

**South Somerset District Council**

*Notice of Meeting*



# Area West Committee

*Making a difference where it counts*

**Wednesday 19th September 2018**

**6.00 pm**

**The Guildhall, Fore Street  
Chard, TA20 1PP**

(Disabled access and a hearing loop are available at this meeting venue)



The following members are requested to attend this meeting:

Jason Baker  
Marcus Barrett  
Mike Best  
Amanda Broom  
Dave Bulmer  
Carol Goodall

Val Keitch  
Jenny Kenton  
Paul Maxwell  
Sue Osborne  
Ric Pallister  
Garry Shortland

Angie Singleton  
Andrew Turpin  
Linda Vjeh  
Martin Wale

There are no planning applications.

For further information on the items to be discussed, please contact the Case Services Officer (Support Services) on 01935 462055 or [democracy@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@southsomerset.gov.uk)

This Agenda was issued on Tuesday 11 September 2018.

**Alex Parmley**, *Chief Executive Officer*

This information is also available on our website  
[www.southsomerset.gov.uk](http://www.southsomerset.gov.uk) and via the mod.gov app



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

## **Information for the Public**

The council has a well-established area committee system and through four area committees seeks to strengthen links between the Council and its local communities, allowing planning and other local issues to be decided at a local level (planning recommendations outside council policy are referred to the district wide Regulation Committee).

Decisions made by area committees, which include financial or policy implications are generally classed as executive decisions. Where these financial or policy decisions have a significant impact on council budgets or the local community, agendas will record these decisions as “key decisions”. The council’s Executive Forward Plan can be viewed online for details of executive/key decisions which are scheduled to be taken in the coming months. Non-executive decisions taken by area committees include planning, and other quasi-judicial decisions.

At area committee meetings members of the public are able to:

- attend and make verbal or written representations, except where, for example, personal or confidential matters are being discussed;
- at the area committee chairman’s discretion, members of the public are permitted to speak for up to up to three minutes on agenda items; and
- see agenda reports

Meetings of the Area West Committee are held monthly, usually at 5.30pm, on the third Wednesday of the month (except December) in village halls throughout Area West (unless specified otherwise).

Agendas and minutes of meetings are published on the council’s website  
[www.southsomerset.gov.uk/councillors-and-democracy/meetings-and-decisions](http://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/councillors-and-democracy/meetings-and-decisions)

Agendas and minutes can also be viewed via the mod.gov app (free) available for iPads and Android devices. Search for ‘mod.gov’ in the app store for your device, install, and select ‘South Somerset’ from the list of publishers, then select the committees of interest. A wi-fi signal will be required for a very short time to download an agenda but once downloaded, documents will be viewable offline.

## **Public participation at committees**

### **Public question time**

The period allowed for participation in this session shall not exceed 15 minutes except with the consent of the Chairman of the Committee. Each individual speaker shall be restricted to a total of three minutes.

### **Planning applications**

There are no planning applications.

## **Recording and photography at council meetings**

Recording of council meetings is permitted, however anyone wishing to do so should let the Chairperson of the meeting know prior to the start of the meeting. The recording should be overt and clearly visible to anyone at the meeting, but non-disruptive. If someone is recording the meeting, the Chairman will make an announcement at the beginning of the meeting.

Any member of the public has the right not to be recorded. If anyone making public representation does not wish to be recorded they must let the Chairperson know.

The full 'Policy on Audio/Visual Recording and Photography at Council Meetings' can be viewed online at:

<http://modgov.southsomerset.gov.uk/documents/s3327/Policy%20on%20the%20recording%20of%20council%20meetings.pdf>

Ordnance Survey mapping/map data included within this publication is provided by South Somerset District Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to undertake its statutory functions on behalf of the district. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. South Somerset District Council - LA100019471 - 2018.

# **Area West Committee**

## **Wednesday 19 September 2018**

### **Agenda**

#### ***Preliminary Items***

- 1. To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 15th August 2018**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Declarations of Interest**

In accordance with the Council's current Code of Conduct (as amended 26 February 2015), which includes all the provisions relating to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI), personal and prejudicial interests, Members are asked to declare any DPI and also any personal interests (and whether or not such personal interests are also "prejudicial") in relation to any matter on the agenda for this meeting.

Members are reminded that they need to declare the fact that they are also a member of a County, Town or Parish Council as a Personal Interest. Where you are also a member of Somerset County Council and/or a Town or Parish Council within South Somerset you must declare a prejudicial interest in any business on the agenda where there is a financial benefit or gain or advantage to Somerset County Council and/or a Town or Parish Council which would be at the cost or to the financial disadvantage of South Somerset District Council.

#### **Planning Applications Referred to the Regulation Committee**

The following members of this Committee are also members of the Council's Regulation Committee:

Councillors Mike Best, Angie Singleton and Martin Wale.

Where planning applications are referred by this Committee to the Regulation Committee for determination, Members of the Regulation Committee can participate and vote on these items at the Area Committee and at Regulation Committee. In these cases the Council's decision-making process is not complete until the application is determined by the Regulation Committee. Members of the Regulation Committee retain an open mind and will not finalise their position until the Regulation Committee. They will also consider the matter at Regulation Committee as Members of that Committee and not as representatives of the Area Committee.

- 4. Date and Venue for Next Meeting**

Councillors are requested to note that the next Area West Committee meeting is scheduled to be held on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018 at 5.30pm at The Guildhall, Chard.

- 5. Public Question Time**

This is a chance to ask questions, make comments and raise matters of concern.

Parish/Town Councils may also wish to use this opportunity to ask for the District Council's support on any matter of particular concern to their Parish/Town.

Anyone wishing to raise matters in relation to items on the agenda may do so at the time the item is considered.

## **6. Chairman's Announcements**

### *Items for Discussion*

- 7. Appointment of Vice-Chairman of Area West Committee** (Pages 6 - 7)
- 8. Update on the Cresta Swimming Pool, Chard** (Page 8)
- 9. Area West - Draft Strategic Priorities 2019/20** (Pages 9 - 11)
- 10. Chard Regeneration Scheme Town Centre Regeneration - Public Consultation Feedback Report** (Pages 12 - 17)
- 11. Area West Committee - Forward Plan** (Pages 18 - 20)
- 12. Planning Appeals** (Pages 21 - 31)

**Please note that the decisions taken by Area Committees may be called in for scrutiny by the Council's Scrutiny Committee prior to implementation.**

**This does not apply to decisions taken on planning applications.**

# Agenda Item 7

## **Appointment of Vice-Chairman of Area West Committee**

*Director:* Netta Meadows, Strategy & Commissioning  
*Lead Officer:* Angela Cox, Specialist – Democratic Services  
*Contact Details:* [angela.cox@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:angela.cox@southsomerset.gov.uk) or (01935) 462148

### **Purpose of the Report**

To agree to appoint a new Vice-Chairman of Area West Committee for the remainder of the Council year.

### **Public Interest**

At the Council meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July, Members formally elected Councillor Val Keitch to be the new Leader of Council from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018. When Councillor Keitch took up her new position, it left a vacancy for the position of Chairman of the Area West Committee. This was subsequently filled by the then Vice-Chairman, Councillor Jason Baker, and so there is now a vacancy for the position of Vice-Chairman of the Area West Committee

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that Members appoint a new Vice-Chairman of the Area West Committee with immediate effect for the remainder of the Council year.

### **Report**

The Local Government Act 2000 (Part II) and the Council's Constitution require the Council to appoint a Leader of the Council at the start of each Council term. The appointment is normally for the whole of the Council term but the Constitution sets out the circumstances in which the appointment may end.

In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, Councillor Pallister gave notice that he would be stepping down as Leader of the Council with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018. At the Council meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July, Councillor Val Keitch was elected as the new Leader of Council from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018. This created a vacancy for the position of Chairman of Area West Committee from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018, to which the Committee subsequently elected Councillor Jason Baker. This now leaves a vacancy for the position of Vice-Chairman of the Area West Committee which Members are being asked to fill at this meeting.

### **Financial Implications**

There are no direct financial implications in taking this decision as there will still be the same number of District Councillors, Portfolio Holders and Committee Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen. The allowance associated with this appointment can be funded from the existing councillors' allowances budget.

### **Carbon Emissions Climate Change Implications**

There are no specific environmental implications arising from the subject matter of this report.

## **Equalities and Diversity Impact**

There are no specific equality or diversity implications arising from the subject matter of this report.

## **Background Papers**

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

District Executive Agenda and Minutes of meetings held on 2<sup>nd</sup> September & 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2010

Council Agenda and Minutes of meetings held on 16<sup>th</sup> September & 9<sup>th</sup> December 2010 & 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011

Council Agenda and Minutes of meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2015 and 19<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

Area West Committee Agenda and Minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018.

---

# Agenda Item 8

## **Kingfisher Community Pool**

### **Update from Cllr Amanda Broom, 4th September 2018**

This is a written report provided on the date shown, a verbal update will be given at the next Area West meeting as matters are changing daily.

It has been an incredible few weeks since Somerset County Council announced that they were going to close, empty and decommission 'Cresta' Pool.

Since then, a public meeting has been held, and the core group of initial volunteers have been overwhelmed with the community response. The options at the meeting were:

1. Do nothing & the pool closes on 3rd September
2. Find a way forward and the pool is mothballed from 3rd September, until the community can reopen it – this option means the pool will be emptied and pumps turned off
3. Or, find enough volunteers, fund raising avenues & keep the pool open from 4th September  
– although this is challenging, it is possible

The vote was unanimous, and that evening over 100 residents signed up to help. Since then, the group has had more people get in contact and offer assistance; locally, and pool operators from across the South West.

As it stands, the core group have completed the following:

- Submitted a formal Letter of Intent to Somerset County Council
- Been accepted as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation
- Submitted a draft Business Plan
- Completed a site survey, with a qualified pool operator
- Established the level of potential staffing and volunteering required
- Contacted all volunteers to update them
- Set up a crowd funding page
- Set up an email account
- Opened a bank account

With these efforts, we are extremely pleased to announce that Somerset County Council will no longer empty the pool on the 4<sup>th</sup> September, we now have until the 14<sup>th</sup> September to submit the full Business Case. Whilst the pool is now closed, every effort is continued to be made to ensure pumps are left on, and the required chemical dosing is undertaken.

Still to be done:

- The formal Business Case is well under way and will be submitted ahead of the revised deadline of September 14<sup>th</sup>

Current fundraising:

- Over £670 on Just Giving
- Over £2485 in cheques
- £20k pledged by Chard Town Council
- £500 cash raised outside Tesco

Cllr. Amanda Broom

---



# Agenda Item 9

## **Area West – Draft Strategic Priorities 2019/20**

*Service Manager: Jan Gamon, Lead Specialist Strategic Planning*  
*Lead Officer: Jan Gamon, Lead Specialist Planning*  
*Chereen Scott, Specialist, Strategic Planning (West/North)*  
*Tim Cook, Locality Manager*  
*Contact Details: chereen.scott@southsomerset.gov.uk*

### **Purpose of the Report**

To present the draft strategic priorities for Area West as agreed at a workshop in July 2018.

### **Public Interest**

The new operating model will be introduced in January 2019 and the way that area priorities are identified and resourced will change. The Committee's priorities will become a chapter of the council plan with resources pulled from across the organisation in Area + teams. This report gives a summary of the draft strategic priorities agreed at a previous workshop and details of the next steps.

### **Recommendation**

That members agree the priorities to be presented to District Executive for consideration for inclusion in the Council Plan.

### **Background**

The Area+ proposal states that "The Council will become strategy led and data informed", which puts the annual strategic planning process at the heart of driving delivery in the Areas.

The Area+ Implementation plan sets out the new way of addressing area priorities and details how resources will be allocated from across the organisation to improve area working.

Area Plans will be developed for adoption as chapters of the Council Plan in February 2019 and will 'go live' in April of that year. The SLT Sponsor for each area will have an overview of the emerging Area Plans.

Draft priorities were identified by members of Area West at a workshop after the July meeting of the committee.

### **Draft Strategic Priorities for Area West**

The four key priorities identified by members of Area West include the following:

1. Community Transport: Creating improved community transport links (including improvements to access to train services at Crewkerne and Axminster from Chard)
2. Community Safety: Addressing perceived growing crime in Chard, Crewkerne, Ilminster and rural settlements
3. Housing: Bringing forward Key sites
4. Economic Development: Supporting businesses

Additional discussion points not categorised as priorities included affordable housing, leisure facilities, Stop Line Way and tourism.

Further work on developing these priorities will take place in collaboration with the chair of the committee.

## **Next Steps**

The process and timescale for the adoption of area priorities as council priorities are as follows.

1<sup>st</sup> Oct: meeting with Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) to share the draft set of 'Priorities On a Page's' (POPs) and seek their input

4<sup>th</sup> Oct: initial workshop with District Executive

1<sup>st</sup> Nov: District Executive review of final set of POPs, agree priorities for inclusion on Council Plan  
Draft Council Plan then goes through SLT, Scrutiny and District Executive during November.

The SLT sponsor for Area West is Alex Parmley who will be an advocate for the Area Plan through the adoption process and maintain an overview of progress. The SLT sponsor will provide high-level input into the development of Area Plans making sure that they contribute towards the broader aims of the council and take account of relevant regional and national policy.

## **Resourcing Area Plans**

Identifying the resources needed to deliver the Area Plans will need to be done as an integral part of the planning process.

### **Area+ teams**

Area+ teams can begin to be established as soon as the details of the Area Plans are known. Input from Specialists will be needed in the development of the Area Plans, which will help to build familiarity with the priorities. However, many people will not start new roles until January 2019 and the transition period will have an impact on when teams can make a start on delivery.

### **Budgets**

Work will be required to align the area budgets and available resources (capital programme, S106, etc.) with the new Area Plans. There needs to be recognition that resources are finite and will be allocated according to need. Any new work will be assessed in order to establish relative priorities.

## **Financial Implications**

There are no new financial implications arising directly from this report.

## **Corporate Priority Implications**

The priorities have been developed taking into account the SSDC Corporate plan priorities.

## **Carbon Emissions & Climate Change Implications**

This is considered on an individual project and programme basis as appropriate. The overall priority is to seek to create more balanced communities where people can live, work and get access to the services and facilities they need on a daily basis. Area working (Area+) helps to improve access to facilities, activities and services, reducing the need to travel.

## **Equality and Diversity Implications**

This is considered on an individual project and programme basis as appropriate. All Area Plans will have an Equality Impact Assessment.

**Background Papers:** *Area+ proposal, Area + Implementation Plan*

---

# Agenda Item 10

## **Chard Regeneration Scheme Town Centre Regeneration Public Consultation Feedback Report**

*Director:* Alex Parmley (Chief Executive Officer)  
*Lead Specialist:* Jeb Farrah, Chard Regeneration Scheme Project Manager  
*Lead Officer:* Jeb Farrah  
*Contact Details:* [jeb.farrah@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:jeb.farrah@southsomerset.gov.uk)

### **Purpose of the Report**

1. This report updates members of Area West Committee on the public consultation programme for the regeneration plans and proposals for SSDC landholdings adjacent to Chard Town Centre. The site comprises the Boden Mill, the former ACI factory site, the Boden Street and Marketfields car parks.
2. The formal consultation programme was opened at a public exhibition of the plans and proposals at the Guildhall in Chard on Saturday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2018. Further consultation activities are being undertaken before the closing date of this initial consultation on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2018.
3. The report provides a summary analysis of main comments received so far.

### **Public Interest**

4. The regeneration of the Boden Mill site (and the adjacent landholdings) is an integral part of the Chard Regeneration Scheme and the site has been the subject of different redevelopment proposals in recent years. For reasons outlined in the 'Background' to the report (below), it was not possible to deliver the earlier redevelopment schemes.
5. In 2017 the Chard Regeneration Scheme (CRS) Board requested that South Somerset District Council (SSDC) officers should explore options for a more 'community focussed' scheme to improve the health, leisure, cultural and tourism opportunities available in the town. This coupled with a range of general public amenities on the site would create a site of high public interest and usage that would help increase footfall to the town centre without detracting from the town's existing retail provision.
6. This resulted in a completely new development proposal for the site that would include a range of public facilities. The formal consultation on the design concepts for this development began on the 16th June.
7. The exhibition panels used on the 16th June can be viewed via the District Council website at any time and a link for comments is provided. See Paragraph 16 below.

### **Recommendation**

8. It is recommended that Area West Committee note the content of this report.

## Background

9. Until 2016 the proposed development had included a mixed development scheme 'anchored' by a suitable major food retailer. Plans to develop the site in this way proved constrained by a number of key factors including; its lack of uniform shape; the listed buildings it contains and the general ground conditions. Additionally, a change in the market demand for major food retailing meant that the scheme could not be brought forward. It should be noted that this change of retailer strategy was not specific to Chard as the economic trend away from developing large supermarkets has impacted on the whole of the country.
10. The decision to explore alternative options for a new community-driven development scheme for this site was endorsed by SSDC District Executive Committee in December 2016 when the Committee agreed to fund the exploration of new options, development appraisals and scheme designs. SSDC resolved that the regeneration project should be progressed to a new phase with SSDC acting as developer and retaining control of the project through the feasibility, design and build stages. This would optimise the site potential for the regeneration of the town centre and better ensure the delivery of the project. It was also recognised that there was a need for much stronger community ownership of the project and that the facilities developed within the scheme will need to strongly reflect the aspirations of the community.
11. Throughout 2017 preliminary design and feasibility work was undertaken that tested the site for the number of facilities that might be included in the scheme, and tested the market demand for those facilities. The resulting designs include a range of community facilities; a leisure centre with the potential for a new swimming pool, a base for public services, location for a new library and museum, health centre, learning hub, workspace and other potential facilities. The designs include car parking and additional public spaces that would lend themselves to a variety of uses. The proposal also includes a residential component at the Boden Mill. Additional residential conversion of SSDC owned premises (e.g. the Lacemill) were also considered to help underpin the viability of the overall scheme.
12. The scheme also proposes the development of other initiatives that will support the regeneration of Chard Town Centre including:
  - support to attract creative businesses and artisan / independent retailers
  - support to develop the growth of local food producers and food businesses
  - events and promotion
  - digital enabling
13. The new scheme proposals were considered by the CRS Board in February 2018 and then presented in confidential session to the Area West Committee in April 2018. Approval was given by the Committee to consult the community on the proposals and for SSDC officers to work up and progress the implementation of the new development proposal.

14. It was noted that the designs are concepts at this stage, and their inclusion in a scheme moving forward will be subject to agreement from various external partners and to further detailed development and appraisal to confirm the viability of the various components of the scheme.

## **Report**

### **The Consultation**

15. The formal consultation period opened on June 16<sup>th</sup> 2018 and extends to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2018. This is a consultation on the initial proposals for the scheme and for the associated design concepts. The consultation sought the opinions of the residents and businesses of Chard and the surrounding areas.
16. A series of consultation boards were prepared for public viewing and these can be viewed at <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/business/chard-regeneration/>.
17. The Consultation Launch (16<sup>th</sup> June 2018) was held at Chard Guildhall on Saturday June 16<sup>th</sup> 2018. The event was advertised extensively by the media following a general press release, it was also covered extensively on social media. Printed invitations were sent to approx. 6000 addresses in Chard and surrounding villages.
18. Several officers and members were on hand throughout the event and were able to answer questions and help explain the proposals to the public.

### **Consultation Analysis**

506 people attended the launch event

137 people left written comments on the day

To date a further 32 comments have been received via communication channels.

19. For analysis purposes the responses were grouped into categories and the top 5 groups of comments told us that:
  - A new Leisure Centre with swimming pool would be welcomed, ideally with places to eat and socialise.
  - There was an affirmative response for a community hub hosting a range of public services.
  - Support for local businesses would be welcomed, particularly assistance and advice for small independent retailers, new workspace and a covered market.
  - Affordable and interesting attractions are needed for young people .
  - more open space/ green space for community use wanted within the scheme
20. Each of the following bullet points record the next most commonly recurring comments. These too are listed here in descending order of the frequency with which they were recorded:

- A covered market would offer a different retail experience
  - Consideration should be given to adequate car parking
  - We do not need any major retail outlets, but need more bespoke, boutique or niche retail
  - Do not lose or detract from the existing character of the town
  - A cinema or good facilities/environment in which films can be shown
  - Consider the unique atmosphere of the existing museum
21. The following general comments were also made by several consultees. These are also listed in descending order of frequency:
- There is a lack of public transport to the town – this particularly affects the villages and elderly people
  - Business rates are too high –particularly for small businesses
  - Consider free parking
22. There were also a number of specific comments relating to or affecting neighbouring properties. These will need to be investigated and considered prior to design and planning stages.
23. Generally the overwhelming response to the consultation was positive and enthusiastic. Whilst we did receive a number of critical comments it would be fair to say that these were offered in the spirit of constructive criticism rather than as an objection to the scheme. It was also noted at the launch event that early scepticism from some of the attendees was generally replaced by enthusiasm and support for the scheme once their questions had been answered.
24. For balance, it should be noted that there were a very small number of comments that were purely negative. One challenged the expenditure of public money on such a scheme, whilst the ability to deliver the scheme was raised by more than one person.

### **Additional Consultation Sessions**

25. A consultation session was held at Chard Youth Club on 3<sup>rd</sup> August. This was primarily aimed at the parents of children attending the 'Play Day' event. 20 adults were in attendance and had the opportunity to view the display boards and leave comments. Approximately 20 comments were received offering broad support for the scheme - particularly for the new leisure centre and a better provisions market. As with the consultation at the Guildhall, there were comments made on some wider issues and these included; no more retail; better parking; better management of the traffic lights; more open space and activities for children.
26. The next scheduled consultation will be with teenage school students on 27<sup>th</sup> September.

27. This will not be the only phase of consultation on the scheme and SSDC will seek public opinion on future occasions as the regeneration plans move forward. This will include statutory consultations as required by the Planning Process.

### **Moving the Regeneration Scheme Forward**

In order to maintain momentum and progress, the following measures have been taken:

28. Jeb Farrah was appointed as Chard Regeneration Scheme Project Manager (May 2018)

29. A formal Chard Regeneration Programme Board has been approved (Full Council, May 2018) and set up to comprise the following representation:

- SSDC's Leader and Deputy Leader
- 4 SSDC local members
- SSDC's Chief Executive Officer as the project sponsor.

Additional officers and advisors may be called by the Board in an advisory capacity as/when required

30. The following work on the scheme has begun:

The Project Team has put together a phased approach to bring forward a demolition application of the appropriate buildings on the ACI site to enable some initial site clearance to be undertaken, before progressing on to a full detailed planning proposal.

The following surveys have been commissioned:

- Preliminary and follow-up ecology surveys
- A heritage survey
- A needs assessment evaluation

Ecology - the follow-up ecology report will detail the extent and type of protected species on the site and what mitigation measures need to be adopted, to enable the demolition application to be brought forward without harm to wildlife.

A heritage survey - is required as part of the planning application. The site has three listed buildings that the heritage consultant will review, not only to support the planning process, but potentially to assist the Council in securing Heritage Lottery funding.

A needs assessment evaluation – is required as part of the Sport England funding criteria. The Council have made an initial submission to Sport England and are in 'the pipeline' of applicants awaiting a funding application assessment. Consultants have been appointed to undertake this work not just for Chard but for the whole District as it will also inform the District's future sporting and leisure facilities needs and priorities.

### **Financial Implications**

31. There are no financial implications directly associated with this report on the initial consultation stage of the project.



The costs for development and design work are initially covered from residual budget as set by the District Executive committee in December 2016 and residual One Public Estate (OPE) budgets (approximately £25k) for feasibility work.

The One Public Estate budget enables us to explore the possibilities and benefits of relocating a number of public services into one central, accessible location. It will help us to determine the need for potential shared space within the overall scheme.

### **Council Plan Implications**

32. The Chard Regeneration Scheme is a specific objective of the Council Plan and a priority project for 2018-19.

### **Carbon Emissions and Climate Change Implications**

33. None at this stage

### **Equality and Diversity Implications**

34. None at this stage

### **Background Papers**

35. The reports referenced at points 10, 13 and 29 were presented to committees as confidential reports as all included third party restricted information that was deemed to be commercially sensitive or confidential.
-

# Agenda Item 11

## **Area West Committee - Forward Plan**

*Communities Lead:* Helen Rutter, Communities Lead  
*Service Manager:* Tim Cook, Locality Team Manager  
*Agenda Co-ordinator:* Jo Morris, Case Services Officer (Support Services)  
*Contact Details:* jo.morris@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462055

### **Purpose of the Report**

This report informs members of the proposed Area West Committee Forward Plan.

### **Recommendation**

Members are asked to:-

- (1) comment upon and note the proposed Area West Committee Forward Plan as attached.
- (2) identify priorities for further reports to be added to the Area West Committee Forward Plan.

### **Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan sets out items and issues to be discussed by the Area West Committee over the coming few months.

The Forward Plan will be reviewed and updated each month in consultation with the Chairman. It is included each month on the Area West Committee agenda and members may endorse or request amendments.

To make the best use of the Area Committee, the focus for topics should be on issues where local involvement and influence may be beneficial, and where local priorities and issues raised by the community are linked to SSDC corporate aims and objectives.

Councillors, service managers, partners and members of the public may request that an item is placed within the forward plan for a future meeting by contacting the agenda co-ordinator.

***Background Papers:*** None.

---

## Notes

- (1) Items marked in italics are not yet confirmed.  
 (2) Further details on these items, or to suggest / request an agenda item for the Area Committee, please contact the Agenda Co-ordinator; Jo Morris, 01935 462055 or e-mail jo.morris@southsomerset.gov.uk

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Background / Purpose</b>	<b>Lead Officer(s) SSDC unless stated otherwise</b>
<b>17<sup>th</sup> October 2018</b>	<i>Impact of closure of Ilminster Community Office</i>	<i>At the November 2017 meeting a decision was taken to provide face to face services in an alternative way to best suit customer demand including the withdrawal from Ilminster Community Office with effect from 1 February 2018.</i>	<i>Debbie Haines, Deputy Community Office Support Manager</i>
	<i>Town Centre Events Programme</i>	<i>Update on the events funded by the Town Centre Events Programme</i>	<i>Alison Baker, Area West Neighbourhood Development Officer</i>
<b>21<sup>st</sup> November 2018</b>	<i>Highways Update report</i>	<i>To update members on the highways maintenance work carried out by the County Highway Authority.</i>	<i>Mike Fear, Assistant Highway Service Manager, Somerset County Council</i>
	<i>Crewkerne Leisure Management (Aqua Centre)</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Angie Singleton</i>
<b>12<sup>th</sup> December 2018</b>	<i>AONB Management Plan</i>	<i>To approve the draft AONB Management Plan</i>	<i>Tim Cook, Locality Team Manager Nicky Doble, Neighbourhood Development Project Officer Cllr. Martin Wale</i>
	<i>Making It Local Executive Group</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Martin Wale</i>
	<i>Chard &amp; District Museum</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Amanda Broom</i>
<b>16<sup>th</sup> January 2019</b>	<i>Avon &amp; Somerset Police</i>	<i>Report on activities on neighbourhood policing and partnership working to reduce crime and fear of crime.</i>	<i>Sgt. Rob Jameson</i>
	<i>Avon and Somerset Police and Crime Panel</i>	<i>Update Report</i>	<i>Cllr. Martin Wale</i>

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Background / Purpose</b>	<b>Lead Officer(s) SSDC unless stated otherwise</b>
<b>20<sup>th</sup> February 2019</b>	<i>Ile Youth Centre Management Committee</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Val Keitch</i>
	<i>Ilminster Forum</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Carol Goodall</i>
<b>20<sup>th</sup> February 2019</b>	<i>Crewkerne &amp; District Museum</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Marcus Barrett</i>
<b>20<sup>th</sup> March 2019</b>	<i>A Better Crewkerne &amp; District (ABCD)</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Mike Best</i>
<b>20<sup>th</sup> March 2019</b>	<i>Meeting House Arts Centre, Ilminster</i>	<i>Reports from members on Outside Organisations</i>	<i>Cllr. Carol Goodall</i>

# Agenda Item 12

## **Planning Appeals**

*Director:* Martin Woods, Service Delivery  
*Lead Specialist:* Simon Fox, Lead Specialist - Planning  
*Contact Details:* simon.fox@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462509

## **Purpose of the Report**

To inform members of the appeals that have been lodged, decided upon or withdrawn.

## **Recommendation**

That the report be noted.

## **Background**

The Area Chairmen have asked that a monthly report relating to the number of appeals received, decided upon or withdrawn be submitted to the Committee.

## **Report Detail**

### **Appeals Received**

17/02693/FUL - Land at Bullring Farm Knowle Lane Misterton Crewkerne Somerset  
Alterations to widen access with associated landscaping  
(Committee decision)

18/00163/FUL - Demolition of 8 residential units and office. Erection of 10 No. single storey dwellings with associated parking, garages and landscaping  
24 - 37 Riverside Horton Ilminster Somerset TA19 9RS  
(Non-determination)

### **Appeals Dismissed**

17/04872/FUL – Bridgefield, Middle Street, Misterton, Crewkerne TA18 8LX  
Alterations to create off road parking area.  
(Officer delegated decision)

16/04907/FUL - Land OS 7562 Part Stonage Lane Haselbury Plucknett Crewkerne Somerset  
Siting of 1 No. mobile home for equestrian worker (temporary dwelling) (part retrospective).  
(Officer delegated decision)

16/05220/S73 - Land OS 7562 Part Stonage Lane Haselbury Plucknett Crewkerne Somerset  
Application to vary condition No. 04 of 11/00915/FUL and condition No. 04 of 11/03462/S73 to allow a restricted amount of commercial use.  
(Officer delegated decision)

## **Background Papers**

Appeal decision notices attached



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2018

**by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/W/18/3199448**

**Bridgefield, Middle Street, Misterton, Crewkerne TA18 8LX.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Palmer against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 17/04872/FUL, dated 17 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is described as 'to create off-road parking'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) came into force during the course of the appeal. The parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the implications of the guidance on the appeal and I have also taken it into account in determining the appeal.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
  - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.
  - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the site's location in Misterton Conservation Area (the conservation area).

### Reasons

#### *Highway Safety*

4. The site fronts onto Middle Street (the A356) at a point where the road begins to slope steeply uphill. A short stretch of on-street parking currently occurs on the side of the road immediately in front, and to either side of the site. Whilst a pavement serves the side of the street on which the appeal site stands, there is no pavement opposite, and houses and boundaries here are positioned hard against the road edge. This layout and on-street parking combine to narrow the road width.
5. Whilst representing only a snap-shot of road use, during my mid-week late afternoon visit I observed that that Middle Street, which is a classified A Road,

was heavily trafficked with a wide range of vehicles including lorries and buses regularly passing along it. I also observed that the on-street parking noted above caused an intermittent bottleneck in the flow of traffic with queues quickly developing. A resulting potential for head-on collisions appeared to exist, whilst the appellants also recount their experience of an accident involving a passing vehicle.

6. Whilst the plans provided with the application suggest that the parking space would accommodate 2 cars, I consider that only one car could comfortably use the space envisaged. The space itself would clearly not be large enough to allow a vehicle to turn within the site, and would as such require vehicles to either reverse into or off of the road. Whilst I acknowledge that some vehicles may currently reverse into on-street parking spaces, and indeed observed this occurring during my visit, I note the Council's point that this is not essential.
7. Given the necessity to stop and manoeuvre against the direction of travel, reversing off the road into the proposed space could potentially be hazardous, particularly at times of peak traffic flow. Reversing off the road across the pavement could also bring some additional risk to pedestrians given that the potential restriction of visibility by vehicles parked either side of the access would obstruct a driver's view of people using the pavement.
8. Though the Council's officer report also notes the disruption to the 'free flow' of traffic that a reversing manoeuvre would cause, and both parties note disruption currently caused by use of on-street spaces, the efficient operation of the A road was not itself a reason for refusal. In this context, though it has been claimed by a third party that removal of on-street parking outside the site could be beneficial in terms of traffic flow, the conditions creating the current bottleneck would remain given that on-street parking would continue either side of the access.
9. The access would be flanked on the uphill side by the boundary of the attached neighbouring dwelling, and on the other, beyond the pedestrian gate, the frontage of a building immediately to the east. The Council notes that the elevations submitted with the application are inaccurate in their depiction of the latter, and I concur that the frontage of the building immediately to the east stands in much closer proximity to Bridgefield than shown, and in fact partially overlaps its frontage. Both the frontage of this building and the boundary of the attached neighbouring dwelling are located at the back of the pavement, and in consequence of this would act to severely restrict visibility from the proposed access. The Council considers that visibility exiting from the proposed parking spaces on to the highway would be severely below the recommended standards, and I concur with this.
10. Due to the severe restriction of inter-visibility from the proposed space and the pavement on either side, vehicles exiting it in either forward or reverse gear would be likely to have an adverse effect on pedestrian safety. This would be especially true with regard to pedestrians walking downhill past the attached neighbouring dwelling.
11. I observed that parked cars could effectively obstruct inter-visibility between the driver and vehicles travelling downhill regardless of whether exiting the space in forward or reverse gear. The resultant need to edge into the flow of traffic in order to ascertain whether the highway was clear or not would represent a considerable hazard which would be most acute where reversing,

- and particularly dangerous for passing cyclists. Though inter-visibility with traffic travelling in the opposite direction would be somewhat better, and the resultant risk somewhat less, this would not in my opinion make the act of exiting the access any less dangerous overall.
12. The provision of the parking space would clearly remove the dangers inherent to those entering and exiting a vehicle parked on the road, particularly where involving a child accommodated on the back seat. However whilst I acknowledge that this would be a benefit of the scheme, my findings above indicate that the development would create a number of new risks for road users, pedestrians and indeed occupants of vehicles using the proposed parking space, the collective impact of which would outweigh this benefit.
  13. The provision of a mirror on the building opposite has been proposed as a means of helping to address the issue of limited visibility. The building in question however lies outside the control of the appellants, and I consider that this would not otherwise satisfactorily mitigate the dangers identified. This is because of the limited and distorted field of view a mirror would provide, and the probable obstruction of reflected images by parked cars and/or passing vehicles.
  14. My attention has been drawn to other existing accesses where visibility is judged to be inadequate. Whilst I lack the full details of these accesses, the County Council indicates that none have been subject of formal approval. As such I see no reason to consider that their existence justifies the creation of the proposed access or the hazards to which this would give rise.
  15. Given my findings above, the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse effect on highway safety. It would not therefore be in accordance with Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028), which amongst other things aims to secure inclusive, safe and convenient access, or with the second bullet of paragraph 108 of the Framework which similarly to seeks to secure safe and suitable access to sites.

#### *Conservation Area*

16. The site lies within the conservation area, which is a designated heritage asset. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
17. An important part of the significance of the conservation area appears to me to lie in the collection of traditionally constructed and enclosed historic buildings it contains. In this regard Bridgefield lies at the end of a row of traditionally constructed dwellings prominently located on Middle Street. These are set back from and elevated above street level behind mixed masonry retaining/boundary walls which run continuously along the back of the pavement, and are punctured only by pedestrian accesses. I consider that this group of buildings, their layout and the street edge definition and enclosure provided by retaining/boundary walls make a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area.
18. The proposed development would see the front wall of the property removed and part of the garden excavated. This would break the continuity of the enclosed street frontage, and open up a gap which I consider would appear



visually discordant. This impression would be accentuated by its use for parking, the abrupt change in levels, and the contrasting surface of the parking area. These points would in my view be harmful to the established character and appearance of the conservation area.

19. Whilst the appellants have acknowledged the sensitivity of the conservation area by pledging to reuse existing masonry in the construction of new retaining walls, specifying the colour of hard surfacing to reflect that of the dwelling, replacing the existing gate and through soft landscaping, I consider that the gap in the frontage would nonetheless remain visually discordant and harmful.
20. The Council's officer report notes that the scheme would not cause "significant harm" to the conservation area on account of the extent, scale and siting of the work. This implies that some harm, albeit not significant, would arise. With more specific reference to the terms used in the Framework, I consider that the development would cause 'less than substantial harm', for similar reasons to those given by the Council. As such I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and this is a matter to which I afford great weight in accordance with paragraph 193 of the Framework.
21. Though acknowledging some harm would arise, the Council failed to carry out the balancing exercise required by paragraph 134 in the former version of the Framework, which is now carried forward into paragraph 196 of the revised version. Therefore the Council also failed to reach a conclusion with regard to the effect of the development on the conservation area. Given this lack of clarity further comments were sought from each of the parties during the course of the appeal regarding the effect of the scheme on the conservation area. Comments were only received from the appellants, and I have taken these comments into account in my reasoning above.
22. Taking into account the considerable importance and weight to be afforded to the statutory objective of preservation of the conservation area, I consider that the development would not provide any significant public benefits that would outweigh the harm it would cause to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Accordingly the Framework indicates that development should be restricted.

### **Other Matters**

23. It is noted by the appellants and a third party that the proposed development would improve access to a driveway opposite. However I have no information regarding the current or prospective use of this driveway or the resultant highway safety implications, and as such this has not had a significant bearing on my decision.

### **Conclusion**

24. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

*Benjamin Webb*

INSPECTOR



---

## Appeal Decisions

Hearing Held on 17 July 2018

Site visit made on 17 July 2018

**by H Porter BA(Hons) MScDip IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 16 August 2018**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/R3325/W/18/3193263**

**Larncia Livery, Stonage Lane, Haselbury Plucknett, Crewkerne, Somerset TA18 7PE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr C Rowson against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 16/04907/FUL, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2017.
  - The development proposed is stationing a mobile home for occupation by an equestrian worker.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/R3325/W/18/3193270**

**Larncia Livery, Stonage Lane, Haselbury Plucknett, Crewkerne, Somerset TA18 7PE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
  - The appeal is made by Mr C Rowson against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 16/05220/S73, dated 18 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2017.
  - The application sought planning permission to reposition approved manege without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 11/03462/S73, dated 3 November 2011.
  - The condition in dispute is No 4 which states that: The land and buildings hereby permitted shall be used only for the keeping of horses for private purposes and shall not be used for any commercial activity.
  - The reason given for the condition is: To safeguard the amenities and character of the area in accordance with policies 5 and STR1 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies of ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.
- 

### **Decisions**

1. Appeal A is dismissed. Appeal B is dismissed.

### **Procedural Matters**

2. During the course of the appeal, the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 24 July 2018. Both main parties

were given the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the Framework in reaching my decision.

3. A revised signed and dated planning obligation that seeks to limit commercial use of some stables on a full-livery basis was submitted at the Hearing. A previous signed copy had been considered and commented on by the Council's legal department. The revised obligation incorporated some, but not all, of the suggested amendments made. Given that the revised document was not a substantial departure from that previously shared with the Council, I do not consider any party would be prejudiced by taking it into consideration.

### **Background and Main Issues**

4. Under Appeal A, the appellant seeks permission for a mobile home to accommodate a full-time equestrian worker. Under Appeal B, the appellant seeks new planning permission without complying with a condition that restricts the use of the land and buildings for private equestrian purposes. The reason for imposing the disputed condition relates to safeguarding the amenities and character of the area. However, the proposals relate to what would be a change of use of land for the siting of a mobile home and for running an equestrian enterprise on a commercial basis, which the Council refused partly on highway safety grounds. To reduce repetition and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals together within a single decision letter. The main issues are:
  - Whether the use of the land for siting the mobile home is justified by the needs of the proposed equestrian enterprise at the site, having regard to policies that seek to restrict development in the countryside;
  - The effect of the commercial enterprise, and removal of the disputed condition, on highway safety.

### **Reasons**

5. The appeal site is accessed off Stonage Lane and comprises an L-shaped portion of land that includes grazing, stables, yard, sand school, ancillary barns and turning out-areas. Between the stables and paddocks, an unoccupied static caravan is in situ. Situated in rural surroundings on the outskirts of the village of Haselbury Plucknett, and beyond a settlement development boundary, the appeal site is within the open countryside where new development is restricted by planning policy.
6. Paragraph 79 of the Framework seeks to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless, amongst other things, there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work. Policy HG9 of the South Somerset Local Plan, 2015 (LP) sets out various criteria that would demonstrate essential need; including whether there would be a clearly established existing functional need, and whether the enterprise would be economically viable.
7. The appellant purchased the appeal site in 2016, and has subsequently invested in expanding and improving the facilities, with the intention of growing a commercial equestrian enterprise. At present, nine horses are kept on the site: five owned privately, which are stabled on a non-commercial DIY livery basis, and four owned by the appellant. The intended enterprise would include a full-time livery for up to five horses, with additional income deriving in part from covering mares, foaling brood mares, and schooling horses for competition.

8. Taking into account the number of horses being cared for, some of which would be of high value or particularly vulnerable through being in foal, I accept that the enterprise would necessitate an equestrian worker residing full-time on site. I am also satisfied no alternative accommodation would be available in the vicinity, and that a mobile home would be in reasonable proximity and earshot of the stables and grazing land in case of emergencies. Even though the projected business figures do not include some expected expenditure, such as additional labour costs, utilities and site maintenance, the evidence shows that there would be a reasonable prospect of a successful enterprise operating profitably, providing that sufficient land was available to support it.
9. The appellant owns a portion of flat grazing land of approximately 3.5 acres that has subdivided into paddocks. For the number of horses kept at the appeal site, the animal to land ratio is higher than average guidance. However, the appellant's land is currently supplemented by adjoining grazing land of roughly the same amount, which belongs to neighbouring landowners. At the time of my site visit, mid-way through a dry summer, the quality of the grazing appeared to be good, and the combined total of grazing land for the number of horses sufficient.
10. That said, in order to maintain quality grazing year-round, it is evident that the paddocks are rested and rotated, which relies upon the neighbouring land continuing to be available. Furthermore, the difference in the soil type and drainage between the appellant's and neighbours' land emphasises that the aggregated land would be critical to ensuring adequate quality grazing year on year. However, the neighbouring land is not secured.
11. Although horses would be given hay and feed, and turned out for just part of the day or night, I do not consider that the land demonstrably within the appellant's control would be sufficient for the existing number of horses on site, let alone ensure a viable, sustainable enterprise, growing as forecast. I have taken account of the strong support and endorsement given from the neighbouring landowners, and assurances that the land would continue to be available to the appellant. However, without anything formal in writing, such as a rental agreement or lease contract, the existing situation is based on personal trust and verbal assurances.
12. I note too that other land has been offered for rent, which could offer a degree of flexibility for keeping the appellant's own horses. However, as this land would not be so close to the appeal site and has not been contractually secured, its availability cannot be usefully relied upon. In the absence of anything substantive to more robustly secure terms upon which the neighbouring land is available, there is insufficient evidence before me to convincingly show that the future of the enterprise could be secured.
13. I conclude that, although there would be a functional need for an equestrian worker to live on site, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the enterprise would be viable. Consequently, there would be conflict with policy HG9 of the LP paragraph 79 of the Framework and planning permission for even a temporary period has not been sufficiently justified.

*Highway safety*

14. Stonage Lane is a narrow country lane that terminates at the junction with the A3066, a relatively busy route with a 30mph speed restriction. I was able to observe during my site visit that visibility is severely restricted, notably exiting

from Stonage Lane and looking to the left. Indeed, I found visibility at this junction so poor, it required nudging well forward into the highway to see oncoming traffic. Owing to the straight nature of the A3066, I observed cars travelling in what appeared to be excess of the 30mph limit. With this in mind, there would be a propensity for vehicles pulling out of Stonage Lane into the path of oncoming vehicles. This, in my judgement, poses a serious risk in terms of highway safety.

15. The appellant attests that the proposed commercial use of the appeal site would substantially reduce the number of daily vehicular journeys compared with the extant private use. However, the traffic movement projections are vague and generalised, unsubstantiated by a movement survey, which casts doubt over whether the forecasts are realistic. Furthermore, it was suggested at the Hearing that the appellant and existing livery users access the appeal site via the village, rather than using the A3066 junction. On the other hand, the commercial use would involve journeys by a broader range of visitors and clients, who would be less accustomed to the local road network. I note the suggestion that the appellant could suggest alternative directions to the appeal site, through the village. However, this does not rule out intensification of vehicular movements at an already dangerous road junction.
16. A strand of the proposed enterprise relates to horses that are not stabled permanently on site, being brought on a temporary basis, for covering, to foal, or to be schooled. These animals would be likely to be visited, but also transported to and from the appeal site in boxes or large trailers. With some mares being kept for just two to three weeks, the potential turnover would be relatively high. To my mind, for an enterprise of the nature envisaged, the number of animals arriving and leaving the site in trailers, combined with the customers visiting in intervening periods, has not been realistically calculated.
17. I have considered whether the use of a planning obligation or conditions could make the development acceptable in planning terms. However, I do not consider that full livery use would secure any meaningful reduction in vehicular journeys to the site. Even if this obligation could ensure some of the privately-owned horses were stabled on a full-livery basis, there is still nothing to prevent an owner from riding or visiting more frequently than once or twice a week. More fundamentally, such an obligation would have no impact on limiting the number of trips associated with the non-livery aspects of the enterprise.
18. I consider it would be counter-intuitive and unreasonable to impose limitations or restrictions on customer visits that would be potentially detrimental to the business operation. I appreciate that a degree of traffic movement would already be generated by the existing private use and the DIY liveries and the appellant living elsewhere. I also note that the appellant intends to undertake a number of horse movements himself, however, this cannot be controlled. Moreover, the commercial use would run with the land and there would be no mechanism to control significant intensification at the substandard A3066 junction.
19. For these reasons, I consider it reasonable and necessary to retain the disputed condition. Notwithstanding the reason for imposing the condition related to amenities and character and appearance, its removal would facilitate a commercial use and this would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This would run counter to the highway safety aims within Policy TA5 and EQ8 of the LP and paragraphs 108 and 109 of the Framework, insofar as

these seek to achieve safe and suitable access to a site for all users and prevent development on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### **Other matters**

20. I have considered comments from the Parish Council in relation to the impact on the character and appearance. The mobile home is unobtrusively located within the appeal site and the Council confirmed at the hearing that it did not oppose it on visual grounds, subject to a landscaping condition. In any event, in view of my finding on the main issues, this matter has not proved decisive in this case.

### **Conclusion**

21. I realise that my decisions will come as a disappointment to the appellant, the commitment and expertise of whom is not in doubt. However, in the light of national and local policies that seek to protect the countryside and highway safety in the wider public interest, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

*H Porter*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Chad Rowson	Appellant
Paul Dance	Planning Agent

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Mike Hicks	Planning Officer, South Somerset District Council
Peter Williams	Reading Agricultural

### **INTERESTED PERSONS:**

Laura Scott	Neighbouring land owner
Ruth Haskell	Livery user
Hugo Boylan	Neighbour

### **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING**

- 1 Letter of support from Isle Valley Vets Ltd
- 2 Unilateral Undertaking dated 17 July 2018
- 3 Traffic movements statement
- 4 Farleigh Meadows Appeals site context and access plans