

## MENDIP DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Board held on Wednesday, 22 July 2020 via Live Stream starting at 6.00 pm.

### PRESENT:

Councillors Damon Hooton (Chair), Nigel Hewitt-Cooper (Deputy Chair), Peter Goater, Francis Hayden, Edric Hobbs, Helen Kay, Lindsay MacDougall, Matt Martin, Heather Shearer, Laura Waters, Nigel Woollcombe-Adams and Ros Wyke

### SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS:

Councillor Tom Killen substituted for Councillor Alan Townsend  
Councillor Mike Pullin substituted for Councillor Eve Berry  
Councillor Lucie Taylor-Hood substituted for Councillor Nick Cottle

### OTHERS COUNCILLORS PRESENT:

Councillors John Clarke, Michael Dunk, Garfield Kennedy, Richard Pinnock and Lois Rogers

### OFFICERS PRESENT:

Helen Bowen	Committee Officer
Anna Clark	Principal Economic Growth Planner
Claire Dicken	Committee Officer
Martin Evans	Legal Advisor
Julie Reader-Sullivan	Group Manager, Planning & Growth Services
Ben Sugg	Committee Officer
Simon Trafford	Team Leader – Development Management
James U'Dell	Senior Planning Officer

Agenda Item Number	Subject	Actioned By
1	<p><b>Chair's Announcements</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave an overview of how the virtual meeting would proceed.</p> <p>The Committee Officer confirmed that the meeting was being streamed live and accessible to the general public via a link on the Council's website.</p> <p>At this point the Chair undertook a roll call to confirm that Members could hear and see him and were attending the meeting by remote means.</p> <p>He reminded Members that if at any point during the item they lost connectivity and had not heard the debate or seen all of the presentation then they should state</p>	

	<p>'absent' when asked for their vote. He further reminded Members that the Committee needed to ensure that the meeting was quorate for each item – which was a minimum of 8 Members.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Eve Berry, Alan Townsend and Nick Cottle.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>Councillor Damon Hooton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in DM01 Land North and South of Sandys Hill Lane, Frome because his employer was the neighbouring landowner.</p> <p>He also declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in DM02 because his wife was employed by the dioceses of Wells.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor pointed out that the applicant of DM01 was a fellow Councillor and that all Members should record a personal interest in that item. He also advised that individual Members should consider whether they had a prejudicial interest in the item because of their relationship with the Councillor. There were none.</p>	<b>Claire Dicken</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Public Participation</b></p> <p><b>Items not on the agenda</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>Items on the agenda</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Previous Minutes</b></p> <p>The Board was asked to consider the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2020.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2020 be approved.</p>	<b>Helen Bowen</b>

6	<p><b>Resolution to Agree All Recommendations made on Development Management Applications Not Raised for Discussion</b></p> <p><b>DM04 2020/1001/FUL</b> New Estate Road, Cornbash, Commerce Park, Frome</p> <p><b>DM05 2020/0879/HSE</b> 21 Wells Road, Wookey Hole, Wells</p> <p>This was proposed by Cllr Mike Pullin and seconded by Cllr Nigel Hewitt-Cooper. This was carried. Cllr Woollcombe-Adams declared he had dropped out of the call so was not able to vote.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>It was resolved to agree all recommendations made on Development Management applications not raised for discussion.</p>	<p><b>Anna Clark</b></p> <p><b>Josh Cawsey</b></p>
7	<p><b>Development Management - Planning Applications</b></p>	
DM01	<p><b>2019/1671/OTS Land North and South of Sandys Hill Lane, Frome, Somerset</b></p> <p>The Chair had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item because his employer was the neighbouring landowner. He left the meeting for the consideration of the item. The Deputy Chair invited the Team Leader – Development Management to present the Officer Report.</p> <p>The Officer’s Report stated that this proposal was for outline planning application in which all matters were reserved apart from access and the main distributor road. It comprised a mixed use development, including access off Sandys Hill Lane; the demolition of existing farm buildings/farmhouse; development incorporating up to 235 dwellings; employment floor space within Use Classes B1 (a/b/c) of up to 4,050sqm (unit sizes ranging from 140sqm to 560sqm), a Drive Thru unit of up to 170sqm (Use Class A3/A5), a food retail building of approximately 1,800sqm and a non-food retail unit of approximately 1,400sqm.</p> <p>The Officer Report stated that the application had been previously brought to the Planning Board on 10 June 2020 when Members had resolved to defer making a</p>	<p><b>Simon Trafford</b></p>

decision on the application to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the following issues:

- 1 to look at alternative/better access arrangements for the site itself including the possibility of an additional access;
- 2 to look at the re-use of Keyford Farmhouse (and associated buildings) rather than knocking it down;
- 3 to include a wider green buffer zone between existing houses on Little Keyford Lane and the new proposed housing, in order to protect the setting and tranquillity of the listed buildings and the amenity of existing residents (area north of Sandys Hill Lane only).

The Report was therefore an update and implications report with reference to the report that was considered at the Planning Board on 10 June 2020. It was explained that the report pack for this case included the submissions provided by the applicants agent regarding the deferral reasons, the report as presented on the 10<sup>th</sup> edited to reflect the updating sheet points (referred to as the main report below) and at the front an overview for members considerations at the present meeting.

The application had originally been referred to the Planning Board as the proposed development would be a departure from the existing adopted Development Plan; furthermore, the application needed to be determined by the Board for probity reasons as a District Councillor was one of the joint applicants.

As stated above the Officer's Report addressed each of the reasons for deferral in turn and provided an overall conclusion. It stated that the applicant had confirmed that they wished the Board to determine their application as it was presented to the meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> June 2020 with the only alteration being that Sandys Hill Lane should remain accessible for emergency vehicles from Little Keyford Lane.

Regarding the first area of concern raised, whilst a secondary access might be desirable, the Highway Authority had re-examined the proposals in light of the Members' concerns and continued to confirm their lack of objection. With provision now made for a secondary access into the site for emergency service use, Officers considered that the changes proposed redressed the safety access that had been raised. In terms of controlling these details through the planning process, conditions could be applied. Given that there were no objections from the Highway Authority in terms of the access

arrangements Officers considered that they also met the requirements of Policy DP9 and the NPPF test of providing a satisfactory access. Therefore the refusal of the application on this basis was not considered to be justified.

In terms of the second area of concern, it was considered that the benefits associated with the application scheme, including maximising the delivery of housing including affordable housing on the site, would outweigh the harm arising from the demolition on the Keyford Farmhouse and associated buildings.

As for the third area of concern, Officers were of the view that an adequate buffer could be achieved at reserved matters stage, which would preserve the setting of the designated heritage assets and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, it was considered by Officers that refusal of the application for this reason would not be justified.

The Team Leader – Development Management continued that, as per the Report presented which incorporated the changes as set out on the Updating Sheet to the Board on 10 June 2020, the Officer Recommendation remained to approve the application subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement and conditions.

Key points as stated from the main report were that the site had been put forward as a mixed use housing allocation/employment allocation for a minimum of 200 dwellings and approx. 4.5 hectares of employment land in the emerging Local Plan Part II.

The Report stated that the Ward Member for Selwood had no objections, the Ward Member for Park Ward Frome had objected and the Ward Member for Keyford Ward Frome had requested that the application be referred to Planning Board.

Frome Town Council had no objection although it had raised some concerns. Selwood Parish Council recommended refusal.

In terms of local representation, there had been 31 letters of objection, 1 letter of support and 3 letters expressing neutral comments. Objections had also been received from The Frome & District Civic Society and the Frome Chamber of Commerce.

The Officer Report stated that the application reflected the emerging policy framework which covered the period 2006-2029 in terms of the land-uses that were proposed. On this basis, it was considered to represent a sustainable form of development. In addition, the proposed means of access to serve the development was also considered acceptable.

The Report continued that it had been demonstrated through the assessment of the application that the quantum of development as applied for, including 235 residential units, could be accommodated on the site without resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area including ecological impact and/or the wider residential amenities of the area.

It noted that the applicant had agreed to enter into a Section 106 Agreement which covered matters in relation to affordable housing (Policy DP11), open space and green infrastructure (Policy DP16) and developer contributions (Policy DP19).

The Report also set out how the application scheme met the three objectives of sustainable development identified in the NPPF and concluded that, given that no significant harm had been identified in terms of delivering the quantum of development as proposed, either actual or in policy terms, taking into account the benefits, it was considered to weigh in favour of the granting planning permission for the application scheme, including the uplift in the number of residential dwellings that was proposed (235).

For these reasons, the Officers Report recommended that the Board grant delegated authority to Officers to permit the application subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement and following the completion of advertising the application as a departure from the development plan and no new issues having been raised by comments received.

This recommendation was represented to the Members for their consideration.

In opposition to the application, Mr Andrew Pope was invited to speak. He said he was still waiting for a written response from the Deputy Chair about issues he had raised at a previous meeting. The Deputy Chair reminded him that his speech must relate to the planning

application in question. Mr Pope stated that he objected to the application and that he sympathised with the many Frome residents who had also objected. He said that there would be a loss of green fields and fauna and flora. He continued that the access was poor and that the residents would be disconnected from Frome Town Centre. He said that there should be opportunities for more speakers and was concerned that the Members of the Planning Board in attendance at today's meeting were not the same as at the previous meeting. He said that substitutes should not be used because they would not have heard the first debate.

In response, the Legal Advisor said that the identity of the landowners was irrelevant, that the Planning Board was a-political and Mendip's Constitution allowed for substitutes to sit on the Planning Board. His advice was that the Board could proceed.

The Chair reminded Members that each application was to be considered on its own merits.

In support of the application, Mr Kevin Bird was invited to speak. He said he represented the applicant, Silverwood Partnership. He gave details on the history of the application. In September 2019, the Inspector had confirmed the proposed allocation for a mixed use development on the site was sound. He stated it had not been a rushed application and had taken 6 years of work and full consultation. He continued that the site was now in the local plan and that it would contribute to the Council's housing supply. He added that the application was recommended for approval by the Officers.

Ward Councillor Helen Kay was invited to speak. She was concerned about lack of a traffic management plan. She welcomed the affordable housing; however she was concerned about traffic on the access road. She said that the area was congested even before the recent lockdown and was very congested when the lockdown started to ease. She said the employment land was unlikely to be attractive to businesses and was likely to end up as more houses. She was disappointed that she could not display her photographs of the farmhouse and outbuildings as Members would not be able to appreciate their appearance. She pointed out the bat activity at the farmhouse which would be lost if the buildings were to be demolished. She also said that the other access points at the northern end of the site had not been fully assessed

and was disappointed that more had not been done to pursue these.

Ward Councillor Shannon Brooke had arranged for her comments to be read aloud by the Chair. She said she supported the application. However, she had concerns about transport and access issues and pointed out that decisions made now may not be reversed later in the planning process. She would also have liked to retain the farmhouse.

Ward Councillor Richard Pinnock was invited to speak. He said he was disappointed with the haste at which the application had come back to the Planning Board. He was seriously concerned about the Gore Hedge Junction in Frome which was already very congested, but felt that there had not been much recognition regarding The Butts which was a serious bottleneck for traffic on the approach to the town centre. He continued that as Keyford House was a listed building it would be very difficult to make a change to buffer zone at the reserved matters stage, if the distribution road layout was approved at tonight's meeting.

The Deputy Chair thanked the Frome Members for their contribution and invited the Team Leader – Development Management to respond to the speakers so far. He referred Members' attention to the Updating Report which set out a 3 further objections to the application. Since issuing the updating report he confirmed that a further 5 representations all raising an objection to the planning application proposal had been received that were not recorded on the updating sheet. All of the concerns had been covered in the report pack except one regarding the duration of the construction period. He advised that Members should not give any weight to this or give it as a reason for refusal, given that the land had been allocated for housing. There would be an update to Condition 11 if the application was approved.

In the discussion that followed a number of Members were seriously concerned about the demolition of Keyford Farmhouse, which was acknowledged as a non-designated heritage asset. Some Members considered the existing buildings to be re-useable and were disappointed that more thought had not been given to the possibility of using the existing buildings in the plan, such as re-use of the buildings to provide some of the commercial space required.

A number of Members were further concerned that the access was still inadequate. Some Members had serious concerns that the congestion would be so bad, particularly at lunch times when the queue to enter the McDonalds 'drive-thru' was often backed up to the mini roundabout, that the residents of the site would not be able to access their homes and would be effectively "cut off". This, some members considered, was a case to demonstrate demonstrable harm.

Some Members disagreed with the findings of the Highways Authority who had said that there need only be one access point to a site of this size. They felt this did not take any account of local knowledge of the area and suggested the road should at least be widened with a right hand turning zone into McDonalds. They acknowledged the creation of access for emergency services since their last debate.

The Team Leader – Development Management stated that if the application was refused on Highway Safety grounds the case would not be that strong given that the Highway Authority had not raised an objection to the application.

The Legal Advisor said that the site was allocated in the emerging Local Plan Part 2 and this needed to be given significant weight. He continued that the loss of the farmhouse was material to Members' consideration but as the Council did not have a 5 year plan, refusal could only be justified if it was concluded that there was significant and demonstrable harm resulting from the demolition of the farmhouse which would outweigh the benefits of the proposal. He felt this would be difficult to defend on appeal.

One Member pointed out that the demolition of the farmhouse would cause less than substantial harm and refusal on that basis could not be justified. Another Member said that the provision of much needed housing was of greater benefit than defending the demolition of the farmhouse, which was not listed.

The Legal Advisor said that any application had to be considered in relation to the development plan as a whole and material considerations. He reminded the Board that the principle of the development of the site was accepted. With regards to the single access, he pointed out that the Highway Authority had not objected to this. He continued that if there were an appeal, an Inspector would look at

the technical evidence. It was likely that they would give the technical evidence more weight in their decision.

There was much discussion about what access there would be to the site during the construction, including access for emergency vehicles. One Member reiterated the concern that the only access road was blocked every lunchtime due to the 'drive' thru'. He suggested that a condition should be added relating to the access during the building works. It was suggested that the condition could relate to the construction vehicles use of Little Keyford Lane. The Team Leader – Development Management agreed that Condition 9 could be amended to include a requirement that the applicant submit an access route plan, which would require further consultation with the Highway Authority.

Councillor Helen Kay proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the loss of the heritage asset and the harm to the setting of the listed building and loss of ecology would outweigh the benefits. This was seconded by Councillor Peter Goater.

There were 7 votes in favour of refusal and 7 votes against. As Deputy Chair, Councillor Nigel Hewitt-Cooper used his casting vote to vote against the motion. Therefore the proposal to refuse was not carried.

Councillor Nigel Hewitt-Cooper proposed that on balance he would propose that the application be approved as recommended with changes to Conditions 9 and 11 s discussed. This was seconded by Councillor Nigel Woollcombe-Adams.

Councillor Francis Hayden proposed that the application be deferred again due to the issue of the harm that would be caused to the potential residents of the development which had not been fully addressed. The proposal was not seconded.

Subsequently the Officer recommendation was put to the vote and there were 8 votes for approval of the application and 6 votes against.

### **RESOLVED**

Delegate to permit subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement and following the completion of advertising the application scheme as a departure from the development plan and no new issues having been raised

	<p>by comments received and with changes to conditions 9 and 11 as follows.</p> <p>Condition 9 to add the following requirement in terms of the list of details required:</p> <p>An access route plan for construction vehicles arriving and departing from the site.</p> <p>Condition 11 to add the following drafting before the wording as set out in the report pack: “ For each phase of development...”</p>	
<p><b>DM02</b></p>	<p><b>2020/0158/FUL Land At Green Pits Lane, Nunney, Frome, Somerset</b></p> <p>The Officer’s Report stated that this application was for the erection of 82 no. residential dwelling houses with associated infrastructure including landscaping, open space, drainage and highway access and parking. The application had been referred to the Planning Board as it was an application for development that would be a departure from the existing adopted Development Plan.</p> <p>The application related to an area of greenfield land on the southern edge of the village of Nunney. It was bound by a mix of residential and commercial properties. The site had been allocated under Policy NN1 of the Emerging Mendip District Local Plan Part 2, to provide a minimum of 70 dwellings.</p> <p>Nunney Parish Council had objected to the application due to the impact of flooding and the capacity of the local sewage system.</p> <p>There had been 36 letters of objection and 3 letters of support from the local residents. Among the objections raised in these letters were the lack of infrastructure within Nunney to support the additional houses, drainage and flooding, noise pollution, loss of privacy and the houses being overbearing and dominant. There were also concerns regarding the design and layout of the site and the impact the development would have on the ecology and wildlife of the area. Comments in support of the development included that more family homes were needed in the village which would in turn support the local school which needed more pupils.</p>	<p><b>James U’Dell</b></p>

In the Updating Report, the Officer advised that the Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust had raised no objections to the proposal, subject to contributions of £14,097 being secured through the S106 Agreement for the provision of health care. Also comments had been received from Natural England which had resolved the issues relating to the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). The Updating Report also confirmed that the applicant had agreed to contribute £20,000 towards traffic calming and new signage provision within Nunney which would be secured via the S106 Agreement.

The Report continued that the site was allocated in the Local Plan Part 2 (including proposed changes) and was identified as Policy NN1. Although the process of adopting the plan remained ongoing, at this stage and given the outcome of the examination process in relation to this site, the principle that this was a sustainable location for a residential development was considered sound.

In addition, as a result of the need for additional housing allocations within the District, the Inspector as part of the post-examination changes qualified that the requirement for 70 dwellings on the site should be treated as a minimum requirement. On this basis it was considered that significant weight could be attributed to this emerging policy in completing the assessment of this application.

With regards to affordable housing, the Report stated that adopted Policy DP11 set out an expectation that 30% of the dwellings on the site should be affordable. The Housing Enabling Officer had raised no objection to the affordable housing scheme offered, which included 30 per cent affordable housing, distributed within the site, with 21 social rented units and 4 intermediate (shared ownership) units, which complied with the mix of affordable dwellings sought by Policy DP11.

This affordable housing provision would need to be secured by a S106 Agreement, which the applicant had confirmed they were willing to enter into, prior to the approval of planning permission.

The Report also stated that the scheme included green ecological corridors and a high quality public open space strategy including the provision of play equipment within a LAP and LEAP located on site.

In conclusion, the Officer Report stated that the application had not identified any other adverse impacts that would arise and the proposal was considered acceptable in relation to the landscape impacts; amenity of neighbouring residents and the locality generally; public safety of the surrounding highway network; ecological and environmental impacts. It was therefore recommended that planning permission be granted, as a departure from the development plan and subject to a S106 Agreement.

On completion of the presentation, the Chair permitted Members time to read the updating to the original report pack which had only been made available earlier in the day.

In support of the application, Mr Colin Danks was invited to speak. He said he was speaking on behalf of David Wilson Homes. He said they were policy compliant in all respects and had engaged with the Parish Council and local residents. The objection from the Parish Council on flooding had been addressed. He also advised that they will pay £20k to a traffic calming and signage scheme within Nunney making cycling within the village easier and safer. He also confirmed that they would agree to the off-site contribution towards healthcare provision.

The Chair advised that a Mr Roots had written to request that the Council should not determine this application at this time due to other issues at land adjacent to the Nunney Catch roundabout. However, he said that there was a large enough distance between the two sites to continue.

Ward Councillor Francis Hayden was invited to speak. He said affordable housing was the main issue and the site was the only option within the village. He was concerned about the risk of flooding in the eastern side of the site which was heavy clay. On the whole he supported the application.

In the discussion that followed, Members noted that the layout seemed to be well thought through and the design of the houses were good. One Member noted that there were quite a lot of detached properties which were very close to each other and felt it would have been better to have more terraced housing to prevent heat loss.

	<p>Members suggested that the developer should offer photovoltaic roof panels to be installed on the properties as they were sold off plan.</p> <p>Councillor Heather Shearer proposed that the application be approved with conditions as recommended on the Updating Report. Councillor Peter Goater seconded the proposal which was carried unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That delegated authority be given to Officers to approve, subject to the satisfactory resolution of matters relating to the entering into and completion of a Section 106 Agreement and following the completion of advertising the application as a departure from the development plan with no new significant material planning considerations being raised by any representations received.</p>	
<p><b>DM03</b></p>	<p><b>DM03 2020/0324/FUL 2 Belle Vue, The Street, Chilcompton</b></p> <p>The Officer's Report stated that this was an application for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access. The site was an end terrace dwelling located on a corner with a long garden and 2 existing access point. The proposal was for a 1.5 storey dwelling with dormers to the front and rear elevations.</p> <p>The application had been referred to the Planning Board by one of the Ward Members and was within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, Low Risk Coal Development Area, SSSI Impact Risk Zone and within Development Limits.</p> <p>Chilcompton Parish Council had objected to the proposal due to the loss of light and privacy in the neighbouring garden, overdevelopment and lack of parking. There had also been 4 letters of objection from local residents for the same reasons as the Parish Council, plus the impact on the highways due to increased traffic and that the soakaway details being inadequate.</p> <p>The Officer Report continued that the site was located within the development limits of Chilcompton where there was a presumption in favour of development and was therefore acceptable in principle having regard to Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Mendip District Council Local Plan Part 1.</p>	<p><b>Josh Cawsey</b></p>

Although the proposal would have an impact on the street scene it was assessed that the impact would not be harmful over and above that of the existing layout. The proposal also set the dwelling at a 90 degree angle to 2 Belle Vue, in line the existing properties within The Pitching. Regarding objections that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the plot, the Report concluded that the application sat comfortably within the rear garden of an existing dwelling. The proposal was small in scale being a 2 bedroom house and 1 and ½ stories in height.

The Report stated that the proposal by reason of its design, siting, scale, massing, layout and materials was acceptable and maintained the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It went on to analyse the objection based on lack of privacy and light. Again, given the scale, massing and siting of the proposed development, the Report concluded that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the amenities of any occupiers or adjacent occupiers through loss of light and overlooking sufficient to refuse the application subject to the conditions as recommended in the report pack

With regards to the means of access and parking arrangements, these was deemed acceptable and would maintain highway safety standards and ensure the free flow of traffic on the highway.

In conclusion the Officer's Report recommended that the proposal be approved subject to conditions.

In opposition to the application, Ms Gail Lewis had arranged for her comments to be read aloud by the Chair. She said the development would cause unacceptable harm to 1 Belle Vue. Even if the overlooking windows in both the bathroom and bedroom were fitted with obscure glazing, it would still affect the use of the neighbouring garden. She suggested that the dormer windows could be replaced by roof lights to protect their privacy.

Ward Councillors Sam Phripp and Josh Burr had arranged for their comments to be read aloud by the Chair. They felt the application was over development of the site and would cause a loss of amenity for the neighbours at 1 Belle Vue making the garden unusable.

The Team Leader – Development Management said that Members would have to balance the issue of overlooking against the planning policies. He showed Members the

relationship between proposed dwelling and existing garden. He said that Condition 3 relating to the bathroom window would safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DP7 of the Mendip District Local Plan Part 1. The overlooking would be towards to bottom of the garden and it was likely that the bedroom would be occupied mostly when the garden was not being used. This was why the obscure glazing was recommended for the bathroom only. He advised that roof lights rather than windows could be considered.

In the discussion that followed some Members commented that the site seemed very small and wondered how the dwelling could sit comfortably on the plot. However, it was noted that not all people want large gardens and this could not be a reason for refusal.

One Member questioned why the soakaway was positioned right up against the boundary with the neighbour's property and whether this would be adequate. She also queried whether the suggestion of roof lights as a solution to the overlooking would conform to the dark skies policy in the village. The Team Leader – Development Management pointed out that there was no dark skies policy in this location. He said that there had been no comment from the drainage authority so was unable to determine if the soakaway was adequate.

Other Members pointed out that there was a need for small single person dwellings and that applications like this should be supported. The idea of roof lights to replace the proposed dormer windows was not good and that the dormers would provide more space within the rooms. Both the bathroom and the bedroom would be the least used rooms in the house and so the overlooking would not be as problematic as at first perceived.

Councillor Lindsay MacDougall proposed that the decision be deferred which was seconded by Councillor Mike Pullin. When asked to clarify the reason for the deferral, Councillor Pullin withdrew his offer to second the proposal and the proposal was withdrawn.

Councillor Francis Hayden emphasised the importance of the drainage and soakaway which would affect the cleanliness and health of our waterways - therefore there should be a condition regarding this. The Team Leader – Development Management advised that a condition could be added regarding the soakaway arrangements but

	<p>there was no need to condition the foul drainage as this would be covered by other process separate to the planning process.</p> <p>Councillor Ros Wyke proposed to accept the application with the added soakaway condition. This was seconded by Councillor Nigel Woollcombe-Adams.</p> <p>The proposal was carried with 13 votes in favour, 1 abstention and 1 absent.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>To approve the application with conditions as recommended and an additional condition to require the surface water drainage arrangements to be submitted for approval notwithstanding the details as shown on the submitted plans.</p>	
8	<p><b>INVESTIGATION INTO THE FAILURE TO NOTIFY PARISH COUNCILS AND WARD MEMBERS OF APPLICATIONS AT PLANNING BOARD</b></p> <p>This report was noted.</p> <p>Members thanked the Officers for the work they have done to support the Council during the pandemic.</p>	Julie Reader-Sullivan
9	<p><b>Urgent Business</b></p> <p>None.</p>	

The meeting finished at approximately 9.10 pm