

South Somerset District Council

Draft Minutes of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held at the **Long Sutton Village Hall on Wednesday 24 June 2015.**

(2.00pm - 5.05 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Shane Pledger (Chairman)

Clare Aparicio Paul	Crispin Raikes
Neil Bloomfield	Jo Roundell Greene
Adam Dance	Dean Ruddle
Graham Middleton	Sylvia Seal (from 2.05pm)
Tiffany Osborne	Sue Steele
Stephen Page	Derek Yeomans

Officers:

Chris Cooper	Streetscene Manager
Charlotte Jones	Area Development Manager (North)
Adrian Noon	Area Lead (North/East)
John Millar	Planning Officer
Stephen Baimbridge	Planning / Enforcement Assistant
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
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.

4. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meetings held on 22 April 2015 and 21 May 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

There were no apologies for absence.

6. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Councillors Tiffany Osborne and Derek Yeomans each declared a personal interest in planning application 15/01502/FUL as they are also members of Curry Rivel Parish Council.

7. Date of next meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted that the next meeting of Area North Committee was scheduled for 2.00pm on Wednesday 22 July 2015 at the Edgar Hall, Somerton.

8. Public question time (Agenda Item 5)

There were no questions from members of the public.

9. Chairman's announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman welcomed new members of the committee and thanked previous members for their work and commitment. He noted a letter of gratitude would be sent to all the retired councillors.

The Chairman also informed members of the news that Tony Fife, a councillor who had served for many years in Area South, had sadly passed away the previous day.

10. Reports from members (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Derek Yeomans noted that a member of the public had asked him to draw members attention to the last meeting of the Abattoir Liaison Group where a complaint had been received about noise at the abattoir. Since the meeting monitoring had taken place and found noise levels to be in excess of limits leading to several visits and long discussions.

11. County Highway Authority Report - Area North (Agenda Item 8)

The Assistant Highway Service Manager presented his report as detailed in the agenda, and noted that several updates had been left with the Committee Administrator to circulate as necessary.

In response to a comment about an issue in Isle Brewers regarding works to a highway that was understood not to be suitable for vehicular traffic, the officer noted he would look into the matter and provide an answer to the ward member.

During the brief discussion, concern was also raised about the change in policy regarding the removal of second cuts to A and B roads.

The Chairman thanked the officer for his report and attending the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

12. Performance of the Streetscene Service (Agenda Item 9)

The Streetscene Manager summarised the report as shown in the agenda. He highlighted to members the work of the team and other key points including:

- The team were currently in the middle of the weed-spraying programme – on course for two full treatments a years
- It was hoped to further develop the working with Community Payback, and to use the teams to help with street cleansing across the district.

- Coordinating with Skanska to carry out litter picking along busy roads when carriageways are already cordoned off for highway maintenance works.
- The size of flytips in Area North seemed to suggest that tipping was likely to be by householders rather than commercial parties.

Responses by the Streetscene Manager to comments raised during discussion included:

- Regarding the Parish Ranger Scheme – staff could look at work required to provide an estimate of time and costs, and he would circulate a schedule of costs for information. He would also circulate useful phone numbers for members of the Streetscene Team.
- Acknowledge some parishes were wanting more dog bins
- There were the same number of enforcement officers available regarding the monitoring of dog fouling, and members should contact them through Environmental Health.

Members thanked the Streetscene Manager for his informative report.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

13. Area North Development Plan - Review of 2014-15 (Agenda Item 10)

The Area Development Manager (North) introduced the report as shown in the agenda and gave a comprehensive presentation which included information about:

- The work of the team and Area North priorities for 2014/15
- Statistical information about the service
- Community projects including examples of success stories
- Summer children's holiday play schemes
- The year ahead

She drew members attention to an email received from a member of the public which queried what support had been provided to the Somerton Historic Buildings Preservation Trust (SHBPT) who sought to acquire ownership of the Old Town Hall as a social enterprise, (detailed as project 70 in appendix A of the agenda report), and what action was being taken with the empty shops in West Street. In response she noted that the support given to the SHBPT had been through occasional contact providing guidance and information on funding and business planning to this community led project. Contact had been very limited over the past 18 months or so, and no financial support provided. She understood that the project would not continue under the proposed business model, and so it was noted as complete in the Area Development Plan. The town council had been aware at all times of the input by SSDC officers. Regarding the empty shops, the units concerned were integrated with wider site development proposals for the Old Court House, and officers would continue to work with the town council to ensure the shops are brought back into use.

During a short discussion members raised various comments about community grants. The Area Development Manager clarified that the £1000 limit for community grants was a District Executive policy and had been reviewed in recent years. She felt the limit was appropriate in proportion to the total grants budget.

Members noted there would be a future workshop to discuss the Area North priorities, and a revised set of priorities would be recommended for agreement at a future meeting

of the committee. The Chairman thanked the Area Development Manager for her informative report.

RESOLVED: It was resolved that:

- (1) The report and presentation be noted.
- (2) The suggestions for the review and agreement of priorities for the Area North Committee for 2015-16 and beyond, as detailed in section 2 of the agenda report, be endorsed.

14. Area North Committee - Appointment of Members to Outside Organisations and Groups for 2015/16 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 11)

The Area Development Manager (North) introduced the report and explained that members were advised to defer making appointments to the Somerset Waterways Advisory Committee and the Levels & Moors Task Force, pending future funding arrangements for the new Somerset Rivers Authority.

During discussion it was also agreed to defer making an appointment to Strode College Community Education Advisory Committee, to ascertain if a full appointment is necessary or whether a liaison member would be acceptable. It was also questioned if there would be any conflict of interests if Councillor Page were to possibly be that liaison member. Regarding the Martock Community Planning Partnership it was suggested that both ward members be appointed so that one or the other could attend any meetings as the SSDC appointed member.

Members were content to note that a future report would be made about the Area North Marketing Working Group, and it was agreed that Councillor Sue Steele continue as the appointed member regarding Community Safety / Neighbourhood Policing Liaison. The Committee agreed that appointments be made to the other outside organisations and groups as detailed in the agenda report.

RESOLVED: It was resolved that:

- (1) It be noted that a separate report will be made later in the year to provide an update about the Area North Marketing Working Group.
- (2) Councillor Sue Steele be appointed as the member to represent Area North Committee regarding Community Safety / Neighbourhood Policing Liaison.
- (3) That the following members be appointed to the outside organisations and groups for 2015/16 as listed below:

Reason: To appoint district council representatives to outside organisations and working groups

Outside Organisations & Groups	2015/16 Representatives
Somerset Levels & Moors Local Action Group Executive Board	Jo Roundell Greene
Langport Abattoir Liaison Group	Clara Aparicio Paul Derek Yeomans

Martock Community Planning Partnership	Graham Middleton and Neil Bloomfield
Somerset Waterways Advisory Committee	Deferred
Strode College Community Education Advisory Committee	Deferred
Huish Episcopi Leisure Centre Board	Clare Aparicio Paul Tiffany Osborne
Levels and Moors Task Force	Deferred

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

15. Scheme of Delegation - Development Control (Management) - Nomination of Substitutes for Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2015/16 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 12)

The Committee made the appointment of members to serve as the substitutes for the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

RESOLVED: That in line with the Development Control Revised Scheme of Delegation, Derek Yeomans (first substitute) and Sylvia Seal (second substitute) be appointed to act as substitutes for the Chairman and Vice Chairman to make decisions in the Chairman's and Vice Chairman's absence on whether an application should be considered by the Area Committee as requested by the Ward Member(s) for the year 2015/16.

Reason: To appoint two substitute members for the Chairman and Vice Chairman in line with the Development Control Scheme of Delegation for 2015/16

(Voting: 11 in favour, 2 against)

16. Area North Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 13)

The following updates to the Area North Committee Forward Plan were agreed:-

- Area North Development Plan – Review of Priorities – moved to September 2015

RESOLVED: That the Area North Committee Forward Plan be noted.

17. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 14)

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

18. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined By Committee (Agenda Item 15)

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

19. Planning Application 15/00879/FUL - Land Adjoining Highfield Farm, Windmill Lane, Pibsbury. (Agenda Item 16)

Proposal: Proposed erection of a 2 bedroom dwelling.

The Planning Officer presented the report as detailed in the agenda, and briefly reminded members of the neighbouring site where the previous committee had granted permission about a year ago.

Mr M Williams, agent, commented the location was an infill plot and there were no major any objections from consultees. He felt it was unfortunate that officers were taking such a strict policy view considering there was no local objection. He noted that other locations nearby, but further from amenities, had recently been approved such as at the April meeting, and it would now be inappropriate to say this site was not in a sustainable location. The proposal would not cause harm and would enhance the area, and he asked the committee to approve the application.

Ward member, Clare Aparicio Paul, noted it was her predecessor who had requested this application came to committee, and she did not have any issues with it being approved.

During discussion, mixed opinions were raised by members including:

- Appropriate to approve as within walking distance of the town and amenities by pavement.
- Policy needed to be carefully considered
- Feel it's in open countryside and the local plan policies have only just been agreed.
- Looking at the site feel could also say it needs tidying up, and this proposal would improve the site.
- Policy SS2 is important but this site is in between other development.
- Policy SS2 could be interpreted in several ways.
- A lot of policy SS2 is to do with what locals want.

In response to comments made the Area Lead clarified that:

- There had been no objections in terms of highways or visual amenity etc, the reason for the recommendation of refusal was a policy issue.
- With reference to the last sentence of SS2, it was noted that Pibsbury has none of the required facilities as defined in the policy.
- The neighbouring permission had the advantage of tidying up of the site and so there was an exception, but there was no justification for this proposal.
- If specific wording relative to this site only was used in the justification it would not set a precedent.
- If members were minded to approve the application the reasoning needed to be site specific and he advised caution about using a general statement that suggested Pibsbury as a settlement was in a sustainable location.
- If members felt the proposal had local support then it could form a reason for approval.

It was suggested to approve the application based on it being a small, undeveloped infill plot within existing development, which would not set a precedent, is within walking distance of facilities and is sustainable in that regard, and it is wished for by local public.

In response to the suggested proposal, the Area Lead suggested the wording for the justification could be: the site is an appropriate infill location for a new dwelling that is of an acceptable design and impact. As such the proposal complies with policies SD1, SS1, SS2 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-28) and the NPPF. Subject to conditions for:

- Time limit
- Approved plans
- External material to be agreed
- Landscaping
- Access to be provided prior to occupation
- Parking and turning areas to be maintained

It was proposed to approve the application for the reason as suggested by the Area Lead, and on being put to the vote was carried 10 in favour and 3 against.

Councillor Adam Dance wished it to be minuted that he voted against the proposal.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/00879/FUL be APPROVED, contrary to the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

The site is an appropriate infill location for a new dwelling that is of an acceptable design and impact. As such the proposal complies with policies SD1, SS1, SS2 and EQ2 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 plan: drawing no. '6438-02'.

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.

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 proposed access shall be constructed in accordance with details shown on approved plan, and shall be available for use before the dwelling hereby permitted is first occupied. Once constructed the access shall be maintained thereafter in that condition at all times.

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 area allocated for parking and turning on the approved plan, 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: 10 in favour, 3 against)

20. Planning Application 15/00471/FUL - Land East of Knightlands Lane, Long Sutton (Agenda Item 17)

Proposal: Proposed erection of an agriculturally tied dwelling.

The Planning Officer presented the application as shown in the agenda report which was for a fairly large four bedroom dwelling. He explained that the main reason for the recommendation of refusal was because it was felt there was not currently adequate justification for such a dwelling. Whilst it was acknowledged there might be need for someone to be living on site it was considered this should be a temporary permission at this time.

Mr R Cox, spoke in support of the application, and noted that the report stated no planning history, but about 24 years ago they had applied for permission for the buildings currently on the site. The applicant, his father, continued to farm but using contractors. He was disappointed at the comments of the Landscape Architect and felt they were flawed as the site was not in open countryside in the true sense of the word. Comments about the temporary permission were acknowledged but he also noted that the applicant in theory could convert one of the barns.

Mr Della Valle, agent, noted this was not a new start up business, and the applicant had farmed the holding for 42 years and lived remote from the site. The applicant now wished to run the farm with an employee living on site for security, as the site had been subject to multiple incidents of theft, vandalism and fire over the years despite a serviced alarm system. He considered in this instance that temporary permission was not appropriate and there was justification for a dwelling. The proposal had full support of the local community.

Ward Member, Councillor Shane Pledger, commented he had known of the farming family for many years. He was fully supportive of the application, and felt it was the right place for a building for continuation of this family business.

During discussion varying views were raised members including:

- Is the requirement for temporary permission normal practice?
- Anyone who farms should be supported but it's a substantial dwelling.
- Clearly an established farmer and business.
- No issue with design but concern about principle based on evidence in agenda report.
- It has the support of the parish council and is an opportunity for a young farmer to be employed.
- Needs security on the site as open to theft and vandalism
- Farmers need support
- Large building for an agricultural workers dwelling with little justification
- Security issue would be addressed in the short term by a temporary permission
- Its not the current business to be considered but the future.
- Applicant clearly confident business will work

The Area Lead explained in more detail the procedure regarding permissions for agricultural worker dwellings and the normal practice to approve temporary permissions first to allow a period of time to prove that the business is viable and a permanent dwelling justified. He also clarified that:

- Local knowledge about the family business was a material consideration.
- There was no issue with the location only the principle of evidencing the need.
- Subject to normal tests, someone could apply to remove an agricultural tie, but would need to be evidenced as to why.
- Agricultural ties were not really used any more, instead occupancy conditions were relied upon.

- Scale of the proposal was not really an issue and considered to be in scale for a farm manager's dwelling.

At the end of discussion it was proposed to refuse the application as per the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote was carried 7 in favour (of refusing the application), and 6 against.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/00471/FUL be REFUSED, as per the officer recommendation:

For the following reason:

01. It has not been suitably justified that there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at the site. As such the case for the construction of a permanent dwelling is not sufficient to outweigh the aims of local and national planning policies that seek to restrict development in the countryside. Furthermore it has not been demonstrated that alternative accommodation is not available in close enough proximity to the site to be able to serve any need. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SD1, SS1, SS2, HG9 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

01. The applicant is advised that an application for a temporary dwelling on this site, may be able to be supported by the Local Planning Authority, on the basis of the proposed diversification into livestock farming.

(Voting: 7 for, 6 against)

21. Planning Application 15/01502/FUL - Little Orchard, Heale Lane, Curry Rivel (Agenda Item 18)

Proposal: Erection of an attached single storey annexe.

The Planning Assistant presented the application as detailed in the agenda, and explained that the proposal was considered to be of poor design. It was felt the proposal, with two en-suite bedrooms, in effect equated to a new dwelling.

Mr B Bristow, applicant, noted the proposal was for his parents to be able to live with them, both of which had suffered health issues in recent times. He explained the design had been with a view for wheelchair access in the future, and he highlighted the annex would be accessed from the back of his own property.

Ward members, Councillor Tiffany Osborne, noted it was her predecessor that had requested the application came to committee. She supported the application and commented that the property was already piecemeal.

During discussion varying views were expressed by members including:

- Sympathy with applicant but agree with officer recommendation

- Applaud anyone who looks after parents in old age but this proposal will give over enclosure to neighbours.
- Virtually a new house, over development and will make design of house even worse.
- Concern about connection to main dwelling and could be sold as a separate dwelling.

At the end of discussion it was proposed to refuse the application, as per the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote was carried 10 in favour and 3 against.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/01502/FUL be REFUSED as per the officer recommendation:

For the following reasons:

01. The proposed single storey extension by reason of the level of accommodation and degree of self-containment, with no shared facilities is tantamount to a new dwelling in a rural settlement for which no reasonable justification has been submitted, contrary to policies SD1, SS1, and SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.
02. The proposed single storey extension is an over-development of the site and is of poor design contrary to policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

Informatives:

01. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;
 - offering a pre-application advice service, and
 - as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions

In this case, pre-application advice was not sought and there are no minor solutions to overcome the significant objections.

(Voting: 10 in favour, 3 against)

22. Planning Application 15/01379/FUL - Shearstone, Silver Street, East Lambrook (Agenda Item 19)

Proposal: Install a dual pitch roof to replace an existing flat roof and erect a rear extension.

The Planning Assistant presented the application as detailed in the agenda report. He highlighted to members the application was at committee solely due to the applicant's position within SSDC and not for any planning reason. It was noted that the installation of

a dual pitched roof was considered to be beneficial in terms of design and character of the property within a Conservation Area.

Ward member, Councillor Derek Yeomans, noted this was a common-sense and acceptable application, and he supported the application.

There being no further discussion it was proposed to approve the application, as per the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote, the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/01379/FUL be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The proposed roof extension and rear extension are of an appropriate design, detailing, and size and would have no adverse impact on visual or residential amenity, the historic environment, or highway safety. As such the proposal complies with policies SD1, SS1, EQ2, EQ3 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan, and the provisions of the NPPF.

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 and email:
Drawing Number: 15/1478/01 rev B, received 01 May 2015
Email from Agent confirming external materials to match, received 09 May 2015.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt.

(Voting: Unanimous)

23. Planning Application 15/02210/FUL - The Nook, Buttle Lane, Shepton Beauchamp (Agenda Item 20)

Proposal: Demolition of existing single storey flat roofed extension and outbuilding, alterations and erection of a two storey extension.

The Planning Assistant presented the application as detailed in the agenda report. He highlighted to members this application was also at committee solely due to the applicant's position within SSDC and not for any planning reason. It was noted the proposal had no close relationship with any neighbours and was of an appropriate design.

Ward member, Councillor Crispin Raikes, commented that he and Councillor Adam Dance had been present at the parish council meeting when the application was discussed, and no objections had been raised. He recommended approval of the application.

There being no further discussion it was proposed to approve the application, as per the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote, the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/02210/FUL be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The proposed two-storey extension is of an appropriate design, detailing, and size and would have no adverse impact on visual or residential amenity or highway safety. As such the proposal complies with policies SD1, SS1, EQ2, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, and the provisions of the NPPF.

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 (except where directed otherwise by the conditions below):

Site Location Plan of the drawing number: 6490 - 01, received 14 May 2015

Drawing Number: 6490 - 02, received 14 May 2015

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt

03. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the render for the two-storey extension hereby permitted shall be the colour 'Biscuit' as shown on the colour chart, received 05 June 2015.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the property and local area in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028)

(Voting: Unanimous)

.....
Chairman