

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the
LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2:00 pm on Monday 14 August, 2017

PRESENT

Councillors: S J Good (Vice-Chairman – in the Chair); M A Barrett; H B Eaglestone;
Mr P Emery, Mrs E H N Fenton and Mr E J Fenton J Haine; P J Handley; H J Howard
and P D Kelland

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Catherine Tetlow, Abby Fettes, Miranda Clark and
Paul Cracknell

19. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 10 July, 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mr D S T Enright, Mr R A Langridge and Mr K J Mullins

Mr A H K Postan attended for Mrs M J Crossland

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers in matters to be considered at the meeting.

22. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated. A schedule outlining additional observations received following the production of the agenda was circulated at the meeting, a copy of which is included within the Minute Book.

(In order to assist members of the public, the Sub-Committee considered the applications in which those present had indicated a particular interest in the following order:-

16/03627/OUT, 16/04234/OUT, 17/01612/FUL, 17/01613/LBC, 17/01785/FUL,
17/01993/S73, 17/01248/FUL, 17/01563/HHD and 17/01844/FUL.

The results of the Sub-Committee's deliberations follow in the order in which they appeared on the printed agenda).

RESOLVED: that the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

3 16/03627/OUT Land at Butts Piece, Main Road, Stanton Harcourt

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

Mr Charles Mathew addressed the meeting on behalf of the Stanton Harcourt Parish Council in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Howard, Mr Mathew confirmed that, whilst the County Council had raised objections to the development based upon the lack of public transport, it had not done so on highways grounds. In response to a further question from Mr Fenton, he advised that the bus service serving Stanton Harcourt had been withdrawn with effect from 23 July 2016.

Mr Postan enquired whether the developer contributions requested by the Parish Council were adequate and Mr Mathew advised that there had been no response or discussion with the Parish regarding their requests.

Mr Steven Sensecall, the Applicant's Agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

The Principal Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Emery noted that, given the absence of an evidenced five year housing land supply, Paragraph 14 of the NPPF was applicable. He noted that it was proposed to locate the built form to the east of the site, closer to the listed buildings and the conservation area whilst leaving the land to the west undeveloped and questioned the underlying rationale. In response, the Principal Planner explained that the land to the west of the site was considered significant in terms of visual amenity, providing an important linking feature with land to the north and south. By remaining as open space this land would serve as a linking feature preserving views from north to south. Officers considered that it was important to retain this open section to the west of the site. Whilst this brought the built form closer to the heritage assets, the development would back on to what was clearly modern development and was hence considered to be less intrusive in this location.

As a secondary consideration, locating residential development in this location placed it further away from the industrial uses to the west of the site. The Principal Planner confirmed that the presence of the former refuse disposal site was not an influencing factor in this decision.

Mr Emery questioned whether the visual amenity of the view from north to south could be enhanced by linking into the green space on the adjoining development. In response, the Principal Planner advised that there was an extensive landscape buffer to the north end of the airfield site. The proposed landscaping arrangements would provide a net benefit as to how the two sites interacted.

Mr Fenton considered that the development was generally well thought through but expressed some concern over the proposed pedestrian link which would open onto the main road at a bend. This would present a danger to pedestrians and, in particular, to children walking to and from the local school and Mr Fenton was concerned that this could lead to accidents. He also expressed concern that development was being permitted in the hope that infrastructure such as the reinstatement of the local bus service would follow and considered that infrastructure provision should lead rather than follow.

The Principal Planner acknowledged that these were valid concerns but reiterated that there was no objection from the County Council on highway grounds.

Mr Howard also raised concern over the proposed pedestrian access and suggested that consideration should be given to providing a footpath link to the east from Butts Piece to the primary school rather than onto a dangerous bend. He also suggested that a footpath link should be provided from the airfield site to the proposed shop. In conclusion, Mr Howard advised that, whilst Thames Water had a statutory duty to provide an adequate fresh water supply and sewage disposal facilities, Officers were not able to take account of concerns expressed by local residents in relation to these matters in the absence of documented evidence. He advised that residents could obtain flow meters and pressure gauges to assess whether service requirements were being met. Without empirical data, it was impossible to say whether residents' assertions were accurate. Similarly, he indicated that there was no evidence of any class 1 or 2 sewerage incidents having been reported to Thames Water. It was essential that any such occurrences were properly reported to provide recorded evidence to support residents' assertions.

Mr Howard indicated that he was unable to identify any planning grounds on which to refuse consent.

Mr Postan indicated that a footway was required and stated that Thames Water did not provide sufficient funding to maintain the current level of service provision. As the Sub-Committee had not had sight of the full schedule of developer contributions he proposed that consideration of the application be deferred pending the submission of a full Section 106 schedule to provide mitigation of the impact of the development. The proposition was seconded by Mr Handley.

The Principal Planner drew attention to the schedule of developer contributions agreed with the formal consultees as set out at paragraphs 5.52 to 5.57 of the report. Whilst she acknowledged that a separate request for funding had been put forward by the Parish Council she advised that any matters not raised by the technical consultees could not be enforced by the Council but would have to be the subject of consultation between the Parish Council and the developers.

Most of what had been requested by the parish fell within the remit of the statutory consultees. Matters that did not could not be required and the report set out in some detail those which could reasonably be required in legal terms.

Mr Howard questioned whether a continued deferral could lead to the applicants submitting an appeal against non-determination. In response, the Development Manager advised that if an application was not determined within the statutory timescale or within a period of time agreed with the applicant, an appeal against non-determination could be made. In such circumstances the Council would lose control over negotiations on developer funding to the Planning Inspectorate.

Whilst developer contributions could only be demanded to mitigate the impact of development, the local planning authority could take account of other contributions offered by an applicant. Accordingly, there could be scope to secure additional developer funding as requested by the parish but the application could not be considered to be unacceptable should this not be forthcoming.

The Chairman questioned whether there were sufficient grounds to defer the application but acknowledged that Members wished to see a finalised schedule of Section 106 contributions.

The Development Manager contended that the quantum of developer contributions was clear and advised that, if the application was approved, it would still be possible to seek to secure the additional benefits the Parish Council was requesting. However, he reiterated that it was now prescribed as to what the Council could legitimately require.

Mr Kelland agreed that the proposed access onto Butts Piece was dangerous. He also suggested that it would be preferable for a road to link this with the adjacent airfield site and to consider both together.

Mr Handley considered that the application should be deferred to enable discussions regarding further Section 106 contributions to take place between the developers and the Parish Council. A delay of four weeks was inconsequential and the developers were unlikely to appeal against non-determination.

In response to a question from Mr Fenton it was confirmed that the County Council had given consideration to the safety issues raised and had not objected to the application on highway grounds. The Development Manager advised that there was an existing public right of way that joined the highway at the proposed pedestrian access point and the Principal Planner suggested that the highway authority was satisfied with the proposed arrangements as there would be no change to the highway layout which, in some respects, created its own traffic calming measures.

Mr Haine reminded Members that the current application was in outline only and suggested that the question of the footpath could be addressed at reserved matters stage. The Development Manager advised that it was not clear whose control the land fell under as it was not shown as part of the site area. In the absence of technical objections the provision of a footpath could not be required. The Development Manager suggested that, if it were to be made a requirement, the provision of a footpath link could become a ransom issue. Paradoxically, there was a greater chance of securing such a link without that degree of compulsion.

The proposition was then put to the vote and was carried.

Deferred to enable discussions regarding further Section 106 contributions to take place between the developers and the Parish Council.

27 16/04234/OUT Land north, west and east of Belclose Cottage, Witney Road, North Leigh

The Development Manager introduced the application and reported receipt of observations from Mr Justin Timms and the local representative, Mr H E J St John. He advised that the County Council had withdrawn its drainage objection and agreed to the reservation of land to provide a cycleway. The Development Manager made reference to a letter sent by the applicant's agent to Members confirming that their clients were prepared to make a financial contribution of £ 50,000 towards the provision of a cycleway.

Mr Ian Hogg addressed the meeting on behalf of the Parish Council. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Handley enquired whether the Parish Council was supportive of the application subject to the applicants meeting their requirements in terms of Section 106 contributions. In response, Mr Hogg advised that the Parish Council remained opposed to the development but, if it were to be approved, were seeking to make the 'best of a bad job'.

In response to a question from Mr Fenton, Mr Hogg advised that the Parish Council would prefer to see access to the development off the A4095 by way of a roundabout rather than the proposed 'ghost island'.

Ms Jollande Bowater, the applicant's representative, then addressed the meeting in support of the development. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented his report. He explained that the Council was unable to require the applicants to make financial contributions to the Parish Council for matters which were the responsibility of other authorities. He drew attention to paragraph 1.13 which set out the Parish Council's aspirations in terms of financial contributions and advised that, whilst it would be unreasonable to seek land to be gifted to the Parish for allotments, Officers had sought to secure those elements which were CIL compliant.

Mr Emery noted that, given the absence of an evidenced five year housing land supply, Paragraph 14 of the NPPF was applicable and, having visited the site indicated that he could not see that the development would result in significant demonstrable harm. However, he expressed concern over the access from the A4095 and questioned whether access could be taken via Windmill Road.

In response, the Development Manager advised that the County Council had expressed concern over the tortuous alignment of Windmill Road and the extent of on-street parking which rendered it unsuitable as an access.

The Highway Authority had raised no objection to the proposed access which exceeded the relevant applicable standards.

Mr Howard expressed similar concerns, indicating that drivers did not adhere to the speed limits. He considered that the only way of providing a safe access off the A4095 was by creating a controlled junction.

Mr Postan suggested that any consent should include requirements to provide broadband infrastructure and three phase power for charging electric vehicles. He also questioned the adequacy of current car parking standards. In response, the Development Manager advised that the Council had yet to adopt a policy regarding charging points for electric vehicles.

Mr Kelland considered this was an isolated site without adequate connections to the existing settlement. He too expressed concern over the access and questioned whether approval of the current application would set a precedent for further development in the vicinity.

The Chairman reminded Members that it was incumbent upon them to consider and determine the application as submitted.

As a regular user of the A4095, Mr Haine noted that the road was heavily trafficked at peak times resulting in traffic travelling at or below existing speed limits. He acknowledged the reduction in the quantum of development from 100 to 50 units and proposed the Officer recommendation of conditional approval. The proposition was seconded by Mr Eaglestone.

Mr Handley expressed concern that Members had not viewed the site from the intended access point at the recent site visit and believed that the application should be refused until such time as more appropriate access arrangements were devised. As submitted, the proposed development would change the nature of the village. The Development Manager advised that it had been decided to meet at Windmill Road to view the site as it was considered too dangerous to attempt to park 10 vehicles in the lay-by on the A4095. Having viewed the site from that vantage, Members had looked at the access point from the highway.

Given the clear advice provided by the Highway Authority, the Development Manager cautioned against seeking to refuse the application on highway grounds. He noted that it was intended to create a pedestrian access onto Windmill Road which provided easy access to the school and local facilities.

In terms of the cumulative impact of the development, he indicated that North Leigh was not alone in receiving significant levels of development as Central Government guidance placed local planning authorities under pressure to deliver higher levels of residential development than in the past. In conclusion, he advised that, whilst the Parish Council had sought to locate the proposed cycleway adjacent to the A4095, this had been considered to have an urbanising impact and the route proposed took the cycleway through the village.

The Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis set out in the report and to such conditions as are considered appropriate by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

(In view of their concerns over the safety of the access, Mr Emery and Mr Howard abstained from voting on this application and Mr Handley requested that his vote against the application for the same reasons be so recorded)

41 17/01248/FUL 9 – 11 Burford Road, Carterton

The Planning Officer presented her report and recommended that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to resolution of the concerns expressed by the Council's Drainage Engineers.

Mr Handley expressed concern over the condition of the existing boundary wall and the Planning Officer advised that an appropriate condition regarding boundary treatment could be applied.

Mr Howard expressed his disappointment that the Carterton Town Council's Masterplan had not been brought into force as it was development of this nature that it sought to resist.

Mr Emery expressed some concern over the principle of providing residential accommodation over garages but acknowledged that this form of development had been approved elsewhere within the District.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Haine and seconded by Mr Fenton and on being put to the vote was carried.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to resolution of the concerns expressed by the Council's Drainage Engineers and to the following additional condition:-

10. No dwelling shall be occupied until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials, type and timing of provision of boundary treatment to be erected has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This is to include the front boundary wall which adjoins the footpath. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

- 48 17/01563/HHD 13 Elms Road, Cassington
 The Development Manager presented the report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.
 The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Emery and seconded by Mr Postan and on being put to the vote was carried.
 Permitted
- 53 17/01612/FUL Four Winds, Bushey Ground, Minster Lovell
 The Senior Planner introduced the application.
 Mr Raymond Cole, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the development. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.
 In response to a question from Mr Fenton, the Senior Planner advised that no comments had been received from Thames Water.
 In response to questions from Mr Handley and Mr Emery, Mr Cole outlined the proposed layout of the site and explained that it had not been possible to provide the accommodation required as an extension to the existing listed building whilst still respecting its designation as such. He reiterated that the proposed cabins were to be ancillary to the existing building and occupied as part of that single residential unit.
 The Senior Planner presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.
 Mr Handley expressed concern that the cabins could be occupied independently of the existing dwelling and that the application would set a precedent for similar development in the vicinity. His preference was for an extension to the rear of the existing building.
 Mr Howard concurred and expressed concern that the creation of five additional bedrooms on the site would result in a significant increase in vehicular traffic. He proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.
 The Development Manager advised that the intended use of the cabins was as a private, not a paying retreat. Whilst Members might wish to carry out a site visit, he cautioned against seeking to refuse the application on highway grounds without the support of the Highway Authority.
 The proposition of deferral was seconded by Mr Fenton and on being put to the vote was carried.
 Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.
- 65 17/01613/LBC Four Winds, Bushey Ground, Minster Lovell
 Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.
- 69 17/01785/FUL Land at Patchfield Barn, Standlake Road, Northmoor
 The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Dr Graham Shelton, the Chairman of Northmoor Parish Council, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Steven Sensecall, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mrs Fenton noted that the Environment Agency had indicated that, as its flood model had a level accuracy of plus or minus 250mm, it would remove its objection should the Council wish to grant consent. Having regard to this and the level of local support, she expressed her support for the application.

Mr Emery concurred and proposed that the application be approved. The proposition was seconded by Mr Barrett and Mr Howard expressed his support for the application.

The Development Manager acknowledged the Sub-Committee's desire to assist the applicants but reminded Members that planning permission ran with the land. Accordingly, there was nothing to prevent the applicants from selling the site on with the benefit of planning consent. Given that approval of the current application could set a precedent for similar applications, the Development Manager stressed that it was important that Members made clear what differentiated this particular application.

With regard to flood risk, the Development Manager advised that, whilst the proposed property itself might not flood, it was possible that residents could be cut-off by flooding in the surrounding area putting pressure on the emergency services to carry out a rescue.

Mr Kelland expressed his support for the application indicating that there had been development in that location in the past. He went on to advise that this site had not been flooded during earlier flooding events and indicated that, if necessary, residents could evacuate the site if it appeared that there was a danger of becoming cut off.

Mr Fenton questioned whether the level of local support was sufficient of itself to militate against similar applications in the future. Mr Postan indicated that he too would wish to support the application and emphasised that the quality of finish would be critical to the acceptability of the development.

Having regard to the tenure of the debate the Development Manager acknowledged that Members were of the opinion that the proposal represented an exemplary sustainable development which would bring the existing sub-standard buildings on the site up to a suitable standard, improving their appearance and that of the local landscape. In view of this and the applicant's long standing local connection Members considered the application to be acceptable.

Mr Haine expressed concern that the current application was tantamount to the provision of a new dwelling in the open countryside which the Council's planning policies sought to resist. Whilst he acknowledged Members' reasons for supporting the application, he questioned whether there were sufficient grounds to depart from policy.

Mr Emery indicated that he would wish to support the views expressed by local residents.

The recommendation of conditional approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

2. That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

3. Before above ground building work commences, a schedule of materials (including samples) to be used in the elevations of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in the approved materials.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and first occupied only by Mr and Mrs Sparrowhawk.

Reason: Permission is given as an exception to approved policies in the light of the special personal circumstances of the applicant.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D, E, G and H shall be carried out other than that expressly authorised by this permission.

Reason: Control is needed to protect the occupants from potential flood risk and to retain the character of the building.

6. That, prior to the commencement of development, a full surface water drainage plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of the size, position and construction of the drainage scheme and results of soakage tests carried out at the site to demonstrate the infiltration rate. Three tests should be carried out for each soakage pit as per BRE 365, with the lowest infiltration rate (expressed in m/s) used for design. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Development shall not take place until an exceedance flow routing plan for flows above the 1 in 100 year + 30% CC event has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the proper provision for surface water drainage and/ or to ensure flooding is not exacerbated in the locality (The West Oxfordshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Statement 25 Technical Guidance).

7. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Water Resource Associates, Final report, May 2017, V3 and Proposed Elevations Drawing No. AL103 Rev A Date: FEB' 2017 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. Finished flood levels are set as high as possible and no lower than 64.50 metres above Ordnance Datum as shown in drawing no AL103 Rev A Date: FEB' 2017. The mitigation measure(s) shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

8 Prior to the first commencement of development full details of sustainable and energy efficient features for the proposed conversion which shall include high levels of insulation, solar energy, water harvesting, and low energy lighting etc., shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The building shall be converted in accordance with those approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable form of development in order to help justify the departure from policy.

INFORMATIVES:

1 No work must begin on the development until the applicant has secured scheduled monument consent from the Secretary of State advised by Historic England.

The Surface Water Drainage scheme should, where possible, incorporate Sustainable Drainage Techniques in order to ensure compliance with;

- Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (Part 1 -

Clause 27 (1))

- CIRIA C753 SUDS Manual.

- The forthcoming local flood risk management strategy to be published by Oxfordshire County Council sometime after March 2015. As per the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (Part 1 - Clause 9 (1))

(Mr Handley abstained from voting on the proposition and Mr Eaglestone and Mr Haine requested that their votes against the foregoing application be so recorded.)

77 17/01844/FUL 30 Stoneleigh Drive, Carterton

The Planning Officer introduced presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Howard advised that he had spoken to Mrs Crossland, the local representative, and concurred with her assessment of the application. The current application represented a minor variation to the extant planning consent and Members had been aware that there was to be significant development in the vicinity.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Howard and seconded by Mr Handley and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted

(Mr Postan requested that his abstention from voting on the foregoing application be so recorded)

82 17/01993/S73 Grange Farm, Burford Road, Brize Norton

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Mark Paterson addressed the meeting in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix H to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Howard questioned whether Mr Paterson had taken any action over the alleged failure to adhere to the approved hours of operation. In response, Mr Paterson advised that he was not aware of any action having been taken and indicated that the suggestion that the applicant had been operating outside the permitted hours had been made by other objectors.

In response to a question from Mr Postan, Mr Paterson confirmed that he lived in one of the converted barns adjacent to the application site.

Mr Roger Smith of Savills, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix I to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Handley, Mr Smith advised that the application sought an extension of hours of operation for six days a week, excluding Sundays.

Mr Emery enquired as to the applicant's response to the condition as originally imposed. In response, Mr Smith explained that he had not been involved in the application at that time so was unaware of the applicant's views.

In response to a question from Mr Fenton, Mr Smith advised that he believed that his client was complying with the current restriction in hours of operation.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

She advised that complaints regarding noise could be addressed through Environmental Protection legislation and should be reported to the Council's Environmental Health section. Concerns over damage to highway verges were a matter for the County Council as Highway Authority.

Whilst acknowledging the Parish Council's objection, Mr Postan indicated that farmers carried out vital work in providing food for the nation. He explained that he was familiar with operational requirements and suggested that, whilst the permitted hours of operation were satisfactory for the majority of the year, longer hours of operation were required during the harvest period which ran from July 15 until the end of September. During this time, the constraints were such that work had to be carried out when weather permitted.

Mr Postan suggested that maintaining the existing hours for the majority of the year but permitting the extension during the harvest period would protect the interests of both parties.

Mr Handley questioned whether it was reasonable to consider the converted barns as a residential area given that the surrounding land and buildings had always been in agricultural use. He expressed support for the Officer recommendation as he did not consider 7:30 to be unduly early but suggested that Bank Holidays should also be excluded from the extension.

Mr Emery expressed support for Mr Postan's suggestion.

Mr Haine questioned whether it was possible to adopt the Parish Council's suggestion to restrict the hours of operation for the construction of the other barn. In response, the Development Manager advised that, whilst he would investigate to see whether this might be possible, it would be highly unusual as protection from noise and disturbance during construction works was provided through the Environmental Protection Act.

Mr Howard expressed support for Mr Postan's suggestion and, as there was only one Bank Holiday during the harvest period, did not consider that this should be excluded from the extension. He also agreed that hours of operation on Sundays ought not to be extended and suggested that reversing warning horns on vehicles should be disabled before 8:30am.

Mr Handley reiterated that this had always been a working farm and that living in close proximity to such an operation came with the associated consequences. Any unreasonable disturbance could be addressed through the Environmental Protection Act.

The Development Manager reminded Members that the Council's Environmental Health service considered the application to be acceptable as submitted; that is commencing operation at 7:30am throughout the year, excluding Sundays when the original start time of 9:00 would be maintained.

Mr Postan indicated that to disable warning horns would be dangerous and place individuals at unacceptable risk. He went on to propose the Officer recommendation. This was seconded by Mr Handley and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted

23. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of applications determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing under delegated powers together with appeal decisions was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 5:20pm.

CHAIRMAN