



The Old Courthouse,
Jaycroft Road,
Burnham on Sea,
TA8 1LE

13th October 2026

To: All Members of the Planning Committee

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED TO ATTEND a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** to be held on **19th October 2026** in the Council Chamber, Old Courthouse, Jaycroft Road, TA8 1LE at **6.30 pm** for the purpose of transacting the business set out in the agenda below.

Please note that vehicular access is now via Mendip Way, TA8 1GA.

what3words: ///dimension.reworked.loved

All members of the public are welcome to attend.

Building doors will be open at 6:15pm

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E Dutton".

Elaine Dutton
Deputy Town Clerk

Please contact the Town Council reception (01278 788088) if you need further information on this agenda.

Members of the Planning Committee

Councillor P. Clayton
Councillor G. Gudka
Councillor A. Matthews
Councillor L. Millard
Councillor S. Perry
Councillor B. Vickers

Councillor J. Flurry
Councillor A. Hendry (Chair)
Councillor B. Metcalfe
Councillor P. Mills
Councillor C. Searing

Public participation

A public participation session will now be held before the meeting starts. Anyone wishing to speak on any matters is encouraged to give notice of the request and subject matter to the Town Clerk no later than midday on the last working day prior to the meeting. Public participation shall be restricted to the public participation session, unless directed otherwise by the Chair. In accordance with standing orders the public participation time will not exceed 15 minutes in total with no individual speaker exceeding 3 minutes.

Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

19th October 2026

- 532.0.P26 To receive apologies for absence**
- 533.0.P26 To receive any declarations of interest on items included on this agenda**
- 534.0.P26 To receive and approve the minutes of the Planning meeting held on 6th October 2026**
- 535.0.P26 Matters arising from previous minutes**
- 536.0.P26 To consider response to correspondence received**
536.1 To note a letter received from a resident raising concerns regarding commercial development on the edge of town.
- 537.0.P26 To consider the following Planning Applications, copies of which are available from: https://sdc.somerset.gov.uk/planning_online**
- 537.1.P26 Planning application number: 11/26/00080/TTE**
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension to the rear and dormer extension to first floor
Location: 4 Brunel's Way, Highbridge
sdc.somerset.gov.uk/planning_online/GetDetails?app=11/26/00080
- 537.2.P26 Planning application number: 11/26/00081/TTE**
Proposal: Proposed roof extension to provide habitable space
Location: 8 Adams Close, Highbridge
sdc.somerset.gov.uk/planning_online/GetDetails?app=11/26/00081
- 538.0.P26 To consider a pavement license application at BOS Café, 54 High Street, Burnham-on-Sea**
- 539.0.P26 Date of next meeting**
The next meeting of the Planning Committee is scheduled for 2nd November 2026 at 6.30 pm.



**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on 6th
October 2026 in the Council Chamber, The Old Courthouse,
Jaycroft Road, Burnham-on-Sea at 6.30 pm**

Present: Councillors P. Clayton, A. Hendry (Chair), L. Millard, P. Mills, S. Perry, C. Searing, B. Vickers

In attendance: E. Dutton (Deputy Town Clerk) and three members of the public

Public Participation: There were no representations made

523.0.P26 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Gudka and Matthews.

524.0.P26 To receive any declarations of interest on items included on this agenda

There were no declarations of interest.

525.0.P26 To receive and approve the minutes of the Planning meeting held on 21st September 2026

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee, held on 21st September 2026, were presented by the Chair.

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 21st September 2026 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

526.0.P26 Matters arising from previous minutes

There were no matters arising.

527.0.P26 To consider response to correspondence received

527.1 To appoint members to review the Draft Somerset Heritage at Risk Register

Members were invited to volunteer to review the Draft Somerset Heritage at Risk Register. No members wished to undertake the review. Cllr Perry suggested that the document be placed on the Town Council's website to enable the community to review and comment.

528.1.P26 Planning application number: 11/26/00068/LE

Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission 11/25/00015 (change of use of first floor from restaurant/managers accommodation



to holiday let and 4no. bed house in multiple occupation (HMO)) to amend the approved plans listed in schedule A to include a dedicated rear access to first floor holiday flats

Location: 75 High Street, Burnham-on-Sea

Resolved to support the application, as the rear access door is required and appropriately located. The Committee also requests that the Local Planning Authority note the shortage of refuse storage and the incorrect reference to parking arrangements, given that no parking is provided.

528.2.P26 Planning application number: 11/26/00079/LE

Proposal: Proposed conversion of dwelling and detached garage/store to form 2no. dwellings

Location: 28 Rectory Drive, Burnham-on-Sea

Resolved to support this application as the site is of sufficient size, the proposal does not adversely affect neighbouring properties, and appropriate parking provision is included.

529.0.P26 To consider an application Variation of Premises License at 33 High Street, Burnham-on-Sea

Resolved to support this application.

530.0.P26 The following applications are to note only:

11/26/00072/TTE - 4 Isleport Lane, Highbridge

Proposal: certificate of lawfulness for the proposed change of use from a C3 dwelling house to a C4 HMO for up to 6 non-related residents. The application was noted.

531.0.P26 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on 19th October 2026.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Burnham on Sea

Somerset

TA8 1 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Rt Hon Steve Reed OBE MP
Minister for Housing, Communities & Local Government
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

1 October 2026

RESIDENTIAL IMPACTS OF 'EDGE OF TOWN' SUPERMARKETS – A CASE STUDY

I live next to a mid-size, 'edge of town' Tesco supermarket. When I bought my house in 2004, the store was there, but it was smaller, hidden behind a mature woodland screen and all external operations (deliveries and traffic) were managed away from existing housing on the 'edge of town' side of the store. The only issues we faced were rubbish from the site and shoplifters using our road as an escape route. The store was then significantly expanded with works completed in 2012.

From the start of expansion to date, we have faced a constant battle with the Developers, Tesco and the Local Authority. As the closest impacted resident (until 2017 when a further 17 houses were added to our Close), I have been at the forefront of in-store, Tesco Head Office and Council liaison. I use the store, my daughter worked there before and during University and I am not a NIMBY. However, after living with this expanded operation for over 10 years, and in light of national debate about increased development across the UK, I would like to bring to your attention the risks with 'edge of town' commercial developments and their potential impacts on existing residents.

I will provide the background to my experience, highlight my view of the Pros and Cons of these 'edge of town' developments and offer some ideas for planning consideration (some of which have been successfully implemented here).

Background

An application to expand the Burnham on Sea Tesco store, which would result in all traffic / store operations being brought considerably closer to existing dwellings¹, was submitted in late 2004. After a lengthy consultation period and some minor changes to the plan, the application was referred to the Secretary of State for determination and a Public Inquiry. Despite strong representation by residents and environmental groups, permission was granted in 2009, with 7 out of the 20 Planning Conditions imposed on the Developer and Tesco aimed at protecting residents. Work commenced in late 2011 and was concluded in 2012.

The very first Developer activity that took place on site was the removal of the established woodland screen that shielded houses from the original store, thus exposing residents to the full impact of the works. This green screen was replaced at the very end of the build by what was described by Tesco

¹ From over 100m to 20m.

representatives as “a substantial landscape bund” but was in fact a 1m mound of earth with a few trees and bushes that did (and still does) little to mitigate the impacts of the revised layout.

In 2013, after many months of living with the impacts of the approved development, I presented a case in person to the Development Committee of Sedgemoor District Council (now part of the Somerset Unitary Council). My evidence-based approach was as follows:

- I bought a house next to a small Tesco store that operated quietly and was hidden from view;
- I did not object to the expansion ‘in principle’ but I did have concerns about the revised layout – especially the noise and light risks;
- It felt like I was now living next to a 24 / 7 industrial facility;
- Post development support by *specific* council staff was good but took considerable effort;
- I sought resolution not compensation.

As a result of my actions, several early changes were made on site:

- A 24 / 7 accessible public recycling facility 50m from houses (originally approved to be 20m) was removed to stop constant unsociable hours use and harmful waste build up;
- An open-bar yard gate was replaced with a solid one, to dampen yard noise and prevent rubbish egress;
- The store external lighting scheme was changed to reduce constant overnight illumination of houses;
- A 6ft fence was erected along part of the access road, and additional trees were planted, to reduce headlight strike on houses.

In addition, after considerable effort by residents, a Breach of Condition Notice was issued to Tesco by the Council due to repeated delivery curfew hours infringements. Tesco stated they would plead not guilty if the case went to court so, despite the evidence, the Council withdrew the Notice. Tesco did however voluntarily change the AM delivery start time from 0700 to 0730.

The Benefits of Edge of Town Supermarkets

Notwithstanding the fact that poor site layout here had an immediate (and continuing) adverse impact on residents, there are definite benefits from having a large supermarket located on the edge of a town like ours:

- Deliveries can be restricted to major roads rather than passing through the town or residential areas;
- The store can serve a large portion of the local community on foot or by car (from outlying villages) without traffic having to go through the town;
- It is well placed to serve the large influx of holidaymakers who stay locally;
- It offers employment for a broad spectrum of local residents²;
- It supports charitable activities with / for the local community.

The Problems with Edge of Town Supermarkets

Although this specific development was an issue from the start, my observations of it in operation over the last 14 years highlight the interface risks to existing residents from *any* development of this nature. What appears acceptable during the planning process can quickly unravel, especially when

² Including students who can re-locate employment while studying and employees with additional needs / disabilities.

most problems are caused by individuals not complying with the rules (rather than a corporate decision to ignore them) or 'loose' planning conditions.

The key issues I feel it important to highlight:

1. Noise pollution (especially at night) is the single biggest problem with a facility that operates 24 / 7 even without customers on site. Specifically:

a. Yard operations:

- Handling of metal stock cages outdoors (including offloading / loading via HGV tailgates and not the approved stockroom ramp);
- Use of external bulk waste containers and compactors;
- Storage of waste in cages (for removal) that do not adequately retain the contents;
- Failure to close the gate during and after deliveries;
- Dismissive behaviour of yard staff when asked to be considerate and / or compliant.

b. Deliveries:

- Failure to shut down engines and refrigeration units³ on arrival and in the yard;
- Reversing siren use;
- Unloading outside of the yard;
- Failure to use the approved (noise suppressing) HGV ramp / bay;
- Poor handling of pre or post curfew HGV arrivals⁴.

c. Car park nuisance: with no barriered access control to the site, the car park attracts numerous silent hours users / (ab)users including car 'enthusiasts' and motorcycle trainees.

2. Aggressive behaviour by (some) drivers or staff when asked to be compliant / considerate. Other residents and I (including several elderly ones) have faced verbal (and on one occasion) physical abuse from drivers or store staff. After recently asking a Duty Manager to have a non-compliant⁵ refrigerated HGV (with no driver inside) shut down while parked outside the yard, I was told "you should not have bought a house next to a supermarket if you don't like it".

3. Vehicle and plant pollution: regular stacking of idling HGVs and queuing customer traffic causes a recognisable increase in pollution for adjacent houses.

4. Light pollution: on conclusion of the development, a local resident pointed out to planners (and Tesco) that the lighting scheme was in contravention of what was approved. This was modified but late-night lighting of the yard still affects houses next to it.

5. Criminality: aside from known illegal behaviours by car park (ab)users (e.g. drug use and nitrous oxide sniffing), increased reported crime at the store *may* reflect negatively on the local postcode area for insurance risk scoring and costs. Additionally, residents feel less secure with the knowledge that people are committing crimes, at night, near their homes.

6. Wider site and waste management: the impact of disorganised and unfit for purpose waste handling on site, increased littering and trolley dumping in surrounding areas. Waste attracts vermin,

³ This is the single biggest issue – especially proving a case when noise nuisance incidents repeatedly occur within the 07.00-23.00 legal delivery window.

⁴ Under planning approval, early / late deliveries must be turned away (including from all residential roads around the store). Following the voluntary adjustment to delivery timings by Tesco, residents agreed to ignore very occasional slightly early or late lapses provided the delivery was handled with extreme care.

⁵ In accordance with the Tesco (Noise Sensitive Site) Guidance Rules on the yard gate and driver site risk assessments.

this was one of the reasons for removal of the recycling facilities. Inadequate provision and poor ongoing maintenance of greenery and fences.

7. Creep: we rely heavily on a local community website for information about Tesco planning amendment applications and our own checks for non-compliance. Specific development controls were placed on the amount of advertising, signage, car park turnover to other activities and use of outside areas for sales during the approvals process. Many of these have been officially and unofficially modified or disregarded over time. If residents don't stay on top of 'creep', the activity can quickly become the accepted norm and *could* be used as leverage in future planning requests.

8. Growth: local development has led to greatly increased footfall, deliveries and waste generation.

9. Impact of poor site design and equipment failures: store and yard systems have required considerable modification and constant repair. Most of the rectification work has taken place at night with little or no notification, creating added noise and light nuisance.

10. Breech escalation: understandably, Councils need good evidence to investigate a breech, and this makes presenting the right evidence of the occasional (but recurring) lapse hard for residents⁶. The subsequent casework will also be a burden on a small Council enforcement team, especially if trying to stand up to a big company like Tesco⁷, but holding to account for legally applied conditions should never fall to residents.

Opportunities for Future Improvement

Residential growth will require commercial growth, so it would be short-sighted to suggest that we need to stop building supermarkets near houses. However, there are many ways in which the planning and development process could be improved for the welfare of existing and future residents and to reduce the burden of investigation and enforcement by Councils:

1. Operating hours: does a rural town need a supermarket that is open from 0700-2300⁸. There are certainly no grounds for 24 / 7 opening, and this should never be an option.

2. Delivery hours: *most* working residents are probably asleep, in bed, or at least getting ready for bed by 22.00. Trying to settle down to the noise of a parked refrigerated HGV which then has to negotiate a poorly designed delivery yard before being unloaded then re-filled with waste cages, is without doubt the most stressful issue we face. Likewise, being woken at 07.00 on a weekend by the same problem – all (technically) within the law. Is it time to review the curfew windows⁹ in the UK for commercial premises operating next to residential areas?

3. HGV hold-off areas: if a refrigerated lorry arrives on site and is not able to access the yard to shut down and unload immediately, then it should be mandatory to either leave the site and park away from properties, or be marshalled to an appropriate holding area that is on the rural (rather than residential) side of the site. In response to concerns raised by residents to another local edge of town supermarket wishing to extend its delivery hours (outside of curfew) the company stated, “drivers will be instructed to pull over and shut down refrigeration units prior to arriving at the store via the existing residential area”. Although *most* drivers would probably comply – in my experience not enough would. Thankfully this application was rejected – for now.

⁶ Aside from setting up cameras or manning an observer rota each night, it is generally night noise that creates an alert and by the time this has been realised the evidence may have been lost.

⁷ The failed case locally proves this point although the outcome was thankfully favourable (for a time).

⁸ Sunday and Holiday trading hours (10.00-16.00) are fine as they are.

⁹ Put in place to protect local residents.

4. Local authority ‘nice to haves’: recycling centres, clothes banks etc... appear morally good and community enhancing on paper, until they are (ab)used. They should either be taken out of Local Planning requirements or positioned with more caution (and then monitored).

5. Un-announced planning compliance inspections: during development and at intervals after completion (6 mths, 12 mths, 2 years, 5 years, 10 years?)¹⁰ with statutory powers to immediately enforce identified failures / breeches of planning.

6. Tighter control on plant operation: if we are seeing higher UK temperatures, we are likely to see increased and longer use of refrigeration units which *may* create more Statutory Nuisance¹¹. Developers may highlight their use of electric or hybrid vehicles during planning approval, but neglect to mention the accompanying refrigeration plant on the vehicles. Gathering evidence and gaining traction on intermittent but recurring plant noise nuisance has been a huge (ongoing) challenge here.

7. Removal of reversing ‘beepers’: replace with the ‘squawk’ type nationally – they are just as effective in close proximity, but the sound carries considerably less distance.

8. Analyse the whole store ‘operational process’: stock arrival, handling, positioning, movement on site and associated waste removal (including when mitigating systems fail). A condition on a Planning Approval that states ‘No goods, waste or other items or materials shall be stored or displayed in the open area on site, including the shop forecourt or entrance way.....’¹² sounds reasonable, but lacks detail. Does this include the rows of metal, rubbish laden, cages that are stacked waiting to be removed from the uncovered yard? This becomes very hard to prove either way, so our store ignores requests not to do this with the consequent noise and rubbish issues this creates.

9. Post-opening reviews: 6-12 monthly site meetings to include resident representatives, a council officer and store management.

Conclusion

This short study is based solely on my experience of living next to a small store that was allowed to get bigger without sufficient thought. The case for expansion was strong, but residents were doomed from the start due to inappropriate design, current legislation and ‘loose’ planning conditions. By reviewing the current planning rules, paying closer attention to developers’ intent and listening better to well-reasoned concerns from residents in advance, these stores would have a much greater chance of long-term benefit to the edge of town community, generate less work for Council Officers once running and significantly reduce the impact they have on residents. I hope therefore that this submission has some use nationally and locally.



Copy to:

- Somerset Council Development Committee
- Sir Ashley Fox MP
- Burnham and Highbridge Town Council Planning Committee

¹⁰ A FOI request regarding the number of Council Staff site visits and inspections during the development of this (large) store confirmed there had been none.

¹¹ Environmental Protection Act 1990, Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006 and Defra Noise Policy Statement for England 2010.

¹² Sedgemoor Planning Approval for Tesco Stores Ltd development 11/08/00136 dated 18 August 2009.