

MEETING AN.06:1011  
DATE 22:09:10

## South Somerset District Council

**Draft Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held in the Village Hall, Barrington on **Wednesday, 22nd September 2010.**

(2.00 p.m. – 5.40 p.m.)

### Present:

**Members:** Patrick Palmer (in the Chair)

Jill Beale (from 3.20 p.m.)	Paull Robathan
Ann Campbell	Keith Ronaldson
Tony Canvin (from 3.20 p.m.)	Jo Roundell Greene
Rupert Cox	Sylvia Seal (from 2.15 p.m.)
Roy Mills	Sue Steele
Derek Nelson	Derek Yeomans

### County Council Members:

Ann Larpent (until 3.30 p.m.)

### Officers:

Charlotte Jones	Area Development Manager (North)
Madeleine King-Oakley	Area Support Team Leader (North)
Nigel Marston	Licensing Manager
Keith Wheaton-Green	Climate Change Officer
Adrian Noon	Area Lead North/East – Development Control
Lee Walton	Planning Officer (North)
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Andrew Blackburn	Committee Administrator

### Also Present:

Ian McWilliams Planning Liaison Officer (Highways), Somerset County Council

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

### 63. Minutes (Agenda item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 25th August 2010, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

### 64. Apologies for Absence (Agenda item 2)

There were no apologies for absence.

**65. Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 3)**

There were no declarations of interest.

---

**66. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda item 4)**

The Chairman reminded members that the next meeting of the Area North Committee would be held on Wednesday, 27th October 2010 at the Village Hall, Chilthorne Domer.

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

---

**67. Public Question Time (Agenda item 5)**

No questions or comments were raised by members of the public.

---

**68. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 6)**

The Chairman referred to the Area North Annual Meeting with town and parish councils, which had been held on 15th September 2010 at Long Sutton Golf Club. He referred to the event having been very successful with a good rapport before and after the meeting.

The Chairman also mentioned that he had chaired a public meeting on 8th September 2010 as part of the Langport and Huish Episcopi Community Governance Review. He indicated that the matter was ongoing and that a report would be submitted to full Council in January 2011.

---

**69. Reports from Members (Agenda item 7)**

No reports were made by members.

---

**70. SSDC Licensing Service – Update Report (Agenda item 9)**

The Licensing Manager summarised the agenda report, which updated members on the activities of the Licensing Service under the Licensing Act 2003, Gambling Act 2005 and taxi legislation together with other general licensing matters in respect of the financial year 2009/10. He also circulated to members present at the meeting a supplementary report showing the numbers of licences, permissions and consents issued in respect of Area North under the various categories.

During the ensuing discussion, the Licensing Manager responded to members' questions and comments. Points addressed included the following:-

- reference was made to the risk rating system for licensed premises and the Licensing Manager explained how the premises were graded into high, medium and low categories. Reference was also made to how often the premises were inspected and what was involved in making an inspection by letter. He also confirmed that a change in the supervisor of licensed premises would trigger an inspection;

- an explanation was given of why it had been necessary for the premises licence in respect of the Kings Arms, Crewkerne to be reviewed;
- reference was made to the Licensing Service being self-funding and the Licensing Manager explained how the budget was managed to balance income and expenditure and how any surplus or shortfall was accommodated;
- reference was made by a member to private hire vehicles and the Licensing Manager explained under what circumstances a licence was required;
- the Licensing Manager informed members of how staff were organised in the Licensing Team to carry out the various tasks and functions;
- a member referred to those persons who applied for a licence being a client/customer and expressed his view that there was a need to consider whether value for money was evident bearing in mind that the licence fee may be considered to be yet another tax on them or their businesses. He hoped that costs of the service would not increase out of hand;
- reference was made to the Licensing Sub-Committee hearings, which sometimes had to be cancelled after the arrangements had been made for them to take place and a member referred to the cost involved with this exercise. The Licensing Manager explained that there was a strict statutory timescale that had to be followed but attempts were made to resolve issues, which may enable a person to withdraw a representation before a hearing was called;
- it was noted that the Licensing Service was one of the first services to work through a business case for joint service provision in partnership with East Devon District Council.

The Chairman thanked the Licensing Manager for his report, which was noted by the Committee.

**NOTED.**

*(Nigel Marston, Licensing Manager – 01935 462150)  
(nigel.marston@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

## **71. Carbon Reduction Projects (Agenda item 8)**

The Climate Change Officer gave a presentation giving a summary of the Council's carbon reduction projects and of how carbon emission targets were being met. Those projects included:-

- desk top electric sockets in offices to make switching off at the plug easy;
- changes to timings and temperature settings at Goldenstones Swimming Pool;
- wind turbine at Yeovil Innovation Centre;
- use of Mega Electric Van at Lufton Depot;
- voltage optimisation equipment to be installed at Brympton Way Offices in Autumn 2010;
- trial of electric pool bike for staff to replace short car journeys;
- employee engagement with cutting carbon including the 'Switch Off Campaign'.

The Climate Change Officer also informed members of a capital bid that was being made to install solar shading at Brympton Way to reduce overheating and for the installation of

photovoltaics at the Brympton Way Offices and the Octagon Theatre. He further referred to projects that were under investigation including lighting upgrades at the Octagon Theatre, Goldenstones and Lufton workshop and the use of wood heat installations, particularly at Lufton depot and possibly the Octagon Theatre with a back up gas boiler. Reference was also made to the potential for the use of bio-gas fuel for the Council's vehicle fleet.

The Climate Change Officer responded to members' questions on points of detail regarding the projects and technologies mentioned.

During discussion, a member expressed his view that the Council did not have to do everything themselves and commented that, in addition to initiatives and projects that may be carried out by the Council itself, it was felt that the authority could also act in a supportive and enabling role to help individuals to invest in carbon reduction projects. Another member expressed his view that the role of the Climate Change Officer had now become mainstream and that where an initiative was more cost effective and carbon friendly then it should be done rather than not being done.

The Chairman thanked the Climate Change Officer for his presentation, the details of which were noted by the Committee.

**NOTED.**

*(Keith Wheaton-Green, Climate Change Officer – 01935 462651)  
(keith.wheaton-green@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

## **72. SSSDC - Community Offices Review and Update (Agenda item 10)**

The Area Development Manager (North) summarised the agenda report, which provided an update on the current position and potential changes for face to face public access in Area North, including SSSDC Community Offices and locally managed Local Information Centres and Community Offices.

In addition to the information contained in the agenda report, the Area Development Manager also referred to a supplementary paper, which was circulated to members at the meeting, giving details of the footfall figures for the Langport Area Office reception and Somerton Community Office over the period April – September in both 2009 and 2010. The Area Support Team Leader reported further background detail relating to the collection and breakdown of the footfall figures for members' information.

The Area Development Manager particularly referred to the conclusions and the next steps to be taken in Area North, details of which were set out in sections 6 and 7 of the agenda report. Members were asked to note and comment on the conclusions and planned next steps.

During the ensuing discussion, the officers responded to members' questions and comments. Points addressed included the following:-

- reference was made to members having to prioritise having regard to affordability. It was recognised that in the past many services could only be accessed face to face but that there were many channels through which they could now be presented given the availability of technology. It was noted, however, that technology was not available or suitable for all. The need to continue to look at mobile or outreach working was mentioned;

- a member commented that he was glad to see the trial of the Northgate system in the Martock Community Office. He also referred to future advances in IT meaning that officers could work remotely without necessarily needing an office base. It would also mean that officers could work locally without direct network links and their associated costs;
- comment was also expressed that the numbers of people who needed to walk into an office were decreasing and those who accessed services on-line were growing with the pace of technology increasing day by day;
- in response to comments, the Area Development Manager explained the details of the service in Somerton, which was provided by the Council from the Parish Rooms whilst the Local Information Centre was now run by the Somerton Tourism and Heritage Partnership who currently rented space within an antiques centre in the town centre;
- reference was made to the need to work together with the community, including with volunteers, and for business plans to be produced. The Area Development Manager commented that she did not feel that the current arrangements in Somerton were necessarily the best model to provide a service at least cost, but work was ongoing with support from the Parish Rooms Committee and the Town Council. She was of the view, however, that the proposed arrangements in Langport involving the relocation of public access to Council services to the Local Information Centre in the town in partnership with Langport Town Trust were a model to work towards. A member expressed his view that an SSDC presence in the Information Centre would be welcomed and that the office at Old Kelways may be seen as being out on a limb;
- a member referred to the service in South Petherton being provided in co-operation with the Police and to the possibility of such partnership working being extended in other localities;
- reference was made to there being a need to achieve a balance in respect of accessing frontline services in the next ten years or so. Although recognising the advancements in technology, there was still a need to provide access to services for vulnerable people. The need to ensure that benefits and housing advice could be found in market towns was also mentioned;
- a member referred to the importance of such centres to town centre vitality, serving both visitors and residents;
- a member referred to the excellent service provided by the Council's Welfare Benefits Team, which could provide a face to face service in the home;
- the need for the right 'signposting' to where services could be accessed was highlighted.

The Area Development Manager clarified that the next steps were set out in section 7 on page 12 of the agenda and included consideration by District Executive of the relocation of public access to the Council's services from the Area Office at Old Kelways to the Langport Information Centre. If approved this would be followed by further consideration of the staffing requirements including the number of hours the service would be available, which she hoped would be a local decision. She referred to the other steps mentioned in the agenda being ongoing but not yet completed.

The Committee indicated its support for the next steps including the relocation of public access to the Council's services in Area North from Old Kelways to the Langport

Information Centre. A member asked, however, that a further comprehensive report be submitted to the Area North Committee to inform members of progress with the changes. The Committee concurred with this request and asked that a progress report be submitted to the December 2010 meeting to inform members of the latest position, what had been learnt, and of any further proposals.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that the report of the Area Development Manager (North) including the conclusions and planned next steps set out in sections 6 and 7 of the agenda report be noted and supported;
- (2) that a progress report informing members of the latest position with the actions in section 7 be submitted to the Committee's meeting in December 2010.

*(Charlotte Jones, Area Development Manager (North) – 01458 257401)*  
*(charlotte.jones@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

### **73. Area North Committee – Forward Plan (Agenda item 11)**

Reference was made to the agenda report, which informed members of the proposed Area North Committee Forward Plan.

**RESOLVED:** that the Area North Committee Forward Plan as attached to the agenda be noted.

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

---

### **74. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 12)**

Members noted that there were no details to report since the last meeting regarding planning appeals that had been lodged, dismissed or allowed.

**NOTED.**

*(David Norris, Development Manager – 01935 462382)*  
*(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

### **75. Planning Applications (Agenda item 13)**

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).



**10/00938/FUL (Pages 21-29) – The conversion of 2 no. barns into 1 no. dwelling and 1 no. holiday let together with associated access, parking and turning (GR 345829/126298), Little Upton Bridge Farm, Langport Road, Long Sutton – Mrs. Gill Rickards.**

Prior to summarising the details of the application, the Planning Officer, in updating members, reported the details of a further letter from the occupier of Upton Bridge Cottage, reiterating concerns about the application. The Planning Officer also indicated that he wished to amend recommended condition 9 so that it more clearly specified the details of the access, including boundary treatment, to be submitted for approval before development commenced. He reported that such details should include splays and landscaping details to the rear of the roadside boundary wall and any associated planting. He also recommended the inclusion of an additional condition concerning a requirement for all boundary treatments to the south eastern, west and north west boundaries to be submitted for approval, including a natural stone wall to the south east boundary, which took into account concerns raised about the lack of a stone wall on that boundary. He further referred to the extant permission relating to the formation of the vehicular access, which was currently under construction. As the access could also be seen as part of the current scheme he recommended that the condition attached to the extant permission regarding the stopping up of the existing access immediately to the west of Little Upton Bridge be included in any approval of the current application.

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, then summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He referred to the key considerations to be taken into account including the principle of the development, character and appearance, setting of the listed building and highway safety. In response to a question he clarified the circumstances regarding the location of the access and parking provision, details of which were set out in the agenda report.

The Committee noted the comments of the representative of Long Sutton Parish Council, Mrs. J. Turner, who commented that the Parish Council had serious concerns about the proposals. Reference was made to the impact on the setting of the nearby listed building and to the large scale of the site, which could lead to more development. Concerns were expressed about the access and parking provision and it was felt that there was insufficient space to allow parking and the movement of vehicles. Reference was also made to the proposed boundary fence, which was felt to be harsh and would be seen clearly. Natural stone would be preferred. It was generally felt that the development of the site had not been thoroughly thought through.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr. G. Pringle and Mr. T. Walford in objection to the application. Points raised included the following:-

- the process for notifying neighbouring residents and the accuracy of the plans was queried;
- concerns were expressed about the access arrangements and the impact on highway safety, reference being made to the volume and speed of traffic at this location. It was felt that no account had been made of visitors and delivery vehicles. The view was expressed that the access was not wide enough to accommodate the entrance and exit of vehicles, comment being made that there was no splay on the entrance or layby for delivery vehicles. Reference was made to the use of the access to Little Bourne being preferable but the applicant was not prepared to alter the plans to relocate the access;
- concerns expressed about the visual impact of the development, which was on a greenfield site and difficult to screen;

- although not having a fundamental objection to development on the site, it was felt that this particular scheme was poor;
- the site was too cramped and an unsatisfactory compromise;
- a decision should not be based on the possibility of losing any planning appeal.

The applicant, Mrs. G. Rickards, commented that she had worked with the Planning Department in order to make optimal proposals for this site. She also indicated that she had been to Long Sutton Parish Council who had advised her to seek pre-planning advice and subsequently met the Planning Officer on site. Discussions had also taken place with neighbours. She felt that the proposals would make most use of the buildings with minimal impact on the area. She knew there were concerns, which she was trying to address. With regard to highway safety she referred to the Highway Authority being content. In referring to concerns raised about parking she explained the parking provision that had already been approved together with that for which permission was being sought. She mentioned that there was space for 10 cars and to there being room to turn and park. She also referred to parked cars not being visible from the road as the parking area was screened by a wall. The applicant further indicated that she was content with the additional conditions regarding screening and boundary treatment.

Cllr. Rupert Cox, ward member, referred to the concerns expressed by the Parish Council and neighbouring residents and commented that it had been taken on face value that the access was to one dwelling although it was known that there was the potential for further development on this site. He expressed his disappointment that a comprehensive scheme had not been submitted for the whole site and felt that this was a poorly thought through scheme. He referred to the applicants having originally asked for an access to serve one dwelling but not three. He referred to there being little space for vehicle movements and to the impact on privacy including car lights shining in the existing property. He was of the view that the applicants had not supported the Planning Officer in looking for alternatives for this site and could not support the application.

The Planning Liaison Officer (Highways) referred to the width of the access and indicated that there needed to be a minor alteration to the wall to provide a splay to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site more smoothly, which could be covered by the amended condition 9 as referred to by the Planning Officer earlier in the meeting. He further commented that there was adequate visibility in both directions and that vehicles were able to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. On that basis he could not see how the application could be refused on highway grounds. In response to questions from members he advised that there were no requirements in the car parking strategy relating to visitors, there was, however, space for 10 vehicles so room would be available. He also reported that there had been no recorded injury accidents in the last 5 years. He further clarified that the access was satisfactory but just needed the walls cut back to facilitate a splay. The Area Lead North/East confirmed that this would be covered by condition 9 together with the amendment of the reason for the condition to include highway safety.

During the discussion, varying views were expressed by members. Some members were of the view that there needed to be a comprehensive scheme for the whole site and that there were other possibilities that could have been explored. Reference was also made to the possibility of using the alternative access and the Planning Officer explained the difficulties in doing so in this case. A member mentioned the potential impact of the parking area on the existing dwelling including a reference to the number of vehicles that may be situated in front of the building.

Other members indicated that they found the proposals to be acceptable. Comments were expressed that the Committee needed to look at the application that had been submitted. Reference was also made to the access having already been approved for one dwelling. It



was highlighted, however, that it should be ensured that the splay to the wall where the access joined the road was achieved.

In response to comments, the Area Lead North/East reported that the changes to the access were small and did not materially change the application before the Committee. He indicated, however, that recommended condition 9 as amended would put an onus on the applicant to provide the necessary splay and that, if it were not provided, the Highway Authority would no doubt prompt the Council to take action to enforce that condition. He also expressed his view that the development of this part of the site would not compromise the development of the rest of the site.

After further discussion, the majority of members indicated their support for the application to be granted subject to the conditions and informative note set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of condition 9 and the inclusion of additional conditions as recommended by the officers.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to:

- (1) conditions 1 – 8 and 10-12 and informative note 1 as set out in the agenda report;
- (2) the amendment of condition 9 to read as follows:-

No development shall take place before details of the access, including boundary treatment to walls has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details should include splays and landscaping details to the rear of the roadside boundary wall and any associated planting. Once approved such details shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, the setting of the nearby listed building and highways safety, further to policies ST5, ST6 and EH5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

- (3) the inclusion of additional conditions as follows:-

Notwithstanding the submitted drawing details of all boundary treatments to the south eastern, west and north west boundaries, and within the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed in writing such details shall be implemented by first occupation of the development. These details should include a natural stone wall to the south east boundary in accordance with the applicant's email dated 23rd September 2010.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and character further to policies ST6 and EH5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

The existing access immediately to the west of the dwellinghouse known as Little Upton Bridge shall be stopped up and its use permanently abandoned within one month of the new access hereby permitted being first brought into use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, further to policy 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan.

(7 in favour, 6 against).

**10/01587/COU (Pages 30-36) – Temporary change of use of land for the storage of 50 caravans (GR 344639/118563), The Old Rope Walk, Parrett Works, Martock – Mr. John Baker.**

Prior to summarising the details of the application, the Planning Officer, in updating members, indicated that he wished to amend recommended condition 1 so that it more clearly set out that any permission granted would be for a temporary period only until 1st October 2013.

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, then summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He referred to the key considerations to be taken into account including the conservation interests, neighbour amenity and highway safety. He indicated that the proposal was linked to the safeguarding of the listed building and the granting of the application would give the applicant the opportunity to raise additional finance that could be put towards the property. He indicated that the application had the support of the Conservation Officer. The Planning Officer also referred to the highway considerations to be taken into account. It was noted that the Highway Authority had been asked to reconsider their recommendation of refusal for reasons of visibility given further information submitted by the applicant that their deeds enabled them to control the visibility to the west of the access, although the Landscape and Tree Officers had indicated that they would not like to see vegetation or trees removed. The Planning Officer further reported, however, that given the conservation aspects of this application a three year temporary permission subject to conditions was recommended. He also indicated that it was for members to decide whether they wished to support this opportunity that sought to encourage the safeguarding of the listed building.

The Committee noted the comments of Mr. J. Peachell on behalf of the applicant. He indicated that there were three individual parties who had purchased the property and referred to the site being in a poor state. In referring to the unit he owned he mentioned that there were 15 or so employees and lorries using the access. He further mentioned that caravans would not be brought to the site on an ad-hoc basis but would be delivered to Southfork Caravan Park, an adjacent operator, who would then manoeuvre the caravans to the site, which he did not feel would cause a problem in terms of the access.

The Planning Liaison Officer (Highways) clarified the situation with regard to the highway considerations. He acknowledged that the site generated a level of traffic movement in connection with its existing use but the access was so poor and an increase in traffic would be a highway safety concern. He commented, however, that given the information about the deeds, if the applicant were to trim a section of the vegetation so that vehicles approaching from the west had significantly increased forward visibility of vehicles emerging from the access then the proposals would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. In response to a question, he indicated that there was no accident record for this locality.

Cllr. Patrick Palmer, one of the ward members, referred to the long history of Parrett Works and commented that he had seen the site go downhill over time since the war. He referred to the need for the deterioration of the building to be halted and for it to be properly restored. He was of the view that approving this application would help and was the first proposal to do something sensible with the site. He mentioned that there was no accident record and felt that the storage of caravans would not cause extra traffic from that generated when cattle were kept on the site.

Cllr. Ann Campbell, also a ward member, hoped that the future would see the regeneration of this heritage site and commented that the owners had the passion to see the site restored. She felt that this application could make a difference in getting started and that the building should not be left to fall down. In referring to the access she referred to vehicles going very slowly at that point of the road. She also referred to the operator of Southfork Caravan Site who would manoeuvre the caravans within the recommended hours.

During the ensuing discussion varying views were expressed by members. A member commented that, although supporting the proposals for the storage of caravans on the site, he could not support the application being linked with the safeguarding of the listed buildings. That view was supported by some other members. Reference was also made to there being no guarantee that any financial benefit would go to safeguarding the listed buildings. Comment was also expressed that any monies from these proposals were not likely to be sufficient to have a significant impact. Some members also mentioned that they were not content with the proposal to store caravans on the site and felt that the application should be refused because of the visual impact of the caravans on the open countryside.

Other members indicated that they were content with the application as recommended and supported permission being granted. Comment was expressed, however, that the vegetation alongside the roadside to the west of the access should be trimmed to improve visibility.

During the debate, the officers responded to members' comments. The Area Lead North/East indicated that it was intended that any money raised from the storage of caravans would be used to repair the buildings and to investigate the ways that renovations could perhaps be carried out. He also commented that the Council could reasonably expect any financial benefit to go towards the listed buildings although there may not be absolute surety. He further mentioned that if it were not for the historic conservation interests identified the application would not have been supported. On the basis of the conservation interests, however, it was recommended for approval. He also indicated that any action that may be needed to secure the cessation of the use once any permission had expired should not be a consideration in determining this application, which should be considered on its merits as submitted. He also suggested that any permission could be strengthened by making it personal to the applicant and co-owners of the site. The Senior Legal Executive clarified that the grant of a temporary permission would not set a precedent with regard to any future use of the land for which a planning application may be submitted.

After further discussion it was proposed and seconded that the application be refused because of the visual impact of the caravans on the open countryside and because there was no justification for the application to be linked with the safeguarding of the listed building. On being put to the vote, 5 members voted in favour of refusal and 8 against. The proposal was therefore lost.

It was then proposed and seconded that the application be granted as recommended subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of the wording of condition 1 with regard to the permission being temporary until 1st October 2013. The Area Lead North/East also recommended that the permission be made personal to the applicant and the co-owners of the site as identified in the application form. An additional condition would also be included regarding the trimming of the vegetation along the roadside to the west of the access. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried, (8 in favour, 5 against).

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- (1) conditions 2-4 as set out in the agenda report;
- (2) the amendment of condition 1 to read as follows:-

The permission shall be personal to the applicant John Baker and to Ilona Herdeg and Michael Lucas who are referred to as co-owners in the application form (Certificate B), and shall be for a limited period only to expire on 1st October 2013. The use hereby permitted shall cease on or before that date and any structures, materials or other items associated with the permission shall be removed from the land and the land reinstated to its former condition to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In view of the special circumstances that are considered to exist at this site and to enable options for the future maintenance and safeguarding of the listed Ropewalk to be explored and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the site and ensure the site is cleared on expiry of the temporary planning permission in the interests of visual amenity, landscape character and the setting of the listed building(s) in accordance with policies EC3, ST6, EH5 and EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the advice of Planning Policy Statement 5.

- (3) the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the vegetation alongside the roadside to the west of the access to be cleared and maintained in accordance with details to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(8 in favour, 5 against)

(Cllr. Paull Robathan wished his dissent to be recorded because he believed that the Council had made a fundamental error in linking the application to the safeguarding of the listed buildings).

*(David Norris, Development Manager – 01935 462382)*  
*(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

.....  
Chairman