

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held at the **Edgar Hall, Somerton** on **Wednesday 22 April 2015**.

(2.00pm - 5.10pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Shane Pledger (Chairman)

Pauline Clarke	Jo Roundell Greene
Graham Middleton	Sylvia Seal
Roy Mills	Sue Steele
Terry Mounter	Barry Walker (from 2.12pm)
David Norris	Derek Yeomans
Patrick Palmer (to 4.05pm)	

Officers:

David Norris	Development Manager
Paul Wheatley	Principal Spatial Planner
Sarah Hickey	Locum Planning Solicitor
Adrian Noon	Area Lead (North/East)
Nick Head	Planning Officer
John Millar	Planning Officer
Charlotte Jones	Area Development Manager (North)
Becky Sanders	Democratic Services Officer

NB: Where an executive or key decision is made, a reason will be noted immediately beneath the Committee's resolution.

192. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2015, copies of which had been circulated were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

193. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Paul Thompson.

194. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Patrick Palmer declared a personal and pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 14, planning application 14/04206/REM on land South of Coat Road, Martock, as his family business provided crop spraying services on the land in question. He noted he had no interest in ownership of the land and was declaring an interest as advised by the Solicitor to the Council. He confirmed that he would take no part in the debate or voting on this application.

195. Date of next meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted that the next meeting of the Area North Committee was scheduled for Wednesday 24 June 2015 at a venue to be confirmed.

196. Public question time (Agenda Item 5)

There were no questions from members of the public present.

197. Chairman's announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman thanked all councillors not seeking re-election and wished them well for the future.

In the absence of the Vice Chairman, the Chairman proposed that Councillor Derek Yeomans be appointed to act as Vice Chairman for the meeting and members were in agreement with this.

198. Reports from members (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Sue Steele referred to a recent press article mentioning Curry Mallet as a top place in England to live.

199. Area North Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 8)

The Area Development Manager (North), noted there were no updates to the Forward Plan as detailed in the agenda. The Forward Plan would reviewed with the new committee after the elections, and wished those seeking re-election good luck.

200. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 9)

Members noted the report that detailed recent planning appeals that had been lodged, dismissed or allowed.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

201. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined By Committee (Agenda Item 10)

Members noted the schedule of planning applications to be determined at the meeting.

202. Planning application 14/05234/OUT - Land OS 5775, north of Kelways, Wearne Lane, Langport (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Residential development of land, formation of vehicular access, provision of roads and open space, demolition and alteration of wall.

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda report and provided members with updates including:

- that comments had been received suggesting that the applicant being shown as 'The Cook Family' was in effect anonymous – this was not the opinion of the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the description was adequate and the necessary certificates had been served.
- Point 5 under recommendation (a) on pages 26/27 of the agenda should be disregarded as monitoring fees were no longer applied.
- If members were minded to approve the application it was recommended that there be an addition condition for the requirement of a construction management plan.

The presentation included illustrations of the indicative layout and design for the site. It was noted that the application included the removal of a small length of the boundary listed wall to the south of the site. This would require listed building consent which was the subject of a separate application, but many comments in this presentation would apply.

He noted that much representation had been received about coalescences between Huish Episcopi, Langport and Wearne. Concerns had also been raised about accessibility and the angles of road junctions. The presentation included extracts of the South Somerset Local Plan with plans indicating that there would be approximately a 200 metres distance between the edge of the proposed site and the primary road running east to west through Wearne.

Mrs S Nicholas, representative for Huish Episcopi Parish Council and Mr J Wood, representative for Huish Episcopi Parish Council and Langport Town Council, made comments in objection to the proposal including:

- Concerns about coalescence with Wearne
- Officer report mentions jobs but where would they be, and don't think there are local opportunities available, and reference to Census data regarding percentages of people travelling to work
- Feel strongly that Huish Episcopi has had enough applications
- Concerns about the suggested access onto Wearne Lane
- Approval of this application would take the approved housing figure well over the aspirational policy figure stated in the Local Plan, and would make Huish Episcopi three times the size of Langport. This was one large development too many with not enough being done to bring communities together.

Mrs A Michell, Mr K Howe, Mr R Morfee, Mr R Moore, Mr B Wilcock then addressed members in objection to the proposal and raised comments including:

- Residents of Wearne and the Kelways estate were very much against the application.
- Concerns about education and the figures quoted in the report not being the most relevant – this proposal would effectively push the local primary school to breaking point by 2017. The school has an operating figure of 150, but 139 pupils at the moment with 150 expected for September.
- Application has caused much local anger and seems contrary to the Local Plan. No local need for the housing and concerns about coalescence with Wearne and

the proposal would leave nothing but a small paddock between the settlement of Huish Episcopi and Wearne.

- Transport movements from the proposed site would double the traffic through the existing Old Kelways development. This would include potentially negotiating three right angle bends, parked cars as well as children playing, and locally raised serious road safety issues.
- Scale of growth not in line with the Local Plan and contrary to Policy SS5, and would build 158 more homes than the area can sustain, and be at detriment to local services.
- There were negative impacts of the development including part demolition of heritage asset, building on quality agricultural land, no land set aside for employment and conflict between different road users should be prevented.

Mr M Williams, agent, commented that the applicant had worked with officers to address issues and minimise work to the listed building. The proposal site was in the direction of growth within in the Local Plan, and that direction could not now be put aside. He noted that sooner or later that the land was likely to be developed. He highlighted that SSDC would take control of the open space at the north of the site to offer some comfort, and there were a number of reasons to approve the application but minimal to refuse.

Ward member, Councillor Shane Pledger, commented there were a number of issues and he did not like the application. With reference to the Local Plan he acknowledged the site was in the direction of growth but also that that the locality was already over subscribed for housing. He was of the opinion that if there had been long-term plans to develop the land that the road layout on the Kelways estate would have been better designed. He felt there were a number of policies in the Local Plan that could be grounds for a refusal and the highways on the Kelways estate were not big enough for accessing the proposed site.

During a lengthy discussion by members, comments raised included:

- Inappropriate proposal and struggling to understand why recommendation is for approval. The application should be refused.
- Scale and design of existing Kelways development had been carefully considered due to listed building.
- Proposed road layout is crazy and how would emergency access onto Wearne Lane be policed?
- Too many houses in that area, not the right application for this site.
- Proposal would create housing well above and beyond level of development in the Local Plan, acknowledge it's possible to approve but we need to be absolutely sure the infrastructure can cope and there are benefits for the local community.
- Feel no need for the houses, there's a plot nearby with permission yet to be built, and there is no employment so difficult to support the application.
- Acknowledgement that officers have to work within policy and guidance given. Number of houses beyond aspirational figure in the Local Plan could form a basis for refusal.
- Concerns about shortage of school spaces. County Education have requested funding to provide additional school places but where would any additional classroom space go, only option would be on the field but then there would be no outside play space. Feel County have got it wrong.
- If permissions weren't given on good agricultural land then wouldn't be building anywhere.

- SSDC should start to gather evidence regarding any impacts from the loss of agricultural land.

Responses by the Area Lead, Development Manager and Principal Spatial Planner to comments raised during discussion included:

- The starting point for any consideration were the policies within the Local Plan.
- Referring to the direction of growth, if not building on agricultural land then likely to be going into flood zones.
- Understood that the existing Kelways development was designed with further development in mind. County Highways did not consider the proposal to be so unsafe as to warrant refusal.
- A key consideration was over delivery of housing so early in the Local Plan which did bring in some concerns.
- Acknowledge concerns about education provision but as County Education were not objecting it was difficult to make a case for refusal.
- Difficult for officers to support robust reasons for refusal based on the Local Plan but hear the substantial local concerns and that this scheme would take us 40% over the housing figure in the Plan.
- Impact on the listed building and impact from the level of growth were acknowledged.
- Unrelated to this application there had been discussions about building on agricultural land in general regarding the loss of the land and impacts. Learning from other appeal decisions, there was a need to clearly substantiate the damage/impact of loss of agricultural land if it was deemed to be a reason for refusal.
- Bollards would be placed across the emergency access to Wearne Lane.

At the conclusion of discussion, members were minded to refuse the application on grounds of over delivery of the housing target as set out in the Local Plan, erosion of the open gap between Langport/Huish Episcopi and Wearne, and impact on the setting of the listed wall. Some members felt strongly that the reason for refusal should also include the non-provision of employment space and loss of agricultural land, however most members did not agree that these two aspects should be included in a reason for refusal.

As members were minded to refuse the application the Principal Spatial Planner suggested the wording for a refusal could be that the proposal for up to 71 dwellings would take the level of growth for Langport/Huish Episcopi to 532 dwellings over the plan period through to 2028. This would represent a scale of growth which is 42% over the identified target of at least 374 dwellings for the town as set out in Policy SS5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028). As such, the development would be a significant increase over that envisaged in Policy SS5 and would be contrary to the intended growth strategy and settlement strategy as set out in Policy SS5 and Policy SS1 of the South Somerset Local Plan. The development would adversely erode the gap between Langport and Wearne and would have a significant impact on the setting of the listed wall to the north of the Old Kelways site, contrary to the aims of Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the officer recommendation, for the reason as worded by the Principal Spatial Planner. On being put to the vote, the proposal to refuse the application was carried 11 in favour with 1 abstention.

(One member abstained as they had arrived late and missed the start of the officer presentation.)

RESOLVED: That planning application 14/05234/OUT be REFUSED, contrary to the officer recommendation, for the following reasons:

01. The proposal for up to 71 dwellings would take the level of growth for Langport/Huish Episcopi to 532 dwellings over the plan period through to 2028. This would represent a scale of growth which is 42% over the identified target of at least 374 dwellings for the town as set out in Policy SS5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).

As such, the development would be a significant increase over that envisaged in Policy SS5 and would be contrary to the intended growth strategy and settlement strategy as set out in Policy SS5 and Policy SS1 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

The development would adversely erode the gap between Langport and Wearne and would have a significant impact on the setting of the listed wall to the north of the Old Kelways site, contrary to the aims of Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).

(Voting: 11 in favour, 1 abstention)

203. Planning application 14/05235/LBC - Old Kelways, Somerton Road, Langport (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Demolition of western end of wall.

The Area Lead introduced the application, and commented that the officer recommendation in the report was for approval based on the recommendation to approve the associated outline application 14/05234/OUT, as previously discussed on the agenda. As the outline application had been refused by members, the officer recommendation for this listed building consent needed to change to refusal.

He suggested the wording for a reason of refusal could be that in the absence of a reasonable justification to facilitate acceptable development the proposal to remove 6.7m of this grade II listed wall would be detrimental to its special architectural and historic qualities. As such the proposal is contrary to policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-28 and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

There was no discussion and it was proposed and seconded to refuse the application for the reason as suggested by the Area Lead. On being put to the vote, the proposal to refuse the application was carried 11 in favour with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning application 14/05235/LBC be REFUSED, contrary to the officer recommendation, for the following reason:

01. In the absence of a reasonable justification to facilitate acceptable development the proposal to remove 6.7m of this grade II listed wall would be detrimental to its special architectural and historic qualities. As such the proposal is contrary to policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-28 and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 11 in favour, 1 abstention)

204. Planning application 15/00514/FUL - Land opposite Autumn Leaves, Pibsbury (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Erection of 2 detached dwellings with garaging and parking together with vehicular access.

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda report, and highlighted briefly the history of the site, and reference to a tree on the site that was the subject of a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The site for was not considered to be in a sustainable location as it was some distance away from local facilities. There is extant permission on the site for one dwelling but the Local Planning Authority did not feel there was justification for two large two-storey dwellings.

Mrs S Nicholas, representative for Huish Episcopi Parish Council, noted that they had no objection in principle but had hoped for much needed bungalows. The current proposal would enhance a site which had been an eyesore for years. It was felt the proposal was in keeping with nearby houses, and if the site was deemed sustainable for one dwelling why not for two dwellings?

Mr G Richmond, addressed members in support of the application on behalf of nine households in Pibsbury including four nearest to the site. He considered the report to contain inconsistencies and noted that the report also failed to refer to poor monitoring of the historical usage of the site. Reference was made to previous appeal decisions on the site. It was felt the proposal was in keeping with other two storey dwellings nearby and was dismayed that the recommendation was for refusal.

Mrs S Rolli, applicant, disagreed that the site was not in a sustainable location, as the secondary school was within walking distance and buses passed the site. The tree subject to a TPO had permission to, and would be removed as part of the extant permission on the site. She queried if the tree had not been a concern for the extant permission why was it now? She noted that several new oak trees had been planted nearby and felt the Tree Officer had not researched the site and locality properly. Originally they hoped to apply for three properties but reduced the number to two after consulting the local authority and nearby residents.

Ward member, Councillor Roy Mills, commented the site had been untidy for a long time. He felt this proposal was reasonable and he supported the application.

During discussion varying opinions were raised by members including:

- Regarding sustainability the applicant had stated site was in reach of facilities if required. Site has been an eyesore and the proposal could only improve the site

and complement other houses nearby. Don't think dwellings would damage the large tree but the roots may go under the buildings.

- Not overly keen on the design, and dwellings are quite large for the plot, but the tree should be protected.
- Could the site be redesigned so that the dwellings were around the tree, rather than needing to fell the tree?
- A previous application for a bungalow had been allowed on appeal, tree was not a concern then but is now.
- No problem with principle of two dwellings
- Applicant could continue with extant permission and fell the tree.
- Application should be deferred with a view to retaining the tree.
- TPO has only recently come forward.

In response to points made during discussion the Development Manager and Area Lead clarified that:

- The site was possibly big enough for the two dwellings to be repositioned and retain the tree.
- Members could defer the application with a view to negotiation with the applicant regarding redesign of the site layout with a view to keeping the tree.
- Members needed to consider if the tree was of sufficient importance to defer the application.

Most members were minded to approve the application on the grounds that the site was considered to be in a sustainable location and that loss of the tree had been acceptable with the extant permission on the site.

The Area Lead clarified the suggested wording for the justification and noted that conditions would be required for time limit, approved plans, materials, landscaping and parking.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the officer recommendation, subject to the conditions and reason as suggested by the Area Lead. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried 8 in favour, 2 against, with 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/00514/FUL be APPROVED, contrary to the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The site is a sustainable location for two dwellings that are of an acceptable design and impact. The loss of the oak tree, which has previously been accepted, is not objectionable. As such the proposal complies with policies SD1, SS1, SS2, EQ1 and EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to the following conditions:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town

and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing no.s '3214/14/5', '3214/14/6A', '3214/14/7B', '3214/14/8A', '3214/14/9B', '3214/14/10B', '3214/14/11A', '3214/14/12', '3214/14/13A', '3214/14/14A', '3214/14/15A', '3214/14/16A' and '3214/14/17A', received 27th January 2015.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the development authorised and in the interests of proper planning.

03. No development shall be carried out on site unless particulars of materials (including the provision of samples) to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby approved has submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

04. No development shall be carried out on site unless there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of the development, as well as details of any changes proposed in existing ground levels; all planting, seeding, turfing or earth moulding comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season after the development hereby permitted is first brought into use; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

05. The area allocated for parking and turning on the approved plans shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 8 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions)

205. Planning application 15/01021/REM - Land south of Coat Road, Martock (Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Residential development of land for 95 dwellings (reserved matters following outline approval 13/02474/OUT) (Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are the reserved matters) Discharge of the remaining conditions on the outline permission will be subject to a separate application, and supplementary information relating to these conditions is included with this application.

(Cllr Patrick Palmer having declared a pecuniary interest left the table for this item and did not take part in discussions or voting on the item)

The Planning Officer introduced the application and noted it was a re-submission of reserved matters. He reminded members why the previous application had been refused when considered in December, and provided members with updates including:

- An amended plan provided more detail of some site levels.
- Since the report had been published further comments had been received from SSDC Housing and County Highways but neither raised any concerns.
- A further letter of representation had been received raising concerns about safety of the attenuation and drainage measures, and elements of the application not fully meeting objectives in the outline permission.
- Some drainage and filtration testing had recently taken place, which indicated ground conditions would not accommodate soakaways. More detail would be provided and considered when the application to discharge the relevant condition was made.

The Planning Officer went on to present the application as detailed in the agenda, noting that the proposal was to retain some 2½ storey dwellings for variation but the quantity had reduced from 34 to 8, the ridge heights also being reduced so that they were more akin to nearby two-storey dwellings. He highlighted the design changes since the previous application had been considered, plus changes to the attenuation scheme and associated fencing. Advice received from Wessex Water and the Drainage Board indicated they would not agree to the ditch being culverted. It had been suggested by the Drainage Board, for safety that steps were put in to facilitate an escape and to erect additional fencing. The state of surface of the Hills Lane track was outside the responsibility of the applicant, but it was acknowledged that the path links from south of the application site would lead onto it.

Mr N Bloomfield, representative for the parish council, noted they were grateful to the developer for their efforts and further consultation, however the parish council were still of the view that three storey dwellings had no place in Martock. This proposal is urban development in a rural setting and is too dense, with small gardens and the estate would be very enclosed. It was accepted the attenuation ponds needed be there, but the development was of a poor design and not good for Martock.

Mrs J Hulme-Atthis, Mr A Clegg, Mr F Dowding then addressed committee in objection to the proposal and points raised included:

- Village cannot cope with more development and extra traffic
- Possibility of winter flooding
- Proposal is dense with tall, narrow and deep houses.
- All the houses are in each other's shadow so impacting on energy consumption. Would be helpful if the design could have gone to a design review group.

- Would be better if materials more sympathetic to Martock could be used. Could some dwellings be built from natural stone?
- More effort could be made for an interesting design.

Mr D Hayes, agent, noted the current application followed the previous refusal based on the 2½ storey element. Clearly the parish council did not feel the reduction in numbers is still appropriate. He noted that over the previous months the comments of consultees, parish council and residents had been carefully considered. It was felt the changes made incorporated a design that is of acceptable density and design, and appropriate to the area.

Ward member, Councillor Graham Middleton, acknowledged the willingness of David Wilson Homes to engage in consultation and noted he had been recently approached by them regarding an informal meeting about the proposal. He suggested deferring the application for further consultation and negotiation about design, as there were still local concerns and issues to be resolved.

The Area lead clarified that legal advice was that it was inappropriate to have further informal meetings. He noted the 3 / 2½ storey dwellings had been designed to look like two storey with loft extensions. There were similar buildings in Martock, but admittedly not many. Regarding materials the site was well outside the historic area of Martock.

During discussion varying views were expressed including:

- Feel there will be little light between the houses. Development should reflect Martock, and other recent developments have been done more considerately.
- The Paul Court development includes 2½ storey dwellings and in a sort of way is attractive as it's different. Agree that David Wilson Homes have gone to lengths to consider comments and engage in consultation.
- Don't like the 2½ storey element. If not acceptable before it shouldn't be now.
- Need to consider what will be acceptable. Materials, design and density are important. Should be deferred for a different layout.
- Still have concerns about drainage and density.
- Question if the development reflects the local area, as this will be totally different to the neighbouring Hills Orchard and Coat Road dwellings.
- Outline permission already granted for up to 95 houses so density not really relevant. Unlikely to get less houses and more space on this site.
- Don't feel we can ask the developer to do any more. Substantial affordable housing is to be built from profits of the market housing.
- Not compulsory to build 95 houses.

In response to comments made, the Area Lead reminded members that when the previous application had been refused in December that the number of dwellings was not an issue. He noted that the neighbouring Hills Orchard estate had little, if any, hamstone, and there was a need to consider context of the site location not just the historical core of the village. He noted he was struggling to see how we could say the height of the 2½ storey dwellings is so objectionable to neighbouring two storey dwellings.

The Development Manager advised members that if they were minded to defer the application there needed to be clear and specific reasons why. He also noted that the Area North Committee would determine this application not the parish council, and he was not convinced that the applicant and parish council would come to a full mutual agreement regarding the design of the development.

It was proposed and seconded to defer the application to further negotiate with David Wilson Homes on the grounds that the 2½ storey element is unacceptable, and the proposed design of the houses is out of character with the area. Some members expressed a wish to see some use of local materials. On being put to the vote the proposal was lost, 4 in favour, 7 against.

An alternative proposal was put forward and seconded to accept the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote, was carried 7 in favour, 3 against.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/01021/REM be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the 95 houses proposed in this sustainable location is acceptable by reason that it respects the character and appearance of the area and would not be harmful to residential amenity, ecology, archaeology or highway safety and provides for appropriate drainage mitigation. As such the proposal complies with the policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to the following:

01. No development hereby approved shall be carried out until particulars of following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
 - a) details of the design, recessing, materials and finish (including door canopy, bay window and cill and lintel details) to be used for all new windows (including any roof lights) and doors;
 - b) details of the rainwater goods and eaves, verges and fascia details and treatments
 - c) details of position and colour finish of meter cupboards, gas boxes, soil and waste pipes (soil and waste pipes are expected to be run internally)

Once approved such details shall be fully implemented unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

02. The proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, tactile paving, cycleways, bus stops/bus lay-bys, verges, junctions, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, carriageway gradients, drive gradients, car, motorcycle and cycle parking, and street furniture shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before their construction begins. For

this purpose, plans and sections, indicating as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

03. The specifications, including position and material finish, of all boundary treatments, shall be carried out in accordance with details as indicated on approved plans '2942-200 Revision E', '2942-206-01', '2942-206-02', '2942-206-03', '2942-206-04', '2942-206-05 Revision A', '2942-BD-01' and 'SD14-018'. The approved boundary treatments shall be installed prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved and once carried out shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity, in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 7 and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

04. All obscurely glazed windows, as indicated on the approved plans shall be fitted with obscure glass (minimum level 3) and be non-opening below a height of 1.7m above the finished floor level of the rooms in which the openings are to be installed, and shall be permanently retained and maintained in this fashion thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

05. The areas allocated for parking on the approved plans shall be kept clear of obstruction at all times and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

06. The proposed landscape scheme shall be carried out in accordance with details as indicated on approved plans 'GL0027 14D' and 'GL 0027 15C', unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All planting, seeding, turfing or earth moulding comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become

seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with saved policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the provisions of Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

07. No vehicular access shall be formed from the application site directly into Hills Orchard.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity, in accordance with policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of chapter 4 and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

08. The development hereby permitted shall not commence unless a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include construction operation hours, construction vehicular routes to and from site, construction delivery hours, car parking for contractors and specific measures to be adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of the Environmental Code of Construction Practice. Once approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity and highway safety, in accordance with policies TA5, EQ2 and EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the core planning principles and provisions of Chapter 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

09. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans: 2942-200 Rev E, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206-01, 206-02, 206-03, 206-04, 206-05 Rev A, 404-01 Rev D, 410-01, BD-01 SD14-018, GL0027 14D and GL0027 15C and House and Garage Types SFs11 Rev A, SF11 Rev A, SH28 Rev B, SH39 Rev B, T310-E Rev A, T310-I Rev A, P315 Rev A, P331 Rev B, H404 Rev A, H417 Rev A, H433 Rev B, H436 Rev B, H455 Rev A, H469 Rev A, H500 Rev A, H585 Rev A, H585s Rev A, S-GAR-01, S-GAR-02, S-GAR-03, D-GAR-01, D-GAR-02, T-GAR-01, T-GAR-02, T-GAR-03, SD-GAR-01 and SD-GAR-02.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the development authorised and in the interests of proper planning.

(Voting: 7 in favour, 3 against)

.....
Chairman