

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at the **Council Offices Churchfield Wincanton on Wednesday 12 July 2017.**

(9.00 am - 12.15 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Nick Weeks (Chairman)

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

Officers:

Helen Rutter	Communities Lead
Tim Cook	Area Development Lead (East)
Lisa Davis	Community Office Support Manager
Angela Watson	Legal Services Manager
David Norris	Development Manager
Adrian Noon	Area Lead (North/East)
Lee Walton	Planning Officer
Dominic Heath-Coleman	Planning Officer
Kelly Wheeler	Democratic Services Officer

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

19. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Agenda Item 1)

Councillor Anna Groskop advised that she would like an amendment to minute number 17 (Area East Forward Plan) of the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 14th June 2017, copies of which had been circulated.

She advised that the committee had agreed, in principle, to seek outline planning permission using their own funds, for a retail unit in Wincanton. It was agreed that the minutes would be amended to reflect this.

The Chairman also advised that concerns which were raised over grass verges in Keinton Mandeville were not included within the minutes.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the minutes would be amended to include additional text to detail the grass verges in Keinton Mandeville and that in principle, AEC would apply for outline planning permission for a retail unit in Wincanton, subject to a report to follow at the next month's AEC meeting.

On being put to the vote, this was carried 6 votes in support, with 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the previous meeting were agreed subject to the following additional text to minute number 17;

2) That in principle, Area East Committee would facilitate outline planning permission for a retail outlet, using their own funds, subject to a review of costs to be carried out by the Assistant Director (Communities), for which a supplementary report would be provided to members at the August Area East Committee meeting.

And an addition to minute number 12;

Members raised concern over the machines which were being used to cut the hedgerows/verges across the district, particularly in Keinton Mandeville.

20. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David Norris and Councillor Hayward Burt.

21. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

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

22. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted that the date of the next scheduled meeting of the Area East Committee would be held at the Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton on Wednesday 9th August 2017 commencing at 9am.

23. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 5)

Ms E Elson, spoke to publically thank the local police for their brilliant help which they had given to her during a recent event. She was very grateful for the help which she received from the staff at the Wincanton police station based at Churchfields.

24. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman advised that the Area East Regeneration Board would now only meet as and when a meeting was required. The dates remain in his diary; however he would decide whether the board would meet prior to each meeting.

25. Reports from Members (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Tony Capozzoli advised members that there were problems at Limington where a ditch has been dug near to someone's home to carry out repairs to a blocked drainage pipe. He was concerned that should there be heavy rain, that there could be flooding. He also expressed his concern that a reply had not been received from RNAS Yeovilton in relation to the flooding at Stockwitch Cross.

Councillor Colin Winder explained to members that he was still being contacted by members of the public for clarification over which types of plastics could be included in the weekly recycling collections. He also raised concern that enforcement action had not yet been taken at 55 High Street, Wincanton following a recent refusal of a retrospective planning application. He also pointed out there was a mobile home, which was being occupied, on Bennetts Field Trading Estate in Wincanton.

In response to the points made, the Area Development Lead Officer (East) advised that there was clear information on the SSDC website which detailed the type of plastics which could be recycled and that he would ensure that this was made available to Councillor Winder. He also advised that the mobile home on Bennetts Field Trading Estate was being dealt with by a Somerset County Council officer.

Councillor Mike Beech pointed out to members that there was still an issue with oversized machines being used to trim the hedgerows around the district.

26. The Balsam Centre - Allocation of Healthy Living Centre Funding for 2017/18 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 8)

The Area Development Lead presented his report to members. He explained that the Balsam Centre was the only Healthy Living Centre within the district and that the funding for the centre, and the decision for its allocation had been transferred to Area East Committee.

He explained that it had been a positive year for the centre and that the award of £10,000 was to match the funding that the centre receives for the 'Like Minds' project. He further advised that the Balsam Centre had received funds from the Armed Forces Community Covenant to employ a Community Development worker to support military families' integration into the Deansley Way housing estate.

In response to a members question, the Area Development Lead confirmed that the Conkers Nursery was part of the Balsam Centre, however the funding which was being sought, was for the Balsam Centre and Balsam Centre projects only. He advised that this funding was not to be absorbed by Conkers Nursery. He further advised that the Balsam Centre was regulated by charity law, which would scrutinise where funding is spent to ensure that money would not be spent on the nursery.

The Area Development Lead suggested that it would be useful if members could have a report on how Conkers Nursery was funded and agreed that this would be made available to members at the next Area East Committee meeting.

RESOLVED: that members

- 1) Noted the report
- 2) Awarded the £10,000 ring fenced for Healthy Living Centres to the Balsam Centre for the delivery of the work programme subject to a follow up report detailing the funding for Conkers Nursey be referred to Area East Committee.

(Voting: unanimous)

27. Retail Sector in Area East (Agenda Item 9)

The Community Support Assistant presented her report to members. She explained that the report detailed the trends of the 3 market towns in Area East.

She pointed out that the Retail Support Initiative was a successful project and that the team were currently considering 3 new applications for grants and that 19 application packs had been requested from the team. She advised that a recent grant for the Red Lion had not been made as the pub had changed hands and that the money had not been drawn.

She further advised that her report contained suggested revisions to the scheme.

The Neighbourhood Development Officer advised that 2 High Street banks were likely to close in Wincanton and that mobile banks are likely to be provided as an alternative. Following the discussion around mobile banks, she advised that there had been strong lobbying by the Business Association of Wincanton to try to secure the banks from closing in Wincanton.

Members suggested that the car park information which was detailed within the report should be fed into the SSDC corporate review of car parks and that the graphs should be referred to the relevant Town Council. The Neighbourhood Development Officer agreed that she would ensure that this information was referred to the relevant Town Councils and would be included within the SSDC review of car parks and offices.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the report be noted and to approve the revised RSI scheme for 2017/18.

On being out to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that members noted the report and agreed to approved the revised RSI scheme for 2017/18.

(Voting: unanimous)

28. Community Offices Update 2016/17 (Agenda Item 10)

The Community Office Support Manager presented her report to members. She explained that the report provided details of the footfall and enquiry figures for across the district.

She advised members that there had been a decline in all of the area offices since last year. She suggested that this was due to an increase in the use of online services.

Universal Credit, which is being rolled out across the UK, requires all applications to be made online. She pointed out that members of the team were able to assist members of the public with making these online applications. She pointed out that where help is required to make these claims; this is usually offered the next working day.

She informed members that customer satisfaction survey had been undertaken and that the results of which indicated that 99% of customers had received a good or very good service, she further pointed out that the team are very experienced members of staff.

Looking forward, she explained that she was hoping that the Transformation Project would look to enhance the online services, which would help ensure that face-to-face help would still be required for those that need it.

During the discussion, members questioned whether these services could be provided from the libraries. The procedure for reporting of waste problems was also clarified for members, as this is something which the team assist with.

The Assistant Director (Communities) advised members that SSDC was working with the Somerset County Council on the One Public Estate Programme which looks at ways of sharing public buildings for advice services.

RESOLVED: that the report be noted.

29. Planning Appeals (For information only) (Agenda Item 11)

Members noted the planning appeals which had been received, allowed or dismissed.

30. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 12)

The Assistant Director (Communities) advised that the CIL report scheduled for the September meeting would be moved to the agenda for the October meeting.

She further advised that a report on the outline planning application for a retail unit in Wincanton would be included on the agenda for the August or September meeting of the Committee.

She requested that a report on the funding for the Conkers Nursery to be included on the Forward Plan for the August meeting of the Committee.

Councillor Anna Groskop suggested that it would be useful for members to visit the Balsam Centre to look at the benefits which they provide to the community and further requested a report on Tourism in Area East.

Members requested that a report on the future of the Churchfield offices be presented to the Committee following a Portfolio Holder Briefing which was taking place in the near future.

RESOLVED: that the CIL report, currently scheduled for the September meeting would be moved to the October meeting of Area East Committee.

A report on the outline planning application for a retail unit in Wincanton and a report retiling the funding for Conker Nursery would be on the agenda for the August or September meeting of the committee.

A report on Tourism in Area East and the future use of Churchfield would be included within the Forward Plan.

31. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 13)

Members noted the Schedule of Planning Application to be determined by Committee.

32. 17/01636/OUT - Land adj The Old Mill House, Lower Kingsbury, Milborne Port (Agenda Item 14)

Application Proposal: Outline application for the erection of a four bedroom dwelling and garage (resubmission of 14/01514/OUT)

The Planning Officer presented his report to members with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. He explained that the application was a re-submission of an earlier outline planning application and that the extant permission will remain as a fall back position.

Mr P Davies and Mr S Jones addressed the Committee to speak in objection to the scheme. Their points included;

- A site visit would be advisable as the access to the site was a single track steep road which was bounded by stone walls and was close to Listed Buildings.
- The steep access road was well used and congestion was frequent.
- A site visit would enable members to appreciate the changes in the land levels on the site.
- The stability of the land was questionable as the access was over an old mill pond.
- Social and economic benefits are limited.
- The proposal was impact on The Old Mill, which was an old landmark building. The access will overlook The Old Mill and will remove all privacy.

Mr A Preston, the agent, addressed the Committee. He explained to members that the application site had gained outline planning permission in 2014 and was therefore regarded as appropriate infill and that the access was reasonable. He further advised that there had not been significant amendments to planning policy and that he felt that the application was acceptable.

Councillor Sarah Dyke, Ward Member, sought clarification on the position of the previous outline planning permission. The Area Lead Officer (North/East) clarified that the outline application remained as a fall-back planning application and that an application for reserved matters had now been submitted. He further clarified that the site had an extant outline planning approval.

During the discussion, members agreed that the access was a narrow, steep and well-used road.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as detailed in the officer's report; however on being put to the vote, this was not carried with 4 votes in support of the proposal and 5 votes against.

It was subsequently proposed and seconded, that the application be deferred to allow members to undertake a site visit to allow members to appreciate the setting of the

proposed dwelling and to bring the report to a later committee meeting for determination at the same time as the current reserved matters application which was being considered by the planning team.

On being put to the vote, this was carried 7 votes in support, with 1 vote against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: that planning application 17/01636/OUT be **deferred** to allow members to undertake a site visit and for the application to return to the Area East Committee for determination at the same time as planning application 17/02438/REM which had not yet been determined.

(Voting: 7 votes in support, 1 vote against and 1 abstention)

33. 17/01659/FUL - Plot 1 Alma Field, Castle Cary (Agenda Item 15)

Erection of a new dwelling and garage (revised design to that approved 15/04460/FUL)

(Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest, Councillor Henry Hobhouse left the room during the discussion of this item)

The Planning Officer confirmed, that with the Chairman's permission, that he was going to present agenda items 15 and 16 together. He made it clear that although outline permission was granted for 3 dwellings on one site, that the site had now been separated into 3 units and that 2 of which were being considered at the meeting. The 2 units had different owners and different planning agents and would need to be considered separately.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, he provided images of the proposed plans and photographs of the site. He pointed out that the design of the houses was different to the design which had been approved and that the dimensions of the dwellings had been reduced. He advised members that it was his suggestion that the planning application be approved.

Pek Peppin, representing Castle Cary Town Council addressed the Committee. She explained to members that the site was not in the area of growth and that the original application for these houses had been supported for one reason only, which was the unique design of the houses which were proposed to be Hanse Haus dwellings. Hanes Haus dwellings are high efficient and as they are pre-fabricated, would cause little disruption to neighbours. She further pointed out that the original proposal was for 3 houses of similar and matching design. She was disappointed that the current proposal was for modern looking houses with amended window arrangements and amended fenestration. She hoped that the application would be refused.

Mr C Hurd, spoke in objection to the application. He explained that the amended application was no longer in-keeping with the surrounding area. He expressed concern over the disruption which would be caused and the time it would take to build the houses. He raised further concern over the windows which would overlook dwellings.

Mr J Nuth, the agent acting for plot 1, explained that the proposal was still for a timber framed house and pointed out there were no restrictions within the approval to restrict

construction techniques He pointed out that the proposed dwellings were of traditional design and not a modern design. He also clarified that the roof height at the position closest to the neighbour's boundaries are no higher than what was approved. He pointed out that the windows which were facing existing properties were roof lights and would not cause a loss of privacy.

Councillor Nick Weeks, Chairman and Ward Member, advised members that the Town Council had felt let down by the application as they had previously supported the unique Hanse Haus dwellings. He advised that the current applications were very different and now had concern over the window positions.

Mr S Cooper, the owner of plot 2, advised members that the 3 windows which overlook existing properties would be obscured and fixed shut.

During the discussion, the overlooking issue was discussed, however it was clarified that a condition had been included to ensure the windows on plot 3 were obscured and fixed shut on plot 2.

It was proposed and seconded that planning application 17/01659/FUL be approved as per the officers report. On being put to the vote this was carried 7 votes in support, with 1 against.

RESOLVED: that planning application 17/01659/FUL be **approved** as per the officer report for the following reason;

01. The proposal, by reason of its location, represents appropriate infill adjacent to the development area and is therefore sustainable development in accordance with the aims of objectives of policy SS1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

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: P-02 and P-03 received 10 April 2017.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

03. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.

Reason: In the interests of neighbour amenity further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028

04. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, foul and surface water drainage details to serve the development, shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority and such approved drainage details shall be completed and become fully operational before the development hereby permitted is first brought into use. Following its installation such approved scheme shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of neighbour amenity further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

05. Prior to commencement full particulars detailing the layout of the natural stone boundary walls bordering the access road, their appearance, including that of the gate piers, use of materials, including a sample panel to show coursing and pointing, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details as shall be agreed shall be undertaken as part of the development and thereafter retained and shall not be removed or otherwise altered.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, character and appearance and for the avoidance of doubt further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

06. 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 materials (including the provision of samples where appropriate) to be used for the external walls and roofs;
 - b. details of the internal finished ground floor levels

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

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

(Voting: 7 in support and 1 against)

34. 17/01646/FUL - Plot 2 Alma Field, Castle Cary (Agenda Item 16)

Application Proposal: Erection of a dwelling and garage (revised design to that approved 15/04460/FUL)

(Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest in this item, Councillor Henry Hobhouse left the room during the discussion of this item)

The discussion of the item had taken place with the discussion of agenda item 15.

It was proposed and seconded that planning application 17/01646/FUL be approved as per the officers report, subject to the amendment to condition 7 to include the wording; 'unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority'. On being put to the vote this was carried 6 votes in support, 1 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: that planning application 17/01646/FUL be **approved** as per the officer report, subject to an amendment to condition 7 to include the wording

'unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority' for the following reason;

01. The proposal, by reason of its location, represents appropriate infill adjacent to the development area and is therefore sustainable development in accordance with the aims of objectives of policy SS1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

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: Location Plan, TWP17-CC-003, 001, 002, 004, 005, 008 and 012 received 5 May 2017.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

03. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.

Reason: In the interests of neighbour amenity further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028

04. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, foul and surface water drainage details to serve the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such approved drainage details shall be completed and become fully operational before the development hereby permitted is first brought into use. Following its installation such approved scheme shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of neighbour amenity further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

05. Prior to commencement full particulars detailing the layout of the natural stone boundary walls bordering the access road, their appearance, including that of the gate piers, use of materials, including a sample panel to show coursing and pointing, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details as shall be agreed shall be undertaken as part of the development and thereafter retained and shall not be removed or otherwise altered.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, character and appearance and for the avoidance of doubt further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

06. 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 materials (including the provision of samples where appropriate) to be used for the external walls and roofs;
 - b. details of the internal finished ground floor levels

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

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

07. Prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use the first floor windows in the north elevation shall be fitted with obscure glass (and fixed closed) and shall be permanently retained and maintained in this fashion thereafter, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of neighbour amenity, further to policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

08. Prior to commencement of the approved development, the appointed construction/groundworks contractor shall arrange for the Council's Tree Officer (01935 462670) to attend a pre-commencement site meeting at a mutually convenient time. Tree protection measures -specifically the installation of protective fencing and signage, shall be installed by the appointed construction/groundworks contractor, inspected and approved in writing by the Council prior to any commencement of the development. The approved tree protection fencing shall remain undisturbed and in-situ for the duration of the construction of the approved development and shall only be moved or dismantled with the prior approval of the Council in-writing.

Reason: To preserve existing landscape features (trees) in accordance with the following policies as stated within The South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028); EQ2: General Development, EQ4: Bio-Diversity & EQ5: Green Infrastructure.

(Voting: 6 votes in support, 1 against and 1 abstention)

35. 17/01064/FUL - Land at Camp Road, Dimmer Lane, Dimmer (Agenda Item 17)

Application Proposal: Erect security building and staff parking area. Erect perimeter security fencing all in association with the storage of motor vehicles. Change of use of the land from B2 to B8 use.

The Planning Officer presented his report to members. He explained that since the report had been published, he thought it appropriate to add an additional condition to ensure that no washing or valeting of vehicles occurred until a drainage system had been installed and agreed.

He provided details of further updates to the application. Two letters had been received from LMR Planning Law, which had been circulated to members. The letters argue that there is inadequate detail contained within the application to determine the application

and that the officer report lacked detail in key areas such as the principle of development, drainage and highways. Three further letters of objection had also been received, which raised further concern over highway safety.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, The Planning Officer provided maps, plans and photographs to show the area and the application proposal. He further provided plans to show a scheme adjoining the site which had recently been granted planning permission, however had not yet been implemented.

He advised members that in 2008, an established use of B2 was agreed by way of a certificate of lawfulness application. He suggested that a B8 use would have less impact on residents than the already permitted B2 use. His recommendation, as detailed in the report, was that the application be approved subject to the conditions, to include an additional drainage condition.

Mr T Evans, representing Lydford on Fosse Parish Council, addressed the committee. He explained to members that proposal detailed excessive opening times, would create pollution and offered limited employment for the community. He explained that he had concern over the traffic and the impact on the road network. He pointed out that there was little detail contained within the application in relation to number of vehicles to be stored on the site and the traffic movements to and from the site; however he thought that this would be considerably higher than with the current use at the site. He advised members that 20% of the traffic which uses the B3135 is a HGV.

Mr C Edwards, representing Ansford Parish Council, addressed members. He explained that he had grave concerns over the road network and the access to the site which would be used by large transporter vehicles. He explained that the road is unsuitable for HGV's and that some areas of the road narrowed to single track in some areas, which results in delays and dangerous situations, and this increase in traffic would make the situation worse.

Ms P Peppin, representing Castle Cary Town Council, addressed the Committee. She explained that the Town Council had concerns over the road network and the increased traffic. She advised that it was wrong to compare this application to a similar application in Henstridge as that site was situated next to an A road and not a B road. She explained that if the vehicle transporter vehicles were taller than 4.5m high, then they would be unable to go west on the B3153 and would all have to go through the village of Clanville. She further pointed out that there were no staff facilities included within the proposal, no drainage details, only two members of staff to be employed and that the opening hours were too long.

Ms V Nobles, Ms B Britz, Mr A Gibbons, Mr Knight and Mr Kay addressed the Committee. Their comments included;

- There is a lack of highways information provided.
- The opinions and decisions of planning inspectors have been ignored. Two planning appeals have been refused for highway reasons.
- A building would be needed for staff and for storage and this has not been shown on the plans.
- A business plan should have been provided.
- The opening hours are too long.
- Only 2 jobs will be created.

- The additional traffic will make the road dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists as there is no footpath. There is also a nursing home close to the road.
- There will be an increase in traffic from the waste transfer station which has already been approved. The road cannot take further traffic.
- HGV's cause damage to verges, walls and property. 30% of traffic which goes through Clanville is a HGV.
- The access to the site has a concrete road, can this be extended to reduce the amount of dust created from the site?
- There is a lack of information in the report and some errors.

Mr P Dance, the planning agent, addressed the Committee. He advised members that, in his opinion, a B8 storage use would be better for the local residents and that a good balance would have been found, which was supported by the SCC Highways Department. He clarified that a vehicle transporter could carry 11 vehicles. He further pointed out a water treatment plant had been proposed in the previous application for an industrial unit.

Councillor Henry Hobhouse, Ward Member, expressed his concern that additional traffic would be using B3153 when the waste transfer station has begun operating from Dimmer. He agreed that the road through Clanville was tight and over-used. He hoped that the application would be refused.

Councillor Nick Weeks, also Ward Member, agreed with the comments of Councillor Hobhouse. His view was that this application would make the already unbearable issues significantly worse. He advised that he couldn't offer his support to this application.

During the discussion, members commented that this application was inappropriate for a rural area and that lighting and security was a concern. It was further commented that the small amount of employment offered little benefit to the community.

Members further commented that the highway was unsafe for pedestrians and motorists. It was further commented that this site cannot be compared to a similar scheme in Henstridge.

The Area Lead (North/East) pointed out to members that the site had not been included within the current local plan with a specified use and that the 2008 certificate of lawfulness, to confirm B2 use, remained unchallenged.

He further advised that the highway issues were not the responsibility of the developer/land owner, however acknowledged that the application would result in a considerable increase in traffic. He clarified that previous inspector decisions took the view that in previous applications it had not been shown that traffic could be safely accommodated, rather than that road was unsafe.

One member pointed out that as the site was included within the SSDC Local Plan; it was unfair on the land owner/developer that possibilities for the site were not clear. Members agreed that the Planning Policy team should provide support to the land owner to consider and confirm possible future uses for the site. It was agreed that this concern would be raised with the Planning Policy team for them to consider possible future uses of the site in the local plan review.

Councillor Anna Groskop, suggested that an informative be added to the refusal to highlight the concern over the cumulative effect of traffic for this site due to the approval of many homes in Castle Cary and the approval of the waste transfer station. She further

suggested that the certificate of lawfulness application which agreed a B2 use of the site was now inappropriate and not suitable. However, the Area Lead (North/East) felt that this would be unreasonable to add as an informative to a refusal.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the planning application be refused, contrary to the officer recommendation, as the submitted supporting information lacks a thorough and detailed assessment of the likely levels of traffic that would be generated by the proposed use. Without such information it has not been demonstrated that the additional traffic could be safely accommodated on the B3153 between Ansford Bridge and Lydford Cross without detriment and safety to the residential amenities of occupiers of properties adjacent to the road and road users. As such the proposal is contrary to policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

On being put to the vote, this was carried 5 votes in support, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: that planning application 17/01064/FUL be **refused**, contrary to the officers recommendation for the following reason;

01. The submitted supporting information lacks a thorough and detailed assessment of the likely levels of traffic that would be generated by the proposed use. Without such information it has not been demonstrated that the additional traffic could be safely accommodated on the B3153 between Ansford Bridge and Lydford Cross without detriment to the residential amenities of occupiers of properties adjacent to the road. As such the proposal is contrary to policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 5 votes in support, 2 against and 2 abstentions)

36. 17/01471/DPO - New Spittles Farm, Ilchester Mead, Ilchester (Agenda Item 18)

Application Proposal: Application to vary s106 agreement dated 19th March 2013 between SSDC, Richard Don Knight and Heather Diana Knight to allow use of part of the land for anaerobic digester

The Development Manager explained that the application was strongly linked to a separate planning application for an anaerobic digester plant on the same site and recommend to members that the application be deferred. He suggested to members that this would allow the committee to consider the two planning applications together at the same meeting which would ensure that members have a full transparent picture of the planning applications which are proposed for the site.

It was proposed and seconded that planning application 17/001471/DPO be deferred to a later meeting of the Area East Committee to allow the application to be determined at the same meeting as planning application 17/01515/FUL. On being put to the vote, this was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: that planning application 17/001471/DPO be **deferred** to a later meeting of the Area East Committee to allow the application to be determined at the same meeting as planning application 17/01515/FUL.

(Voting: unanimous)

.....
Chairman