



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

**TUESDAY 4 MARCH 2025
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON
& HYBRID MEETING FACILITY**

Committee Members Present:

Councillor N Hampshire (Convener)
Councillor D Collins
Councillor J Findlay
Councillor A Forrest
Councillor N Gilbert
Councillor C McGinn
Councillor S McIntosh
Councillor K McLeod
Councillor J McMillan
Councillor C Yorkston

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor L Jardine
Councillor C McFarlane

Council Officials Present:

Mr K Dingwall, Service Manager – Planning
Ms E Taylor, Team Manager – Planning Delivery
Mr J Allan, Planner
Mr C Grilli, Service Manager – Governance
Mr S Robertson, Assistant Planner
Mr J Canty, Transportation Planning Officer
Mr J Bee, Team Manager – Development & Regeneration
Ms E Barclay, Democratic Services Assistant

Clerk:

Ms B Crichton

Visitors Present/Addressing the Committee:

Item 2: Mr R Whellans
Item 3: Mr R Whellans and Mr R MacEwen
Item 4: Mr I Troke and Ms A Schonwalder

Apologies:

Councillor C Cassini
Councillor L Allan

Declarations of Interest:

Item 4: Councillor Collins declared an interest due to: having dog walkers using her land; having been offered land by the applicant, which she had refused; and having been involved in the application site under a previous owner.

Keith Dingwall, Service Manager – Planning and Chief Planning Officer, explained a required change in the agenda order, whereby Item 3 would be heard prior to Item 2. This was because one of the tests for consideration for conservation area consent was whether the proposed redevelopment was acceptable, and this could not be decided until the planning application had been determined.

1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

a. Planning Committee, 14 January 2025

Planning Committee members agreed the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting.

b. Planning Committee, 4 February 2025

Due to a delay in producing the minutes, the minutes would be approved at the April meeting of the Planning Committee.

3. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/01050/P, ERECTION OF 14 FLATS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, 34 DIRLETON AVENUE, NORTH BERWICK

A report had been submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 24/01050/P. James Allan, Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to refuse consent.

Officers responded to questions from Councillors McLeod, Findlay, McGinn, and the Convener. Mr Allan confirmed that the height of the proposed building would be 13.9m, compared to the existing building's highest point of 13.8m; variations in the width were 19.5m to 28m for the existing and new buildings respectively, and length were 23m to 29m. He explained that the proposed parking was acceptable because, although each flat may have more than one car, the use would be less intense than an 18-bedroom hotel, and because the site was close to the town centre and good public transport links. Jon Canty, Transportation Planning Officer, added that the site access points had decreased from two to one, which would also free up some on-street parking. Mr Allan confirmed that a tree, which had been subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), had been removed at some point prior to the submission of the application on the basis that it would be replanted; the formal process had been followed, but the tree had not yet been replanted. There was also another tree on site which was subject to a TPO. Mr Allan confirmed that it was proposed that six trees would be lost, but 13 would be planted. He reported that the Landscape Officer had pointed out that no tree survey had been submitted to support the loss of any trees, and mitigating planting would be expected; as such, the Landscape Officer objected to the application.

Ronnie Whellans, applicant, spoke to the application. He said the proposal was to build high quality apartments, for which the company had a proven track record. He was confident the apartments would sit well within the North Berwick community. He pointed to a shortage of apartments within the town, which the proposals would help to address. He acknowledged the need for affordable accommodation, but felt the development was not suited for this type of

tenure, but he was willing to make the appropriate financial contribution to East Lothian Council.

Responding to a question from Councillor McLeod, Mr Whellans explained that many people in North Berwick wished to downsize from their larger homes, and pointed out that this would release larger houses for families.

Affordable housing was discussed in response to questions from Councillors McIntosh and Gilbert, and the Convener. Mr Whellans felt that a mix of affordable housing and the large and expensive apartments proposed would be difficult to achieve; thus, he would prefer to make an offsite contribution towards affordable housing. James Bee, Team Manager – Development & Regeneration, advised that the developer had not discussed the matter with the Housing Enabling Team. Although he acknowledged Mr Whellans' point about the high-end cost, the Housing Enabling Team would discuss provision of affordable housing and other methods of delivery before a commuted sum would be agreed. He explained that the flats provided would be evaluated for suitability for affordable housing, and then other provisions, such as low-cost home ownership, would be considered. An ultimate cost could not be determined until the properties had been valued, and higher property value increased developer contributions.

Responding to questions from Councillor McMillan and the Convener, Mr Whellans advised that the daylight test showed that the development would affect one window on a neighbouring building by one degree. He felt that the development would sit well on the site and was confident that the landscaping package proposed was of high quality. He advised that anything that could be recycled would be kept on site, and other materials would be recycled offsite; he was conscious of keeping the development's carbon footprint low.

Robin MacEwen spoke against the application, and advised that he lived on the adjoining site. He referred to a displayed diagram, which showed the outline of the existing building over the proposed building, and said he considered that the proposed development was too large for the site. Although the difference in height between the existing and proposed building appeared to be minimal, he pointed out that this only took into consideration the tallest point of the former Golf Hotel; he described the roofline of the existing building as having 'nooks and crannies', which allowed light to come through in various places, and which contrasted the solid mass of the proposed building. He also pointed out that the proposed building would be considerably nearer the road than the existing building, which was contrary to the character of this part of the conservation area. He was concerned that there was too little space for the proposed new trees to mature, despite mature trees also being a characteristic of the area. He was also concerned about the effect of the proposals on bats. He considered that the proposals would spoil the corner, would be out of keeping with the surrounding buildings, and that the building was too large and too close to the road in both directions.

Mr MacEwen responded to questions from Councillor McLeod. He agreed that he was unhappy with the current state of the site, however, he felt the fabric of the existing building did not look too bad. He considered that the site only needed a cleanup, and suggested that the building could be converted.

Responding to points made by the Convener about maximising use of free land when there was a desperate need for smaller accommodation in North Berwick, Mr MacEwen pointed out that the site was currently determined for use as a hotel, which would cater for many families.

Councillor McFarlane, a local member, explained she had called the application in response to the lack of accommodation for single and older people in North Berwick, and because there were many older people left in large homes which were unsuitable for adaptation. She felt that the site had sat for a long time and become derelict, and pointed out that the tourism industry had moved away from hotels and towards short-term lets.

Councillor Findlay, also a local member, agreed with the officer's recommended reasons for refusal. He also agreed that the state of the ground was terrible, but pointed out that this was the fault of the owner and could be tidied up. He thought there was too little space for parking, and commented that on-street parking was already very busy in the area. He also considered that there were too many unanswered questions on the matter of affordable housing. He disagreed with Councillor McFarlane's comments regarding tourism, and thought the town did need more hotel space, particularly when short-term lets were being lost. He would support the officer's recommendation for refusal.

Councillor McLeod remarked that people wanted to downsize their properties but stay in the area. He could not see reason to refuse the application, and considered that there would be means of agreeing an affordable housing contribution through a commuted sum. He would vote against the officer's recommendation to refuse consent.

Councillor Collins said she agreed with Councillor Findlay's comments. She commented on the significant decrease in short-term let properties, resulting in visitors being unable to find accommodation in the town. She felt that the hotel could be a viable business for use by tourists and golfers, and would support the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Forrest pointed out that small hotels on the market were not being bought, and that short-term lets had been detrimental to the hotel trade. He supported the proposals for spacious apartments, and felt this would also work for affordable housing. He would vote against the officer's recommendation.

Councillor McMillan remarked upon the difficulty of the decision. He pointed out that the design would reflect elements from the existing variety of built form in the surrounding area, and would be respectful to the finishes and architecture of neighbouring buildings. He acknowledged that the area around the application site was characterised by buildings of predominantly traditional stone construction, but also acknowledged Councillor McFarlane's points about the need for the proposed type of housing in North Berwick. He thought that the applicant would have considered the hotel's potential. He also commented that issues around bats had to be explored. On balance, he considered there to be real need for housing, and he did not consider there to be potential for significant detriment to amenity; he would therefore vote against the officer's recommendation.

Councillor McIntosh commented on the distinctive characteristic of the approach to North Berwick along Dirleton Avenue, in that the buildings were large, all quite unique, and set well back from the road. She considered that the proposals were not remotely in keeping with the conservation area, and felt that there was no point in having conservation areas if Committee members were willing to allow it to be built over per the proposals. She pointed out of National Planning Framework 4's (NPF4) directive to reuse existing buildings where possible, and she thought the existing structure was still a beautiful building. She was concerned that the argument that the site was now derelict would encourage developers to allow sites to be neglected into a state of disrepair, and commented that the current poor state was the fault of the owner. She would vote to uphold the officer's recommendation.

Councillor McGinn commented on the startling properties in the area. He would vote against the officer's recommendation because the proposals would provide several smaller properties to benefit those who wanted to downsize.

The Convener recalled his own time in the hotel trade in an old Victorian building; he commented that it was difficult to provide high quality ensuite bathrooms, which guests expected, in an older building. He felt that tourists preferred to use short-term lets or modern hotels, and said no one would invest in the building as a hotel. He pointed to other changes to the area, such as a large house which had been demolished and new buildings developed, and recalled advice that conservation areas would evolve over time. He agreed that people

wanted to retire to smaller properties. He thought that the maximisation of properties on the site was a positive aspect of the proposals, and commented that there would still be land around the building and the quality of amenity space would still be high. He thought that the loss of daylight would not be significant, and that there were real benefits to the proposals.

The Convener advised that conditions would have to be agreed with the Planning Authority. He asked the applicant whether he would be willing to carry out a bat survey, and Mr Whellans agreed. Mr Dingwall added that, as bats were a protected species, the bat survey had to be carried out before planning permission could be granted. Therefore, Committee members were required to take a vote on the current proposal; if members voted against the officer's recommendation, then he recommended that the application be continued to allow the bat survey to be undertaken. Following the bat survey, a report would be brought to the Planning Committee, at which point, members would agree whether to grant planning permission.

Responding to a question from the Convener, Mr Dingwall stressed that the following decision on the application to demolish the existing building must be taken on its own merits; even if the Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the replacement building, this was not the only factor to be considered.

Councillor Findlay proposed that the application be continued to allow a bat survey to be undertaken, and this was seconded by Councillor Collins. The Convener moved to a roll call vote on this proposal, and votes were cast as follows:

Support: 4 (Councillors Collins, Findlay, McIntosh, and McMillan)

Against: 6 (Councillors Hampshire, Forrest, Gilbert, McGinn, McLeod, and Yorkston)

Abstain: 0

The proposal to continue the application fell. The Convener therefore moved to a vote on the officer's recommendation to refuse consent. Votes were cast as follows:

Support: 3 (Councillors Collins, Findlay, and McIntosh)

Against: 7 (Councillors Hampshire, Forrest, Gilbert, McGinn, McLeod, McMillan, and Yorkston)

Abstain: 0

Decision

The Planning Committee indicated support to overturn the officer's decision to refuse consent. However, the application would be continued to a future meeting to allow a bat survey to be undertaken, and a report on the outcome of the bat survey would be brought to the Planning Committee for final determination.

2. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/01051/CAC, DEMOLITION OF BUILDING, 34 DIRLETON AVENUE, NORTH BERWICK

A report had been submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 24/01051/CAC. Mr Allan presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to refuse consent.

Councillor McIntosh asked about the process, should Scottish Ministers decide to call the application in. Mr Dingwall explained that notification to Scottish Ministers was used quite rarely and only in extreme cases. The Planning Authority would submit the plans and report,

and Scottish Ministers had a 28-day period in which to call in the application. He explained that notifications and consultations would not be undertaken, but residents could contact the DPEA to make representation. He advised that Scottish Ministers could call in and determine the application, decide to determine the application as the Planning Committee saw fit, or request a further 28-day period.

Councillor McGinn asked about the Council's enforcement powers against owners whose buildings had been allowed to slide into significant disrepair, and pointed out that such buildings could become magnets for antisocial behaviour. Mr Dingwall advised that, under Section 179 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, a Wasteland/Amenity Notice could be served where the Planning Authority was satisfied that the poor condition of a piece of land was harmful to the amenity of an area. These notices would require an owner to take steps to remedy the poor condition of the land. He advised that a developer would be contacted; the Planning Authority would not move directly to enforcement action, but enforcement action would be taken if the developer was not willing to tidy up a site. Mr Dingwall advised Committee members that they must not make their decision based on the poor state of the site, as this could encourage others to allow sites to fall into a poor state. The Convener added that, although the Council held these powers, they were expensive to use.

Councillor Findlay asked whether the owner of this property had been approached to tidy up the site. Mr Dingwall advised that there had been no complaints regarding the poor condition of the site, but agreed that it would be possible to ask for the site to be tidied up. He advised that actions would have to be agreed, and if the developer did not comply, then enforcement action would be taken. He pointed out that the Council would seek to recoup any costs incurred, and that, in his opinion, this course of action would not incur considerable cost. The Convener reiterated his concern that use of this power across the county could still incur significant cost.

Responding to a question from the Convener, Mr Allan confirmed that, despite previous consideration of alterations and extensions to the building, no acceptable scheme had been agreed with the applicant.

Mr Whellans spoke to the application. He believed that the building had not been used as a hotel since 2006, and described it as being totally unsuitable for the modern market. He advised that various investigations into upgrading the existing building had not returned a design that was fit for the modern market due to the confines of the existing building; he therefore considered the only option to be demolition and rebuild. He advised that, in response to a call from Mr Dingwall, he had tried to tidy the site, and had also boarded up windows following break-ins.

Responding to a question from the Convener, Mr Whellans advised that his company had purchased the property on the open market in 2021 from the McDonald Hotel Group; prior to this, it had effectively been used as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) since 2006.

Councillor Collins asked about the preservation and reuse of materials. Mr Whellans hoped that the façade of the building could be reused, and the internal walls would be used for materials such as hardcore.

Councillor McFarlane, local member, reported that the building had previously been used as accommodation for staff at The Marine Hotel, but said it had sat empty for a long time. She commented that it would have been ideal if someone had wanted to run the small hotel, but she also pointed out other local small hotels which had been on the market for some time and had not been purchased.

Councillor Findlay, local member, felt that the application had to be refused under NPF4 policies. He considered that reasonable efforts had not been made to retain, repair, and reuse

the building. He felt that the building's architectural design had huge landscape value, and the structure of the building was entirely sound. In terms of reuse, he suggested that the building could be made into a single house or converted into flats. He considered that the reasons used to demonstrate that it should be demolished had not been fulfilled; therefore, approval of the proposals would undermine NPF4 Policy 7, and any building in a conservation area would be at risk. He would vote in support of the officer's recommendation.

Councillor McIntosh agreed with Councillor Findlay's remarks, and commented that it was not the job of the Planning Committee to give the market what it wanted, but rather that it must be the custodian of the built environment. She highlighted the significant profit to be made from selling 14 luxury apartments, but said that the proposals would be entirely to the detriment of the conservation area. She was unconvinced that the building could not be used for smaller or fewer apartments. She reiterated that the Committee's job was to protect the townscape of the conservation area and not to assist a developer in making money. She would vote in support of the officer's recommendation.

The Convener felt the current form did not enhance the conservation area, and acknowledged that attempts to add extensions and make alterations had not come to fruition. He felt that the building would be difficult to convert into flats of reasonable proportions, which could be kept warm and suit the requirements of modern living. He felt that the building was past its best and did not lend itself well to an extension, and believed it would be better to have a modern and well-designed building which would enhance the conservation area. He supported maximising use of the land to house 14 families. He referred to other old buildings across the county having been demolished and replaced with modern buildings, and felt that overturning the officer's recommendation was the right decision for this building and site.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote on the officer's recommendation to refuse consent. Votes were cast as follows:

Support: 4 (Councillors Collins, Findlay, Gilbert, and McIntosh)

Against: 6 (Councillors Hampshire, Forrest, McGinn, McLeod, McMillan and Yorkston)

Abstain: 0

Decision

The Planning Committee indicated support to overturn the officer's decision to refuse consent. However, the application would be continued to a future meeting to allow a bat survey to be undertaken, and a report on the outcome of the bat survey would be brought to the Planning Committee for final determination. The outcome would also be subject to prior notification to Scottish Ministers.

Sederunt: Councillor Collins left the meeting.

4. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/00660/P: CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND AND OUTBUILDINGS TO USE AS A DOG EXERCISE PARK AND DOG DAY CARE BUSINESS (RETROSPECTIVE), THORNFIELD, THORNTONLOCH, INNERWICK

A report had been submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 24/00660/P. Mr Allan presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Officers responded to questions from Committee members. Responding to a question from Councillor McLeod, Mr Dingwall advised that Planning Enforcement Officers investigated complaints of condition breaches. If conditions were found to have been breached, then the Planning Enforcement Officer would usually point the breach out, seek to negotiate change, or take enforcement action, such as serving a Breach of Condition Notice.

Responding to a question from Councillor McGinn, Mr Allan confirmed that details of measures to protect and enhance biodiversity on the application site would have to be submitted to the Planning Authority within two months of the decision date; the Biodiversity Officer would confirm whether the details were suitable, and compliance would be established before the grant of planning permission in one year.

Councillor McIntosh asked whether an acceptable decibel range could be specified, and commented that this seemed subjective without a set range. Mr Allan reported that the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) had not specified a decibel level which would be harmful, but had advised that noise monitoring devices could be installed within residential properties if there were noise complaints.

Councillors Jardine and Findlay asked questions relating to compliance with conditions. Mr Allan advised that any complaints regarding operation outwith the conditioned hours, or hosting more than the allowed number of dogs, would lead to a Planning Enforcement Officer opening a case. He advised that the maximum number of dogs had been reached following consultation with the EHO. Mr Dingwall added that details of how to make a complaint were contained within the Planning Enforcement Charter, or complainants could email environment@eastlothian.gov.uk. He also outlined how a Planning Enforcement Officer might investigate a complaint. Councillor Findlay raised concern that it would be very difficult to accurately count the number of dogs on site.

The Convener asked how the movement of vehicles could be controlled on a dangerous bend and in an area of high agricultural vehicle movements. Mr Allan advised that only the applicant's vans would travel to site. Mr Canty added that Roads Officers had assumed that the gate would be opened at the start of the day and closed at the end of the day, and stated that the gate was not to be opened and closed throughout the day.

Ian Troke, applicant, spoke to the application. He outlined the procedures for dropping dogs off, whereby first van opened the gate and the last van closed the gate. He advised that there would be a maximum of 55 dogs across three vans, and the vans left the site at the same time. He reported that there was a commotion in the first five minutes after drop-off time, and then the noise calmed down. He reported that the dogs did bark, but it was very rare that there was noise from a large number of dogs. He advised that the vans arrived between 9am and 9.30am and left at 12.30pm, and the business operated only Monday to Friday. He said he was understanding of the surrounding community, and explained that barking dogs were isolated in a van to minimise disruption. He pointed out that another business nearby also hosted dogs, and, depending on the wind direction, said that this noise could sound like it was coming from his business.

Councillor Jardine asked a number of questions relating to control of noise. Mr Troke explained that the business actively discouraged barking, but conceded that the dogs were set off when someone went past; this was why customers were not allowed to visit the land. He said he would be willing to engage with EHOs about noise levels. He advised that three members of staff were on site every day; staff were aware of which dogs could cause trouble and could intervene where necessary.

Mr Troke responded to further questions from Councillors Gilbert, Forrest, and Findlay. He advised that there had been just two instances where the business had refused to continue looking after disruptive dogs. He confirmed arrangements for the vans entering and leaving

the site, which he explained did not arrive in convoy. He also confirmed that the business only operated Monday to Friday 9.00am to 12.30pm, with occasional maintenance required on Saturdays.

Responding to a point made by Councillor McMillan, Mr Dingwall agreed that recommended Condition 2 could be amended with restricted hours to reflect the business' hours of operation, if Committee members felt this was justified. Councillor McMillan suggested that the time be restricted to 9.00am to 12.30pm so that neighbours knew what times the business could operate. Mr Troke suggested that hours of 8.00am to 2.00pm would provide leeway in certain situations, such as staff being unable to catch a dog.

Audrey Schonwalder spoke against the application. She reported that a van went to the site every Saturday and Sunday, and also every afternoon; she had sent in a picture of the van to Councillors. Ms Schonwalder recounted having had more than forty happy years living in the area, and talked about a close friend who had owned the field opposite and kept a number of animals. Ms Schonwalder then recounted a tragic incident whereby her friend and her friend's dogs had died in a caravan fire in 2018, which Ms Schonwalder had witnessed. Ms Schonwalder said she had been unable to look at the field for a year because it had been so upsetting, but things had started to improve until the dog walkers had started using the site. She reported suffering from panic attacks because of the dogs' barking and fighting, following the tragic scene she had witness in 2018; these panic attacks caused serious issues with her other health conditions. She reported that her health had deteriorated since the dog walkers had started to use the site. She said that there were some days that the dogs were not loud, but most days, particularly if there was a southerly or westerly wind, they caused disturbance. She reported that, because of the noise of the dogs, she could not open her windows or go outside, and she felt trapped. She summarised that granting the application would cause a massive loss of amenity.

Councillor Jardine, local member, commended Ms Schonwalder for speaking about her experience; although some of her points were not technically planning concerns, Councillor Jardine thought the presentation showed how the business' impact on its closest neighbours. She raised some concern about ratios of staffing. She pointed out that noise travelled a considerable distance in a rural community. She welcomed the suggestion of a reduction to operating hours, and the applicant's commitment to engage with neighbours; she offered her assistance in meeting mediation. She pointed out that others were impacted as well as Ms Schonwalder, although felt her situation was worth note.

The Convener said he had been made aware of concerns over the operation of the facility. Although officers recommended approval, he felt that the situation must be monitored carefully to ensure the business operated in line with conditions. He felt the site would have to be visited regularly, and anyone adversely affected by its operation would need to contact the Council. Any evidence gathered would be considered in one year when the applicant applied for planning permission once again. He agreed that the hours of operation should be restricted. He also commented that businesses in the rural community had to minimise their impact. He would support the application on the basis that conditions would restrict the site's to between 8.00am and 2.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Councillor McMillan said he had listened closely to the applicant and objector, and highlighted the importance of good management and engagement. He pointed out that Ms Schonwalder would be able to complain if the site's operation caused a disturbance. He felt that the hours should be restricted to 9.00am to 1.00pm to facilitate the business' core operating hours and provide leeway for emergencies. The Convener suggested that hours be restricted to 8.30am to 1.00pm.

Councillor McGinn was sure that the facility would be well used, and commented on the importance of such facilities for the welfare of dogs who may otherwise be left at home. He

was aware of the service and its reputation, and hoped that the business would use the temporary grant of planning permission to prove that it was going to be a good neighbour. He also asked the applicant to note the concerns raised. He would support the application.

Councillor Findlay commented that the purpose of the Planning Committee was not to create business opportunities, but was meant to support residents; he felt that the proposals were a step too far for residents. He felt that the Committee must ensure that the land was not let out to other people on weekends, and he would not support the proposals to protect the amenity of the existing residents. The Convener responded that, should the application be refused and go to appeal, then it may not be possible to restrict the hours of operation. He felt it would be prudent to grant the application on the basis of restricted hours, and to monitor the situation for a year.

Following comments from various Committee members about restricting hours and use of the fields, Mr Dingwall suggested an amendment to wording of recommended Condition 2, noted below. This amendment to recommended Condition 2 was formally proposed by Councillor Findlay and seconded by Councillor McMillan. The Convener moved to a roll call vote on the amended condition, and Committee members unanimously voted in support of this amendment.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote on the officer's recommendation to grant consent and votes were cast as follows:

Support: 8 (Councillors Hampshire, Forrest, Gilbert, McGinn, McIntosh, McLeod, McMillan, and Yorkston)

Against: 1 (Councillor Findlay)

Abstain: 0

Decision

Planning permission was granted, subject to the following:

- 1 The use of the dog walking area shall be for a temporary period of one year from the date of any grant of consent to allow any complaints that may arise due to noise to be monitored and assessed.

Reason:
In order to protect the amenity of nearby residential properties.
- 2 The external dog walking area shall only be used between 0830-1300 hours, Monday to Friday (inclusive). The dog walking area shall not be used at any other time.

Reason:

In order to protect the amenity of nearby residential properties.
- 3 The total number of dogs permitted on-site at any one time, including dogs housed in other temporary accommodation such as a vehicle or shelter, shall be limited to 55 dogs.

Reason:
In order to protect the amenity of nearby residential properties.
- 4 Within 2 months of the date of this decision notice a Noise Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The Noise Management Plan will outline the measures to be taken to minimise the impacts of noise from dog barking arising from the use of the proposed dog walking area. The measures outlined in the Noise Management Plan shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason:

In order to protect the amenity of nearby residential properties.

- 5 Details of measures to protect and enhance biodiversity on the application site shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority within 2 months of the date of this decision. The measures as so approved shall be implemented and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity on the site and within the surrounding area.

Signed

Councillor Norman Hampshire
Convener of the Planning Committee