

## South Somerset District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at the **Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton. on Wednesday 10 January 2018.**

(9.00 am - 1.15 pm)

**Present:**

**Members:** Councillor Nick Weeks (Chairman)

Mike Beech	Henry Hobhouse (from 9.05am)
Hayward Burt	Mike Lewis
Tony Capozzoli	David Norris
Nick Colbert	William Wallace (until 1pm)
Sarah Dyke	Colin Winder
Anna Groskop	

**Officers:**

Helen Rutter	Communities Lead
Kelly Wheeler	Case Services Officer (Support Services)
Angela Watson	Lead Specialist (Legal)
Tim Cook	Area Development Lead (East)
Simon Fox	Lead Specialist (Planning)
Dominic Heath-Coleman	Planning Officer
Colin McDonald	Corporate Strategic Housing Manager

**Also Present:**

Ric Pallister	Leader of the Council, SSDC
Sue Berry	Stonewater
Charlotte Brace	Stonewater
Helen Vittery	Service Manager, Highways Development Management Somerset County Council

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

---

### **20. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Agenda Item 1)**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> December, copies of which had been circulated, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

---

### **21. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)**

There were no apologies of absence received.

---

### **22. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)**

Councillors William Wallace, Anna Groskop and Mike Lewis, 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 SSDC.

---

**23. 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, Churchfields, Wincanton on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> February at 9am.

---

**24. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 5)**

There were no questions from members of the public.

---

**25. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 6)**

The Chairman made no announcements.

---

**26. Reports from Members (Agenda Item 7)**

Councillor Capozzoli advised members that Mudford Parish Council were looking at ways to solve problems with local residents using the Village Hall car park. He advised that people were parking in car park overnight and that the PC were considering additional signage and that enforcement action had led to fines being issued.

The Area Development Lead confirmed that the car park had a time restriction of 12 hours, however the sign did not clearly specify no overnight parking. He agreed to contact the car park team to look at the issues around the use of the car park.

Councillor Groskop advised members that Redlynch Park in Bruton had been classified as being 'at risk' by English Heritage. She further advised that the Chief Executive Officer of SSDC had been made aware and would like to know the reasons why the area had been classified at this level. The Communities Lead agreed to follow this up with the Conservation Team.

Councillor Winder pointed out that planning application 17/02712/FUL had still not returned to Area East Committee for determination, following the resolution at the October meeting to defer the application to the November meeting of the Committee. However, he noted that the application was deferred to gather additional information and that this takes time which was likely to be the reason for the delay.

He also raised concern over possible contamination of land at Mudford and pointed out had not received a response after raising this concern at the November meeting. The Communities Lead advised that the Planning Team had been investigating this as part of the planning application and that she would ask the Planning Lead Specialist to contact him to advise him of the situation.

---

## **27. Highways Update Report - Area East (Agenda Item 8)**

The Assistant Highways Service Manager sent his apologies as he was unable to attend the meeting. Members had a brief discussion in his absence.

One member raised concern that the speed indicator devices across the district were being removed and wondered whether communities could purchase these.

He also raised concern that there was still resistance from Somerset County Council to enforce a lower speed limit on the road outside The Park School at Chilton Cantelo. The B3151 at Yeovilton was also raised as a concern.

**RESOLVED:** that members deferred the report to the February meeting of the Committee to allow a representative from Somerset County Council to attend.

---

## **28. Affordable Housing Development Programme - Area East (Agenda Item 9)**

The Corporate Strategic Housing Manager presented his report to members. He explained that this was an annual update report and that the affordable housing development programme had been reasonably healthy across the district.

He drew members' attention to the graph within the report which detailed the number of new homes delivered in Area East. He explained that 12 new affordable properties were built last year, however only 6 were built this year.

He advised members that the Strongvox development had been particularly successful and that bespoke property had been developed within the development.

He advised members that there had been a number of property disposals made by Yarlington Homes and that the amount in Area East was disproportionately higher when compared to the rest of the district. 5 of the 8 disposals across the district were in Area East.

He explained that there were now further grants available for Community Led Housing developments, through a bidding process to the Homes and Communities Agency.

He advised members that there was an affordable housing event currently being arranged.

He highlighted the figures detailed in the appendix to his report. He explained that planning permission had been granted for up to 174 affordable dwellings. One of these developments included within the table, was a development at Vedelers Hay in Wincanton. This was a 'Rent to Buy' scheme which was being developed by Stonewater.

He introduced Sue Berry and Charlotte Brace from Stonewater. They provided members with a short introduction to explain the background of Stonewater and provided information on the 'Rent to Buy' scheme. They explained that this was a new scheme which provided tenants affordable rent and financial support to enable and to encourage them to save money towards purchasing the home, either in full or as shared ownership.

They responded to questions from members.

**RESOLVED:** that members noted the report.

---

**29. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 10)**

Members noted the Area East Forward Plan. It was agreed that the Countryside Service Update Report would be moved the March agenda and that the Highways Update Report would be rescheduled to the next meeting of the Committee in February.

One member suggested that the wording of the Wincanton Community Hospital report should be amended to read 'future of the Wincanton Community Hospital', rather than 'closure of Wincanton Community Hospital'.

**RESOLVED:** that members noted the Area East Forward Plan.

---

**30. Action List from Previous Meeting (For Information Only) (Agenda Item 11)**

Members noted the Action List from the Previous Meeting.

**RESOLVED:** that members noted the report.

---

**31. Planning Appeals (For Information Only) (Agenda Item 12)**

Councillor Pallister, Leader of the Council, addressed members. He explained to members that there had been some confusion in the way appeals are measured by SSDC and DCLG. He advised that the appeals approved by The Planning Inspectorate were slightly over the target threshold, and as a result the government could now intervene with the determination of planning applications.

He further advised that although the New Homes Bonus was at risk of being lost, it had now been secured. He explained that the appeals data would be examined and warned each refusal and subsequent appeal would be looked at.

One member advised that they had found that some of the decisions made by PINS had been inconsistent.

**RESOLVED:** Members noted the appeals which had been allowed or dismissed.

---

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

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

---

**33. 17/03029/OUT - Land OS 5439 Part Townsend Green, Henstridge (Agenda Item 14)**

***Application Proposal: Outline planning application for up to 130 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, suitable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Woodhayes Way.***

The Area Lead Planner (East) presented his report to members. He explained that the application was an outline application and that all matters except access would be reserved for the reserved matters application.

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation he provided images of the site which also showed the adjoining access and proposed access point along the A357. Plans which identified the site location and indicative layout were also shown.

He advised that there had been no objections from the Highways Team, the Lead Local Flood Agency, the SSDC Ecologist or the SSDC Landscape Officer. He did however advise that there had been significant concerns from neighbours. He acknowledged that the application was for more dwellings than the Local Plan requirement for rural settlements.

He advised that the applicant had agreed to the contributions which had been requested and that the application would be CIL liable. He informed members that the site was close to employment opportunities and in the absence of a five year housing land supply; he recommended that the application be approved.

Mr M Player, representing the Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He advised that the applicant carried out a public consultation event at the village hall and that large numbers of the members of public that attended were in objection to the application. He disagreed that the application would provide any benefits to the village and felt that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages. He pointed out that North Dorset D.C had objected to the application and raised concern over the access and the highway and pointed out that there were areas along this busy road which did not have pavements.

Ms Z Godden, also representing the Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. She pointed out that weight should be given to the Henstridge Design Plan Statement and Parish Plan and that the plan should not be disregarded. She advised that the application does not provide any community services or employment and that the majority of the residents are not in favour of the application.

Mr H Bentley-Marchant, also representing the Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He was disappointed that the PC had been asked to consider this application. He felt that a large number of the local residents disagreed that the application would provide significant benefits. He suggested that the settlement hierarchy should be considered and that this was overdevelopment for Henstridge as housing targets had already been exceeded.

Liz Payne, representing the CPRE, spoke in objection to the application. She drew members' attention to the comments made by the Planning Policy Planner which were detailed in the report. She highlighted that the amount of houses was not commensurate with the rural settlement tier as detailed in the Local Plan. She felt that this application under minded the Local Plan and pointed out that the housing target for Henstridge had already been exceeded.

Mr D Sekers, Mr P Dimishky, Mr A Simpson, Mr R Roden, and Mrs D Petherary representing the A357 Group spoke in objection to the planning application. Their comments included;

- Approval of this application would be damaging to the Local Plan and that the hierarchy of development tiers should be considered.
- It was contrary to the Local Plan.
- Concerns over the access and highway safety.
- Cars park along the road where the access was proposed. Residents that live on the A357 have nowhere else to park.
- There are areas along the stretch of road with no footpaths. The back lane routes were dangerous with blind bends.
- It was not safe for pedestrians to walk to the school or to the public house; which were facilities highlighted in the report.
- There is nowhere safe for the school bus to park and HGV's get stuck along the road.
- The cumulative effect of up to 800 homes approved along the A357 should be considered.
- A similar application in Martock was refused and dismissed at appeal as it was inconsistent with the Local Plan. This application was for much less homes and Martock is a larger town.
- The extra traffic would bring harm to the village. Concerns over traffic and pedestrian safety.

Mr R Holme, Dr A Gaymer, Mrs H Howlett, Mrs, J Bates, Mrs D Coates, Mr A Smkziav, Mr C Savage spoke in objection to the application. Their comments included;

- The increased population will affect the water supplies, streams and infiltration of water. The spring on the edge of the development site has a reduced water level.
- Concern over the medical provision. The local doctor at the surgery in Stalbridge is close to retirement age. There is a chance that the surgery could close which will mean that 4000 patients will need to move to an alternative practice, which will stretch their resources.
- Planning permission for 20 houses has already been approved for 20 homes in Henstridge. There is potential for 250 new homes in Henstridge, which is a 30% increase of the existing number of homes.
- The water table is extremely high and with many underground streams, flooding is a concern.
- This will have a negative effect on the school as the additional pupils will just be squeezed in.
- There isn't a dentist or doctor's surgery in the village. The school is filled to capacity and the bus service has been removed.
- There is no part time work available.
- It is not safe for local children to walk to school or to the shop. The owners of these homes will have to drive to a supermarket.
- School buses cannot stop safely on this stretch of road.
- Quality of life of residents will deteriorate.
- There has been flooding further down the stream and additional homes will exasperate the problem.

Megan Pashley, the agent, addressed the Committee. She advised that there was a national shortage of homes and that there is massive pressure in the UK to create new

homes. She also advised members that there was no technical reason for the application to be refused.

Councillor Hayward Burt, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He explained to members that he was concerned about the cumulative effect of other dwellings which could be built in the area. He referred to the SSDC Streetscene Services comments in the officer report. He explained that if it had been calculated that 130 homes could be mean an increase of 290 residents, then the additional homes close by which had been approved could result in an additional 1382 people in total.

He further added that he felt that that the lack of a five year housing supply was not an overriding factor and that the additional dwellings would breach policy SS1. He added that Henstridge was a rural settlement.

He advised members that all of the villages services, such as shop, school and church, were north of the site, on a road which was dangerous and had limited pavements.

He also added that the additional number of residents would be an unreasonable pressure on the health infrastructure.

Councillor William Wallace, also Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application and agreed with the comments made by Councillor Hayward Burt. He highlighted the appeal in Martock, which was dismissed by PINS for fewer houses, in a larger town with more services. He advised that Henstridge was a rural settlement and should be treated as a rural settlement.

In response to a members question, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management SCC, confirmed that the additional dwellings which had been approved nearby had been considered when an assessment of the site had been carried out. She confirmed that this included 4 other developments which totalled 530 dwellings.

During the discussion, members commented that there were few jobs available in Henstridge and that the application would result in overdevelopment of a rural village.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused, contrary to the officer recommendation as the settlement hierarchy should not be ignored and that the application was overdevelopment for the village, the application failed to provide a safe and suitable access and that sufficient information relating to flooding had not been provided.

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

**RESOLVED:** that planning application 17/03029/OUT be **refused**, contrary to the officer recommendation, for the following reasons:

1. Henstridge is defined as a rural settlement; it is considered the scale of development proposed by this application and cumulatively with other approved/proposed developments in the area would undermine the settlement hierarchy set out in Policies SS1 and SS5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2015). Furthermore the development would be contrary to the provisions of Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2015) in that it does not provide employment opportunities create or enhance community facilities or meet identified housing need in Henstridge, and its scale is not commensurate to the

- settlement. These impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the scheme.
2. The development is contrary to Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2015) as it fails to secure safe and convenient access, on foot, cycle and by public and private transport that addresses the needs of all, to key local facilities and services.
  3. The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that sufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development will not bring rise to flooding locally and downstream contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: unanimous)

---

**34. 17/02643/OUT - Land at Dancing Lane, Wincanton (Agenda Item 15)**

***Application Proposal: Outline application for up to 23 dwellings with approval for means of access sought and all other matters reserved for future consideration.***

The Area Lead Planner (East) presented his report to members and explained that the application had been deferred from the previous month's meeting. He explained that the application remained identical, however there had been an amendment to the contributions being sought and that the 100k contribution would no longer form part of the application. He recommended that the planning application be approved subject to a section 106 to include an overage clause to allow some money to be claimed should the application be more profitable than currently expected.

The Legal Services Manager advised members that the profitability of the scheme and any possible contributions could be considered and negotiated at a later date when it was known whether there are any funds available from the developer. She also suggested that this could be decided in conjunction with the Wincanton Ward Members. She felt that by applying this review mechanism, the application could be determined in a consistent and fair way and it would be clear what scale of contribution was appropriate.

Mr R Pratt spoke in objection to the application. He explained that the original application was for bungalows and hoped that the homes could still be bungalows. He also hoped that weight could be given to policy and that the application would be refused. He suggested that the traffic assessment does not include the Verrington Hospital site.

Mr Andrew Fleming, the agent, addressed the Committee. He explained that the site has permission for more homes and that the number of dwellings had been reduced to 23. He also pointed out that there was no requirement for affordable homes on the site.

Councillor Nick Colbert, Ward Member, explained that he regretted that this application had been deferred. He advised that he had objected strongly to the original application and felt that it was positive that the number of homes had been reduced to help retain the character of the area. He also felt that it was positive that the affordable homes aspect of the application had been removed.



Councillor Colin Winder, also Ward Member, agreed that the negotiations over the possible funds available in respect of the overage clause should involve the Wincanton Ward Members.

In response to a member's question, the Area Lead Planner (East) clarified that the application was an outline application and that all other matters, with the exception of access, would be considered at a later stage when a reserved matters application had been submitted. He also confirmed that no contributions towards education were being sought.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the application be approved, as per the officer report subject to additional wording to ensure that any negotiations over possible contributions following a review would involve agreement with Wincanton Ward Members.

On being put to the vote, this was carried 10 voted in support, with 1 against.

**RESOLVED:** that planning application 17/02643/OUT be **approved** subject to;

a) The prior completion of a section 106 agreement or unilateral undertaking (in a form acceptable to the Council's solicitor(s) in conjunction with the Ward Members) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued to secure a planning obligation review mechanism, designed to recoup a proportion of any available surplus.

b) For the following reason:

The principle of residential development in this sustainable location on the edge of a market town is considered acceptable. The proposed development of the site would respect the character of the area, with no demonstrable harm to the setting of the nearby listed building, highway safety, flood risk and drainage, protected species, or residential amenity. As such the proposal complies with local plan policies SD1, SS1, SS5, SS6, TA5, TA6, HG3, EQ2, EQ3, EQ4, and HW1, and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

**Subject to the following conditions;**

01. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale of the development hereby permitted (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: As required by Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: As required by Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

03. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan at 1:5000 scale, received 20 June 2017.

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

04. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures detailed in section 4 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (EAD, Sep 2014) unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: For the protection, conservation, and enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with NPPF chapter 11.

05. No works shall commence on the site until the works within the public highway shown on drawing 13780/T04, received 20 June 2017, have been fully implemented. A detailed design and specification for those works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any works take place and thereafter be adhered to in full.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

06. Any proposed roads approved at the reserved matters stage, including footpaths and turning spaces where applicable, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling, before it is occupied, shall be served by a properly consolidated and surfaced footpath and carriageway constructed to at least base course level between the dwelling and the existing public highway of Dancing Lane. The roads shall be subsequently completed in accordance with an approved timetable. The timetable shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority before any dwelling so served is first occupied.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

07. Before each dwelling hereby permitted is first occupied, a properly consolidated and surfaced access linking it to the relevant access road shall be constructed in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These access shall not be surfaced in loose stone or gravel.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

08. As part of a reserved matters application, a plan showing parking spaces in accordance with the Somerset County Council Parking Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Each parking space shall be properly consolidated in the approved manner before any dwelling it is intended to serve is first occupied and shall thereafter be made available at all times solely for the parking of vehicles in association with those dwellings.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

09. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a construction management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of construction vehicle

movements, construction operation hours, construction vehicular routes to and from the site, construction delivery hours, expected number of construction vehicles per day, vehicle parking for contractors, specific measures to adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of compliance with the Environmental Code of Construction Practice and a scheme to encourage the use of public transport by contractors, The plan as approved shall be fully adhered to at all times through the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity and in accordance with policies EQ2, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

10. As part of a reserved matters application, details of a 'no build zone' shall be submitted in plan form to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The 'no build zone' shall correspond closely to the area shown as undeveloped on illustrative layout site layout plan ref no 1174/03 dated 30 July 2014 and submitted as part of application 14/01704/OUT. No development shall take place within the 'no build zone' other than any that may be required in association with any approved drainage scheme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

11. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of a scheme for the protection of trees and vegetation around the periphery of the site, and specifically in the vicinity of Verrington Lodge, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be adhered to in full throughout all phases of construction activity relevant thereto.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

12. As part of a reserved matters application, details of measures for the enhancement of biodiversity, to include a landscape and ecology enhancement and management plan relating specifically to the 'no build zone', shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of conserving and enhancing biodiversity in accordance with policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

13. Prior to, and within 2 months of, the commencement of each significant stage of ground works, an update survey for badger setts shall be undertaken by a competent person, the identity of whom shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. A schedule of the said significant stages shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development commences. If any badger setts are found to be present within 30 metres (including on adjoining land) of any area of activity, the works shall not proceed until a method statement for the protection of badgers has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and any necessary Natural England licences have been obtained. Any method statement thus approved shall be implemented in full in the approved manner.

Reason: in the interests of conserving and enhancing biodiversity in accordance with policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

14. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until such time as a surface water drainage scheme (to include a full drainage masterplan, associated drainage calculations and a management plan governing future responsibility for and maintenance of the scheme) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained and managed in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements and management plan embodied within it.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and protecting against flood risk and in accordance with local plan policy EQ1 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development, a Measures only Travel Plan Statement is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such Travel Plan should include soft and hard measures to promote sustainable travel as well as targets and safeguards by which to measure the success of the plan. There should be a timetable for implementation of the measures and for the monitoring of travel habits. The development shall not be occupied unless the agreed measures are being implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable. The measures should continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and sustainable development and in accordance with policies SS1, SD1, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset local plan.

#### **Informatives:**

01. The applicant will be required to enter into a suitable legal agreement with the Highway Authority to secure the construction of the highway works necessary as part of this development. Please ensure that an advisory note is attached requesting that the developer contact the Highway Authority to progress this agreement well in advance of commencement of development.
02. Development, insofar as it affects a right of way should not be started, and the right of way should be kept open for public use until the necessary (diversion/stopping up) Order has come into effect. Failure to comply with this request may result in the developer being prosecuted if the path is built on or otherwise interfered with.
03. The developer should be aware of the concerns of the SSDC Conservation Officer in regard to the submitted indicative layout and the likely impact on the setting of the nearby listed building. Similarly the developer should be aware of local concerns in regard to the submitted indicative layout as to the potential impact on the residential amenity of adjoining residents. Before submitting any reserved matters application the developer is advised to contact the planning department to discuss how the indicative layout could be amended to address the above concerns.
04. Please be advised that subsequent full or reserved matters approval by South Somerset District Council will attract a liability payment under the Community Infrastructure Levy. CIL is a mandatory financial charge on development and you

will be notified of the amount of CIL being charged on this development in a CIL Liability Notice.

You are required to complete and return Form 1 Assumption of Liability as soon as possible and to avoid additional financial penalties it is important that you notify us of the date you plan to commence development before any work takes place Please complete and return Form 6 Commencement Notice. You are advised to visit our website for further details <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/cil> or email [cil@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:cil@southsomerset.gov.uk)

(Voting: 10 in support, with 1 against)

---

**35. 17/03899/FUL - The Church Byres, Church Farm, Sparkford Road, South Barrow (Agenda Item 16)**

***Application Proposal: Erection of single storey extension to east elevation of the dwelling.***

The Area Lead Planner (East) presented the report to members. He explained that there had been some further information received from the applicant which confirmed that 2 of the 4 existing bedrooms were used for occasional bed and breakfast accommodation.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, members were shown plans to show the location of the dwelling as well as photos and plans to show existing and proposed elevations.

The Area Lead Planner (East) read out an extract from supplementary guidance titled 'SSDC Conversion of Barns and Other Historic Buildings 1991', to highlight the requirement to preserve the specific characteristics of the barn by avoiding additional extensions. He explained that the officer was recommending that the application be refused.

Mrs J Cox, the applicant and owner, addressed members. She explained that the application would enable her to offer self-catering accommodation as well as bed and breakfast accommodation, which she felt would encourage visitors to stay in the area for longer and increase tourism. She also explained that the extension was not on the front of the property, nor was the property listed or had any historic significance. She also pointed out that the Parish Council had supported the application and that no neighbours had objected. She also highlighted that an extension to the rear of the building had previously been approved.

Councillor Nick Weeks, Ward Member, felt that small businesses should be encouraged and further stated that the site was in a good location and was not overlooked.

Councillor Henry Hobhouse, also Ward Member, agreed that the site was hard to find and could not overlook any other properties. He commented that he could see no reason why this application should be refused.

During the discussion, the Area Lead Officer (East) confirmed that the site was not in a conservation area. Members also noted that the barn had previously been extended and felt that tourism should be encouraged.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the application be approved, contrary to the officer report as members

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

**RESOLVED:** that planning application 17/03899/FUL be **approved** contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reason;

1. The proposal, on an already extended barn, will have no substantial adverse impact on visual or residential amenity in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the relevant sections of the NPPF.

**Subject to the following conditions;**

1. 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.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans date stamped as received 27.09.17 and reference:

- a) Site Location Plan (scale 1:100)
- b) Drawing No. 03 – Floor Plan as Proposed
- c) Drawing No. 04 – Elevations Proposal 2 – Timber Frame
- d) Drawing No. 04 – Site Plan (scale 1:500) – date stamped 06.10.17

And the external surfaces of the development shall be of materials as indicated in the application form and no other materials shall be used without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

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

*(Voting: unanimous)*

---

**36. 17/03781/FUL - Perry Hill Farm, Foddington, Bab Cary (Agenda Item 17)**

***Application Proposal: Extension to provide a bedroom, en-suite bathroom, glazed sitting room, garage and glazed link building. Raising paths and patios to create level access.***

The Planning Officer presented his report to members and using a PowerPoint presentation he displayed images and plans to show the dwelling and the proposed and existing elevations. He pointed out that the proposed extension would have a flat roof and advised that the Parish Council were objecting to the application because of this flat roof. In response to this comment, the Area Lead Officer (East) advised members that the planning application only needed planning approval because of a glazed link roof to the existing dwelling, and that the flat roof extension would not require permission should the glazing element be removed from the application.

Mr J Collins, the planning agent, addressed the Committee. He advised that in 2012, planning approval was obtained for a roof terrace which the Parish Council offered their support to. He felt that a pitched roof would not be in-keeping with the area and would

obscure the view from the existing balcony. He also pointed out the extension would provide health benefits to the applicant.

Councillor Nick Weeks, Ward Member advised that he regretted bringing the application to the committee for determination and offered his support to the application.

Councillor Henry Hobhouse, also Ward Member, also offered his support. However, he explained that he did not realise that the dwelling had an existing balcony which explained the need for a flat roof.

Following the discussion, it was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as per the officer report and subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

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

**RESOLVED:** that planning application 17/03781/FUL be **approved**, as per the officer report as detailed in the agenda for the following reason;

01. The proposal by reason of its nature, location, size, design, and materials will have no substantial adverse impact on visual or residential amenity or highway safety in accordance with the aims and objectives of policies EQ2, TA5, TA6 and SD1 of the South Somerset Local and the relevant sections of the National Policy Planning Framework 2012.

**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 works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details in the application and plans numbered D&PM3094/01a, D&PM3094/02, D&PM3094/03, D&PM3094/04, D&PM3094/05a, D&PM3094/06, D&PM3094/07, D&PM3094/08, D&PM3094/09.

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

(Voting: unanimous)

---

.....  
Chairman