

Meeting JAN 02M:09/10
Date 26.08.09

South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council

Draft Minutes of a meeting of the **Joint Area Committee - North** held in the Village Hall, Chilthorne Domer on **Wednesday 26 August 2009**.

(2.00pm – 6.30pm)

Present:

Members: Patrick Palmer (Chairman)

John Bailey (from 4.00pm)	Philip Horsington	Sylvia Seal
Jill Beale	Anne Larpent	Sue Steele
Ann Campbell	Roy Mills	Derek Yeomans
Tony Canvin	Keith Ronaldson	Jimmy Zouche (to 6.00pm)
Rupert Cox	Jo Roundell Greene	

Also Present:

Tim Carroll Leader of the Council

Officers:

Charlotte Jones	Head of Area Development (North), SSDC
Les Collett	Community Development Officer (North), SSDC
Steve Brewer	Community Safety Coordinator, SSDC
Kim Sharp	Assistant Highway Services Manager, SCC
Pam Harvey	Civil Contingencies Manager, SSDC
Nicola Dawson	Civil Contingencies Manager – Somerset Local Authorities Partnership
Teresa Oulds	Community Regeneration Officer (North), SSDC
Nazir Mehrali	Management Accountant, SSDC
David Norris	Development Control Team Leader (North/West), SSDC
Adrian Noon	Major Applications Planning Officer, SSDC
Andrew Gunn	Deputy Development Control Team Leader (North/West), SSDC
Lee Walton	Planning Officer, SSDC
Nick Whitsun-Jones	Principal Legal Executive Advocate, SSDC
Ian McWilliams	Planning Liaison Officer, SCC
Anne Herridge	Committee Administrator, SSDC
Becky Sanders	Committee Administrator, SSDC

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

19. Minutes (Agenda item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 22 July 2009, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

20. Apologies for absence (Agenda item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sam Crabb, Derek Nelson and Paull Robathan. An apology for late attendance was received from Councillor John Bailey.

21. Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 3)

A declaration of interest was recorded, at the time Item 11 was discussed, by Councillor Rupert Cox who declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as an immediate family member used the service. He left the room and did not participate in the discussion or decision.

Also at the time planning application **09/00128/FUL** was being discussed Somerset County Councillor Anne Larpent declared a personal and prejudicial interest and left the room during discussion of this item, although she could not vote, as her husband has a connection with other care homes.

22. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda item 4)

The Chairman reminded members that the next meeting of the Joint Area Committee - North would be held on Wednesday 23 September 2009 at the Village Hall, Norton Sub Hamdon.

23. Public Question Time (Agenda item 5)

There were no questions from members of the public.

24. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 6)

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

25. Reports from Members (Agenda item 7)

Councillor Sylvia Seal thanked Councillor Ann Campbell for all her work as theme advisor with the new flagship play area at Yeovil Recreation Centre that was officially opened on 19 August 2009. Councillor Ann Campbell said it was a great example of what could be achieved with funding an opportunity.

The Chairman passed on his thanks to all those involved with the Martock Play Day which had been a great event. Councillors Sue Steele and Jo Roundell Green commented that the play days in Ilton and Tintinhull had also been very successful.

Councillor Jo Roundell Green wished to pass on her thanks to all officers and partners involved, who had worked well together, to resolve an incident in Montacute with travellers.

Councillor Rupert Cox reported the sad news of the passing away of Redvers Burt of Long Sutton.

26. Community Safety and Policing in Area North (Agenda item 8)

The Community Development Officer introduced Sgt. Alan Bell from Avon and Somerset Police who gave a short verbal update on neighbourhood policing in Area North. He also mentioned that the Community Safety Coordinator was also present to answer any questions from members.

In making his presentation, Sgt Bell referred to the crime statistics that were attached to the agenda report, and explained that the data showed an overall 9% reduction in crime. He indicated that anti-social behaviour was still a large problem, but also since the recent policing restructure there were now more Police Community Support Officers (PCSO).

Sgt. Bell reported that Neighbourhood Watch was celebrating its 25th year and he was working with existing schemes to encourage them to be more pro-active rather than increasing the number of schemes. He also reported there were hopes to create Police Posts in Langport and South Petherton. These posts would not be Police Stations but would be places where staff could start and finish the working day. The potential benefit of the posts would be decreased travel times, increased visibility and quicker response times.

One member asked if the recession had been a factor with any of the crime statistics, and felt that there should be data available to indicate whether it was or not. She also said that elderly people in her ward felt vulnerable and asked if the police were putting any strategies in place. Sgt Bell explained that data was collated but that patterns with crime could not be totally blamed on the recession as other factors often play a part. With regard to strategies, some were already in place such as the Bobby Van Scheme, Sheduction, and the 'No Cold Calling Zone' trial in Martock which informed sales persons that they were not welcome to canvas in the area.

Another member asked where the potential Police Post in Langport was likely to be located. In response, the Head of Area Development indicated it might possibly be the South Somerset District Council offices at Old Kelways as there was potential to provide a secure office at a lower cost to a venue within Langport Town Centre.

During the ensuing discussion, Sgt. Bell answered members' queries on local issues. A number of comments were also made by members, including the following:

- Police Posts – long term funding of posts must be considered, otherwise investment in conversions of buildings is lost.
- Concern over Police response times, in some instances it appeared to be very slow – there needed to be improved communication between the Police and callers about anticipated response times, and make a return phone call if there was going to be a substantial delay.

The Community Development Officer gave a quick overview to some of the local projects which had been supported by grants from the Area North Community Safety Action Panel which included:

- Shepton Beauchamp Youth Consultation Day - £532
- Chilthorne Domer Young People Evening £361.50
- Archies Xtra - £750
- 30 mph stickers for wheelie bins – Aller is going to be the trial in Area North.- £400

Members thanked Sgt. Bell for his presentation.

RESOLVED: That members noted and commented on the presentation

*Les Collett, Community development Officer – 01458 257427
e-mail: leslie.collett@southsomerset.gov.uk*

27. Area North Community Justice Panel (Agenda item 9)

Apologies were given for the Panel Coordinator who unfortunately was unable to attend. The Community Development Officer, Community Safety Coordinator and Sgt Alan Bell collectively presented the report on her behalf.

An overview of the Community Justice Panel was given. It was explained that it was restorative justice and worked to resolve conflict and repair harm, by encouraging the offender to acknowledge the impact of their actions and be given an opportunity to make reparation. A leaflet 'Community Justice Panel – South Somerset Area' giving further detail, including how the panel worked and the process, had been circulated to members with the agenda. It was noted that the Panel was already working in Areas West and East, and was now running across parts of Area North.

Sgt. Bell noted that not all cases were appropriate for the panel. Neither was it a 'soft option' as offenders had to abide in full by the agreement reached at the panel meeting. The Community Safety Coordinator explained that the process allowed the victim to have closure on the event and gave the opportunity for whatever had been done to them to be restored, which the law process doesn't.

Tim Carroll (in audience) highlighted that the re-offending rate was very low, and that he has seen a meeting first hand and that the whole process was impressive. The victim did not feel excluded from the process and offenders, in effect, were given a second chance, as they did not have the crime recorded on a criminal record.

Members raised several questions about how the panel was funded, who was on the panels and how panel facilitators were recruited and trained. The Chairman requested that the Community Development Officer collate the requested information and circulate to all members of the Joint Area Committee – North.

One member asked who made the decision if a case was appropriate for the panel. Sgt. Bell explained that initially the officer dealing with the issue made the decision, which was then reviewed by him. In instances where the offender showed no remorse, or was unlikely to do so, these would normally go through the normal law process. The case would then be discussed with the panel. If the victim chose not to go through the Community Justice Panel, then the offence would be dealt with through the normal criminal justice route.

The Chairman thanked Sgt. Bell and the officers for presenting the report.

RESOLVED: That members noted and commented on the presentation

*Les Collett, Community development Officer – 01458 257427
e-mail: leslie.collett@southsomerset.gov.uk*

28. Civil Contingencies Update (Agenda item 10)

The Civil Contingencies Managers for South Somerset District Council and the Somerset Local Authorities Partnership gave a short presentation with the aid of slides to summarise what Civil Contingencies covered, with particular reference to Area North.

They explained that a major role was to support the 'blue light' services at major incidents. Within Area North, potential major risks included incidents associated with the gas pipeline, flooding, train crash, air crash or major road incident on the A303. To train for such events, exercises, including rest centre exercises were held. The last rest centre exercise in South Somerset was based on a major A303 crash and involved over 500 people acting as casualties, responders and evacuees. Wincanton Race Course was noted as currently being South Somerset's largest rest centre venue, followed by two other venues in Yeovil. Plans were progressing for the provision of a venue to meet the needs of a mass evacuation of up to 3,000 people.

It was reported that work continued to help communities to be more resilient, and members were reminded that there was a Somerset Local Authorities Civil Contingencies Partnership workshop, Building Resilience in our Communities, on 30 September 2009, at which members would be able to feed back any comments.

One member enquired if the partnership had engaged with the Dorset and Somerset Ambulance as they were also seen as a valuable emergency service. The Civil Contingencies Manager for the Somerset Local Authorities Partnership acknowledged they currently did not and agreed it should be investigated.

Members thanked the managers for a clear presentation and concisely written report.

Post meeting note: The Somerset Local Authorities Partnership Civil Contingencies Manager, N Dawson, advised that the Civil Contingencies Partnership's contact with the air ambulance would be via the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Trust. In collaboration with three charities and with the support of the general public the Trust provides four air ambulance helicopters covering Dorset, Somerset, Devon, Cornwall and Isles of Scilly

RESOLVED: That members noted and commented on the presentation

*Pam Harvey, Civil Contingencies Manager – 01935 462303
e-mail: pam.harvey@southsomerset.gov.uk*

29. Langport and Somerton Links Community Transport (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business) (Agenda item 11)

Councillor Rupert Cox declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as an immediate family member used the service. He left the room and did not participate in the discussion or decision.

The Community Regeneration Officer introduced Martin Hawkins from South Somerset Voluntary Community Action, who was present to answer any questions from members. She explained that most information was included within the agenda report but wished to highlight that Councillor Derek Yeomans had also given a grant of £5,000 towards the service from his County Councillor budget. For information, an example fare was given that suggested a private taxi fare from Curry Rivel to Tesco in Langport, could be up to

2.5 times more expensive than that of someone using the Links service with a concessionary bus pass.

Mr Hawkins responded to various members' questions regarding the service and some budget information. He was thanked for the valuable service that the Links Community Transport provided.

RESOLVED: That £5,000 be awarded to South Somerset Voluntary and Community Action (SSVCA) for the Langport and Somerton Links Service from the Area North Grants budget, as the second part of the three-year Service Level Agreement agreed by the Area North Committee in July 2008.

Reason: To endorse the award of funding for the second part of a three-year Service Level Agreement.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

*Teresa Oulds, Community Regeneration Officer – 01458 257435
e-mail: teresa.oulds@southsomerset.gov.uk*

30. Area North 2009/10 Budget Monitoring Report for the Period Ending 30 June 2009 (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business) (agenda item 12)

The Management Accountant presented the report as outlined in the agenda. He explained that the budget had been revised and the budget forecast should be on track for the year-end. However, there may be a small shortfall in income due to the withdrawal of support from Somerset County Council (SCC) for Community Offices.

The Head of Area Development (North) took the opportunity to update members that the Fivehead MUGA project had been successful in securing Lottery funding. Also that monies had not been released to SCC for Cocklemoor Bridge as the easement plans still had to be finalised.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the current financial position on Area North Budgets be noted.
 - (2) That the revised Reserve Schemes and profiling of the Capital Programme for 2009/10 – 2013/14 be approved.
 - (3) That £35,000 be allocated for the Bartletts Elm Roundabout within the Area North Capital Programme.
 - (4) That £10,000 be allocated for Somerton West Street – town centre enhancements for safety and access within the Area North Capital Programme.
 - (5) That £1,533 from the general amenity grants in the capital programme be re-allocated back into unallocated capital reserve.
 - (6) That the position of the Area North Community Grants budget, including details of grants authorised under the Scheme of Delegation by the Head of Area Development (North) in consultation with the ward member be noted.

Reason: To update members on the financial position of the Joint Area Committee – North as of the end of June 09, and to allocate funding within the Capital programme.

(Voting: 9 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

*Nazir Mehrali, Management Accountant – 01935 462205
e-mail: nazir.mehrali@southsomerset.gov.uk*

31. Joint Area North Forward Plan (Agenda item 13)

The Head of Area Development North explained that the forward plan was currently open ended beyond September, pending the outcome of the review of Joint Area Committees (phase 1). A report on the outcome of the review would come to the committee, possibly in October. Members did not request any reports to be added to the forward plan.

RESOLVED: That the Joint Area Committee – North Forward Plan as attached at Appendix A of the agenda be noted.

*Becky Sanders, Committee Administrator (North) - 01458 257437
becky.sanders@southsomerset.gov.uk*

32. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 14)

The Committee noted the details contained in the agenda report, which informed members of planning appeals that were lodged, dismissed or allowed.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

*Simon Gale, Head of Development & Building Control - 01935 462071
simon.gale@southsomerset.gov.uk*

33. Planning Applications (Agenda item 15)

The Committee considered the applications set out in the schedule attached to the agenda and the planning officers gave further information at the meeting and, where appropriate, advised members of letters received as a result of consultations since the agenda had been prepared.

(Copies of all letters reported may be inspected in the planning applications files, which constitute the background papers for this item).

09/01861/FUL - Demolition of existing garage/workshop and adjacent dwelling and the erection of 20 dwellings, associated parking, landscaping, highways and associated works at Yandles Garage, North Street, Martock. Mr & Mrs J Yandle. (Excepted Business)

The Major Applications Co-ordinator advised members of two updates since the report had been written. Firstly he distributed a letter that confirmed the Highways requirements had now been met, with the addition of 8 conditions. A letter had been submitted by a

neighbour regarding the loss of the shop on the proposed site. The applicant was happy to support the 106 planning obligation to deliver Sports Arts and Leisure contributions.

The officer presented the application as shown in the agenda report with the aid of power point slides. He highlighted the amended plans for 20 units which consisted of 6 flats and 14 houses, although the net increase would be 19 units, as an existing property would be demolished. He indicated the entrance to the site and the design of the proposed units. He advised members that the shop was ancillary to the garage use and could not be protected in its own right, it was not the only shop in the area and his recommendation was to approve the application plus the 8 additional conditions.

Mr D Reynolds representing Martock Parish Council was happy with the overall design, although regretted the loss of the business. He expressed concerns regarding the height of the 2½ storey units and the effect of the gable ended property on the appearance of the streetscene along North Street.

Ward Members, Councillors Ann Campbell and Patrick Palmer, regretted that the land behind the site had not been incorporated in the proposed scheme, and were concerned that the 2½ storey units would appear higher due to the gradual rise of the ground. Both felt the entrance to the site could have been better designed.

In response to questions from members the officer replied that: -

- A refusal due to the height of the units would be 'relevant to planning', although he recommended approval;
- The proposal was for four 1 bed-roomed flats and two 2 bed-roomed flats over the proposed garages;
- The difference in height between the 2 ½ storey and the 2 storey blocks would be 1 metre.

During discussion members made the following points that:-

- They did not like the layout of the entrance to the site as it had an adverse effect on the street scene and preferred to see each side of the entrance in a similar style;
- As Martock was regarded as a village the design of the 2½ storey town houses was disliked;
- If the application was deferred for minor alterations would it need to come back to committee.

It was pointed out that the applicant's agent, Graham Chambers of APT, wished to contribute to the debate. In light of the nature of the discussions and as he had not asked to address the committee prior to debate, it was agreed that he could respond to the points raised. Mr Chambers stated that the layout at the entrance was amended to its current form at the request of the Council's Conservation Manager. Previously it was a symmetrical arrangement. He confirmed that his client would be happy to revert to this layout.

With regard to the 2½ storey element Mr Chambers advised that his client would not be prepared to lower these plots to 2 storey. He felt that this would not be out of character or unduly prominent.

Members were advised that as the application had been referred to Committee it should not now be delegated to officers. If deferred for revision the application would have to be referred back to committee for a decision. Alternatively if members were so minded, the

application could be refused and the applicant would be entitled to resubmit a revised scheme.

Members acknowledged that it would be desirable for a decision to be made at this meeting, however, as the application was already out of time, it was felt that no harm would arise from a deferral to enable the application to address the concerns raised

It was proposed and seconded, that a decision on the application be deferred to allow submission of amended drawings to address the concerns raised with regard to the layout of the plots at the entrance and the 2½ storey element, to be reconsidered without prejudice.

RESOLVED: That planning application reference 09/01861/FUL be DEFERRED to enable submission of amended drawings to address the issue of the layout at the entrance to the site and the 2½ storey element, to be reconsidered without prejudice.

(Voting 7 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

09/00128/FUL - The erection of a specialist dementia care home, together with associated vehicular and pedestrian access and landscaping. Land at Foldhill Lane, Martock. Notaro Homes Ltd. (Excepted Business)

(Somerset County Councillor Anne Larpent declared a personal and prejudicial interest and left the room during discussion of this item, although she could not vote, as her husband has a connection with other care homes.)

The Planning Officer advised members that he had received an update in the form of a letter from the Church Street Surgery at Martock, regarding the application for 52 bed spaces, they were concerned that the already busy practice would be overloaded with extra cases. The surgery also felt that the existing nursing home in Martock adequately served the need of the community. Pinders, a professional and consultancy service, had produced a good Needs Assessment Report that highlighted a need for the facility in this area. He also drew members' attention to the objections raised by the SSDC Landscape Architect, as indicated in the agenda report, although a landscape scheme would be provided.

The Officer proceeded to summarise, with the aid of power point slides, the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He indicated: -

- the position of the site was located outside of the development boundaries for Martock, although a previous planning application for a church building had been permitted on the site;
- The provisional allocation of 35 parking spaces;
- The plan of the 52 bed spaces all of which would be en-suite;
- The three main blocks linked by glazed walkways;
- An aerial view of the proposed application;
- The location of the attenuation tank to aid surface water drainage
- The site in comparison with Martock itself;
- The highest point of the building that would be 8.5 metres above ground level.

He explained that the Pinders report showed there was a need for a specialist dementia care home in the area and that by 2017 at least 292 new bed spaces would be required. A number of other sites including the key site had been looked at, but were found not to be suitable. Although the site was not in a Flood Zone, concern had been raised after the

rainfall of last winter. A Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted with this application, the Environment Agency had raised no objections subject to conditions. He indicated that the recommendation was for approval as the design, scale and materials would not adversely affect the setting, nor harm any residential amenity, plus additional conditions to control light pollution.

The Planning Liaison Officer for Somerset Council Council (Highways) advised members that there were no objections from Highways, who were happy with the width of the road into the development; parking was in line with SCC strategy; no accidents had ever been reported near the proposed access point and although visibility was slightly restricted in places adequate improvements would be achieved.

Mr D Reynolds of Martock Parish Council commented that as this application went outside of the building line they could not agree to it, he also felt that there were some inaccuracies within the Pinder report and was concerned regarding the extra strain this application would have on Church Street Surgery.

The Agent, Peter Grubb, made the following points:-

- The evidence found by SSSDC and SCC in the needs report, supported the need for a care home;
- It would provide jobs for local people;
- This application had taken over 18 months to reach this stage with rigorous assessment by officers and consultations; it was a good application that met the stipulated criteria.

Ward Members, Councillors Ann Campbell and Patrick Palmer appreciated that there was a need for this type of care home but there was not just a local need, but also an area need for homes of this kind. However they could not see justification for such a large home within the five-mile catchment area stated and would prefer to have seen a smaller dementia care home in Martock. They also raised concerns whether Foldhill Lane would cope with the increase in traffic, not only from visitors, but delivery vehicles as well.

During discussion members expressed varying views such as:-

- People in general were living longer and there was a great need for a home of this type in the area
- It should be able to employ local people from all walks of life as well as professionals and would help the local economy
- This home would help to prevent bed blocking
- The principle of development had previously been accepted on this site
- It would not just be the elderly who would have access to this home but people of all ages who were affected by dementia
- The home would attract a larger catchment than the five mile radius discussed
- The design was not in keeping with the countryside, was not attractive and looked like an institution
- Better landscaping detail was required
- A smaller home would be preferred
- It was unacceptable due to the landscape objections
- This design was innovative and different to anything else in the area; the size of the home would be big enough as other homes in the area were having to expand to cope with local needs

In response to questions from members the officer replied that: -

- This application came under Class D1 but a condition should be imposed to control the use as it is this need that has been identified and used to justify the development
- The number of external lights was not known at this stage but part of the condition regarding lighting was to enable the Local Planning Authority to see details before commencement;
- The provision of medical care was not a planning consideration therefore it had not been necessary to carry out an impact assessment on the Doctors surgery.

The Planning Officers recommendation to approve this application was proposed and seconded and on being put to the vote was carried. (Voting: 6 in favour, 4 against, 1 abstention)

RESOLVED: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions as laid out in the agenda report and the following additional conditions:

- external lighting
- tinted glazing
- building use to be limited to a dementia care home

(Voting: 6 in favour, 4 against, 1 abstention)

09/01993/ADV – The display of a non-illuminated fascia sign and a non-illuminated projecting sign at Eddystone House West Street, Somerton. Boots Chemist PLC.

After discussion with the legal representative, it was deemed that this application should be regarded as an 'Excepted Business' item.

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, presented his report as outlined in the agenda. He updated members that the pavement at the location was only 1.5 metres in width not 2 metres as originally stated in the written report – the original width stated had been calculated from mapping data. He also drew members attention to the last sentence of the extract of PPG19 in his report and the key issue to consider was highway safety.

The Planning Liaison Officer for Somerset County Council (Highways) explained that the application met all the criteria required with regard to height and distance from the main carriageway, hence Highways did not raise any objection.

Division Member, Councillor Jimmy Zouche, referred to the response of the Highway Authority within the written report and highlighted that the wording seemed a little strange given that signs along that particular length of road had already been knocked down or damaged.

Ward Member, Councillor Tony Carvin concurred and noted that only recently the Highways sign along the same stretch of road had been twisted around.

Members were minded to refuse the application by reason of the position of the protruding sign being a potential risk to public safety. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

RESOLVED: That the advertising consent be REFUSED by reason of the position of the protruding sign being a potential risk to highway and public safety.

(Voting: 9 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)

09/00229/FUL – The erection of a single storey eco house at Mill Farm, Rectory Lane, Norton Sub Hamdon. Mr S Weir.

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He described the site and showed aerial photographs that indicated an established vineyard in the northwest corner and an orchard in the southwest corner. He explained that the application was for an eco dwelling to be situated to the north of the site.

Members were informed by the Planning Officer that the proposal was outside of the development limits. However as indicated in the report, PPS7 does state that in exceptional circumstances development can be allowed, but in this instance it was felt the proposal did not meet the criteria. He drew members attention to other material considerations that applied such as the South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS), as the proposal met several of the goals.

The Planning Liaison Officer for Somerset County Council (Highways) explained that there were concerns regarding Rectory Lane but only the alignment of the very end section. There were no concerns regarding traffic from the single dwelling but there could be if further dwellings were to be permitted in the future.

Mr A Smith, a highways consultant and representing the applicant, noted that he had met with the SCC Planning Liaison Officer on site to discuss the Highways concerns. He confirmed it was only the last section of 57 metres of Rectory Lane, which was unsurfaced, that was of concern. He considered the issue of two vehicles passing was not a concern as there was likely to only be one vehicle movement. Therefore he concluded the concerns were about pedestrian safety. He noted that there were several locations where pedestrians could refuge from vehicles if required and that there was good visibility, hence safety should not be a major issue.

Division Member, Councillor John Bailey, noted that the applicants had involved the village in the plans and that he felt it was an exceptional site and an exceptional building. He also suggested that there was minimal traffic along the far end of Rectory Lane, most of which was agricultural.

Ward Member, Councillor Sylvia Seal, raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety along Rectory Lane and also if the design was of such an exceptional design to merit allowing development outside of the development line.

The Development Control Team Leader responded by stating that the officer considered the dwelling to be of a high standard in terms of its design and energy consumption. The site was also adjacent to the school and close to other facilities. Furthermore this site was unique and would not set a precedent for development outside of development boundaries. If a similar circumstance were to occur then any other scheme would need to be assessed against the same criteria and the scheme before members set the 'benchmark'

During the ensuing discussion, varying views were expressed. Members were of the opinion to support the officer recommendation to refuse the application by reason of the highways issues outlined in the report and also that the proposal is outside the development line. On being put to the vote, was held not to be carried (5 in favour, 7 against).

Another proposal was made, and seconded, to approve the application subject to conditions. On being put to the vote was held to be carried (7 in favour, 5 against).

RESOLVED: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions to be agreed with the Ward Member before any decision is issued. Reference was made to the likely conditions being:

- The Parish Council conditions as in the agenda report – numbers 2 and 3 only.

Plus

- Time limit
- Details of all external materials
- Highways, access, parking etc
- Landscaping
- Details of levels
- Implementation of sustainability measures
- Removal of Permitted Development Rights in relation to outbuildings and extensions

Justification:

The proposed dwelling is considered to be an innovative low impact dwelling that will have a minimal long term impact upon the environment, is well related to existing facilities and will not be prejudicial to highway safety. The application is in accordance with Policy ST5, ST6, ST8 of the South Somerset Local Plan, Policy 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review and goals 8-12 of the South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy'.

(Voting: 7 in favour, 5 against, 0 abstentions)

*Simon Gale, Head of Development & Building Control - 01935 462071
simon.gale@southsomerset.gov.uk*

.....
Chairman