

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday, 3rd July, 2024, 11.00 am

**Councillors:** Ian Halsall (Chair), Lucy Hodge (Vice-Chair), Paul Crossley, Fiona Gourley, Hal MacFie, Toby Simon, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson, Tim Warren CBE and Ruth Malloy

#### 11 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

#### 12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies of absence were received from Cllr Toby Simon and Cllr Deborah Collins.

Cllr Ruth Malloy was substituting for Cllr Deborah Collins.

#### 13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 14 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

#### 15 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Democratic Services Officer informed the meeting that there were a number of people wishing to make statements on planning applications and that they would be able to do so when these items were discussed.

#### 16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was moved by Cllr Eleanor Jackson seconded by Cllr Paul Crossley and:

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 5 June 2024 be confirmed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

#### 17 SITE VISIT LIST - APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ETC FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee considered:

A report by the Head of Planning on the application under the site visit applications list.

**RESOLVED** that in accordance with the delegated powers, the applications be determined as set out in the main applications decisions list attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes.

**(1) 24/00360/FUL - Staddle Stones, 5 Saltford Court, Saltford**

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the erection of a two-storey side extension, new front gable facade, first floor rear balcony and associated works.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Carol Cheung/Helen Mulholland objecting to the application.
2. Chris Dance, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Duncan Hounsell was in attendance as the local Member and raised the following points:

1. The application should be refused as the extension was partially within the green belt, and changes to the green belt boundary should only be defined as part of the local plan process.
2. There were no exceptional circumstances for the substantial increase of built form in the green belt.

He asked the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. There would be a loss of garden and mitigation planting was included as part of the scheme including 3 trees and a replacement hedge.
2. The officer view was that the development did not need screening by further planting.
3. Permitted development rights had been removed as a result of a previous application which meant that planning permission had to be sought for further developments.
4. Officers did not consider the proposed scheme to be an overdevelopment of the plot. The report addressed issues relating to the design, size, scale and siting of the development in the conservation area and officers concluded it to be acceptable.
5. The green belt boundary was not changing but the building was extending into the green belt. The percentage of the overall building in the green belt was 33%.
6. As officers considered the development to be appropriate in principle the test about special circumstances was not triggered. The Committee could make a different judgement about whether the development was a disproportionate addition in the green belt.

Cllr Shaun Hughes expressed concern about the development encroaching the green belt boundary.

Cllr Eleanor Jackson concurred with this view and also stated that the design would not conserve and enhance the conservation area.

Cllr Paul Crossley stated that he considered the development to be disproportionate and inappropriate development in the green belt with no special circumstances as well as the scale and design being out of keeping with the local area. He moved that the officer recommendation be overturned, and the application be refused. This was seconded by Cllr Eleanor Jackson.

On being put to the vote the motion was CARRIED (9 in favour, 0 against - unanimous).

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. Green Belt - the proposed extension represented a disproportionate addition to the original building and was therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No very special circumstances existed to clearly outweigh the harm identified.
2. Design and Heritage - the proposed development, due to its scale and design, would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and would result in less than substantial harm to the Saltford Conservation Area. Public benefits do not exist to outweigh this harm.

## 18 **MAIN PLANS LIST - APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ETC FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE**

### **(1) 24/01004/VAR - Willow Barn, Sunnymead Lane, Bishop Sutton, Bristol**

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the variation of conditions 2 (Plans List (Compliance)) and 5 (Garages (Compliance)) of application 20/03934/FUL (Erection of new garage/carport).

He confirmed the recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Cllr Dave Harding was unable to attend the meeting but submitted a statement that was read in absence summarised below:

1. Stowey Sutton Parish Council had objected to the application.
2. The proposed development was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
3. The area was known to be inhabited and foraged by bats and without an up-to-date ecological assessment of the local, commuting and foraging bats in the new environment, the application could not be said to demonstrate compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan.
4. The Parish Council had requested the Committee to review whether the application should be viewed as a separate site from the main accommodation and therefore a "split site".

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The condition attached to the previous consent requiring the building to be used

only as a private garage predated the Local Plan Partial Update and changes regarding the minimum number of parking spaces. In view of the updated policy, this condition was no longer considered necessary.

2. The use of the site was ancillary to the main building and any change of use to convert the home office to living accommodation would require a new planning application. Any subletting of the home office would also be a change of use requiring planning permission.
3. Officers considered that the application would not result in a significant increase in light spill necessitating a further bat survey. A condition had been included to ensure that any external lighting would need to be approved by the local planning authority in the interest of protecting bats and other wildlife.
4. Officers did not consider it was appropriate to include a condition for blinds/curtains to be installed.

Cllr Tim Warren proposed the officers' recommendation that permission be granted. This was seconded by Cllr Eleanor Jackson who also requested an additional condition, which was agreed by the mover of the motion, requiring the home office to remain ancillary to the main house.

On being put to the vote the motion was CARRIED (9 in favour, 0 against - unanimous).

**RESOLVED** that permission be granted subject to an additional condition requiring the home office to remain ancillary to the main house.

19 **NEW PLANNING APPEALS LODGED, DECISIONS RECEIVED AND DATES OF FORTHCOMING HEARINGS/INQUIRIES**

In response to a question raised about an increase in the number of appeals due to non-determination the Team Manager – Development Management undertook to look into this issue and remind case officers to seek extensions of time when necessary.

In response to a question about vacancies in the Enforcement Team, it was confirmed that the Team was currently at full strength.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 12.17 pm

Chair .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

Prepared by Democratic Services