

OFFICER: Linda Hayden 01935 462534

APPL.NO: 08/00897/FUL APPLICATION TYPE: Full Application

PARISH: Lopen WARD: SOUTH PETHERTON

DESCRIPTION: The erection of an agriculturally tied dwelling (Retrospective) (GR342602/115237)

LOCATION: The Trading Post, Lopenhead, South Petherton, Somerset TA13 5LA

APPLICANT: S Hassell & Steve Friend

DATE ACCEPTED: 29 February 2008

This application is put before the Committee because of the complex nature of the issues involved at the request of one of the Ward Members and the Planning Team Leader with the agreement of the Chairman.

Site Description and Proposal



The site lies on south side of the old A303 and was the former Lopen Head petrol-filling site, it is opposite Lopen Head nurseries. 'The Trading Post' now occupies the site and specialises in the sale of organic goods. The 5-acre site currently accommodates a shop building, a former railway carriage forming the tea-shop, a greenhouse, three large polytunnels, a mobile home and a two storey thatched property of hexagonal form.

The site is in an elevated position with the land dropping away to the south. It is situated outside of any defined development boundary within the open countryside.

This application seeks retrospective permission for the erection of a permanent agricultural workers dwelling to replace the mobile home. Temporary consent was originally granted for two mobile homes in 2001 and renewed in 2004 (one of the mobile homes has now been removed).

History

07/05496/ADV - Display of 3 no. non-illuminated flag signs (refused January 2008)
06/0342/FUL - Low impact timber framed agricultural dwelling (withdrawn March 2008)
06/01771/FUL - Erection of a timber framed extension to shop (approved July 2006)
04/02031/FUL - Renewal of temporary permission for siting two mobile homes and one railway carriage and four polytunnels (approved September 2004)
01/00132/COU - Siting of two mobile homes and one railway carriage (retrospective) and site four polytunnels (approved March 2001)
99/00496/FUL - Erection of wooden shed (approved April 1999)
98/01807/COU - Change of use of premises to nursery/farmshop/teashop (approved September 1998)
92/01345/FUL - Use of land as extension to garden centre (approved February 1994)
89/01229/FUL - Use of land and premises as garden centre and erection of a greenhouse (approved February 1990)

Policy

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 repeats the duty imposed under S54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and requires that decisions must be made in accordance with relevant Development Plan documents unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant Development Plan Documents
Regional Spatial Strategy September 2001:
VIS1 Expressing the Vision
VIS2 Principles for Future Development
EN4 - Quality in the Built Environment

Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review 1991-2011:
Policies:-
STR1 - Sustainable Development
STR6 - Development outside towns, rural centres and villages
49 - Transport requirements of new developments

South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006):
Policies:-
ST3 - Development outside development areas
ST5 - General Principles of Development
ST6 - The Quality of Development
HG15 - Agricultural and Forestry Dwellings
EU1 - Renewable Energy

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13.
Planning Policy Statements 1 and 7.

Consultations

Area Engineer, Technical Services Department has no comments.

The Council's Climate Change officer advises:-

'This building has many design features that - considering the anticipated impact of climate change - should really become more widely incorporated in new buildings where the site allows.

The use of low embodied energy materials such as local ham stone, timber frame, timber cladding, thatch and lime mortar, sheep's wool insulation and the sourcing of most of these locally, result in low carbon dioxide emissions as a result of the buildings construction. Such buildings are described as "low impact"

The building features a large south-facing window to maximise light penetration and solar heat gain when the sun is low, with a balcony above that will provide shade when the sun is high. Use of a 12v PV powered electrical circuit and a log burner as the only sources of energy use will result in the dwelling being carbon neutral in its use.

Considering the impact this building has on the need to travel; services such as education, health, retail and leisure are available at South Petherton and Merriott 2.2 and 2.1 miles distant, each less than 10 minutes travelling time by car and also very accessible by bicycle and even by walking. Employment is at the site of the proposed house. As such, car travel from site could be compared favourably with a house in Yeovil, where the occupants drive to work in Yeovil and to access services. However, the major transport impact of the Trading Post is on neighbouring resident's travel to easily access locally grown bulky produce and the reduction of food miles this enables. The effective use of the site as a market garden - which construction of this house will enable - clearly has the impact of reducing carbon dioxide emissions through reduction of the need for people and bulky goods to travel and supports the council's corporate objective "Promote the purchase of local food....."

There is no doubt that low impact building has merit as an exemplar in terms of minimising carbon dioxide emissions during its construction and the lifetime of its use.

I would recommend acceptance of this application.'

The Economic Development Officer comments:-

'The revised application brings together all of the information relating to the business plan, access and design statement etc into one document. This has allowed the understanding of the situation and the reason for the application to be better presented. Having read and digested the revised application, I fail to see any significant amendments to the original application which allow me to support this application to allow the retrospective erection of an agriculturally tied dwelling on the site.

I understand that someone has lived on this site since 1998, firstly in a single caravan and more recently in a second caravan which doubles as an office. One of the reasons a permanent dwelling is required is to secure the site from thieves and predators. Security should not be a reason for permitting a dwelling in a rural location. The functional and financial test for an agricultural dwelling is based on Standard Man Days (SMD's) derived from a standard calculation depending on the number of livestock units on the farm. There are currently no poultry on the holding, only two sheep and a few pigs. In reality, justification for the dwelling is based on the need to tend to crops during the night in the event of frost.

When analysing the claim that residents living on the site will improve security, it becomes obvious that all of the incidents of theft etc cited have occurred since there have been occupants living in at least one mobile home on the site - 1998

The freezer contents were stolen in December 2004
An intruder entered the premises in April 2006

Six poultry were killed by a fox in March 2006
Four ducks killed in November 2006
Ten ducks stolen in 2002.

This begs the question why, with residents on this site in mobile homes were all of these incidents not prevented? I fail to understand how living in a mobile home compared to living in a permanent dwelling will change this situation.

To permit this application is in my opinion wrong. There is not a functional need to permit a dwelling as the application is based on so few stock numbers. The financial need is based on the whole business turnover and not broken down to identify the income generated from the small holding alone. If this application is permitted, my guess is that we will receive an enormous number of similar applications for small parcels of land throughout the district which like this one will fail to meet a functional and financial test.

I cannot support this application.'

Note: The Economic Development Officer has examined all the additional evidence from the applicant and letters from various bodies in support of the application and continues to stand by his advice.

Lopen Parish Council comment:-

'Thank you for consulting us on the above application. We are aware that we must consider this application on its merits and have no regard to its long history. This we have now done; in other words, we have measured the justification for the application against the rules for the approval of agricultural dwellings as set out in Annex A to PPS 7. We have ignored the many references in the application to considerations that are not material to this fundamental requirement.

The applicant acknowledges that none of the activities, which he lists as taking place at the Trading Post individually, provide the "functional need" justification for a permanent dwelling as required by PPS 7, but argues that when taken together they provide such justification. It is an immensely difficult task judging at what point an accumulation of minor activities represents an appropriate "functional need", although some guidance is provided through case law. We have made every effort to give the applicant as much benefit of doubt as is reasonable but, whichever way we look at the arguments deployed, they simply do not seem to us to "stack up" and meet what Annex A to PPS 7 intended. The present scale of the operation is small (especially the number of livestock) and the number of staff employed offers reasonable alternative methods for managing the various monitoring activities mentioned, which we note mainly take place late in the evening or early in the morning, using existing accommodation arrangements. We would anticipate that the SSDC officer responsible for advising on these types of applications will have similar doubts.

In sum, we accept that the applicant has made an eloquent effort to recover from the early problems associated with this dwelling and justify its construction. We nonetheless believe that the case is not sufficiently strong to qualify under Annex A to PPS 7 and that, if approved, will provide a precedent which undoubtedly will be deployed in the future by others with similarly weak cases.'

County Highway Authority comment:-

'The proposed development site is remote from any urban area and distant from adequate services and facilities, such as, education, employment, health, retail and leisure. In addition, public transport services are infrequent. As a consequence, occupiers of the new development are likely to be dependant on private vehicles for most of their daily needs.

Such fostering of growth in the need to travel would be contrary to government advice given in PPG13 and RPG10, and to the provisions of policies STR1 and STR6 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review (Adopted: April 2000).

Notwithstanding the aforementioned comments, it must largely be a matter for the Local Planning Authority to determine whether or not this is a suitable location for an agricultural dwelling. If it is, and there is an overriding agricultural support and/or the proposed dwelling is required to satisfy a genuine local need, then I would not wish to raise a highway objection to this proposal.

In detail, there is sufficient room for the parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the development and the visibility from the access is acceptable in both directions. Therefore, I would advise you that from a Highway point of view there is no objection to the proposal.'

South Petherton Parish Council do not feel that a strong business case has been made, neither do they feel that an agricultural need has been demonstrated. Hence if an agricultural need cannot be demonstrated they recommend refusal.

Council's Landscape Officer comments:-

'I would agree that the building is visible, as are a number of buildings and structures along the Lopenhead ridgeline, as viewed from the south. However, visibility is only an issue if the proposal is incongruous in any way. Whilst the design of the dwelling is different from the norm (and nothing wrong with that) the house is sited within a context of a small building cluster; the materials are not visually obtrusive; and when setting this dwelling against the scale of the employment structures that have recently been permitted on the opposite side of the road, then its scale is negligible. Consequently I have no landscape objection to the proposal.'

The Council's Agricultural Development Officer advises:-

'The accounts demonstrate that the income generated by the holding (not including resale of bought in produce) exceeded the SMD threshold in 2006. The financial test of PPS7 has therefore been met.'

Representations

Two letters of objection have been received, their comments are summarised as follows:-

- 1) The appearance of dwelling is of a completely different nature and not in keeping with the surrounding buildings and dwellings
- 2) Building has been constructed on a high ridge making it highly conspicuous and visible from a great distance from the Merriott direction
- 3) The building is an eyesore which would look more at home on a Disney set
- 4) It is not for me to conclude that the failure to determine the previous application over a period of 18 months constitutes misadministration nor, for that matter, that this replacement application advances the situation
- 5) PPS7 makes it clear that any residential development in the countryside must be justified exceptionally. Agricultural buildings have to meet the requirements of Annex A of PPS7 and in particular the requirements of functional need
- 6) In the first instance the Trading Post is not a clear agricultural unit - it incorporates a retail unit significantly unsourced from the site and a wayside café - neither of these two elements appear to meet the requirements of Annex A nor does a permanent dwelling facilitate their expansion
- 7) The applicant advances a number of mitigating factors to demonstrate functional need, broadly fall into 4 categories:-
 - a. early morning/late evening activity

- b. occasional need for frost protection measures and fail safe management of heating systems
- c. security (apparently most particularly of the shop unit)
- d. a future but unspecified expansion of livestock
- 8) Note that 7 workers are employed and suggests that some of these could be redeployed to the meet the first and second of above. There is no dispensation in PPS7 with regards security. Existing workforce could deal with fourth category.
- 9) Do not see any convincing case for general functional need, this would appear to be the conclusion of the council's agricultural advisory officer on the last application.
- 10) Arguments on vernacular architecture are at best secondary
- 11) If Council see some case for functional need this will need to be spelt out explicitly to avoid setting precedents for similar developments. Clearly significant conditions would need to be applied.

65 letters of support have been received both from customers and associated businesses. Their comments are summarised as follows:-

- 1) Wish to highlight the exemplary nature of a truly sustainable building, much of material for it has been locally sourced, believe PPS 7 para 11 applies (note: this refers to special justification for designs which are 'truly outstanding and ground-breaking')
- 2) The produce grown here is not only of superior quality but provides an answer to 'low carbon footprints' and 'negative food miles'
- 3) Some foods are brought in but this means one can do a comprehensive shop nevertheless it is still an important principal and strong selling point that at least some of the produce is grown on site
- 4) Deliveries often take place at unsociable hours, any time from 3.30 am to 10.30pm, it is important that someone is on site to sign for deliveries
- 5) The land attached is Grade 1 and highly suitable for market gardening, my observations of the place where; frost, sudden storms and associated electricity cuts, early morning harvesting for fresh daily produce including salad throughout the year, care of livestock and problems with security justifies the need for a manager to live on the site
- 6) We feel it is our duty as human beings to support environmentally aware shops that sell ethically produced food, local food, often home-made products, good for our health and for our planet
- 7) The building is unobtrusive and blends into the natural environment
- 8) This is a labour intensive operation which requires 24 hour, 7 day a week supervision and care; it is essential that the applicants live on site
- 9) Hope that the planning department will show flexibility and imagination in dealing with this application and continue its historically and nationally significant role regarding the promotion and encouragement of more sustainable forms of construction
- 10) Applicants have displayed dedication, vision and all-hours hard work to make the business a success
- 11) Helps to sustain not only their business but many other local businesses
- 12) Demand for organic produce is growing strongly and it is a tremendous benefit to the local community to have such access
- 13) Building is much more pleasant to look at than a mobile home
- 14) The applicants have turned a forlorn site into a hive of industry
- 15) A particularly positive feature of the business is the way they have integrated the cultivation of vegetables and livestock (pigs, sheep and chickens) with the farm shop and café - this supports the objective of reducing food miles

- 16) A mixed small holding of this kind does require on-site management particularly since the applicant raises all his vegetables from seed.
- 17) If someone is not available to deal with the systems for caring for the plants it could result in the total loss of a crop with devastating consequences.
- 18) Building is in stark contrast to the proposals for the industrial site opposite
- 19) Request that a preservation order be placed on the house as a continuation of the rural tradition of the West Country
- 20) Can quite understand why the applicant seized the opportunity to go ahead with the building when time and the builder were available
- 21) For many surrounding villages it acts as the village shop
- 22) Have grown organic vegetables commercially for 26 years and know all too well the huge amount of daily input that is necessary.
- 23) Living on site reduces carbon footprint as there is no need to travel to work
- 24) As a nation we will soon have to be growing far more of own local food and would much rather see organic smallholdings than clunking great business parks
- 25) Local business - cannot stress enough the importance of using the Trading Post as one of main suppliers
- 26) Believe the building is a must for continued success and not a false application looking for financial gain
- 27) Organic farming systems rely more than conventional farming on the constant vigilance of farmer to control problems which arise promptly because chemical sprays etc are not used preventatively for diseases and pest problems

Chapter 7, the Planning Office of The Land is Ours wrote in response to the comments of the Economic Development Officer. Their comments are summarised as follows:-

- 1) The issue of standard man-days is a totally inappropriate way to assess independent owner/small holders working on complex, organic holdings producing a wide variety of products for local clientele. The Organic Farm Management Handbook advises that the labour requirements for organic farms are typically 10-30% higher than conventional farms, the main factors for this being:-
 - a. increased diversity and complexity
 - b. additional enterprises reduce opportunities for economies of scale
 - c. introduction of marketing and/or processing activities
 - d. introduction of labour intensive, high value enterprises such as field scale vegetables
- 2) All four of these apply to the Trading Post. Everyone that knows the applicant, Mr Friend, recognises that he works long hours and is efficient.
- 3) In terms of security, PPS 7 states 'The protection of livestock from theft or injury by intruders may contribute on animal welfare grounds to the need for a new agricultural dwelling, although it will not by itself be sufficient to justify one.'
- 4) Cannot agree with the statement that if permission were granted it would set a precedent. The idea that 'enormous numbers' of people in S Somerset are suddenly going to invest tens of thousands of pounds and tens of thousands of hours of hard work into creating a business such as this and then wait nine years to apply for a house is ludicrous
- 5) The building has some architectural merit being an interesting example of the low impact style.

The Business Manager for the Soil Association comments:-

- 1) In order for this business to be successful it needs to be able to provide a range of seasonal produce throughout the year. This requires the use of polytunnels that have to be carefully managed and require an on-site presence.
- 2) The presence of livestock requires a high level of management. The Soil Association standard requires that an experienced stockperson check poultry three times day and pigs twice daily. The Soil Association considers that this

means that someone should be on the site at all times to monitor and manage the stock and resolve any problems relating to their health and welfare.

- 3) The Soil Association feels that there is a good case for someone to be able to live on site. The livestock and vegetable enterprises both require care and management that extends beyond the standard nine to five of someone simply coming onto the site to work.

The Head of Advisory Services at the Organic Research Centre has written in support of the application, his comments are summarised as follows:-

- 1) Carried out visits for the Organic Conversion Information Scheme (OCIS) in 1999 and was impressed with the plans, energy and commitment at the time.
- 2) In terms of functional need and in response to Gerard Tucker's comments would advise the following:-
 - Security:- theft and vandalism can both contribute to financial losses where even insurance cover exists but more importantly the loss or damage to key items of equipment at critical times of the year could be disastrous
 - Travel:- the management of this holding would require multiple commuting
 - Time management:- much better that someone is on site using time productively rather than travelling to and from the site
 - Enterprise complexity:- a constant presence on site is required for early detection of pest and disease incidence and also to minimise the damage caused by large pests such as wood pigeons, rabbits, foxes etc
 - Out of hours work:- such as packing for box schemes and preparation of produce for market
 - Protected cropping management:- the unit grows all its salad crop from seed and the polytunnels need to be carefully regulated, this is especially important if there is a sudden change in weather conditions. This requires prompt attention especially out of hours when night time frosts can occur.
 - Livestock management:- a high level of animal welfare is subject to particular emphasis in organic systems. It is a manifest requirement whether there are 50 laying hens on site or 5000. This in itself means that the concept of Standard Man Days (SMD) is meaningless, it is not mentioned in the Organic Farm Management Handbook. My opinion is that welfare of the existing and proposed livestock can only be maintained at the required level by a permanent presence on-site of the person with primary responsibility for the animals.

The applicant's agent contends that the principle of residential accommodation on the site has been established and therefore the only matter for consideration at this stage is the siting and design of the dwelling. It is the agent's opinion that by granting a second temporary permission for mobile homes at the site the Council has accepted that there is a need for residential accommodation at the site. In such circumstances, the agent considers that it would be difficult for the Council to substantiate a legitimate planning reason to refuse permission for a permanent retention of the mobile homes at the site. Therefore, as the principle of a residential accommodation on site has been 'well and truly' established the only consideration for the current application, in the agents view, is the siting and design of the building. The agent notes that the Landscape Officer does not object to the proposal and is supported by the Climate Change Officer. The agent does not considered that the granting of permission would set a precedent in this instance due to the unique circumstances and a situation that is unlikely to be repeated.

Considerations:

Key Issues

The principle of a new agricultural workers dwelling on the application site

Annex A of PPS 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' sets out the requirements for justifying an agricultural workers dwelling. These relate to the need to establish both a functional need and meet a financial test to show a requirement for at least one full time worker. It must be shown that another existing dwelling on the unit cannot fulfill this need and the proposal meets other planning requirements such as impact on the countryside and provision of adequate access.

Local plan policy broadly follows these requirements and also requires that if necessary any permission granted be subject to a s106 agreement to preclude fragmentation of the unit.

The functional test

The Trading Post comprises an organic market garden and small holding, a shop selling the holdings produce alongside other local organic foods and crafts, and a café which uses produce from the shop. The holding comprises 5 acres of market garden with 3 large polytunnels and a glasshouse, producing a variety of summer crops from tomatoes, aubergines and soft fruits, and extending the season for more hardy crops such as peas and early potatoes. The holding grows its entire crop from seed. The supporting evidence includes an agricultural appraisal including a comprehensive lists of the tasks carried out by the applicant. The appraisal concludes that a dwelling is required at the site.

With regard to the functional test Para 4 of Annex A to PPS 7 states that: -

A functional test is necessary to establish whether it is essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for one or more workers to be readily available at most times. Such a requirement might arise, for example, if workers are needed to be on hand day and night:

- (i) in case animals or agricultural processes require essential care at short notice;
- (ii) to deal quickly with emergencies that could otherwise cause serious loss of crops or products, for example, by frost damage or the failure of automatic systems.

There is clearly a dispute between the supporting information supplied by the applicant and the advice of the Council's Economic Development Officer with regard to the functional need for a person to live on the site. It appears that the applicants and their advisors believe that the nature of the use and the organic basis of the unit mean that the requirements for a dwelling cannot be compared directly with a standard agricultural unit. Evidence has been submitted which indicates that a presence is required on site to protect against the loss of crops grown in the polytunnels this is in accordance with part ii) of the above paragraph.

It is considered that the supporting evidence does tend to show that an organic farm will be more labour intensive than a conventionally run farm. In addition, there is the applicant's commitment to sustainable living which means that energy demands at the site are more carefully considered than is usual and requires constant vigilance of the polytunnels. Whilst the comments of the Economic Development Officer are noted it is considered that in these very particular circumstances a functional need can be considered to exist for a dwelling at the site. Sufficient information has been provided regarding the sensitivity of the crop production and the nature of the business and it is considered that this proves an established existing functional need for a permanent dwelling to serve the Trading Post. Indeed the need for a dwelling on the site has already been accepted by the grant of temporary permissions for mobile homes in 2001 and 2004. A building or existing dwelling on the unit cannot fulfil this need and there does not appear to be any other existing accommodation in the area that is suitable and available for occupation by the worker concerned. The new dwelling will

replace the existing two mobile homes that were previously given temporary approval on this site.

The PPS also requires that Local Planning Authority ensure that dwellings on agricultural holdings are not speculative. In this case, it is considered that the design and size (80m² total floor area) of the dwelling ensure that it would only ever be occupied as an ancillary dwelling to the holding.

The financial test for an agricultural workers dwelling

It has been demonstrated that the Trading Post has been established for at least nine years, and accounts confirm that the unit has been profitable over the last three years, is financially sound and has a clear prospect of remaining so. The applicants were required to show that a living could be made only from the land itself, not including all the uses on the site. The accounts prove that a living can be made from the land alone. Therefore, the financial test is considered to have been met.

The effect of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area

The position of the dwelling is closely related to the existing buildings and polytunnels on the site. Although situated on the hillside there are existing trees along the ridge, which do provide a backdrop for the house. The design of the house is unusual and described as a fusion of medieval and modern building techniques resulting in a hexagonal cone. It is modest in size with a floor area of 80m² and constructed of locally sourced natural building materials. It has been designed to conform to the highest principles of sustainable development. The new dwelling is adjacent to the site of the previously approved mobile homes, which will be removed should this application be approved. It is therefore considered that the proposed siting of the dwelling relates satisfactorily to the existing development and the holding.

In terms of its wider impact it is not considered that it results in such a significant impact as to warrant refusal of the application. It is constructed of traditional materials and incorporates a thatched roof. As such, it is considered to be appropriate to this rural setting.

The impact of the proposal on highway safety

The site is served by an existing access of acceptable standard.

Other issues

It is acknowledged that the application is for retrospective permission and although it is regrettable that the applicant proceeded with construction prior to gaining a planning consent for the works, this factor cannot be considered in the determination of the application.

Environmental Impact

The ability of the applicant to live on site ensures a reduction in car use, as there is no need to regularly travel to and from the site.

Conclusion

The issues in this case are finely balanced. Permission has already been granted on two occasions for mobile homes at the site; therefore, the need for a full time presence at the unit has been accepted. Whilst the views of the Economic Development Officer are noted it is considered that in these very particular circumstances with the weight of evidence that has been submitted the application should be recommended for approval. It is not considered that the granting of permission in this instance would create a precedent because there are very few sites like the Trading Post with its commitment to organic farming and mixture of uses. Therefore, for these reasons given above, it is recommended that this planning application be approved with conditions

RECOMMENDATION

Approve

JUSTIFICATION

The proposal, by reason of its size and scale and proven need, respects the character of the area and satisfied the criteria for agricultural workers dwellings in accordance with the aims and objectives of policies ST5 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan Deposit Adopted 2006 and Annex A of PPS 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.

Application Permitted with Conditions

01. Notwithstanding the time limits given to implement planning permission as prescribed by Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), this permission (being granted under section 73A of the Act in respect of development already carried out) shall have effect from the 29 February 2008.

Reason - To comply with Section 73A of the Act

02. The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture or in forestry, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority would not have been prepared to grant planning permission but for this special need.

03. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no extensions to this building without the prior express grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to reserve to the Local Planning Authority control over the size of the dwelling in relation to the needs of the agricultural holding, in accordance with policies ST6 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2006).

04. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no garages or outbuildings shall be erected without the prior express grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to reserve to the Local Planning Authority control over the site in terms of the needs of the agricultural holding, in accordance with policies ST6 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2006).