

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee - East held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cannards Grave Road, Shepton Mallet BA4 5BT, on Tuesday, 4 June 2024 at 2.00 pm

Present:

Cllr Nick Cottle (Chair)

Cllr Edric Hobbs (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Adam Boyden

Cllr Dawn Denton

Cllr Bente Height

Cllr Tony Robbins

Cllr Barry Clarke

Cllr Martin Dimery

Cllr Martin Lovell

Cllr Alistair Hendry

16 Apologies for Absence - Agenda Item 1

2

It was noted that Councillor Helen Kay was on a leave of absence and that Councillor Michael Dunk was acting as her substitute. Councillor Susannah Hart had sent apologies and Councillor Alistair Hendry was her substitute. Apologies had also been received from Councillors Claire Sully and Rob Reed.

16 Minutes from the Previous Meeting - Agenda Item 2

3

The Committee was asked to consider the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2024.

The Committee Officer explained that the paragraph at the end of page 30 would be removed as this did not actually occur during the meeting. Councillor Michael Dunk said there was a discrepancy on the voting numbers on the same page. The Committee Officer confirmed she would correct these.

Councillor Martin Lovell proposed and Councillor Dawn Denton seconded that they be accepted including the amendments above. These Minutes were taken as a true and accurate record and were approved.

16 Declarations of Interest - Agenda Item 3

4

Councillor Nick Cottle declared a non-registerable interest in agenda item 5 - Planning Application 2023/2177/OUT - St Edmunds Community Hall Car Park, due to his association with the Town Council and also as he was a trustee of St Edmunds Community Hall. He said he would listen to presentation, speak as the Division Member, then leave the room.

16 Public Question Time - Agenda Item 4

5

There were none.

**16 Planning Application 2023/2177/OUT - St Edmunds Community Hall Car Park,
6 Chinnock Road, Glastonbury - Agenda Item 5**

Outline Planning Permission with all matters reserved for erection of 4.no 1-bed units for rental accommodation

The Officer's Report stated that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee at the request of the Vice-Chair, as the recommendation for approval did not accord with the recommendation of Glastonbury Town Council.

The application related to a site within the Windmill Hill area of Glastonbury and was for the erection of 4 x 1 bed units specifically for homeless individuals, which would be built on an existing car park which was owned by Somerset Council, and which served the Community Hall and a convenience shop. The proposal included the provision of 7 car parking spaces.

The Parish Council had objected to the proposal.

The Officer's Report concluded that the proposal would provide housing within use class C3 (dwellinghouses) on a brownfield site which was in accordance as a matter of principal with the development policy framework against which the application had been assessed against. Therefore, the application should be granted unless the harms arising significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In their assessment the Officer concluded that the identified benefits were considered to be significant and the harms moderate. Therefore, the harms of the application did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the recommendation was for approval.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Councillor Nick Cottle as the Division Member spoke first. He made the following points:

- Disagrees with the Officers recommendation to approve the application.
- The car park is essential for the hall to continue to be viable.
- Parking in the vicinity of the hall is impossible. The roads are already congested.
- Trying to fit 4 units into the car park is unreasonable.
- The units are much needed and a good idea, but they are not in the right place.

There were 5 speakers in opposition to the application. Their comments included:

- The hall is an important community facility being used constantly for all sorts of activities including YMCA led youth groups, book clubs, toddler groups, ballroom dancing, weddings and children's parties.
- To lose a majority of the car park will remove viability of the hall and the nearby convenience store.
- There has been a severe lack of consultation with the residents of Windmill Hill.
- Many of the users of the hall, such as single mums with young children or the elderly would be uncomfortable passing the proposed units to access the hall.
- There is no public transport access to the hall as buses refuse to drive that way as there is no room to manoeuvre the bus in the narrow, car lined streets. This would only worsen if the car park was mostly removed.
- The units are a good idea but are not a good location. It would also not be a good location for the future, vulnerable residents of the units.
- Should not have to choose between community space and housing for the homeless. Glastonbury needs both.
- The site is totally unsuitable for these units, for both the current users of the hall, and future residents of the units. They are need in Glastonbury but build them elsewhere.

The representative from Glastonbury Town Council was then invited to speak. He echoed the comments of the previous objectors and said that the Town Council also objected to the proposal. St Edmunds Hall was a vital resource in the area and the proposal would have a negative impact on this relatively isolated community. It was a totally inappropriate location for the units to be built.

The next speaker was the representative of the applicant, Julian House. She made the following comments:

- The applicant has addressed the genuine concerns of the local residents at 4 community events and a dedicated email.
- The future residents of the units are more likely to be victims of crime than perpetrators of it.
- There will be 4 dedicated staff and work experience staff to help clients back into work or education.
- There is evidence to show that residents of Julian House properties have little requirement for car parking spaces themselves.

- The applicant is committed to protecting the users of the hall and are not wanting to increase any risk to them. There will be a careful assessment of future residents for suitability in this location and will respond quickly to any concerns or issues.

Before the discussion, the Legal Advisor reminded Members about the Tilted Balance. As Area East has a lack of housing land supply, Members must be mindful when debating that the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

In the discussion which followed many Members agreed that the viability of the hall would be compromised with the removal of so many car parking spaces to make way for the building of the 4 units. The hall was a vital community asset and very well utilised. They recognised the need for housing for the homeless within Glastonbury and were regretful that there had been no other alternative sites identified for this purpose. However, the harm caused by potential loss of a thriving community hall in this area of Glastonbury significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits of the units. One Member pointed out that even if the future residents of the units may not need to use the parking spaces, their visitors most likely would need to.

It was proposed by Councillor Dimery and seconded by Councillor Height to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2023/2177/OUT be **REFUSED** contrary to the Officer's recommendation as the proposal would result in the loss of the majority of the existing car parking spaces from the site and would introduce a pattern of use that would undermine the future use of the neighbouring Community Hall and increase the demand for on street parking in the residential area adjacent to the site and which would be detrimental to the local amenities and highway safety in the area. Furthermore, members concluded that the harms as identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the units proposed. Delegated authority to officers to add in the relevant development plan policies.

Votes - Unanimous

**16 Planning Application 2022/2509/FUL - Land at The Orchard, Vicarage Lane,
7 Norton St Philip, Bath - Agenda Item 6**

The Officer's Report stated that whilst this application was debated at planning

committee on 7th May it subsequently became apparent that the letters notifying interest parties that the application would be heard at planning committee wrongly advised that it would be held at the July meeting. To enable those parties an opportunity to register to speak against the item and for Members to consider any such representations, the application was brought back to Committee. The application had been referred to the Planning Committee in the first instance as the applicant was a member of staff.

The application related to land located outside of the development limits of Norton St Philip. The land is a small holding including fruit and vegetable growing and there is an orchard which is identified as a priority habitat. The site is also within a bat consultation zone and accessed via an unclassified and unconsolidated lane called Vicarage Lane.

The Report concluded that the proposal had been submitted as a self-build application but it failed to meet the criteria of Policy DP24 as the site was not part of, or adjacent to the nearest recognisable settlement; the scale of the development exceeded the limitations set out in the policy and the design was not in harmony with the character of the area, or of a suitable design which is appropriate to its location. Accordingly, the proposal would result in an isolated rural dwelling in the countryside where development is strictly controlled. Also, the design and scale of the development failed to reflect the character of the area and thus failed to contribute positively to the maintenance and enhancement of local identity and distinctiveness. Together with the concerns with the siting in an isolated location and failure to meet the tests in terms of the principle of development, it would result in unjustified encroachment into the open countryside that would have a significant harmful impact on the rural character of the area and wider landscape. In conclusion, the Officer's recommendation was for refusal.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

There were 3 speakers in support of the application. Their comments included the following:

- The site is not isolated. Children can walk to school and the village shop.
- The site is only 91 metres from the development limit.
- It is a low impact, sustainable dwelling and it should be supported.
- The documents referenced in the Officer's report refer to the first application, not this current application and are therefore misleading. The application is within the permitted size.
- It is a single storey dwelling and clad in local stone. It has a low visual impact and is in keeping with the village.

- 4 other houses have been built outside the development limit in the last 10 years.
- This will be a small, low impact dwelling where the owner will continue to grow food to supply the local community, thus reducing the need to rely on travel to supermarkets.

The next speaker was the Chair of the Parish Council. He explained that after an extensive debate the Parish Council had decided to support the application. He said that the applicant's family had lived in the village for over 45 years and the applicant wanted to live and bring up his own family in the village he had grown up in. Houses in the village are very expensive and it is difficult for people born in the village to continue to live there. The dwelling would not be visible and would be an eco-development.

The final speaker was the applicant and he made the following comments:

- He has a strong local connection with a thriving market garden business and his children attend the local school.
- The apple orchard would not exist if it wasn't for his stewardship.
- The land is much more biodiverse than the adjoining farmland.
- The proposal meets all the criteria of DP24.
- There is full support from the Parish Council.

In the discussion which followed the following comments were made by Members:

- This is a sustainable, low impact development which a short, safe walk to school and is not disassociated from the settlement. There would be no increase in traffic.
- It is in a tucked away position, with no visual impact, no views spoiled and no harm identified.
- Although the design is not the same as the cottages within the village, it is single storey and sits comfortably in the landscape.
- The benefits of this property outweigh the harms.
- Is there a way to ensure that the house remains affordable in the future?

In response to questions raised, Planning Officers advised that when considering the application against DP24 there would be a need for a S106 agreement which would cover the future occupancy. However, if Members considered the location to be sustainable, then the application could be considered using the tilted balance and a S106 would not be required. The Legal Advisor confirmed that Members could approve the application as a sustainable development, with a low impact design and no visual impact. Conditions should be delegated to Officers in conjunction with the Chair, Vice-Chair and division Members.

It was proposed by Councillor Adam Boyden and seconded by Councillor Dawn Denton to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2022/2509/FUL be **APPROVED** contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was deemed that the proposal represented a sustainable development, with a low impact design, no harm to the visual amenity and no harmful impact on the rural character of the area and wider landscape. That delegated authority be given to Officers to impose necessary planning conditions, to be agreed in consultation with the Chair, Vice-Chair and division Members.

Votes - Unanimous

16 Planning Application 2023/1879/FUL - 17 Bath Street, Frome - Agenda Item 7 8

Conversion from office to 5.no dwellings

The Officer's Report stated that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the recommendation for approval did not accord with the recommendation of Frome Town Council.

The application related to a Grade II Listed Building situated within the Frome conservation area and development limits. The site was located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, a Bat consultation zone and town centre boundary. The application sought full planning permission to convert the building from offices to 5 flats and the premises are currently vacant.

The Report continued that the scheme had been amended to take into consideration the Conservation Officer's comments regarding the excessive number of new openings within the roof. Amended plans now clearly show that the proposed dormers would be of the same size and the number of rooflights within the rear roof slope have been reduced to 3 as instructed. Additional details have also been provided with respect to the dormer design detail and mechanical ventilation.

The Town Parish Council had objected to the proposal in its current form, saying that while they were aware of the current need for flats close to the town centre they felt that this proposal did not adequately meet that need.

The Officer's Report concluded that following a careful assessment it was considered that the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the relatively limited

harm with respect to the loss of employment floorspace in the area. The assessment concluded that the proposal raised no adverse design, amenity nor highway safety issues and would secure the listed building's long-term viability. The development was therefore recommended for approval.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

The only speaker was the applicant. He made the following points:

- Town centres are changing and there is less demand for office space.
- The Conservation Officer had welcomed the change of use as it would secure the building's long-term viability.
- The proposed flats will be spacious 1 and 2 bed dwellings above the required size.
- The refuse and bicycles will be stored inside the building and although there will be steps to negotiate to put the bins out, the proposal is a betterment to the existing situation.
- It will be a car free and sustainable development with acoustic dampening measures put in place.

In the discussion which followed Members raised concerns about the proposed arrangements for the storage of refuse bins and the potential for noise disturbance for residents of the flats. They noted that Frome Town Centre was a vibrant place with many pubs and restaurants nearby and would not want these businesses to be the subject of noise complaints in the future. They also recognised that although the refuse storage area would be a combined space for cycle storage ~~shared with bicycles~~, not everyone would have a bicycle and everyone is being encouraged to reduce waste. It was important to keep the building viable and people who move into a town centre must expect a certain amount of noise. The building was never meant to be offices but were built as homes originally for their owners to care for.

In response to questions raised by Members, the Planning Officer confirmed the following:

- The Environmental Protection Officer did not object to the application and if people choose to live in a town centre, they must accept there will be some noise.
- The applicant's agent confirmed that the proposal met all the building regulations for fire safety but this was not a planning consideration for the Committee.
- The conditions state that the bins must be stored inside the building except on collection day.
- The principal of development states there are cumulative advantages to making this accommodation rather than office space. The building has come to the end of its useful life as an office. Many people work from home and the listed building will be

preserved.

It was proposed by Councillor Dawn Denton and seconded by Councillor Adam Boyden to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2023/1879/FUL be **APPROVED** in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Votes - Unanimous

**16 Planning Application 2023/1880/LBC - 17 Bath Street, Frome - Agenda Item 8
9**

Conversion from office to 5.no dwellings

This application was discussed with the previous agenda item 7, as it was the Listed Building Consent application for the same location.

At the conclusion of the debate, it was proposed by Councillor Dawn Denton and seconded by Councillor Adam Boyden to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2023/1880/LBC be **APPROVED** in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Votes - Unanimous

**17 Planning Application 2023/2434/FUL - Land At 362036 145587 Windsor Hill
0 Lane, Downside, Shepton Mallet - Agenda Item 9**

Demolition of existing stables and construction of two storey dwelling and attached garage

The Officer's Report stated that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the Officer had recommended refusal which was contrary to the

Parish Council's recommendation of approval.

The application related to a site within the scattered settlement of Downside which currently supported stables and was situated within open countryside and within the Somerset Levels and Moors phosphate catchment. The application was for the demolition of the stables and for the erection of a dwelling with attached garage using existing access.

The Officer's Report concluded that the site lay in the countryside where development was strictly controlled. The proposal did not represent sustainable development due to its distance and poor accessibility to local services and facilities. There would be a reliance on travel by private vehicle. The proposal would also be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area and wider landscape and would fail to preserve the character of the countryside. The limited benefits of a small increase in housing supply did not outweigh the harms identified and as such the recommendation was for refusal.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

There was one person registered to speak who was the applicant. She made the following comments:

- This application has been necessary due to suffering a serious accident in 2020 which resulted in permanent injuries which require a specially designed house which can accommodate a wheelchair and wet room.
- She has family links to Windsor Hill Lane and although she enjoys her current home, it is not suitable for adapting for a disabled person.
- There is a bus and cycle route within 700m of the site.
- The Parish Council supports the application.
- She would like to continue to live locally and has tried to design the building to fit in with the local amenity.

In the discussion which followed Members made the following comments:

- Although the site could be said to be isolated, there are a number of properties nearby.
- It is an isolated area and should not be further developed.
- Who would be harmed if the application was approved, other than the applicant herself?
- The proposed building is quite large and significant and we must adhere to the planning guidelines and Officer's recommendations.

- Even if the application was revised to just one storey high, it would still be refused due to its isolated position.

The Planning Officer said that there were 2 harms identified, those being the harm to the rural character of the area and also the isolated location, which was wholly reliant on the use of a private car. These harms, when weighed up against the lack of housing supply, significantly outweighed the small benefit of the provision of one house.

It was proposed by Councillor Bente Height and seconded by Councillor Michael Dunk to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried with 7 votes for, 1 vote against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2023/2434/FUL be **REFUSED** in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Votes – 7 for, 1 against, 2 abstentions

**17 Planning Application 2022/1028/FUL - Land adjacent to Sunlea, Fosse Way,
1 Kilmersdon, Frome - Agenda Item 10**

Erection of a single dwelling and associated access

The Officer's Report stated that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee as it was outside the defined settlement limits and was therefore a departure from the Local Plan.

The application related to a plot of land which was currently being used as residential garden space. The site was surrounded by other residential properties and some sports facilities. An application on neighbouring land for the erection of two dwellings had been granted but not yet implemented.

The Parish Council had recommended approval as the plot size was sufficient for one dwelling, the access was acceptable and it was well screened.

The Officer's Report concluded that the development was situated outside of the development limits which was contrary to the adopted policies within the

Development Plan. However, the relevant policies to this currently have reduced weight and the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' would apply so long as any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The site was located within close proximity to local facilities, services and public transport and no harm had been identified in terms of impact upon the rural character of the area or encroachment into the countryside. Also, no harms had been identified in terms of impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers or highways safety concerns. The benefits of the proposal would make a very modest contribution to assisting the Council's shortage of housing land and would have some economic benefits for the duration of the construction phase and thereafter for local services and facilities. For these reasons, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. The development was therefore recommended for approval and had accordingly been advertised as a Departure from the Development Plan.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

The applicant made a brief statement stating that the application had support from the Parish Council, the Highways Authority and the Planning Officer. He also noted that the neighbouring property has had 2 houses approved for a site much smaller than this plot.

In the brief discussion which followed, Members could see no issues with the proposal and agreed that the benefits of this application outweighed any harms.

It was proposed by Councillor Edric Hobbs and seconded by Councillor Tony Robbins to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That application 2022/1028/FUL be **APPROVED** in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Votes - Unanimous

2 Chilcompton, Radstock - Agenda Item 11

Construction of new agricultural barn, access improvements and associated works

The Officer's Report stated that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the Officer had recommended approval which was contrary to the Parish Council's recommendation of refusal. There had also been 17 local objectors.

The application related to 3 hectares of agricultural land within the open countryside and sought full planning permission of an agricultural building with improvements to the existing field access and landscaping works. The scheme had been amended to reduce the overall height of the building to reduce its visual impact and would be of standard portal frame design with timber clad walls and a metal roof.

The Parish Council had recommended refusal due to it being outside the development limits, the impact on the landscape and lack of detail on how animal waste would be dealt with.

The Officer's Report addressed some of the objections raised by local residents including the following:

- *Applicant has no intention of farming the land. The unauthorised use of the land for motorcross use clearly demonstrates this.* It is understood that the motorcross activities on the site have ceased. Any past uses of the site, unauthorised or otherwise are not a material consideration in determining the outcome of the application.
- *Noise and disturbance.* The use of the building for agricultural storage and animal housing will raise no adverse amenity concerns over or above those which currently exist between neighbouring land uses. Although there are protected residential properties within 400m of the site, the very limited scale of the proposal will not result in any adverse noise disturbance and subject to details of how animal waste is to be dealt with, the scheme will raise no adverse odour concerns. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer has raised no objections to the proposal.
- *No economic value/the limited size of the holding could not support a viable farming enterprise.* The applicant need only to demonstrate that the building as proposed is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. There is no requirement for the applicant to demonstrate that their smallholding might be financially sound in order to ensure permission.
- *Increased traffic.* The very limited scale of the development is unlikely to generate any significant increase in traffic which might be considered so severe as to raise highway safety concerns locally or on the wider highway network.

The recommendation was for approval.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

There was one speaker in objection to the application. Some of the comments made were as follows:

- He represented nearby residents from various villages who continue to oppose the plans.
- They share the belief that the purpose of the barn is to support the motocross and possibly a helicopter.
- Although the Officer's Report states the motocross has ceased, there has been no attempt to remove it and reinstate the field to its former condition.
- The noise from the motocross is highly intrusive and the track has destroyed the view for 5 nearby homeowners.
- Concerns that the disposal of animal waste from the barn may not be adequately controlled and water from field seeps into the land and possibly the stream.

In the discussion which some of the comments made by Members included the following:

- Not seen an application recommended for approval with so many genuine objections.
- The location of the barn on such a small field does not seem to be sustainable.
- There are conflicting views on what the use of the barn is. Could it be conditioned to only be used as an agricultural store and not a helicopter store.
- Concern about potential pollution of the nearby watercourse from the animal waste.
- Are there badgers or other protected species on the land?

In response to questions raised, the Planning Officer stated that any conditions added need to be reasonable. The barn will have multiple uses such as a feed store, tractor store and potentially animal housing. The wording of the conditions reflect these potential uses. No badgers have been located but other protected species have, which is why there are conditions to protect them. If the applicant uses the land for something other than what has been approved, it would be an enforcement issue.

At the conclusion of the debate, it was proposed by Councillor Martin Lovell and seconded by Councillor Adam Boyden to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried with 4 in favour 3 against, 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2024/0291/FUL be **APPROVED** in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Votes – 4 for, 3 against, 3 abstentions

17 Planning Application 2024/0002/FUL - Land at Emborough Farm, Roemead 3 Road, Binegar, Radstock - Agenda Item 12

Change of use of agricultural land to a secure fenced dog exercise area

The Officer's Report stated that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the Officer had recommended refusal which was contrary to the Parish Council's recommendation of approval.

The application related to a site outside defined settlement limits which has existing vehicular access to the highway and is opposite a small industrial estate. It is located in the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Risk Area and is approximately 1.2h of agricultural land. It was proposed to open the area no earlier than 7am and no later than 10pm during daylight hours. No outside lighting was proposed and users would book online A shelter and a dog waste collection bin would be provided.

The Officer's Report concluded that the principle of development was unacceptable as the site was within the countryside, outside the development limits where development is strictly controlled. The proposal did not represent sustainable development and it would foster the growth in the need to travel by private car. In addition, the proposal was considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural area. The recommendation was therefore for refusal.

The Planning Officer explained the application to the Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

The applicant was the only speaker. He made the following comments:

- Farming and the countryside will be on the national curriculum from September 2025.
- The income from the proposed enterprise will be used to cover the costs of the

schools' use of a classroom, hopefully to be approved at a future meeting, in which he will teach pupils free of charge about farming.

- The proposed gates and fence would not be visible from outside the property due to the high hedges and lower land surface.
- Visibility is fully acceptable by 2 other planning consultants and has already been approved by the committee for another application.
- The location of the site was chosen to be near to other developments and road, but as far away from houses and holiday lets as possible.
- The land is poor agricultural land, is very stoney and dries easily, making it ideal for this proposal.

In the discussion which followed Members made the following comments:

- Supports the application but hours of operation may need to be reduced.
- Dogs do not generally spend their walking time barking or causing a disturbance.
- There is a need for this business, particularly by residents of housing estates that do not have walkable access to countryside to exercise their dogs.

In response to questions raised, the proposed hours of operation were clarified as daylight only hours in winter and 7am to 10pm in summer. As there were no residential houses nearby, Officers did not feel it necessary to impose any noise management conditions, if approved.

As he felt it was a sustainable location for this type of business, it was proposed by Councillor Edric Hobbs and seconded by Councillor Tony Robbins to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried with 7 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED

That planning application 2024/0002/FUL be **APPROVED** contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was deemed that the site was in a sustainable location for the business in accordance with policies CP1 and CP3. That delegated authority be given to Officers to impose necessary planning conditions, to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Votes – 7 for, 2 against, 1 abstention

The report of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate between 23 April and 22 May 2024 was noted.

(The meeting ended at 6.00 pm)

.....
CHAIR