

Meeting AN 12M 10/11  
Date 23.03.11

### **South Somerset District Council**

**Draft Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held in the Edgar Hall, Somerton on **Wednesday 23 March 2011**.

(2.00pm – 6.15pm)

**Present:**

**Members:** Patrick Palmer (Chairman)

Jill Beale	Roy Mills (to 5.50pm)	Sylvia Seal (from 2.05pm)
Ann Campbell (from 2.20pm)	Derek Nelson	Sue Steele
Tony Carvin	Keith Ronaldson	Derek Yeomans
Rupert Cox	Jo Roundell Greene	

**Officers:**

Charlotte Jones	Area Development Manager (North)
Les Collett	Community Development Officer (North)
Steve Brewer	Community Safety Co-ordinator
Sgt. Alan Bell	Avon and Somerset Constabulary
David Norris	Development Control Manager
Adrian Noon	Area Lead North/East (Development Management)
Carl Brinkman	Principal Planning Liaison Officer (SCC Highways)
Angela Watson	Senior Solicitor
Becky Sanders	Committee Administrator

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

---

#### **143. Minutes (Agenda item 1)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2011, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

---

#### **144. Apologies for Absence (Agenda item 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Paull Robathan. Apologies for late attendance were received from Councillor Ann Campbell.

---

#### **145. Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 3)**

There were no declarations of interest.

---

**146. 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 27 April 2011 at the Village Hall, Long Sutton.

---

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

There were no questions from members of the public.

---

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

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

---

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

There were no reports from members.

---

**150. Area North Community Safety and Neighbourhood Policing (Agenda item 8)**

The Community Development Officer introduced the item and explained it was the regular report, and that Sgt Alan Bell and the Community Safety Coordinator were present to answer any questions. It was also noted that the Chairman of the Area North Community Safety Action Panel (ANCSAP) was present in the audience to take questions if required.

In response to comments and queries from members the officers and Sergeant Bell explained that:

- It was local policy for Police officers to patrol individually unless specific situations indicated otherwise.
- Specials Officers are primarily based in Yeovil but also cover the rural areas.
- Community Speedwatch volunteers were still very active, and further volunteers were being found to undertake some of the administration role.
- There was probably under-reporting in rural areas which would impact upon crime figures.

One member commented that some recent crimes in his rural ward appeared to be unresolved and as a result further crimes may not have been reported, to which Sgt Bell responded that he would correspond directly with the member regarding specific concerns. Sgt Bell noted that police action largely stemmed from crime reports.

The Chairman of ANCSAP, in response to comments about Local Action Groups (LAG), noted that they could be very effective but it was for parishes to instigate a group and the ANCSAP would support them where they were able.

The Chairman (Area North) thanked all the officers for the report and answering questions.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

*Les Collett, Community Development Officer (North)  
leslie.collett@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01458) 257427  
Steve Brewer, Community Safety Co-ordinator  
steve.brewer@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01458) 462390*

### **151. Area North Community Grant – Installation of Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) at Kingsbury Episcopi Recreation Ground (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 9)**

The Community Development Officer summarised the report, and with the aid of photographs, explained that a kick wall had been installed a number of years ago and that the current grant application would enable it to be extended into a MUGA. It was noted that the Kingsbury Episcopi Recreation Trust had worked hard over the years to put in equipment on the recreation ground and had applied to the Big Lottery for £50,000 towards this project. The Lottery grant was in its final stages and the SSDC Community Grant would enable the installation of the MUGA without delay if the Lottery application was successful.

Following a brief discussion, in response to comments from members, the Community Development Officer and Area Development Manager (North) confirmed that there was a sinking fund in place and that conditions were in place requiring other funding sources to be secured.

The ward member commented that it was a dynamic and well thought out project. Members were unanimous in their support for the project and were content to approve the funding.

- RESOLVED:** That an award of £10,000 to the Kingsbury Episcopi Recreation Trust towards installation of a multi use games area at Kingsbury Episcopi Recreation Ground, be approved, allocated from the Area North Community Grants Budget subject to the standard grant conditions for SSDC Community Grants and the following special conditions:
- a) Kingsbury Episcopi Recreation Trust will continue to own and manage the facility, under the existing terms of trust, any future changes to the arrangements for ownership and management of the facility to be agreed in writing by SSDC.
  - b) The applicant makes provision for the future maintenance and replacement of the facilities (e.g.: through the establishment of a sinking fund).
  - c) The final design for the MUGA to be approved in writing by the SSDC Play and Youth Facilities Officer prior to placing orders for equipment or ancillary items; and be in accordance with standard EN15312 for free access multi-sports equipment
  - d) SSDC is notified of, and approves in writing, any proposed changes to the project.
  - e) On completion of the construction work, the applicant commissions SSDC to carry out a Post Installation Inspection of the MUGA and pays SSDC's fees in connection with the inspection.
  - f) The applicant continues to maintain the MUGA in accordance with standard EN 1176 and manufacturers instructions
  - g) The applicant displays and maintains a sign at the entrance to the MUGA that conforms to the guidance set out in EN1176 (information

- supplied from the Play and Youth Facilities Officer).
- h) The applicant sends a representative to SSDC's Routine Visual Playground Inspection Training and Introduction to Playground Management training at their own expense.
  - i) The applicant takes steps to involve and consult the local community about the MUGA proposals and in particular the views of children and young people are sought and considered and provides evidence of this when submitting the final design for approval.
  - j) The applicant includes the following clause in the contract to install the MUGA: "The employer will withhold a 5% retention of the contract value for one year following the date of the site completion certificate. This will be paid to the contractor after one year, unless installation problems occur with the facility and then the employer reserves the right to use the retained funds to rectify any problems experience. The retention and/or use of the retention sum do not preclude the employer from seeking damages for breach of contract, should the value of the breach of contract exceed the sum".

**Reason** To determine an application for financial support submitted by the Kingsbury Episcopi Recreation Trust.

*(Voting: unanimous:)*

*Les Collett, Community Development Officer (North)  
leslie.collett@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462249*

## **152. Area North Community Grant – Refurbishment of the Old School Room in Curry Rivel (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 10)**

The Community Development Officer summarised the report, and with the aid of photographs, explained that the building was of local historical interest having been constructed in 1828 from random materials throughout the village. Sufficient funds had already been raised to enable the roof repairs to have been completed. Internally, the curved ceiling was originally to be replaced, but heritage officers had since agreed to allow the roof structure to remain open so that the historical structure was visible. It was noted that the toilet and kitchen floor had sunk and this grant would enable the floor to be replaced allowing the toilets and kitchen to be refurbished and enable the hall to be open to the community.

The ward member commented that a relatively small amount of grant funding would save a listed building and enable another facility for community use.

Following a brief discussion, in response to comments from members, the Community Development Officer confirmed that:

- The building was owned by the church, but it had a separate management committee and the building would be open to the entire community.
- The hall had been used in the past, before its closure in 2005, by user groups outside of the church groups.
- The success of the project, including use by the wider community, would be monitored as part of ongoing evaluation by the Community Development Officer.

Members were unanimous in their support for the project and were content to approve the grant.

**RESOLVED:** That an award of £1,500 to the Curry Rivel Old School Room Management Committee towards refurbishment of the toilet and kitchen floor, be approved, allocated from Area North Capital Programme - local priority projects for enhancing facilities and services, subject to the SSDC standard conditions for community grants and the following special conditions:

- a) The applicant must make provision for future repair and replacement. SSDC recommends the applicant establish a sinking fund to achieve this condition.
- b) The applicant will work with the Community Development Officer to ensure that fees and charges for use of the Old School Room, are set at a suitable level for community use.

**Reason:** To determine an application for financial support submitted by the Curry Rivel Old School Room Management Committee.

*(Voting: unanimous)*

*Les Collett, Community Development Officer (North)  
leslie.collett@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462249*

### **153. Area North Community Grant – Isle Abbots Village Hall Phase 1 Refurbishment (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 11)**

The Community Development Officer summarised the report, and with the aid of photographs, explained that the hall was a semi-detached building in need of some attention. He explained that the hall committee had worked on the refurbishment project for some time, and had achieved Hallmark 2 status. The group had been ready to make a funding application to the Joint County & District Village Halls programme, but that programme no longer existed.

The ward member commented that the hall was well used and much fundraising had been done but it needed some ‘tender loving care’. During a brief discussion, members raised several comments including:

- the hall needed support
- the project would be good use of a grant
- it was commendable that the parish council had raised the precept to support the project

Members were content to support the project, and on being put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** That an award of £5,000 to Isle Abbots Village Hall Committee towards the refurbishment of the village hall (phase 1) be approved, allocated from the District-wide Village Halls budget subject to the SSDC standard conditions for Community Grants and the following special condition:

- a) Applicants must make provision for the future maintenance and replacement of the facilities. SSDC recommends the applicant set up a sinking fund to achieve this condition.

**Reason:** To determine an application for financial support submitted by the Isle Abbots Village Hall Committee.

*(Voting: unanimous)*

*Les Collett, Community Development Officer (North)  
leslie.collett@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462249*

---

### **154. Area North Committee Forward Plan (Agenda item 12)**

The Area Development Manager (North) had no updates to the Forward Plan. One member suggested that the three update reports on the plan for April - Streetscene, Highways and Civil Contingencies - would be more beneficial to the new incoming members, post local elections. The committee agreed that the reports should be re-scheduled for June 2011 onwards

The ward member for Turn Hill requested that the expected report on the Area North Affordable Housing programme should include detail of the use of funds set aside to support the progress of small-scale schemes of affordable housing for local people, and the success of the committee's effort to prioritise this work in general. He noted his disappointment in the progress of one particular scheme in his ward. Other members concurred in this request for further details of what had been achieved from the set aside funds.

The Area Development Manager (North) agreed to provide a report, noting that as the scheme in question was now subject to a current planning application it would be inappropriate to comment further at this stage.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the Area North Committee Forward Plan be noted.
  - (2) That the reports on Streetscene, Highways and Civil Contingencies be rescheduled for June 2011 onwards.
  - (3) That the relevant officers provide further information on the progress of the Affordable Housing Programme, and the use of the set aside funds in Area North.

*Becky Sanders, Committee Administrator  
becky.sanders@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462077*

---

### **155. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 13)**

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

The Ward Member for Turn Hill commented about the appeal decision at Bridge Horn Barn and noted that he would be standing down at the election. He asked the Committee to keep a watch over developments particularly amendments to any conditions as he felt it important that the local community had every opportunity to be consulted, and that the Area North Committee should consider any future applications.

Both Ward Members for Martock expressed their disappointment at the decision about 47 Birch Road, Martock and they continued to have concerns regarding pedestrian safety.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

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

---

## 156. Planning Applications (Agenda item 14)

The Committee considered the applications set out in the schedule attached to the agenda and the planning officer 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).

**10/03704/FUL – The erection of 133 dwellings and associated garages, highway works and landscaping on land at Northfield Farm, Northfield, Somerton. Applicant: Bellway Homes.**

The Area Lead North/East introduced the application and updated members that since the agenda had been published three further letters of objection had been received, but none had raised any additional points to those already included in the agenda report. A further letter had also raised concerns about the content of the agenda report regarding highways concerns, education contributions and interpretations of allocations in the Local Plan. He noted that further comments had been received from Highways requiring additional conditions for technical specifications and that an independent education consultant for the applicants disputed the financial contributions required to Huish Academy.

With the aid of photographs and plans the Area Lead summarised the application and key points were explained including:

- The allocation policy was in the Local Plan
- A new road junction configuration was proposed at Bancombe Road, Northfield and Langport Road to give access to the estate and improve visibility on to Langport Road.
- The allocation in the Local Plan stated that access to the proposed site was to be from Bancombe Road and Northfield.
- The proposal was for predominantly two-storey buildings with some three-storey, and a mix of materials including stone, reconstituted stone and render.
- Affordable housing, including rented and shared ownership, clustered throughout the development.
- Somerton Town Council had suggested a roundabout to Somerset County Council as an alternative for the junction at Langport Road, however this would not meet required criteria and would need more space than that available.
- Density proposed was 34 dwellings per hectare.
- There were strong local concerns regarding highways issues including access, parking and the potential increase in traffic through existing housing estates. However the proposed new junction had been designed to encourage use directly on to Langport Road.
- The applicant was content with conditions, except the financial contribution to Huish Academy – this condition could potentially be negotiated and deferred for agreement by the Development Manager and Area Chairman.
- Proposed surface drainage was a sustainable urban scheme using attenuation tanks under parking areas. Run off would not be greater than the greenfield site.

The Area Lead circulated a hard copy of proposed revised conditions to members for clarity and highlighted the amendments to conditions 2, 4, 20 and 21. He also informed members of the four proposed additional conditions related to Highways including:

- Detail of roads, pavements and streetlighting
- New and amended road layout to be constructed prior to occupancy
- Before any development – temporary cycle and footway links to be provided
- Details of visibility splay at junction with Langport Road to be submitted

Subject to the amendments, the officer recommendation was to approve the application.

Ms P Short, objector, commented that much housing had been built since the site was first allocated in the Local Plan and queried if the assessment that the infrastructure could cope was still correct.

Ms M Chambers, a local resident, commented that housing was needed but was disappointed that the proposal did not include any domestic energy efficiency measures. She noted that local residents had knowledge of the use of local roads, and the proposal would put users at increased risk while the development was under construction and requested that this was monitored during the build. She also commented that the existing sewerage system would be put under strain and a review was needed by Wessex Water.

Ms C Randall, a local resident, was in favour of development for the town but only if the infrastructure could cope. She didn't feel that public concerns had been taken into account, and was concerned about increased traffic through existing housing estates. She requested that there was further investigation into the viability of a roundabout, and that a pavement be provided along Bancombe Road. She asked members to consider refusing the application.

Mr N Cooper, commented that the design should reflect the local vernacular and hence there should be arched entrances. He also expressed the opinion that there was an insufficient contribution for education towards the pre-school. He noted that Highways was an important issue and the proposal was a dangerous scheme which was not supported locally. *(Mr Cooper commented that he wanted more than three minutes to speak - this was declined by the Chairman).*

Following the public speaking, in response to members comments, officers clarified some points including:

- Energy efficiency measures could not be conditioned as they it is something that was governed outside of planning legislation
- Wessex Water had been consulted at the time the site was allocated and would have commented if needs were identified. They had not raised any objection to the application.
- Capacity of the infrastructure in the future would have been taken into account at the time the site was allocated.
- Acknowledged that needs of pre-school were a consideration but the needs were an existing situation and not for the applicant to remedy.
- The proposed re-configured road junction at Langport Road complied with criteria set out within the 'Manual for Streets' which provided guidance for the planning, design and provision of new residential streets, and modifications to existing ones.
- Bancombe Road 'pinch points' – the proposed re-configured junction would stop-up the end of Bancombe Road and would reduce traffic at the eastern end of the road.



- Monitoring of construction traffic and potential risks to the public would be part of Building Regulations.

The Principal Planning Liaison Officer commented that there was little space available for a roundabout, and that the stopping up of the lower end of Bancombe Road should result in a substantial drop in traffic. He clarified that the proposal was for vehicles to turn off the main road but there would be no dedicated centre lane for traffic turning right into the development. He noted that the proposal met the needs of the Local Plan, and that traffic flow had been satisfactorily modelled using a computer program and it had met criteria. In response to a question from a member, he commented that a dedicated lane for traffic turning right would not fit in the location and a roundabout would need a diameter of at least 28 metres.

Ward Member, Cllr Tony Canvin commented that there had been discussions about the site since around 2001/2002. He agreed that Bancombe Road should be stopped up but also recollected that there had been discussions about the roadside wall along the eastern end of Bancombe Road being re-sited at the time of the Hodges Barton development. He raised concern about the general layout of the development and felt the proposal was wrong for through traffic, and it was difficult to understand why a pavement along Bancombe Road was not required. Regarding sewerage, he was surprised Wessex Water had not raised an objection and thought that the existing network had no extra capacity. He generally felt the proposal was not as had been discussed in the past.

The Area Lead commented that he was aware a number of options for the site had been discussed in the past but none of them appeared to have been given any weight by the Inspector. He confirmed that there were no objections on file from Wessex Water from the allocation and SSDC engineers had not raised objections to the proposed surface water drainage. In response Cllr Tony Canvin commented that he recollected that the original proposal back around 2001 was that the sewage from the site would not go through the existing sewerage system.

During the ensuing, lengthy discussion members raised several comments including:

- Support for the principle of housing
- More clarity required regarding concerns, especially highways and sewerage
- Important to get design and layout right for the new proposed road junction on to Langport Road.
- There should be innovations for green energy and grey water
- Insufficient evidence that an alternative road layout wouldn't work
- Householder amenity outside space was small
- Three-storey aspect was out of keeping

It was proposed and seconded to defer the application to seek further information and clarification regarding:

- Sewage and surface water drainage
- Highways alternatives, in particular with regard to the layout looked at in 2000/2001 and visibility provided at Hodges Barton
- The three-storey element
- Introduction of energy efficiency measures
- Garden size / density

On being put to the vote, members unanimously agreed to defer the application.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 10/03704/FUL be DEFERRED to:

- Seek clarification of sewage and surface water drainage (Wessex Water/Environment Agency/engineers)
- Explore highways alternatives, in particular the internal road layout with regard to 'Bancombe Road bypass' looked at in 2000/01 and the visibility provided at Hodges Barton
- Reconsider 3-storey element (omit?)
- Seek introduction of energy efficiency measures (solar panels etc)
- Review garden size (density)

*(Voting: unanimous)*

**10/00059/OUT – Outline application for the erection of 4 no. dwellings and garages on land adjacent Acre Cottage, Stoney Lane, Curry Rivel. Applicant: Mr J R Kitchen.**

The Area Lead North/East introduced the application and used photographs and plans to summarise the application and key points. The site was in the development area of Curry Rivel and the application sought outline permission to develop the large garden. The indicative plan was for four properties. It was noted there were two protected trees on the site and some other mature trees would be kept as well as new planting. Key considerations were the new access off Stoney Lane and density of the development.

Dr P Goodenough, spoke on behalf of Curry Rivel Parish Council noting that they had listened to residents concerns. He commented that Bawlers Lane and Stoney Lane were used as a cut through by local traffic. The council also had concerns that the proposal was for a higher density than the surrounding dwellings, and that this did not fit with the local form. They were against the proposal and suggested two dwellings might be more appropriate.

Mr M Eason, spoke in support of the application. He noted that the garden needed significant maintenance with an associated cost, and that the proposal kept some of the trees and would give a framework to the site. Access would also be improved.

Mr A Preston, agent for the applicant, commented that that much advice had been sought from officers during preparation of the application. He noted that density was well below the recommended guidance and hoped members would agree that low density development was in keeping with the area. It was commented that the new access was an improvement on the existing one, and that local issues with speeding traffic were a matter for the Police. He felt the proposal fitted within local policy and asked members to consider approval.

Ward Member, Cllr Derek Nelson commented that the rest of Stoney Lane was substantial houses with large gardens. The proposal didn't fit in with the form of the immediate area. He noted the road wasn't suitable for a development of the size proposed, and that the condition for a footway was pointless as it did not connect to another pathway on that side of the road. He felt that the proposal was inappropriate.

During the short, lively discussion members made several comments including:

- Sympathy to applicants needs
- Shame to fit four properties into a garden of such a significant property
- A single entrance for the proposed and existing dwelling might be more in keeping with the area.
- Fewer dwellings would be more in keeping

In response to members questions, the Area Lead and Principal Planning Liaison Officer confirmed that:

- the proposal would remove the entire length of mature hedge along Stoney Lane to be replaced with a newly planted hedge set back to improve highway visibility.
- The proposed density of 15 dwellings per hectare was not considered out of keeping
- If the pathway was not conditioned, or the existing entrance used for the proposed site access, the hedge would still need to be removed for visibility purposes
- The application detailed that the dwellings would be two-storey with garages. The minimum and maximum footprint measurements had been stated, and the layout would generally be in accordance with the plans submitted

The Development Manager reminded members that the proposal sought outline permission and the plans were only indicative. The principle of four dwellings needed to be considered.

Most members were against the proposal due to over-development. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the officer recommendation and on being put to the vote was carried, nine in favour of refusal and three against refusal.

**RESOLVED:** That application 11/00059/OUT be REFUSED for the following reason:

The proposal has failed to demonstrate that the development of this site for four dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated without detriment to the character and appearance of the locality. In the absence of such justification the proposal is considered to constitute the over development of the site at odds with the establish pattern of development on Stoney Lane that would fail to respect the character and setting of the existing dwelling. As such the proposal is contrary to policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

*(Voting: 9 in favour, 3 against, 0 abstentions)*

**10/05122/FUL – Temporary permission for the siting of a mobile home (retrospective) at Old Oak Farm, Back Lane, Curry Rivel. Applicant: Mr A Jones.**

The Area Lead North/East introduced the application and used photographs and plans to summarise the application and key points as shown in the agenda report. The application for residential use was retrospective and had stemmed from the business. It was for a timber clad mobile home and the applicants accepted that the correct way to continue living on site was to seek planning permission.

He updated members that a further letter of objection had been received that alleged that a councillor had a personal interest in the application, however this was not a reason to object to the application. There was a Highways objection regarding visibility splay over a neighbours land. It was explained that there were concerns if there was a functional need for the planning permission for security reasons and whether alternatives had been fully explored.

Mr N Pratt, neighbour, spoke in support of the application. He noted that the applicants had always lived and worked in the area and had strong links to the village. The business had been developed over the years. Other security measures had been tried including the use of his CCTV and dogs in a compound. He considered that the

precedent had been set last year with the approval of the application at Picts Hill on the basis of on-site security.

Ms R Horsey, applicant, commented that living on site was essential to survival of the business which had been operating for fifteen years. Their insurance provider also stated that they had to be on site to be covered. She noted that they had tried to secure the site and protect it, and living on the site appeared to have resolved security issues.

Ward Member, Cllr Derek Nelson commented that the applicants were able to walk to many of the village facilities if they chose to do so. He noted that no objection had been raised by Curry Rivel Parish Council or the neighbour, and suggested that the application be approved.

Cllr Derek Yeomans, commented that the accusation towards him regarding a conflict of interests was unfounded and stated he had no interests to declare, he had only met the applicant once and had no business with him. He acknowledged that there was undesirable activity in the area and felt the officer recommendation was incorrect.

In response to members comments the Area Lead commented that the main reason for refusal was due to insufficient evidence for the functional test. During the short ensuing discussion members raised several comments including:

- The duration of any permission needed to be clear
- The retrospective use had probably helped to prove the functional test
- The equipment is too large to be moved off site continually
- Occupancy should be tied to the business on site

The Area Lead confirmed that if members were minded to approve the application then the reason would be that the functional need had been justified and the proposal complied with the advice of PPS7. There would be two conditions:

- The siting of the mobile home would be permitted for five years
- The occupancy of the mobile home to be restricted to an employee of the business on site.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the officer's recommendations and on being put to the vote was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That application 10/05122/FUL be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

**Justification:**

It is considered that the functional need to live on site in support of this financially viable business has been satisfactorily demonstrated and that the retention of this mobile home would not be detrimental to visual for residential amenity, the character of the locality or highways safety. As such the proposal complies with policies ST3, ST5, ST6 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the advice of PPS7.

**Conditions**

1. The use of the land for the siting of a mobile home hereby permitted shall be discontinued, the caravan removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 31/03/16 in accordance with a scheme of work to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and to enable the matter to be reviewed in light of prevailing circumstances

in accordance with policies St5, ST6 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

2. The occupation of the mobile home hereby approved shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed or last employed in the aboricultural, landscaping and agricultural contractors depot occupying the plot edged red on the attached plan, or a widow or widower of such a person, or any resident dependants.

Reason: To ensure that the accommodation hereby approved continues to meet an identified functional needs in accordance with policy HG15 of the South Somerset Local plan.

*(Voting: 9 in favour, 2 abstentions, 0 against)*

**11/00484/FUL – Demolition of existing single storey extension, erection of two storey and single storey extension and alterations. Applicant: Mr D Heath-Coleman.**

The Area Lead explained to members that the application was only before committee as the applicant was an officer in the Development Control team. With the aid of slides he summarised the application as shown in the agenda report and explained that the property had an unusual garden layout. The proposal was for a two storey extension with a single storey element. It was noted that no objections had been received and the officer recommendation was for approval.

There was a very brief discussion during which members did not raise any concerns and were unanimous in their support for approval.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 11/00484/FUL be APPROVED subject to the conditions stated in the agenda report.

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

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

**157. Exclusion of Press and Public (Agenda item 15)**

**RESOLVED:** That the following item be considered in Closed Session by virtue of the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A under paragraphs:

- 1, information relating to any individual
- 5, Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings
- 6, information which reveals that the authority proposes:
  - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
  - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.

*(Voting: Unanimous)*

**158. Planning Enforcement Action – CONFIDENTIAL (Executive Decision)  
(Agenda item 19)**

The Senior Solicitor gave an overview of the situation to date and explained that a decision needed to be made about the further action to be taken in relation to the breach of planning control at the site identified in the confidential agenda report.

During the ensuing discussion, most members were in favour of pursuing options c) and d) subject to one amendment and on being put to the vote was carried eight in favour and three against.

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to one amendment, options (c) and (d) as set out in the confidential agenda report be pursued regarding the site identified in the report.

**Reason:** To make a decision on the further action to be taken in relation to a breach of planning control.

*(Voting: 8 in favour, 3 against)*

.....

*Chairman*