

I write in response to the comments of the Public Protection team.

You will be aware that this team was consulted in advance of the application. You forwarded their comments to us on 25 September 2025.

After the dog day care facility was approved, the (then) owner of an agricultural building next door obtained planning consent to convert it into a dwelling. He subsequently obtained planning consent to build a new dwelling. In both cases the Council required that he provide mitigation, in the form of a fence to 2.0 metres, to ensure that the occupants were not unacceptably disturbed by the permitted dog day care facility.

In exchanges over the last two years the Public Protection team has acknowledged that the use proposed now, in terms of number of dogs and hours of use, is the same as it was when the Council accepted the noise mitigation fence and permitted the dwelling (now NSR5) to be built.

Therefore in respect of NSR5, the Council (against the opinion of the Public Protection team) has concluded that the mitigation in place is adequate to mitigate the living conditions of NSR5.

A local planning authority must be consistent. It should not permit a dwelling next door to a temporary dog day care facility subject to mitigation, and then refuse to renew the dog day care facility on the basis that the mitigation is inadequate. The Council has concluded that the mitigation provided to enable the dwelling to be built was adequate.

Whilst Public Protection's objection still stands, their objection was also in place when the local planning authority permitted the dwelling. Planning Officers determined that the mitigation was adequate. There would be serious questions to be answered were the planning officers not to follow that decision now.

Accordingly please confirm that planning officers will be recommending approval, without any further mitigation for NSR5.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely

Tony Kernon

BSc(Hons), MRICS, FASAg