also two representations objecting to the proposal had been received and details of these were set out in paragraph 15 of the report. No objections had been received from the Environment Agency or the Highways Authority.

The report recommended that, following consideration of the relevant development plan policies and the comments received through consultation and publicity, that planning permission be refused.

The main issues for the Committee to consider were the suitability of the location and whether the impacts on the neighbouring property would be acceptable. These issues were set out in detail in the report. The applicant had indicated that the main reason for the application was the efficiency which could be achieved by co-locating the businesses, and officers did recognise the economic reasons however, they were not considered sufficient, and it was also acknowledged by the applicant that the waste materials would be sourced from further afield than the local area including nationwide sources.

The Committee was advised that the applicant had requested that the report be deferred as there were errors in the report which could not be addressed in the time available to speak. The applicant had been invited to respond and set out the specific issues, however, no response had been received.

Officers advised that they were satisfied that sufficient evidence had been provided to enable the Committee to make a decision on the application, and the Chairman agreed with this assessment. Members were invited to comment and points raised included the following:

- It was felt that this would be a new application and a new piece of industry in the open countryside. The proximity of the neighbouring property also needed to be taken into account.
- It was acknowledged that there was an extended history of similar commercial use on this site. The arguments regarding impacts on the countryside were understood, however, taking into account the previous uses it was noted that it was not unusual to have businesses such as this in rural areas. However, one member commented they were not convinced that the applicant had sufficiently demonstrated that the business would be able to continue without undue effect on the neighbourhood amenity.

(NOTE: Councillor I Carrington wished it to be noted that he had a professional relationship with Boston Borough Council, but he had not had any input into the response to this application)

- There was a need to balance the interests of economic development with neighbourhood amenity impact. The applicant had been given plenty of opportunity to demonstrate that the proposed activity could be carried out with an immediate neighbour close by, however that evidence had not been produced at this time and so it was not considered safe for the scheme to go ahead.
- There were great concerns around the amenity of the current occupier, who did have links to the business, but there was also the need to protect any future occupier of the property who would not have a close personal connection to the business.

On a motion proposed by Councillor Mrs M J Overton MBE and seconded by Councillor T J N Smith, it was

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The meeting closed at 10.52 am