



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB

Tel: (01453) 754 351/754 321

www.stroud.gov.uk

Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 25 April 2023

6.00 - 10.29 pm

Council Chamber

Minutes

Membership

Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)

Councillor Martin Brown
Councillor Doina Cornell
* Councillor Victoria Gray
Councillor Lindsey Green
Councillor Haydn Jones
*Absent

Councillor Helen Fenton (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Jenny Miles
* Councillor Loraine Patrick
Councillor Nigel Prenter
* Councillor Mark Ryder
Councillor Lucas Schoemaker

Officers in Attendance

Majors & Environment Team Manager
Development Team Manager
Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal

Planning Officer
Senior Planning Officer (Majors)
Democratic Services & Elections Officer

DCC.109 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gray, Patrick and Ryder.

DCC.110 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Jones declared a non-pecuniary sensitive interest in Items 4.5, S.22/2098/VAR and 4.6, S.22/1157/FUL, he left the meeting after Item 4.4 had been determined.

DCC.111 Minutes

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2023 were approved as a correct record.

DCC.112 Planning Schedule and Procedure for Public Speaking

Representations were received and taken into account by the Committee in respect of Applications:

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|---------------|---|---------------|
| 1 | S.22/2596/HHOLD | 2 | S.17/0798/OUT | 3 | S.21/2860/OUT |
| 4 | S.23/0188/VAR | 5 | S.22/2098/VAR | 6 | S.22/1157/FUL |

Late Pages relating to Scheduled Item 4.2 had been circulated to Committee prior to the meeting which confirmed that the Item had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

DCC.113 Follow-up report for planning application S.22/2596/HHOLD at 32 Wharfdale Way, Hardwicke, Gloucester

The Development Team Manager introduced the report and explained that the application was deferred from the last meeting due to the need for an additional site visit. He re-introduced the proposal, showed Members the plans for the site and highlighted the key points which included:

- The site was within the defined settlement limits of Hardwicke.
- The proposed garage would replace one of the original parking spaces and extend over the gravelled drive resulting in 2 parking spaces within the building and a further 2 parking spaces to the front.
- HC8 was the principal policy used to determine the application and ES3 had also been considered.
- Concerns had been raised on the impact of the garage on the outlook from nearby properties however the shortest distance would be approximately 12 metres which exceeded the guidance provided in the Residential Design Guide.

Councillor Schoemaker proposed the Officer recommendation to permit and the Chair, Councillor Baxendale seconded.

Councillor Schoemaker debated that the proposal met the design guides, and the views would be mitigated by the conifer trees on site.

Councillor Brown debated that there were no material planning considerations that would allow refusal as the proposal exceeded the distance required.

Councillor Cornell stated that the site visit was very informative to see the surrounding garages in the area and stated she would support the proposal.

The Chair, Councillor Baxendale, echoed Councillor Cornell's comments regarding the site visit.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To permit the application.

DCC.114 ITEM WITHDRAWN - Land at Sharpness Docks, The Docks, Sharpness, Gloucestershire (S.17/0798/OUT)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda as detailed in the [late pages](#).

DCC.115 Land Adjacent To, Dozule Close, Leonard Stanley, Gloucestershire (S.21/2860/OUT)

The Senior Planning Officer (Majors) introduced the report and explained that the application was an outline application for 13 dwellings, 9 of which would be custom build and the remaining 4 would be affordable housing. He highlighted the following information:

- Access to the site was proposed at the top of Dozule Close.
- The site was identified as a draft allocation (sites PS42 & PS16) of the Draft Local Plan.

- It was adjacent to an established settlement.
- The site would bring benefits by the way of social housing, and it was felt that outweighed any harm.
- There would be approximately 30m distance between the nearest proposed dwelling and the existing dwellings on Dozule Close.
- Access to the rear gardens would remain accessible for drain maintenance.
- There were no objections raised from Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Highways or from Biodiversity Officers however, they had included some recommended conditions.

Councillor Studdert-Kennedy, Ward Councillor, asked the committee to refuse the application for the following reasons. The Parish Council and the local residents directly affected were not in favour of the application being approved. It was felt that sufficient development within the village had already taken place. The buildings proposed would be higher than the existing dwellings which caused concern. Further concerns were raised over the drainage of the land. Page 85 stated that full weight was given to the 2015 Local Plan however the report mentioned weight given to the draft allocations within the new draft Local Plan. The examiners had stated that the draft Local Plan would not be approved without amendments which questioned the weight attributed to it. After the development at Mankley Field was approved, the Inspector gave assurances that the application site should not be built on.

Ms Summers, a local resident, spoke against the application and asked the Committee to reject the application for the following reasons:

- There was a local consultation hearing scheduled for the 18 May to discuss the site being included in the draft local plan as a development allocation.
- The Parish Councillors objected to the development and the Parish Council had requested for Leonard Stanley to be re-classified as tier 4 settlement due to its lack of employment opportunities, services and facilities.
- The planning permission for this application shouldn't be granted ahead of the consultation and approval of the draft Local Plan.
- The entrance to the site was near an entrance to the local primary school which children also utilised to walk to the Church.
- The roads were not suitable for the construction traffic. If permission was granted, she asked Councillors to consider a shorter access.
- Consideration should be given to the mental health and wellbeing of residents who had already experienced 3 years of noise pollution from the Mankley Field development and were assured at that time that this land would not be built on.
- The construction of two storey dwellings next to single storey bungalows would be overbearing.
- The proposed drainage system was not sustainable and would require regular maintenance to avoid flooding.
- Concerns for local wildlife utilising the site as a wildlife corridor or habitat as the site was allocated in the Mankley Field Proposal to support displaced wildlife.
- The land was cleared in February 2022 before any ecological surveys could be carried out in the appropriate seasons.

Mr Davis, the Agent, spoke in favour of the application and asked the Committee to support the proposal for the following reasons. The application consisted of 13 dwellings, 9 of which were proposed to be custom build. Due to this, the outline application had been brought forward in order to allow individual purchasers to design and develop their homes. The layout of the site had been designed to prevent overlooking, the two storey houses

were proposed adjacent to the playing field with no first-floor windows facing west towards existing properties. And next to the existing single storey properties were proposed dormer bungalows. There were four affordable houses proposed within the applications, 2 two-bed and 2 three-bed semi-detached properties. They had worked with an ecologist to ensure a bio-diversity net gain of over 10% within the site. The scheme engineers had carried out robust testing and consultation with Severn Trent regarding the flooding concerns which would be monitored under condition 8. A land drain was proposed across the western side of the site to address any flooding issues from heavy rainfall. Any concerns regarding the construction traffic would be managed under condition 10.

Ms Litton, a Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of Leonard Stanley Parish Council and asked the Committee to reject the application for the following reasons:

- Loss of a valuable green field.
- The Parish and District Councils objected to the Mankley Field development being developed which was later overturned during appeal. This was due to not having a Local Plan in place at that time and being unable to demonstrate a 5-year land supply.
- The Parish Council was given assurance during the Mankley Field development that this land would not be built on.
- The site was important to Biodiversity prior to being cleared with a mechanical digger which would have destroyed the ancient hedgerow growing along the boundary without intervention.
- A housing needs survey in 2018 identified that Leonard Stanley needed 7 affordable houses. The Mankley Field development had provided 50 additional affordable houses therefore the target had been exceeded.
- The field was outside the settlement boundary and the application did not meet the criteria for an exception site.
- The draft Local Plan was still undergoing its examination therefore full weight should be attributed to the current Local Plan.
- Concerned with vehicles travelling to and from the proposed site as they would need to navigate through the entire village and pass by the footpath leading to the primary school which would be unsafe and bad for the environment.
- Large concerns regarding flooding on the site and the conditions mentioned would be unenforceable.
- Leonard Stanley village character was being destroyed by the large number of developments in the area and the loss of green spaces.

The Senior Planning Officer (Majors) advised that the application was on a greenfield site adjacent to a settlement but it was not a green belt location.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officers. In response to queries it was confirmed that:

- Limited weight could be given to the Draft Local Plan due to where it was in the process. The current Local Plan still carried full weight regarding planning applications.
- The application was a departure from the current Local plan however, the site was considered to be in a sustainable location.
- The application site was within the allocations for development in the draft local Plan.
- The application did not qualify as an exceptions site as it was not 100% affordable houses.
- A custom build property was a dwelling designed and built by the developer and then personalised for the customer.

- This was an outline application which established the principle for development, if approved the reserved matters application would follow which was where the detail of plot sizes and other matters could be considered.
- Each application was assessed on its own merits, and the reasons listed for granting this application shouldn't set a precedent for development of other sites outside of settlement boundaries.

Councillor Cornell questioned whether the construction traffic could be restricted around the primary school hours. The Senior Planning Officer (Majors) confirmed that there was a requirement for a construction management plan to be submitted under condition 9.

Councillor Jones proposed to refuse the application as it directly contradicted policy CP15 of the current Local Plan. The application site was outside of the settlement boundary, was not an exception site and did not meet any of the qualifying criteria. Councillor Green seconded.

Councillors debated the possible additional refusal reasons which included; Loss of open space, loss of wildlife corridor, contradiction to Local Plan Policies CP2, CP3, ES8, ES13 and ES15.

The Principal Planning Lawyer informed the Committee of the NPPF paragraph 12 which stated that proposals contrary to a Local Plan would be refused unless material considerations indicated otherwise; therefore he urged them to identify the harm caused by the conflict with the local plan policies as part of their refusal reasons.

Councillor Schoemaker stated that in order to represent the community the Parish Council and the residents' thoughts and feelings should be considered.

Councillor Brown echoed Councillor Jones' comments regarding Local Plan Policy CP15.

Councillor Schoemaker debated whether the proposal was being considered too soon.

The Chair highlighted encroachment into the countryside as potential harm.

Councillor Jones stated that the proposal did not meet any of the 6 exceptions within Policy CP15 therefore the additional criteria was irrelevant.

The Majors & Environment Team Manager explained that identifying the harm would reinforce the refusal reason should the application go to appeal.

The Principal Planning Lawyer clarified that as the land was an unallocated site it would be classed as a green field site therefore it could amount to encroachment into the countryside. He further clarified that because the proposal was contrary to Policy CP15 it could be arguable that it potentially caused harm to the plan-led system. This would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Councillor Jones agreed that those were his initial feelings regarding the departure from the Local Plan and why he was looking to refuse.

Councillor Cornell debated the sustainability of the decision should the draft Local Plan be approved then this site was in a development allocation.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was Carried with 8 votes for and 1 vote against.

RESOLVED To refuse the application and to delegate to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair to agree the wording of the refusal reasons.

The meeting was adjourned for a period of 15 minutes.

DCC.116 Thomas Keble School, Eastcombe, Stroud, Gloucestershire (S.23/0188/VAR)

The Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that it was originally brought to committee in September 2022 and Members had requested an additional condition to restrict construction traffic. The proposal was a variation of that restriction to allow greater flexibility with delivery times but still avoiding the peak school drop off and pick up times. It would also decrease the restrictions when the school was closed.

Councillor Jockel, Ward Councillor, spoke against the variation and asked the committee to refuse. He explained that his reasons for refusal centred around Local Plan Policies CP14 and ES3 and were as follows. That there was no offer to mitigate the increased risk that the variation would create which highlighted the lack of concern for the community. The school's long-term relationship with the community was at risk of further damage from this variation. The current construction management plan was confusing and gave little confidence that the conditions would be met. The variation solely focused on the occupants of the school and didn't factor in work related traffic or the poor infrastructure of the area. There was no offer of offsite road safety measures, only onsite. There was little communication to the community regarding the restrictions and any variation proposed. He informed the committee of incidents already occurring with large vehicles parking for several hours on the road leading to the site.

Mr Cook, spoke on behalf of the applicant, in favour of the proposal and asked the Committee to permit the application for the following reasons:

- This was a department for education project.
- The current restrictions only allowed for deliveries between 9am – 3pm which was very limiting. The new proposal sought to expand delivery times whilst still avoiding peak hours of school drop off and pick up times and to eliminate restrictions during non-term time where volume of school traffic was limited.
- The construction time would take approximately 113 weeks during which time a lot of materials would be entering and leaving the site. Some materials have a much longer loading/unloading time therefore it would be more efficient to get the deliveries onsite prior to the peak school movements and then begin the loading/unloading process while the restrictions were in place.
- The current restrictions had a detrimental impact to the development and risked extending the construction period further.

In response to Councillor Brown, the Planning Officer confirmed that there would be no restrictions on construction deliveries before 8am and after 4pm with the new variation. However, there was a further condition (Condition 5) which would restrict construction hours for the whole site.

Councillor Schoemaker questioned whether there had been any traffic modelling completed around the road. The Planning Officer confirmed the key details would have been submitted for the original application and this was just a variation.

Councillor Jones questioned whether Condition 5 would include dropping off materials. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that it would not include deliveries to and from the site however it would include the loading and unloading of the lorries.

In response to Councillor Cornell, the Chair explained that the Head of Development Management called in the application to the Committee as it was a condition that the Committee had imposed at the time of approval and which the officers felt was not required.

Councillor Jones proposed and Councillor Brown seconded the Officer advise to grant permission.

Councillor Brown stated that the reason the condition was applied in the first place was to protect the children from construction traffic during pick up and drop off times and the new variation satisfied those concerns.

Councillor Jones echoed Councillors Browns comments.

Councillor Schoemaker expressed his concerns that there was no traffic modelling carried out and would like the variation to be extended to include work hours (4pm-6pm).

Councillor Miles expressed concerns with unnecessary restrictions and stated she would be supporting the proposal in hopes to improve the construction efficiency.

Councillor Fenton shared Councillor Shoemaker's concerns with work traffic.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried with 7 votes in favour and 2 votes against.

RESOLVED To permit the application.

Councillor Jones left the meeting.

DCC.117 Land Parcels A & B, Near Whitminster, Gloucestershire (S.22/2098/VAR)

The Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that it was a variation from the original S.21/0465/FUL application for a solar farm. The variation was for 2 masts to be erected in order to connect the solar farm to the grid. The original plan to utilise an underground cable had been found to be unviable. The key issues to consider were:

- Whether the variation would result in any significant adverse effects other than those previously mitigated by the original proposal.
- The masts would be sited next to an original pylon.
- The site was situated in proximity to the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area and a grade II* listed building (St Andrews Church).
- During the application process the masts were re-positioned in order to address Historic England's concerns.
- The applicant had advised that the noise would be no greater than that of the electricity line and pylon.
- There were no Biodiversity objections received, the proposal would remove existing planting at the location of the compound and this would be offset with additional planting to the west.
- Condition 5 would be amended to include the additional spare containers.

Councillor John Jones, Ward Member, spoke against the application and asked the Committee to reject the proposal for the following reasons. The application was not showing on the planning portal for Whitminster despite the masts being located within the Parish, it was only showing on the Moreton Valance portal. The applicants should have been aware of these issues at the time of the original application, and this should have been considered all together. The proposal was more than a variation, it was the erection or two significant masts along with the additional containers and redeployment of the solar panels, it should warrant its own separate application. The addition of the masts would create extra lorry movements through the narrow village roads and would cause a greater disruption during the construction period. At the very least he asked the committee to defer the application for further investigation to be completed.

Mr Paynter, Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of Whitminster Parish Council against the application. He echoed the concerns raised by Councillor John Jones and asked the Committee to reject the application for the following reasons:

- The original application was approved despite the objections raised by the Parish and its residents.
- The proposed masts would be located in close proximity to listed buildings, farms and the newly renovated Whitminster Lock.
- It was not a minor variation but a significant, visually impacting element and should it have been included in the original application the decision to approve may not have been made.
- English Heritage had been consulted and responded with their objection.
- The site was situated next to a 14th century church.
- The addition of the masts would further diminish the landscape, character and heritage of the village and impact the views from the church and the canal.
- The Parish Council was happy to support a more sustainable site closer to the M5.

Ms Younger, a local resident, spoke against the application and asked the Committee to refuse the proposal for the following reasons. Residents wanted to know why the masts were not included within the original application and why the method of connection was not altered during the consultation period. The application was purely for financial gain with no local benefits to the community. It had been reported that at peak times the solar farm would produce approximately one third over the approved megawatts thus producing additional profits. The application was not included on the Whitminster Planning Portal disadvantaging the residents of Whitminster. This variation would result in additional traffic on the country lanes and the added disruption may have had an impact on the determination of the original application. The additional visual impact alone may have influenced the decision taken. The masts would be visible from residential dwellings, Whitminster Lane, School Lane, Stroud Canal and the listed church. The visual impact could not be mitigated by trees or hedges due to their height. The application would give the rural setting an industrial look for the developer's profit.

Mr Baker, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application and asked the Committee to approve the proposal for the following reasons:

- It would support Stroud District Councils (SDC) carbon neutral 2030 strategy.
- The solar farm would lead to the displacement of 20,000 tonnes of CO₂ annually whilst providing the electricity demand for over 15,000 homes.
- In order to do that it would need to be connected to the national grid. Since permission was gained, they had carried out further checks and found it would be unlikely for the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) to connect the cable onto the grid utilising the single compound as planned.

- This was largely due to the type and condition of the existing pylon and would most likely need an additional pylon to be erected by the DNO in order to allow connection.
- The location of the masts was changed after the initial consultation with consultees at a greater cost to the developer.
- The variation would not have an effect on the amount of electricity generated by the farm.
- There would be less HGV movements as it would be two masts instead of a more complicated connection compound.
- Screening had been introduced to mitigate the visual impact from the canal.

In response to Councillor Green, it was confirmed:

- After consent for the original application had been granted, the engineer had attended the site and found the underground cable to not be viable.
- Legislation asked for a public benefit from planning applications not necessarily a local benefit, the renewable energy was seen as a public benefit.

Councillor Schoemaker questioned whether Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments would apply. The Majors & Environment Team Manager explained that as the application would not add pressure to the infrastructure, CIL would not be applicable.

Councillor Prenter questioned whether it would be grounds for refusal for not being advertised on the Whitminster Planning Portal. The Planning Officer confirmed that it was an IT issue from the system developer, and they had asked for it to be addressed. She also highlighted that it had been advertised in the local newspaper and a site notice had been displayed to raise awareness.

In response to Councillor Brown, the Planning Officer confirmed that the approximate distance from the church to the proposed masts was 345m.

Councillor Green questioned the mitigation for the close proximity to the conservation area. The Planning Officer explained that the mitigation had already been considered as part of the original application and this was just a variation.

Councillor Brown proposed the Officer recommendation to permit the application and Councillor Cornell seconded.

Councillors debated the benefit of the application and that it would not be beneficial if it could not be connected to the national grid.

Councillor Green stated that at the site visit her attention was drawn to the existing pylon and personally felt that two additional masts would be more harmful to the nearby listed building and conservation area.

The Chair clarified that the Officer recommendation included the amendment to condition 5 to include the spare containers and reminded the committee that this was not a permanent change and had a lifespan of 40 years.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried with 6 votes in favour and 2 against.

RESOLVED To permit the application.

DCC.118 Land North East Of, Kingston Road, Slimbridge, Gloucestershire
(S.22/1157/FUL)

The Planning Officer introduced the report and explained that it was for a 36MW battery storage facility for a period of 40 years. She then highlighted the following key considerations:

- The proposed location was an agricultural field.
- It was in close proximity to a national cycle route and the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT).
- The site would be connected to an existing substation via an underground cable.
- The battery cells would use lithium-Ion battery technology and would be able to store energy when it was in excess and release it back onto the grid when there was demand. This technology would help prevent power outages and surges.
- The site was in the open countryside
- Locational factors such as provision of access to the national grid and point of connection, availability of suitable land and proximity of point of access to the highway network. This site met the criteria.
- The majority of the site was in flood zone 1.
- There were a number of concerns raised regarding loss of agricultural land, impact on landscape, noise pollution and impact on highways network, all statutory consultees had been consulted and no objections were raised.
- There would be Biodiversity enhancements secured through planting.
- The proposal was over 290m away from the nearest listed building and it was not considered to have an impact on the setting of the listed building.
- Key concern raised regarding the fire risk and the following risk of toxic fumes from the batteries. Further concerns were raised regarding evacuation from the nearby WWT. Further details of the fire safety precautions had been received from the applicant and condition 14 requests for a battery safety management plan to be received prior to any power switch on.

Mr Stayte, Parish Councillor for Slimbridge Parish Council, spoke against the proposal and asked the Committee to reject the application for the following reasons. They believed that the facility was not suitable for the area due to its size, the cables required, and the tracks required for access and would be better suited to a brownfield site. The facility would harm the visual amenity of the area. Stroud District Council promoted the use of brownfields sites and development to be sited away from the Severn in their strategic objectives. In addition, the site was prone to flooding and the noise pollution from the facility and from construction would have an effect on local residents. The access route would have a high volume of tourist traffic for the WWT site, Tudor Arms, caravan park and the Canal. To add construction traffic into this mix would impact on road safety. The road also formed part of the national cycle route and was used by pedestrians and horse riders. Concerns had been raised over fire safety and evacuation from the tourist places as they all utilise the same access road.

Ms Brown, a local resident, spoke against the application and asked the Committee to reject the proposal for the following reasons:

- There were more suitable locations for this facility.
- The applicant appointed consultants to engage with the Parish however those in attendance found the presentation to be ill informed.
- We understand the need for renewable energy however there is also a need to site potentially hazardous structures away from large tourist areas.
- Concerned that this application was purely for profit due to many changes in the company.

- There were many errors in the paperwork which impacted on the credibility and professionalism of the developer.
- There was no consultation for the local surrounding businesses.
- In the event of a large-scale evacuation from the local tourist spots, the evacuation route was a single track lane which initially led towards the proposed site.
- A similar site in Liverpool suffered a 'thermal runaway' after a fire which led to an explosion and the release of toxic gas in a residential area. There is still a lack of knowledge of this technology.
- Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue had highlighted the risk of such a situation and referenced the impact of pollution to the environment. Residents were concerned for their rural location and its many water courses adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Mr Murray, spoke in favour of the application on behalf of the applicant. He asked the Committee to approve the proposal. The UK energy system was currently undergoing a transformation and battery storage would be the enabler for this. Fossil fuel powered generators were being phased out and the UK was transitioning towards a self-sufficient, green energy future. Battery storage would be essential for the network to operate using clean sources of power. The proposed site comprised of predominately lower grade agricultural land, the scheme would provide acceptable screening and significantly enhance the biodiversity benefits. The compound was in flood zone 1, was a viable distance away from the substation and had a valid grid connection. A construction management plan had been submitted to limit any adverse effects on the local road network. Once the construction phase was completed the site would only need to be accessed occasionally by small work vans. A detailed noise assessment report had also been submitted and no objections were received from the councils Environmental Health department. Permission for this application would require a full battery safety management plan to be submitted before development could take place. This would address any safety concerns and was conditioned in the application. There had been a huge leap forward in battery storage systems in recent years since the incident mentioned in Liverpool. They would also look to install water misting shields to form a barrier and limit any smoke escaping from the site in the event of a fire.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officers. In response to queries it was confirmed that:

- The site was either a grade 2 or 4 agricultural land however a classification had not been completed due to the size of the development.
- Page 177 referenced that the site involved essential community facilities. Electricity was seen as an essential community facility.
- Part of the battery safety management plan would involve the applicant to engage with Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service to agree any safety features such as fire hydrants.
- There was grid capacity within the substation which was a key locational factor.
- There were no designated areas for these types of development within the Local Plan.
- The construction period was due to take around 6 months and the developer would need to engage with Gloucestershire County Council Highways in order to manage any disruption when laying the underground cable.
- If the Committee was minded, they could add an informative for the developer to engage with the WWT to keep them updated with the battery safety management plan.

The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that any conditions applied would need to pass the 6 tests in order to be justified.

In response to Councillor Green, the Planning Officer confirmed that there were no flood lights proposed.

Councillor Green proposed to refuse the application as it directly contradicted policy CP15 of the current Local Plan. The application site was outside of the settlement boundary. Councillor Schoemaker seconded.

Councillor Green stated that it was development in the open countryside on what was possibly grade 2/4 agricultural land which would industrialise the character of the area.

The Majors and Environment Team Manager asked Councillor Green clarified that the harm identified for the refusal reason would be to the character of the area and the landscape character. Councillor Green agreed.

Councillors debated further refusal reasons.

The meeting was adjourned for a short break from 10:06 - 10:12pm.

The Chair asked Councillors Green and Schoemaker if they would be happy for the final wording of the refusal reasons to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair. They both agreed.

Councillor Prenter weighed up the comments made and stated he would vote against refusal.

Councillor Brown debated the need for renewable energy storage and expressed concerns for the access of the site as the road was single track and very narrow.

Councillor Cornell echoed Councillor Browns comments and raised concerns that if the proposal was refused then the substation could continue to be under capacity and therefore the storage would need to be nearby whilst avoiding the higher flood risk areas.

Councillor Green summed up by stating that the application was outside of the settlement boundary, on agricultural land. It would cause significant harm to the countryside, landscape character, health and wellbeing of local residents and potential harm to local businesses as well as the other reasons already discussed.

After being put to a vote there were 4 votes for and 4 votes against. On the use of the Chairs second and casting vote, the Motion to refuse permission was lost.

Councillor Cornell proposed the Officer advice to permit the application and Councillor Miles seconded.

After being put to a vote there were 4 votes for and 4 votes against. On the use of the Chairs second and casting vote, the Motion to grant permission was carried.

RESOLVED To permit the application.

The meeting closed at 10.29 pm

Chair