

Appendix 2

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of 26 October 2017

Members viewed plans and photographs of the application site which had been the subject of previous refusals due to its location and unsustainability. The Planning Consultant advised that the principle of keeping horses at the site was accepted. A number of concerns had been raised about the manner in which the site had been used and managed in the past, and how residential development might be pursued in the future. On the latter, the Council's agricultural adviser had commented that any future application for residential development would be no more likely to be granted given that the development now proposed was reversible and not permanent. As a correction to the report, it was clarified that condition ii) should read 'no temporary structures' and that the maximum number of horses would be limited to four.

Councillor Ovenden referred to a previous application that had been refused. An existing field access had previously been unavailable to the applicant whilst the application was pending. However, the field access was now available and she could therefore see no need for the new access. Moreover, the hedgerow lost as a result of the creation of the new access had been cited by the Inspector in dismissing the appeal in relation to application DOV/14/00477. She argued that neighbours had been adversely affected by the keeping of horses on the site which was contrary to Policy DD21 of the Local Development Plan. She queried whether the application could be refused in part.

The Planning Consultant advised that his understanding was that applications could not be refused and approved in part. It was not for the Committee to consider how the land had been used and managed in the past, but whether the land was suitable for the keeping of horses. The amount of hedgerow that had been lost as a result of the current proposal was less than had been proposed as part of the previously refused application. Finally, applications could not be refused on whether the use was needed, but on whether they were policy compliant and acceptable in planning terms.

The Chairman commented that the Committee's role was to consider whether harm had been caused by the removal of the hedgerow. The Planning Consultant clarified that conditions would prevent events being held on site and the ability to build chattels, hard-standings and temporary structures. The Planning Solicitor advised that National Planning Policy Guidance indicated that decisions should not be split without the agreement of the applicant. A more appropriate way to deal with the application would be to seek amended details from the applicant prior to a decision being made.

Councillor Gardner proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that the access was not acceptable, with an informative that the keeping of four horses would be allowed. Councillor Keen added that accessing the site with horseboxes, bales of hay, etc via such a narrow road would be difficult and was therefore unacceptable. The Chairman was of the view that it would be more appropriate to defer the application to enable negotiations to take place with the applicant regarding the access.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/16/01356 be DEFERRED to allow Officers to negotiate with the applicant regarding the removal of the access gate and reinstatement of the hedgerow.