

MEETING AN.03:1213  
DATE 27:06:12

## South Somerset District Council

**Draft Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held in the Village Hall, Martock Road, Long Sutton on **Wednesday, 27th June 2012**.

(2.00 p.m. – 4.55 p.m.)

### Present:

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

|                  |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Pauline Clarke   | Jo Roundell Greene |
| Graham Middleton | Sylvia Seal        |
| Roy Mills        | Sue Steele         |
| Terry Mounter    | Paul Thompson      |
| David Norris     | Derek Yeomans      |
| Shane Pledger    |                    |

### Officers:

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Charlotte Jones     | Area Development Manager (North)              |
| Les Collett         | Community Development Officer (North)         |
| Pauline Burr        | Community Regeneration Officer (North)        |
| Adrian Noon         | Area Lead North/East – Development Management |
| Claire Alers-Hankey | Planning Officer                              |
| Alex Skidmore       | Planner                                       |
| Neil Waddleton      | Section 106 Monitoring Officer                |
| Paula Goddard       | Senior Legal Executive                        |
| Andrew Blackburn    | Committee Administrator                       |

**(Note:** 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 meetings held on the 17th and 23rd May 2012, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as correct records, were signed by the Chairman.

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

There were no apologies for absence.

### 21. Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 3)

Cllr. Shane Pledger declared his personal and prejudicial interest in planning application no. 12/01461/FUL (Erection of a detached dwelling and garage and associated access, land off Cross Lane, Long Sutton) as he was the applicant.

Cllr. Derek Yeomans declared his personal interest in agenda item 8 (Area North Community Grants – Curry Rivel Village Hall Energy Efficiency Improvements) as he was a member of Curry Rivel Parish Council and a former Chairman of the Village Hall Committee.

---

## **22. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda item 4)**

The Committee noted that the next meeting of the Area North Committee would be held at 2.00 p.m. on Wednesday 25th July 2012 at Norton Sub Hamdon Village Hall.

---

## **23. Public Question Time (Agenda item 5)**

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

---

## **24. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 6)**

The Chairman reported that on the 16th June 2012 he had attended the official opening of the Kingsbury Episcopi Village Shop towards which the Area North Committee had awarded a grant. He referred to the good facilities provided by the shop.

He further reported that he had attended the Green Scythe Day at Thorney on the 17th June 2012 and referred to it having been an interesting event.

The Chairman also mentioned that he was invited to Barrington Court on the 19th June 2012 to view the Antony Gormley exhibition and to see a variety of schools workshops. He felt that the organisation behind it was amazing and that it was a fantastic exhibition.

---

## **25. Reports from Members (Agenda item 7)**

Cllr. Pauline Clarke reported that she had attended a meeting of the Strode College Community Education Committee at which a number of interesting items were discussed including their plans for summer school.

Cllr. Sue Steele referred to the tour on 25th June 2012, which had been organised for members of the Council by the Scrutiny and Member Development Manager. The tour visited certain Yarlinton Housing Group Schemes in Chard, which included the retirement living scheme at Bishops Court. She had found the visit to be most interesting.

---

## **26. Area North Community Grants – Curry Rivel Village Hall Energy Efficiency Improvements (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 8)**

The Community Development Officer (North) summarised the agenda report, which asked members to consider a request for financial assistance submitted by Curry Rivel Village Hall towards energy efficiency improvements for the hall.

Cllr. Terry Mounter, ward member, referred to the hall being well used and well run and indicated his support for the application.

Having considered the details relating to the application, the Committee indicated its support for the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:** that a grant of £4,500 from the District Wide Village Halls Budget be awarded to Curry Rivel Robert Sewers Hall towards a programme of energy efficiency improvements, subject to the SSDC standard conditions for community grants and to the following special condition:-

“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 received by the Council from Curry Rivel Robert Sewers Hall for financial assistance.

(Resolution passed unanimously).

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

## 27. Tintinhull Community Plan – Endorsement of Local Priorities (Agenda item 9)

The Community Development Officer (North) referred to the agenda report, which presented a summary of the findings and actions from the Tintinhull Community Plan. The Committee was asked to endorse the priorities set out within the Plan, a copy of which had been circulated to members.

The Community Development Officer (North) explained the background to the production of the Community Plan, which had included a village wide community consultation involving a wide ranging questionnaire in order to obtain a list of priorities to take the plan forward. It was noted that all aspects of the community had been taken into account including the gypsy and traveller community. The Plan had identified a number of priorities, which would help to inform local decision making, led by the Parish Council to take projects forward. The Community Development Officer (North) showed photographs of various sites within the village and recommended that the Committee endorse the Plan.

Cllr. Jo Roundell Greene, ward member, commented that a lot of work had gone into the preparation of this worthy and comprehensive plan and she hoped the Committee would support it. She further referred to a note within the plan that Bearley did not receive the same refuse collection and recycling service as the rest of the village and clarified that, in fact, Bearley did receive the same service but on a different day.

During the ensuing discussion, other members indicated their support for the Tintinhull Community Plan. Comment was also expressed that, although it was a good plan, there was a need for it to be seen in conjunction with other policies and plans such as the South Somerset Local Plan. The Committee noted the comments of a member who remarked that she would like to have seen reference in the plan to the fact that the gypsy and traveller community had been consulted.

The Committee indicated its support for the officer’s recommendation.

**RESOLVED:** that the priorities set out within the Tintinhull Community Plan be endorsed, noting the comments of the Development Manager with respect to land use planning implications.

(Resolution passed unanimously)

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

## 28. Developing Sustainable Tourism in Area North (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 10)

The Community Regeneration Officer (North) summarised the agenda report, which asked members to consider allocating £5,000 from the Area North Reserve to support the installation of a series of interpretation panels at the Cartgate Picnic Area.

The Community Regeneration Officer (North) further commented that the project to create and install these interpretation panels within the Cartgate Picnic Area was the first step to entice visitors to linger longer in South Somerset. She mentioned that the panels could be updated easily when necessary. She also reported that she hoped that the Tourist Information Centre Operations Supervisor and Tourism Officer would attend the next Committee meeting to report on what other ideas could be considered to promote the area.

During the ensuing discussion, the Area Development Manager (North) and Community Regeneration Officer (North) noted the comments of members and responded to questions on points of detail. Points raised included the following:-

- it was confirmed that contributions had been sought from businesses and organisations towards the project and the Community Regeneration Officer (North) informed members of the sponsorship that had been received. It was noted, however, that the request had been a little late for some organisations as they had already allotted their marketing budgets for this year;
- a member commented that many tourists travelled straight through Somerset to Devon and Cornwall and that there was a need to get behind the promotion of the area;
- comment was expressed that this type of project coincided with the work of the County Council as tourism authority for promoting Somerset and it was suggested that they be contacted with regard to the possibility of some funding or other assistance being provided by them towards promotional projects;
- reference was made to this being an excellent scheme, which would benefit the whole district. It was hoped that other projects could be taken forward to promote the market towns.

The Committee indicated its support for this worthwhile project and was content to approve the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:** that £5,000 be allocated from the Area North Reserve to support the installation of a series of interpretation panels at the Cartgate Picnic Area.

**Reason:** To determine a request to support investment at the Cartgate Picnic Area in support of increasing the value of local tourism.

(Resolution passed unanimously).

*(Pauline Burr, Community Regeneration Officer (North) – 01935 462253)  
(pauline.burr@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

## 29. Section 106 Obligations (Agenda item 11)

The Section 106 Monitoring Officer summarised the agenda report, which provided information on Section 106 obligations relating to Area North. It was noted that agreements containing financial contributions were included within the monitoring report and that, if members required any information on other Section 106 agreements, it had been agreed that they should contact the Section 106 Monitoring Officer direct.

The Section 106 Monitoring Officer also referred to an amendment to procedures to ensure that members had earlier notification of Section 106 agreements relating to their ward, particularly with regard to sports, arts and leisure facilities, details of which were contained in the agenda report. It was also noted that progress with the monitoring of historical agreements was ongoing.

In referring to the monitoring report itself, he particularly referred to the schemes in Curry Rivel and Ilton and mentioned that an application was expected from the developers for the discharge of planning obligations in respect of some of the strategic elements. It was noted that the money for the local elements should remain.

The Area Development Manager (North) then showed a number of photographs of schemes and facilities that had been able to be provided resulting from monies collected through Section 106 obligations. She also gave information on the actual amounts of funding invested into communities in Area North through this process as well as the potential amounts that may be realised from Section 106 obligations which were coming up.

During the ensuing discussion, the Area Development Manager (North) and Section 106 Monitoring Officer responded to members' questions on specific points of detail relating to particular Section 106 agreements mentioned in the monitoring report attached to the agenda. The officers also noted comments and responded to a number of questions regarding the monitoring of Section 106 agreements generally. Points mentioned included the following:-

- a member referred to how much use was made of multi-use games areas (MUGAs) and felt that it should be ensured that the facility was what the community wanted before monies were allocated. The comment of the Chairman that the MUGA in his ward was very well used was also noted;
- the Section 106 Monitoring Officer indicated that part of the monitoring of the obligations included ensuring that other organisations such as the highway authority carried out its undertakings;
- the Section 106 Monitoring Officer was congratulated for the progress he had made in creating the database to enable Section 106 obligations to be monitored;
- the Committee noted the comments of a member who suggested that floodlights were needed to enable some of the sports facilities to be utilised in the winter months;
- the Area Development Manager (North) noted the request of members that it would be useful for guidance notes to be provided to them on the Section 106 planning obligations process;
- a general discussion took place on the way in which contributions from developers were applied as part of the planning obligation process between local and strategic facilities, especially in relation to sports, leisure and recreation;

- the Committee noted the concerns of a member who felt that the way the recommendation on the agenda was worded could imply that the Committee endorsed the way any particular monies were spent. The Section 106 Monitoring Officer clarified that the allocation of monies was agreed as part of the planning obligation process when a planning application was being considered. The recommendation on the agenda was merely asking the Committee to note the report and endorse the action that was taken to monitor the progress with the obligations.

The Chairman thanked the Section 106 Monitoring Officer for his report.

**RESOLVED:** that the report of the Section 106 Monitoring Officer be noted and the actions taken in respect of the monitoring of Section 106 planning obligations be endorsed.

(11 in favour, 1 against)

*(Neil Waddleton, Section 106 Monitoring Officer – 01935 462603)  
(neil.waddleton@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

### 30. Area North 2011/12 Outturn Report (Executive Decision) (Agenda 12)

The Area Development Manager (North) summarised the agenda report, which informed members of the actual spend against budgets for the year 2011/12 of the services over which this Committee exercised financial control.

In summarising the report, the Area Development Manager (North) also showed photographs of projects that had been awarded funding under the Area North Community Grants Scheme 2011-12 and of those completed as part of the Capital Programme 2011-12. Photographs of planned schemes in Area North under the Capital Programme for 2012-14 were also shown.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) that the 2011/12 financial outturn position of the Area North Budgets be noted;
  - (2) that the position of the Area North Reserve as at the 31st March 2012 be noted;
  - (3) that the slippage of £127,886 on the Area North Capital Programme be carried forward to 2012/13;
  - (4) that the position of the Play and Youth Capital Investment Programme in Area North be noted;
  - (5) that the Committee note the position of the Area North Community Grants Budget, including details of grants authorised under the Scheme of Delegation by the Area Development Manager (North) in consultation with the ward member(s).

**Reason:** To review the 2011/12 financial outturn position of the Area North budgets as part of the monitoring of the Area North Development Revenue Budgets, Area North Capital Programme and Area North Reserve.

(Resolution passed unanimously).

*(Nazir Mehrali, Management Accountant – 01935 462205)  
(nazir.mehrali@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

### 31. Area North Committee – Forward Plan (Agenda item 13)

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

The Area Development Manager (North) further reported that the following items were to be included in the forward plan:-

- strategic housing outturn report – July 2012;
- neighbourhood policing – date to be confirmed;
- presentation by Chilthorne Domer Recreation Trust – December 2012.

**RESOLVED:** that the Area North Committee Forward Plan as attached to the agenda be noted, subject to the above additions being taken into account.

(Resolution passed without dissent)

*(Becky Sanders, Committee Administrator – 01935 462596)*  
*(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 lodged, dismissed, or allowed.

**NOTED.**

*(David Norris, Development Manager – 01935 462382)*  
*(david.norris@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 file, which constitute the background papers for this item).

**12/01108/FUL (pages 52-56) – Single storey extension, link to and conversion of existing garage. Erection of a double garage (GR 348043/132108), At Last, Peak Lane, Compton Dundon – Mr. Bob Knight.**

The Planner, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. She referred to the key considerations to be taken into account being the impact on the character of the area, impact on residential amenity and impact on highway safety. The Planner indicated that there were no significant concerns regarding visual or residential amenity and the application was before the Committee because the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the highway authority. The Planner explained, as detailed in the agenda report, that it was not considered that the concerns of the highway authority were sufficient to warrant refusal of the application and reported that the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

Cllr. Pauline Clarke, one of the ward members, commented that she was astonished that the application had been brought to the Committee and that she knew the area well. She indicated that the Parish Council supported the application. She was of the view that this was an obvious situation where the application could be granted and indicated her support for the proposals.

Cllr. David Norris, also a ward member, felt that this was a simple application. In terms of traffic, he referred to Peak Lane being a quiet road and to Hayes Lane being even quieter. He indicated his support for the application.

Other members also indicated that they were content with the proposals and that planning permission should be granted as recommended by the officers.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to conditions 1-4 as set out in the agenda report.

(Resolution passed unanimously).

Arising from consideration of the above application, the Area Lead North/East noted the comments of members who asked that the Highway Authority be informed of their concern that in the case of some applications its views did not always seem to reflect the local circumstances relating to a specific development.

**12/00875/OUT (Pages 57-62) – Outline application for the erection of a dwellinghouse (GR 342381/120419), Island House, Stembridge – Mr. Brian Stuckey.**

Prior to summarising the details of the application, the Planning Officer, in updating members reported the details of an additional letter received in objection to the application. She further reported the receipt of a letter from the applicant's agent stating that ten local residents had indicated that they had no objection to the 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. She referred to the key considerations to be taken into account being the location of the site outside of any development area and the planning history of Stembridge where there was a consistency of dismissed appeals for residential development, details of which were included in the agenda report. The Committee noted that the recommendation was one of refusal for the reason set out in the agenda report and that, if the Area Committee was unwilling to accept the officer's recommendation, it would need to be referred to the Regulation Committee.

The Committee noted the comments of the applicant's agent, Mr. M. Williams, who indicated that the applicant was grateful for the opportunity of bringing the application to Committee. He referred to the applicant's family being long standing members of the community and indicated that the dwellinghouse would be used within the family, details of which he explained to the Committee. Reference was made to the applicant wishing to build a two or three bedroom house, which he commented would meet with the Parish Council's objective of having smaller dwellings in the village. He commented that the site was not in open countryside and had buildings adjacent on three sides. He did not feel that the building would be intrusive and indicated that it would not be visible from the through route. He explained the reasons for his view that the proposed dwelling would be in a sustainable area and also why he felt that the application could be granted in policy terms. In referring to the objections, he mentioned that they had not been submitted by people who lived locally and that local people had confirmed their acceptance of the proposals. Reference was also made to the applicant being willing to improve the lane from which the property was accessed. He asked the Committee to approve this outline application to enable the applicant to prepare detailed plans for a dwelling, which would enable an extended family to live in the village and provide a dwelling of a smaller size.



Cllr. Derek Yeomans, ward member, referred to there having been no facilities or services in Kingsbury Episcopi until recently. He informed members of the facilities that were now available including a shop and a pub as well as the primary school. In referring to the history of other residential development in Stembridge having been refused, he commented that those applications had been refused for good reasons. He referred to Stembridge having deliberately been kept separate from Kingsbury Episcopi so that the two villages did not run as one. He referred, however, to this site being between two existing houses and although the access lane was in a poor state of repair, the applicant had indicated that he would be prepared to do some remedial work to it. He further commented that the lane had to be traversed to reach some Yarlinton homes and its improvement would, therefore, be beneficial to the public. He indicated his support for the application, which he felt was on an eminently suitable site, not in open countryside and would bring benefits to Stembridge.

During the ensuing discussion, other members indicated their support for the comments of the ward member and were of the view that the application should be referred to the Regulation Committee with the recommendation that it be approved because it was considered that Stembridge was not an unsustainable location for new residential development, the site was situated between existing houses and not in open countryside and would cause no harm to residential amenity. It was also felt that the proposals would benefit the community given the offer of the applicant to carry out remedial work to the access lane. In that respect it was felt that any permission should be subject to a Grampian condition to require improvements to the access road.

The Committee was also of the view that it would be beneficial for members of the Regulation Committee to hold a site visit prior to determining the application.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that the application be referred to the Regulation Committee with the recommendation that it be approved because it was considered that Stembridge was not an unsustainable location for new residential development, the site was situated between existing houses and not in open countryside and would cause no harm to residential amenity. It was also felt that the proposals would benefit the community given the offer of the applicant to carry out remedial work to the access lane. In that respect it was felt that any permission should be subject to a Grampian condition to require improvements to the access road;
- (2) that members of the Regulation Committee be recommended to visit the site prior to determining the application.

(11 in favour, 1 abstention)

**12/01461/FUL (Pages 63-70) – Erection of a detached dwelling and garage and associated access (GR 346988/125256), land off Cross Lane, Long Sutton – Mr. Pledger.**

Prior to summarising the details of the application, the Planner, in updating members, reported that amended plans had been received, which now omitted the garage from the application.

The Planner, with the aid of slides and photographs, then summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. She referred to the key considerations to be taken into account being the location of the site outside of the development area and the loss of an important open space, which would be harmful to the setting and views to and from the Grade I listed church and conservation area. Reference was made to this being

the third application relating to the site and to the Conservation Officer having objected consistently. The Planner also referred to the applicant having mentioned the untidy condition of the site but she indicated that compliance with the conditions of previous approvals would have seen this rectified. The Committee noted that the recommendation was one of refusal for the reasons set out in the agenda report.

Cllr. Shane Pledger, although having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application, as he was the applicant, exercised his right under the code of conduct to make representations as would any other member of the public. Under the Council's appropriate protocol, a slide showing an historic map provided by the applicant was displayed. The applicant, in referring to the previous two applications relating to this site, referred to the design being wrong in the first instance and explained the reason why the second application was withdrawn. He referred to having known the site since 2003 and to other buildings which he had developed in the locality. He explained the reasons for his view that the site was not an open field but a closed area, including reference to the old wall around the site. He further referred to the clearing of the site and explained why that had not occurred. Cllr. Pledger then withdrew from the meeting prior to the member debate and voting on the application.

The Committee noted the comments of the representative of Long Sutton Parish Council, Ms. P. Jukes. She indicated that the Parish Council supported the application subject to the removal of permitted development rights and landscaping to the rear to prevent light pollution. It was felt that this would be a quality development and that the design was appropriate to the area. She also commented that the site was more enclosed than views would indicate and that there was a lot of public support for the proposals. It was also asked that appropriate conditions be attached to any permission to protect the site for the future.

The Committee also noted the comments of Mr. L. Wellington in support of the application. He indicated that he lived close to and looked directly at the site and he favoured the proposed development. He mentioned that the applicant was a sympathetic developer and felt that the proposed development would be an attractive building that would blend in. He further commented that if the applicant sold the land he did not like to think what it may be used for.

Mr. M. Willoughby also spoke in support of the application. He indicated that he lived close to the site and that although there seemed to be conservation issues he commented that he would rather look out on a good building than on the site as it stood currently.

The applicant's agent, Mr. S. Travers, referred to the site having been considered for a number of years and to barns that had been previously converted nearby. He referred to the sticking point in respect of this site having been planning policy, which had resulted in a previous delegated refusal. He referred to the application having been supported by the Parish Council and explained the reasons why he was of the view that it could be granted in policy terms. He also referred to the proposed development using a previously redundant site and expressed his view that it would reflect and enhance the area in line with the development plan. He referred to the application being supported by the local community and was of the view that the proposals were in line with what the Government, economy and the local community wanted. Mr. Travers concluded by stating that, given the strength of local feeling, there was no reason to override local representations.

In response to comments made, the Area Lead North/East clarified the position regarding the condition concerning the removal of the remaining concrete hardstanding, which was attached to an earlier permission relating to the conversion of the barns at Manor Farm.

During the ensuing discussion, varying views were expressed by members. A member expressed his view that, although the application had not been two starred, he felt that it

had similarities to the previous application discussed by the Committee at this meeting. He felt that any justification for the approval of this application should perhaps be submitted to the Regulation Committee for consideration.

Cllr. Derek Yeomans, who was also a County Councillor in whose County Division the site was situated, indicated his support for the application. He commented that he had no doubt that the application should be approved. He felt that it would be a good addition, completing the local scene and would be undetectable in years to come. He proposed that the application be approved without reference to the Regulation Committee.

Other members were also of the view that the application should be approved. Views were expressed that the proposed development was of a suitable design and would fit in well on this site. Reference was also made to local people supporting the proposals.

Comments were also expressed by a member that he would have been content to support the application if the proposed building was of good design and an established need had been shown but he did not feel that that was the case in respect of this application.

In conclusion, the majority of members indicated that they could not support the officer's recommendation of refusal and were of the view that the proposed dwelling would not result in the loss of an important open space and would not be prejudicial to the setting of, and views to and from, the Grade I listed church. It was also felt that the layout and design of the development would not be at odds with the pattern of local development. Also, the proposal would not constitute unsustainable development and as such complied with the saved policies of the South Somerset Local Plan and the policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, the Committee agreed that the application be granted without reference to the Regulation Committee subject to conditions which should include the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings to safeguard the setting of the church.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted without reference to the Regulation Committee and subject to conditions, which shall include the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings to safeguard the setting of the church. The inclusion of appropriate conditions to be delegated to the Development Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and Cllr. Derek Yeomans.

(8 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention).

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

[At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman informed the Committee that Andrew Blackburn, Committee Administrator, was retiring from the Council after 43 years service and wished him a happy retirement. Andrew thanked him and the Committee for their good wishes.]

.....  
 Chairman