

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at the **Meeting Room, Churchfield Offices, Wincanton** on **Wednesday 10 February 2016**.

(9.00 am - 12.40 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Nick Weeks (Chairman)

Mike Beech	Henry Hobhouse
Tony Capozzoli	Mike Lewis
Nick Colbert	William Wallace
Sarah Dyke-Bracher	Colin Winder
Anna Groskop	

Officers:

Helen Rutter	Area Development Manager (East)
Kelly Wheeler	Democratic Services Officer
David Norris	Development Manager
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Tim Cook	Neighbourhood Development Officer (East)
Chris Cooper	Streetscene Manager
James Divall	Neighbourhood Development Officer (East/South)
Simon Fox	Area Lead (South)
Steve Joel	Assistant Director (Health & Well-Being)

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

166. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th January, copies of which had been circulated, were agreed and signed by the Chairman subject to an addition to minute 162 (15/03441/REM – Well Farm, Ansford, Castle Cary).

At the request of the Chairman, the following addition was added to read;

The case officer was asked to convey to the applicant the committee's concerns over the lack of proper consultation with local residents, site layout, materials used and proposed highways issues in the light of planning permissions granted since the outline permission for Well Farm.

167. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies of absence were received from Councillor Tim Inglefield and Councillor David Norris.

168. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Cllrs William Wallace, Mike Lewis and Anna Groskop all members of SCC (Somerset County Council) would only declare a personal interest in any business on the agenda where there was a financial benefit or gain or advantage to SCC which would be at a cost or to the financial disadvantage of SSDC.

Councillor Sarah Dyke-Bracher declared a personal interest in agenda item 12 (Balsam Centre – Allocation of Healthy Living Centre Funding) as an employee of the Balsam Centre. Councillor Anna Groskop also declared an interest in agenda item 12. They left the room whilst agenda item 12 was being discussed.

169. Public Participation at Committees (Agenda Item 4)

There were no questions from members of the public.

Councillor Colin Winder requested that a report be included on a future agenda to detail the Ombudsman decision for Balsam Park, Wincanton. The Area Development Manager (East) agreed to discuss this issue with Building Control.

170. Reports from Members Representing the District Council on Outside Organisations (Agenda Item 5)

There were no reports from Members.

171. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 6)

Members noted that the date of the next meeting would be Wednesday 9th March 2016 at 9.00am at The Churchfield Offices, Wincanton.

172. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 7)

The Chairman made no announcements.

173. Exclusion of the Press and Public (Agenda Item 8)

The Chairman pointed out an error in the agenda for item 8. The Committee were asked to agree that the agenda items 9 and 10, be considered in closed session, rather than item 2.

RESOLVED: that the following items (agenda items 9 and 10) be considered in Closed Session by virtue of the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A under Paragraph 3: "Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)."

174. Wincanton Community Sports Centre Update Report (Confidential) (Agenda Item 9)

The Committee welcomed the Assistant Director (Health and Well-Being) to deliver his report to Members.

He provided an update on the performance of the Wincanton Sports Centre following the changes in management in 2013. The centre was now being managed by LED Leisure Management Limited, and following the transition was performing well and there had been an increase in membership.

He informed Members that the website had been rebranded and that new IT systems and programmes were in place. He thought that the IT systems which LED were using were particularly impressive and that a new phone app was being developed, which would allow members of the public to book classes and pay for a membership from their phone.

He confirmed that the facility is in good order and that improvements works were being planned to include air conditioning in the dance studio and replacement lights in the hall.

He pointed out to Members that funding from the school had reduced and that the relationship with the school could be improved.

The Assistant Director responded to questions from Members and clarified that the figures from 2013-2014 only included 5 months of data from the date that LED had taken over management of the centre which began in November 2013.

He pointed out that several initiatives were being looked at to try to encourage further use of the swimming pool.

During the discussion Members sought clarification on the level of SSDC subsidy for the facility, noting that this had reduced in recent years. Given the synergy with facilities elsewhere they asked if there was a possibility of them being managed or supported in some way to benefit from the expertise of LED. Members asked that a meeting with relevant parties be arranged to further explore this option

Members offered praise to LED and to the facility.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted

175. Tolbury Mill Funding Contributions (Confidential) (Agenda Item 10)

The Area Development Manager presented her report to Committee and welcomed Sarah Love, Somerset County Council Early Years Manager.

She explained to the Committee that in 2002, Community Kids in Bruton entered into a 30 year, full maintenance lease agreement with SSDC and are responsible for the fabric of the building. The new building had many sustainability features including a roof clad with a recycled product, which was now starting to fail. She confirmed that three material types had been considered, fibre cement slates being the preferred option. She pointed out to the Committee that a £5,000 grant had been offered by Somerset County Council to help the Charity fund the replacement roof and that the charity is doing further

fundraising to replace the front roof. They would also be saving money towards future maintenance.

Councillor Anna Groskop, Ward Member, spoke in support of the funding contribution.

During the discussion, the favoured fibre cement slates to be used were questioned by the Committee. It was suggested that the box profile sheeting might be longer lasting and a better option for the replacement. The Area Development Manager confirmed that property services had done all the necessary adjustments and checks, a structural engineer had been consulted and that she was awaiting the results of a condensation report. A final decision on the roofing material would be agreed in consultation with the Charity the Chairman and Portfolio holder

Members were disappointed that the charity had no ring fenced reserve funds for maintenance repairs and suggested that the District Council could work proactively with the charity to ensure that they set aside a sum regularly for building maintenance

On being put to the vote, it was agreed 8 votes in favour with 1 abstention.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That a contribution of £7,000 (£4,660 from the Members' Discretionary budget and £2,340 from unspent balances) is made towards the replacement of the rear roof of Tolbury Mill Hall, Bruton, subject to all other funding being in place.
 - (2) Members note that a Business Plan is being drawn up with assistance from SCC. This will include a sum set aside annually for further repairs & renewals on this building to protect the asset in the long-term

REASON: To consider a contribution towards roof replacement for Tolbury Mill Hall, Bruton

(Voting: 8 in favour and 1 abstention)

176. Streetscene Service Update (Agenda Item 11)

The Streetscene Manager presented his report to Committee. He summarised the works which had been carried out by the team over the winter months, including the weed killing operation which was on target, winter ditch maintenance and the removal of debris from main roads.

He informed Members that there was an amendment to the report and that South Cadbury had actually reported zero fly tips. He explained that the number of fly tips reported was continuing to reduce, but pointed out that these figures do not include privately owned land; however he would be looking for ways of including this data.

He pointed out to Members some of the future developments of the team including the recycling of fallen leaves and a MOT station at Lufton.

The Streetscene Manager responded to questions from Members.

The Chairman thanked the Streetscene Manager for attending and for the team's hard work.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted

177. Balsam Centre - Allocation of Healthy Living Centre Funding (Agenda Item 12)

The Community Development Officer presented his report to Committee. He provided the Committee with an update on the position of the Balsam Centre. He explained that the money requested would be ring-fenced for the Healthy Living Centre, which was now the only one in the district.

A variety of programmes had been carried out at the Centre during the year to include walking, exercise and cookery classes and that following a lottery grant; a five year programme had been developed.

Following a short discussion, it was proposed to award the £10,000 as detailed in the officer report. On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: 1) Members noted the report
2) The £10,000 ring-fenced for Healthy Living Centres to be awarded to the Balsam Centre for the delivery of the work programme

REASON: To consider the allocation of funding ring-fenced for Healthy Living Centres

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

178. Neighbourhood Plan Progress Report (Agenda Item 13)

The Community Development Officer presented his report to the Committee. He explained that the Neighbourhood Plans for Wincanton and Castle Cary were progressing well and that much evidence had been gathered. He pointed out that the bulk of the report focused on work which had been completed in Queen Camel, which despite some setbacks, had provided a good draft for Neighbourhood Plans.

The Community Development Officer responded to questions from members of the Committee. Concerns were raised over the amount of work which was required to complete Neighbourhood Plans.

Following a short discussion, it was proposed to retain the funds for Neighbourhood Plans and on being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: 1) The report be noted
2) That the remaining £15,264 of the funds secured from DCLG towards Queen Camel Fronrunner, be retained and used for supporting Neighbourhood Plans

REASON: To update on the Queen Camel Neighbourhood Plan and the progress of other Neighbourhood Plans which are underway in Area East

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

179. Area East Annual Town/Parish Council Meeting Update Report (Agenda Item 14)

The Area Development Officer briefly presented her report to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted

180. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 15)

The Area Development Manager (East) referred to the forward plan report and confirmed that she had no amendments to make.

RESOLVED: That the forward plan be noted

181. Planning Appeals (For information only) (Agenda Item 16)

Members noted the appeal which had been dismissed for Land at Eden Nursey, Charlton Musgrove and Land to the rear of 24 High Street, Wincanton.

182. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 17)

Members noted the Schedule of Planning Applications.

183. 15/01500/FUL - Land at Furge Lane, Henstridge (Agenda Item 18)

Residential development, erection of 20 dwellinghouses with associated roads and parking

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

He explained to the Committee that the site already had outline planning permission for 17 dwellings, which had been allowed following an appeal and that the layout of this scheme was fundamentally the same.

He informed the Committee that some additional correspondence had been received from the Parish Council and objectors. The Parish Council raised further concerns over the boundary hedgerow, the Walnut tree, design of dwellings, highway and car parking issues. They also wanted to point out that any views from individual parish councillors provided were the views of the individuals concerned and not the Parish Council.

Further letters of objection had been received which expressed concern over the amount of social housing proposed, the number of houses, design, access, drainage and school capacity.

The planning officer pointed out that the social houses could be allocated to Henstridge residents first through a S106 agreement.

D Nichols, Chairman of Henstridge Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He pointed out that the Parish Council are not against development of the site, but would like to see a carefully designed scheme which would be a positive addition to the village. It was the view of the Parish Council that the development had inadequate access and parking and expressed his concern over the close proximity to the Walnut tree.

Mrs P Thompson, Mr Cullum, Mrs J Bates, Mrs D Coates, Mr P Thompson and Mrs L Courtney spoke in objection to the proposal. They raised several concerns including;

- The access onto Church Street is dangerous
- The proposal will further exasperate parking problems in the area
- Henstridge already provides a high amount of social housing and the wording should be amended to ensure that a maximum of 35% social housing is created
- The Village Plan and Design Statement had been ignored
- Approval should only be given for 17 homes, not 20 homes
- The school is at full capacity and will be unable to cope
- Development is too close to an existing home and will block light into this home and garden
- The proposal has been poorly designed and will not sit comfortably in the village

Mr Matthews, the applicant, addressed the Committee. He pointed out that although the application was for 20 homes, rather than 17, there was very little difference in the proposed development when compared to the previously approval scheme. The Housing Officer had confirmed that there was a requirement for 1 bedroomed homes in Henstridge, which explained the rise in homes from 17 to 20.

Councillor William Wallace, Ward Member, raised points on behalf of Councillor Tim Inglefield as well as himself, to include the number of school places which may be required and the road width along Furge Grove.

He expressed his concern over the design, site levels and the parking issues which he thought may cause problems outside of the proposed development site.

During the discussion, Ward Members expressed that they would like to see a play area in the site and concern was raised over the school places which would be needed. The Development Control Manager confirmed that the case officer had visited the school and that there was no problem with capacity at the primary school.

Members raised concern over the design of the development. It was pointed out that the houses should be of traditional design and that these dwellings had nothing in common with the village and that 17 homes would be adequate for the site.

Following the discussion, it was proposed to refuse the planning application.

On being put the vote, it was unanimously agreed to refuse the planning application contrary to the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED: That planning permission **15/01500/FUL** be refused contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed scheme by reason of its density, layout and design of dwellings would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the locality and does not accord with the requirements of Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Part 7 of the NPPF
- 2 The proposal does not provide sufficient parking which will result in an adverse impact upon highway safety and will displace parking onto the already crowded adjoining highways thus resulting in a negative impact upon amenity. As such the proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan or the standards set out in the adopted Parking Strategy.

(Voting: Unanimous)

.....

Chairman