

**Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held at Bruton Museum\* on Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> August 2018 at 7pm**

\*Owing to the unexpectedly large number of members of public attending the meeting it was moved from its original location at the Community Office to the adjacent Museum.

**Present:** Councillors Anderton, Karen Baker, Brownlow, Jones, Hall and Robinson.  
**In the Chair:** Councillor Hall  
**In attendance:** The Assistant Clerk  
 26 members of the public

1. **Declarations of Interests**

No Councillors had personal interests to declare.

2. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Abigail Baker.

3. **Minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2018**

It was proposed and seconded that the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018 be adopted as a true and accurate record.

**Resolved 6-0-0** [for-against-abstain]

4. **Submitted Plans**

The Committee considered and made observations on received planning applications and will report back to the full Town Council at its next meeting. The plans discussed were as follows:

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
18/01964/FUL	Mr & Mrs Kimber Holloway	Rose Cottage Dropping Lane Bruton BA10 0NG	Recommend approval 6-0-0

**Proposal:** The erection of a replacement dwelling and alterations to access

**Outcome:** The Committee wishes to recommend approval of this application.

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
18/01925/FUL	Mr & Mrs R & S Wright	81 High Street Bruton BA10 0AL	Recommend refusal 6-0-0

**Proposal:** The siting of a shepherd's hut for use as holiday accommodation, the provision of associated parking & turning area.

**Representation from the applicants' agent:** The proposed development was described as small-scale, non-intrusive and likely to increase Bruton's desirability as a

holiday destination. The application was likely to be amended: the proposed removal of a conifer tree was still being discussed with the Planning Authority and the size of the shepherd's hut would be reduced. (A smaller shepherd's hut which had suddenly become available had already been placed on site, at the applicants' risk, but it was stressed that this was not in any way an attempt to forestall or circumvent the planning process).

**Representations from members of the public:** The Chairman invited members of the public to express their views but not to repeat points made by previous speakers. Ten members of the public spoke against the application and none of those present supported it. Among the arguments put forward by opponents of the application were the following:

- The legality of the proposed use of the access lane, between the site and St Catherine's Hill, is uncertain.
- The access lane is very narrow (225cm [7'7"] in one place) and even those who use it regularly find it tricky. The lane is not accessible from St Catherine's Hill because of the tight corner. The awkward line and uneven surface make access from Higher Backway difficult, especially for large cars or vans, and vehicles trying to negotiate it sometimes collide with and cause damage to an adjoining property. It is totally unsuitable for visitors unfamiliar with its challenges and it could be dangerous.
- Emergency vehicles cannot easily reach the site making it unsuitable for holiday accommodation.
- Part of the access track is c.2 metres above adjoining gardens, with a retaining wall in between, so it would have to be surveyed to establish whether it could safely bear more traffic.
- The proposed shepherd's hut would overlook neighbouring properties and compromise their privacy.
- The acoustics of the surrounding area are such that even the sound of the spoken voice carries a long distance, so the recreational use of the site by visitors would compromise the quiet enjoyment of their own properties by other residents.
- Smoke from the three proposed wood-burning appliances (in the shepherd's hut, the fire pit and for the hot tub) would be likely to pollute neighbouring properties.
- The large conifer which the applicants propose to remove is an integral and well-established feature of the Conservation Area.

**Outcome:** The Committee took note of all the representations and also noted the possibility that the application might be amended or replaced by a new application. It was proposed that the application be referred to the next meeting of the Full Town Council but this was not seconded.

**The Committee recommended that the application be refused on the following grounds:**

- **Unsuitable and unsafe access**
- **Impact on the character of a Conservation Area**
- **Loss of residential amenity**
- **Noise pollution**
- **Fire hazard**
- **Lack of arrangements for waste disposal**
- **Removal of a mature tree**

#### 5. **Determinations received**

No planning determinations were received

**Patrick Pender-Cudlip**  
Assistant Clerk