



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Thursday 8 July 2021 commencing at 10.00 am.**

### **PRESENT MEMBERSHIP:**

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Chris McFarling
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Graham Morgan
Cllr Alastair Chambers	Cllr Dominic Morris
Cllr Linda Cohen	Cllr Gill Moseley
Cllr Bernard Fisher	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Mark Mackenzie-Charrington	Cllr Susan Williams

**Apologies:** Cllr Paul Baker and Andy Birchley

### **1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON**

On calling for nominations for the Chairmanship of the Committee, Cllr Mackenzie-Charrington was proposed and duly seconded. There being no other nominations, the Committee

**Resolved**

**That Cllr Mackenzie-Charrington be elected as Chairman for the ensuing civic year.**

### **2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRPERSON**

On calling for nominations for the Vice-Chairmanship of the Committee, Cllr Hale was proposed and duly seconded. Councillor Fisher was also proposed and duly seconded. On being put to the vote, Councillor Hale was duly appointed as the Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee

**Resolved**

**That Cllr Hale be elected as Vice-Chairman for the ensuing civic year.**

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

#### **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions were received.

#### **5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

No Members questions were received.

#### **6. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Resolved**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 18th March 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

#### **7. LIMEKILN FARM MIDDLE LYPIATT STROUD GL6 7LR APPLICATION REFERENCE: 20/0056/STMAJW (DISTRICT REFERENCE S.20/2711/CM)**

A summary of the application was presented by Nick Bainton, Senior Planning Officer aided by a power point presentation. (A copy of the presentation is attached to the signed minute book)

It was explained that this was a planning application, reference number: 18/0065/CWMAJM had been made for the proposed use of field as pet cemetery. The use of the site was for a waste transfer station for the temporary storage of clinical waste; retention of 2no. Cremators for clinical waste burning (ABP Cat 1 material – domestic pets) and extended office building, together with associated works, at Lime Kiln Farm, Middle Lypiatt, Stroud, Gloucestershire.

The various elements of the application were described as the following:

- Pet cemetery: In planning terms, the land use was classified as a landfill. In real terms, this would involve the burial of fully combusted ashes in the ground. There would be associated minor memorials if requested by owners. The use of the land for waste disposal dictates that the proposal was a county matter.
- Waste Transfer Station (WTS): there was currently temporary storage of clinical waste: animals prior to cremation and bandages, coverings, etc. The proposal allowed for that to continue on site. It was noted this had been occurring in excess of 20 years.
- Cremators: The existing Stroud District Council permission limited the use to specified cremators. The use of the replacement cremator represented a technical breach of condition of that permission.
- Buildings: No further built forms were proposed. It was noted that no visible changes were proposed to the site. The buildings and ancillary equipment had been on site for a period exceeding 4 years.

The Committee were referred to the plan of the application site. The sites proximity to the surroundings towns and villages were explained in detail. The site was

situated on a prominence in the landscape between a number of valleys, but due to the existing mature vegetation and the topography, there were no far reaching views of the site.

In terms of the block plan, it was explained that the application site was central to the plan, which contained the reception building, storage building, incinerator building and field where the proposed cemetery would be located. Members were advised that the public highway ran north to south past the site, it was essentially a rural lane. The access was shown as were the two public footpaths, which do not use the access road because they terminate either end of it. The committee noted the two closest dwellings were Little Limekilns and The Limekilns.

Members noted at slide 5 the view was looking to the north from the end of the access, to the left was the office building, central was the main parking area and to the right was the storage building. The Committee were provided with numerous photographs of the site and the surrounding area during the course of the presentation, as it was not appropriate under Covid regulations to conduct a site visit.

Slide 6 displayed a photograph of the incinerator building, with the access road leading off east to the left. The view to the west, where footpath 7 began towards the direction of Stroud was displayed at slide 7.

Slide 8 showed the view from The Lime Kilns, with the top of the incinerator building visible. It was noted the incinerator was undertaking a burn cycle at this time and there was no visible smoke.

At slide 9 the view from the public footpath to the west of the site was shown and the Lime Kilns was visible to the left of the picture. Members were advised that the application site was behind the large clump of trees.

Slide 10 displayed the view along the public footpath to the west of the site, looking north, it was noted the mature hedgerow was continuous. Slide 11 was the view from the access road, into the field where the proposed cemetery would be located, it was explained that the path was not a designated footpath.

Slide 12 – 16, gave various views of the field and the junction of the access track with the public highway, looking east. The public footpath began on the other side of the road. Views of the access road looking west from the public highway were clearly displayed in various directions.

Slide 17 showed the view from public footpath looking North West in the direction of the application site. This footpath joined the public highway south east of the site and north of Middle Lypiatt Manor.

It was highlighted at slide 18 there was limited view in the distance from a gap in the hedge along a minor road running east to west from Middle Lypiatt Manor. Slide 19 showed the view towards the site from Middle Lypiatt Manor. Grade 1 listed building.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

The case officer concluded that planning permission should be granted for the proposed use of field as pet cemetery. Including the use of site as waste transfer station for the temporary storage of clinical waste; retention of 2no. Cremators for clinical waste burning (ABP Cat 1 material – domestic pets) and extended office building, together with associated works, for the reasons summarised in paragraphs 7.54 to 7.56 of the report.

The Chairman invited the following registered speakers to address the Committee:

**Objecting: Mr Richard Claridge:**

*"I live in Middle Lypiatt House, so I am in close proximity to the application site. The application is supported by a transport statement which acknowledges that access to Middle Lypiatt and the site is via a single access lane and the lane to Bisley Road are 2.4m to 2.6m wide and 2.5m to 3m respectively, with limited and tight verges and passing places.*

*HGV's are restricted and there are numerous signs to this effect and it is very narrow and windy lane, which is frequented by walkers as well as horses and other animals. Passing on this lane is already very difficult, even for small cars. It is a very quiet road and it relates to vehicles, befitting its characteristics and its location.*

*The application proposes that traffic to the site will effectively double, this is against the sites current use, which as noted and acknowledged in the application is in breach of planning approvals.*

*It is therefore entirely reasonable to assume that the application would in fact cause a far greater increase in traffic when considered against the smaller use of the lanes were the site currently in compliance with planning. IT is this greater increase that should be relevant to the current application, not against the use which is in breach of planning.*

*This significant increase also assumes that the applicant's assumptions regarding the use of the site and additional traffic to LimeKiln farm are correct and not understated and we have serious concerns about whether these assumptions will prove to be correct. If they are understated, there would be no redress and the impact on residents and others would be very significant. There is no proposed mitigation. We note that the applicant proposes a new car park in addition to the current parking, so the applicant is evidently contemplating visitors far in excess to what the transport statement estimates.*

*The application also estimates one burial a day, which in addition to other visitors will be unrestricted, as well as trucks, HGVs and other vehicles going to and from the site implies a greater increase in traffic than the application admit. We therefore have serious concerns that the traffic on this narrow single access road will increase significantly and the road is not equipped for this.*

*The Waste Core Strategy (WCS19) explains that "development would have an adverse impact on the highway network which cannot be mitigated will not be*

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

*permitted” The increase in traffic will make the lanes dangerous to other users. It is not appropriate in the context of the site location and its tight single access, therefore it should not be permitted.*

*The site lies in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and great weight should also be given to that and the application should not be permitted”*

**Objecting: Jacqueline Kroft:**

*“There is a lot of data about the chemical impact euthanasia chemicals Phenytoin/Pentobarbital have as its cause’s rapid euthanasia through multiple pathways, including brain death, cessation of breathing.*

*Imagine the slow drip of this drug combination and antibiotics being released daily from the graves of hundreds and eventually thousands of pets into Stroud and our surrounding villages. Middle Lypiatt is on a higher altitude and there is only way for the rainwater to go and this is into our pastures, many of which are directly next to the proposed site and water systems. Lime Kiln is 161metres higher than Stroud, the water ways from this elevation is large.*

*Please pay attention to the ad on the internet from Stroud Cremation Service – “Award Winning Service”- that they trusted by 60,000 + families.*

*That is a lot of pets, a lot of graves and a lot of Phenytoin/Pentobarbital and antibiotics reaching our local waterways that will contaminate animals grazing on local pastures and human drinking water.*

*There are a large number of kidney cancer patients in the area, of which I found out first hand by my husbands death of kidney cancer.*

*My father was a pollution expert practicing pollution control from the early 60’s. He always tried to find affordable ways for companies to prevent contamination of the environment.*

*If we must have pet graves then it must be on a lower altitude and bodies must be prevented from leaking toxic chemicals. Contamination needs to be contained and needs to be lower down, and it’s so dangerous at LimeKiln Farm.*

*It’s our responsibility to protect the environment and our health”*

**Objecting: Daniel Burgon:**

*“I am speaking against Time Right’s planning proposal at Lime Kiln Farm and I intend to focus on the irreversible and tragically damaging impact it will have on its surrounding landscape, it will have an irreversible impact.*

*Lypiatt is one of the most beautiful, untouched and idyllic areas within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is loved and enjoyed not only by its residents but by the countless visitors it receives every day in the form of walkers from*

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

*around the Stroud District and even further afield. Lots of people walked the area during the pandemic.*

*As Lypiatt lies within the AONB it is given the greatest level of protection possible. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains in paragraph 172 that “Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in ... Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection.”*

*Lime Kiln Farm is a farm. It always has been a farm and when the incinerator was first built it was by a local farming family for small-scale agricultural purposes and not intended to be an industrial waste disposal operation. If this had been expressed from the outset then it would certainly have been rejected. It should not be granted, as this is a slow and disingenuous move to industrial use.*

*Lime Kiln Farm and its surrounding land’s use as a farm, with grazing land for sheep, is in line with its surroundings. A pet cemetery is not in line with its surroundings. This represents a clear breach of the policy outlined from the NPPF above for this development neither ‘conserves’ nor in any way ‘enhances’ the ‘landscape and scenic beauty’ of the area; in fact, with the expansion of their offices and car park and the change of use of a four-acre agricultural field into a pet cemetery it does the complete opposite: it causes great harm to the ‘landscape and scenic beauty’ of the area. Therefore the policy laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it absolutely clear that this cannot be permitted. The only conceivable benefit of this development would be to the corporate interests of Time Right Ltd. at the expense of everybody else and walkers in Lypiatt. As a resident, it is very visible and it is not in keeping with the local landscape.*

*Waste Core Strategy policy WCS14 also reads:*

*“Proposals for waste development within or affecting the setting of the Cotswolds ... Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:*

- There is a lack of alternative sites not affecting the AONB to serve the market need;’*

*However, the applicant has not demonstrated that there is no alternative site for this use not in the AONB. The applicant has also not demonstrated that there is a prevailing market need. Thank you.”*

**Agent: Chris Wilkes:**

*“The application before you seeks permission to retain two incinerators located in the agricultural barn to the south of the unnamed lane for use of disposal of animal remains, the use of whole site as Waste Transfer Station for the temporary storage of clinical waste, retention of extended office building and change of use of the field parcel to a pet cemetery. I would also highlight that there is an existing consent for incinerators on the site, which have since been replaced by more modern, cleaner models.*

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

*Despite the small scale of the proposals and the existing established use, there have been a number of objections from local residents. The concerns raised in respect of highway safety, pollution and impacts upon the surrounding AONB. In response, I would make the point that the objections raised do not reflect the findings of the specialist consultees. It is noted that there have been a number of photos submitted as part of these objections showing smoke being omitted from the cremators, whilst the applicant has noted and investigated the cause, the events are being dealt with as part of the environmental licence which the site holds. I would also add that these incidents were caused by human error and occurred on only a hand full of occasions over a number of years.*

*The proposed pet cemetery is expected to be a very small part of the ongoing business, the number of visitors is expected to be negligible and estimated based on other UK sites.*

*In terms of planning policy, the NPPF and Stroud District Plan encourage expansion of existing employment sites. Furthermore, the Local Plan is also supportive of farm diversification for appropriate uses. The adopted Gloucestershire Waste Local Plan and Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy are also supportive of waste developments which do not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenity.*

*In summary, the proposal does tick all of these boxes:*

- It will support the continued employment of several members of the local community, with wider contributions to the local economy through the operational needs of the business and third party businesses*
- Provides a local and valuable service to local veterinary clinics and members of the public*
- and, is located in a relatively isolated location which results in no adverse impact upon the surrounding local residents.*

*With regard to technical considerations, the application is accompanied by a comprehensive suite of supporting work, and the application is presented to you with the support of all technical consultees on the application, including the Environment Agency, the Council's Landscape Consultant, the County Air Quality Advisor, the Highways Authority, the Landscape and Visual Architect Consultant and indeed your planning officer.*

*In summary therefore the proposals are fully aligned with all levels of planning policy insofar as it would provide an acceptable expansion of the existing business which operates from the site. All technical constraints have been carefully addressed by the applicant and the application is supported by all technical consultees and your officer. I would therefore urge you to support the application."*

**County Councillor for Minchinhampton, Chalford, Brimscombe & Thrupp:**  
**Chloe Turner:**

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

*“Good morning, I’m grateful for the opportunity to speak briefly in relation to this application, which concerns a site in the outer reaches of my division of Minchinhampton. I would like to echo the comments of my predecessor, Cllr Rachel Smith, in her objection to this application and the proposed further industrialisation of a site that sits within the Cotswold National Landscape.*

*I’m grateful to the Senior Planning Officer for his in-depth examination of the application and for his helpful clarification of various points to date. However, I would have liked to see a business plan for the applicant’s proposed new operations at Limekiln, because without that it is difficult to see why a national cemetery operator could have a commercial interest in a new activity in Middle Lypiatt that is only proposed to generate 2 burials per calendar month, and of course the level of activity has a profound impact on the major factors on which the decision must be made: transport movements, water and air quality impacts.*

*I would echo the comments of Stroud District Council in requesting that “the assessment of this application should carefully consider the impact of any increased vehicular movements, over and above the use of the local highway network and in particular consider the potential conflict to amenity users”, walkers and horse riders particularly with a public right of way commencing adjacent to the site. Also the request from the district council for a Ground Water Risk Assessment, given that the Senior Contaminated Land Officer at the district council advises that the site is located on a principal aquifer, and that there are private water supplies within 500m of the site. The catchment for the site spills down to The Heavens, an area widely used by families whose children play in the streams – I note the Environment Agency’s comments and that the applicant will need to abide by the Regulatory Position Statement regarding the burial of pet ashes, which will need to be enforced if permission is granted.*

*Finally, in the event that the committee is minded to follow the officer’s recommendation, I note and greatly support the advice of the GCC Principal Ecologist for conditions to secure specific landscape & ecology mitigation measures and the control of excavation and external lighting, also the GCC Landscape and Visual Architect’s recommendation that these conditions be strengthened, with regard to details of the parking area, new gates and walls and proposed headstones – I am pleased to see these reflected in the Conditions (although not the gates and walls), and trust that all of these would be carefully enforced. I would also like to see a specific condition requiring that only cremated remains (as opposed to carcasses, the burial of which carries a higher risk profile) will be buried on site, and that no cremated remains will be brought to the site to be buried from the group’s other sites (not all of which have a permit for burial - any additional deliveries would clearly have an impact on the transport assessment)”.*

The Chairman invited questions from Members following the presentation.

The Committee entered into questions.

Councillor Fisher wished to know if the pet graves would be marked and what was the visibility. The Senior Planning Officer referred members to Condition 15, page 62 of the report which clearly stated that memorials would be laid flat and should not be any higher than 10cm above ground level.

Councillor Awford asked if the Environment Agency (EA) and public health had raised any concerns. Members were advised that Public Health were consulted and they had raised no objection to the application, as confirmed at paragraph 6.6, page 41 of the report. In addition, the EA had stipulated that only full combusted ashes could be interred on the site and any pollutants would be removed from the residual ashes, their response was available in details at paragraph 6.5, page 40 of the report.

At this point Councillor Vines declared that his Grandfather had previously bought land in Middle Lypiatt. He wishes to know how the graves would be dug. Members were advised that it was a superficial burial of the remains, which equated to 3-5% of combusted ash. Therefore only a small hole would be required and this could be dug by hand with a shovel.

Councillor McFarling wish to confirm that there were no burials of physical carcasses and questioned the emissions. It was noted that it was only ashes, the carcasses were cremated on site and there was a condition to prevent carcasses being buried directly. In terms of emissions into the atmosphere, it was reported they were within the lawful amounts permitted. The Senior Planning Officer reminded the Committee in planning terms the concern would be was it acceptable to have that use, in that building.

Councillor McFarling also wished to know the number of interments that could take place on the site. The Committee were informed that this could be three burials per month. Councillor McFarling questioned its viability based on this figure and remarked that it was different to what was within the report. The Senior Planning Officer explained that number of cremations undertaken during the day was dependent on the incinerator capability and storage space available. Councillor McFarling felt there was potential for congestion, including pedestrian traffic and horse riders, as all would have a deleterious impact on the access road and will undoubtedly be harmful to local residents.

In addition, he wished to know if there were any private water supplies within 500m of the application site. It was explained that the EA lead on water and they were content with the application as confirmed within their technical advice. Members were advised that in terms of pollution control regimes, Stroud Environmental Health could include conditions for water monitoring on the Environmental Permit if they wished to.

Councillor Chambers wished to know if it was a family business, as he had undertaken his own research and found that it was part of a much larger company who was not registered at that address. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that it was a family business operating on site and that Condition 3 clearly stated that. He also advised the committee that the incinerators on site could only do two burns

per day, and that was also limited by the length of the working day. Members were informed that the application had been submitted by 'Time Right Ltd' at the Lypiatt address.

Councillor Chambers felt that the application should clearly state whether it was a local family business or national company. On the advice of the Legal representative, the agent was asked to confirm the status. Mr Wilks confirmed that it was a family owned business, which was part of a larger company but Lime Kiln Farm was an independent family business.

Councillor Chambers referred to Companies House, as he felt it could give rise to precedent. Once again he questioned who the business belonged too. The Committee were advised that the application was by Time Right Limited, based at Lypiatt in Stroud. Members were reminded that the Committee were there to consider if it was appropriate to incinerate and bury the ashes on site. It was noted that the EA and other statutory consultees had no objection to the application operating on the site. Councillor Chambers disagreed with the Planning Officer, he felt that the technical consultees had based their advice on incorrect information.

The Principal Lawyer reminded the Committee that under planning legislation, anyone could apply for planning permission anywhere, regardless of where they resided.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that Condition 2 limited what the applicant could do and the development being applied for was quite clear. In addition Condition 3 stated that no external waste could be dealt with on the site. Members were reminded that it was not possible to condition 'what if's' it was only possible to condition what was before the Committee.

Councillor Tracey wished to know if it was just domestic pets that would be cremated on site and if there was much smoke. It was confirmed that it would only be small domestic animals, such as cats, dogs, guinea pigs, etc. and there was no smoke, this was detailed at paragraph 6.1 of the report.

Councillor Cohen questioned the business plan and asked whether it should be included within the application. She also asked what was the expected numbers of people that would visit a pet cemetery. The Senior Planning Officer explained that business plan were not required to consider a planning application and Highways had been consulted in relation to the traffic assessment and they had not raised any concerns either.

Councillor Fisher referred to WCS14 in relation to the Cotswold AONB, and that applications should only be granted if there were a lack of alternate site. He felt there were alternative sites in the local area.

Councillor Brown felt that a site visit would have been helpful and questioned why it had not taken place. Members were advised that under normal circumstances a site visit would have taken place, however Covid regulations were still in place. Officers advised the Committee that there was no legal requirement to conduct a

site visit. Given the transport logistics involved if members were to use their own vehicles or the use of coach to social distance members it was not considered appropriate at this time, given the volume of traffic this would involve and the climate change considerations.

The Principal Lawyer advised the Committee that it was within their gift if they wished to defer the application to undertake a site visit at this stage.

Councillor Williams remarked that she also lived locally and was aware of the lanes and questioned the number of visitors to the site. Members were advised that a traffic assessment had been undertaken and Highways had raised no objection to the application. In addition the transport assessment had factored in visits to the graves. It was noted that there would only be the employee's vehicles on site and vans delivering the carcasses, so there were no parking concerns either.

Members requested in the future, site visits are undertaken.

During the questions, members were reminded that the Stroud application was separate to the GCC application and height of the flue had already been consented too. The height of the chimney flue was detailed in paragraph 2.44 of the report. It was noted that the total height of the building was 8.5m.

Councillor Chambers asked in terms of enforcement, if the levels changed would it be investigated. The Senior Planning Officer explained his role in relation to enforcement and if the levels were found to change, the County Council would be responsible for undertaking the investigation.

Councillor Hale referred to paragraph 2.78 of the report and questioned the storage of carcasses. It was explained that control mechanisms would be in place for the washing down and disinfecting of vehicles if the application were permitted.

Councillor McFarling proposed that the application be deferred at this stage for a site visit to be undertaken.

Councillor Moseley felt that a site visit would have been useful, however the photographs provided in the officer presentation had proven useful. She made reference to the leylandi hedge and the brambles and wondered if there was a condition for the continuation of screening or hedging. The Committee were informed that there was recommendation to do so by the technical consultees and the context of the photo was to illustrate the view. It was not possible to condition the leylandi trees as they were not part of the site. However Condition 17, at the request of the County Ecologist stipulated that no hedges should be removed.

The Chairman recapped there were a number of interesting questions on many levels relating to highways, the environment, inert ashes and the risk to the water courses, etc. He felt that it was not possible to know what the number of people visiting the site would be in ten years.

Councillor Fisher referred to the Principal Lawyer's advice regarding deferral for a site visit and requested a site visit once the Covid regulations had been lifted.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Councillor Awford was sympathetic to this request but questioned what the reasons were for deferral.

The Principal Lawyer advised the Committee that reasons for deferral needed to be clear. Councillor Fisher felt that WCS14 was a reason for deferral. Other members wished to visit the site to see the highway for them and questioned the water and pollution impacts.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that if the application were to be deferred for site visit, then application could only be determined on those points, WCS 14: the impact on the AONB, alternative sites, highways, water and pollution. The Senior Planning Officer reiterated there had been no objections from the technical consultees to any of the points raised.

Councillor Vines felt the Committee was duty bound to make a decision, as this could be deemed as non-determination and the applicant could then request an appeal on those grounds. Councillor McFarling seconded Councillor Fisher's request for deferral for a site visit to be undertaken. On being put to the vote, the motion for deferral was lost (4 in favour, 7 against).

At this juncture the committee adjourned for a short break (12:20pm). Councillor Cohen had to leave the meeting at this stage.

The Committee reconvened at 12:30pm and entered into debate.

Councillors Chambers felt the photographs of the hedgerows gave a false impression of the site, as the view would be different in the Autumn/Winter and the application would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area and the AONB. He reiterated his concerns in relation to the application being a large multinational business based in York and not a local family business.

Councillor McFarling felt the application would have an impact on the narrow roads and the impact of visitors would have a cumulative impact and cause harm to the AONB.

Councillor Hale remarked he could see no reason to refuse the application and he fully supported it.

Councillor Fisher objected to the development in the AONB, he had no issue with the cremation part but felt the AONB should be treated with respect and there were alternative sites available.

Councillor Vines proposed that permission be granted, subject to the strengthening on Condition 15 and a minimum/maximum depth be stipulated depending on the ground conditions. Councillor Tracey supported Councillor Vines' proposal.

Councillor McFarling asked if a condition could be applied in relation to external lighting. It was confirmed that the County Ecologist comments on lighting were included within Condition 10.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Councillor Fisher proposed a refusal of the application on the basis of WCS 14 and highways grounds. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Brown. On being put to the vote, this motion was lost (6 in favour and 7 against).

Councillor Vines' proposal to grant the application, subject to an amendment to the minimum depth being 12 inches at Condition 15, this was seconded by Councillor Tracey. On being put to the vote, the application was granted (7 in favour and 6 against).

The Planning Committee therefore:

**Resolved**

**That planning permission was GRANTED for the proposed use of field as pet cemetery. Use of site as a waste transfer station for the temporary storage of clinical waste; retention of 2no. cremators for clinical waste burning (ABP Cat 1 material – domestic pets and extended office building, together with associated works, for the reasons summarised in paragraphs 7.54 to 7.56 of the report.**

**8. ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

During the discussion, members questioned the status of the Clearwell Quarry application. Officers agreed to clarify the position with the enforcement report and report back to the Committee in due course.

**Resolved**

**That the report be noted.**

**9. DELEGATED DECISIONS REPORT**

**Resolved**

**That the report be noted**

**CHAIRPERSON**

Meeting concluded at 12.56 pm

This page is intentionally left blank