



Dear Councillor

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 17 JULY 2023**

I am now able to enclose for consideration at the above meeting the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda Item  
No.**

**LATE REPRESENTATIONS(Pages 3 - 4)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – July 17<sup>th</sup> 2023

### LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

**3(a) 23/00490/FUL – ERECTION OF GRAIN STORE, ASSOCIATED HARD STANDING AND NEW VEHICLE ACCESS - AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS, MANOR FARM, BULL LANE, BROUGHTON**

No Late Representations

**3(b) 23/1100/FUL – ERECTION OF DWELLING AND ALTERATION OF ACCESS - LAND REAR OF FORMER VICARAGE, CHURCH LANE, HARTFORD**

No Late Representations

**3(c) 21/01441/FUL - ERECTION OF A DWELLING - WHITE HORSE COTTAGE, LOOP ROAD, KEYSTON, HUNTINGDON, PE28 0RE.**

#### Applicant email to members

An email has been received from the applicant: Pheasant Holdings - the owners of The Pheasant Inn at Keyston. In the email it states:

*The Officers are recommending refusal (as per the attached document) but there are two major short comings to their report.*

*1. They have completely overlooked the fact that this is a brownfield site - it was previously used as the site for the septic tanks and sewerage processing machinery for The Pheasant. This is no longer in use as the village went onto Main drains in 2020. There is no mention of this in the report. The development will bring an un-used and derelict area of land into use.*

*2. They also don't like the design and location of the proposed dwelling. Our initial design and location was amended by us following advice and recommendation by the Planning Officer handling the case at the time to*

*meet with his requirement. We duly have given what was asked for. Again this is not mentioned in the report (probably because there has been a succession of Planning Officers handling this case).*

#### Officer comments

Regarding point 1: Throughout the report, the case officer clearly refers to the fact that the site has a parking area and outbuildings on it. These outbuildings are of a minor scale and sit in a different location than the proposed dwelling. Officers acknowledge that the site is brownfield land. However, this does not automatically mean the erection of a dwelling on the site is acceptable. As outlined in the report, there is significant concern about the redevelopment of this site and the impact it would have upon the Conservation Area.

Regarding point 2: Officers refer to the fact that the proposal was amended in paragraph 1.9. The previous case officer who advised the applicant has left the authority. Notwithstanding that, the case officer has reviewed the application fully and considers the proposal to be unacceptable in line with the Conservation Team's objection and in terms of internal amenity for the future occupiers.