

Meeting AN 06M 12/13  
Date 26.09.12

### **South Somerset District Council**

**Draft Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held in the Village Hall, Chilthorne Domer on **Wednesday 26 September 2012**.

(2.00pm – 5.25pm)

**Present:**

**Members:** Patrick Palmer (Chairman)

Pauline Clarke	Terry Mounter	Sylvia Seal
Graham Middleton	David Norris	Sue Steele
Roy Mills	Shane Pledger (to 5.10pm)	Derek Yeomans

**Officers:**

Charlotte Jones	Area Development Manager (North)
Mark Williams	Chief Executive Officer
Roger Meecham	Engineer
Pam Harvey	Civil Contingencies & Business Continuity Manager
Pauline Burr	Community Regeneration Officer (North)
Angela Watson	Legal Services Manager
David Norris	Development Control Manager
Adrian Noon	Area Lead North/East (Development Management)
Becky Sanders	Committee Administrator

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

---

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

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 August 2012, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

---

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jo Roundell Greene and Paul Thompson.

---

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

Councillor Shane Pledger declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) for planning application 12/02940/FUL as he was the applicant.

---

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

Members noted that the next meeting of the Area North Committee would commence at 2.00pm on Wednesday 24 October 2012 at the Village Hall, Norton Sub Hamdon.

#### 64. Public Question Time (Agenda item 5)

There were no questions from members of the public.

---

#### 65. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 6)

The Chairman reminded members that they were welcome to attend the Neighbourhood Planning Workshops that had been arranged for parishes.

---

#### 66. Reports from Members (Agenda item 7)

Councillor Sylvia Seal, referred to a circulated email, and reminded members that a planning application for the Norton Sub Hamdon affordable housing scheme would be determined by Area West Committee. She encouraged members to look at the application and make comments.

Similarly, Councillor Derek Yeomans, made reference to an application for a solar farm in Area West which bordered Area North, and encouraged members to look at the application and make comments.

---

#### 67. Flooding, Drainage & Civil Contingencies (Agenda item 8)

The Engineer introduced the report as shown in the agenda and commented that he would be happy to follow up any specific site issues outside of the meeting. He gave a comprehensive presentation about flooding, drainage and changes to relevant legislation which included:

- Rainfall trends and statistics
- Watercourse network in South Somerset
- Maps of flood risk zones, and flood risk susceptibility – fluvial and pluvial.
- The Pitt review
- The Flood and Water Management Act
- Land drainage responsibilities – County Council taken on new responsibilities including determining whose responsible for a flooding incident
- SSDC policies
- Rights and responsibilities of riverside owners
- Routine maintenance, capital and minor improvements
- Emergency assistance and the supply of flood bags
- Encouraging self-help and identifying with more long term solutions.

A further presentation followed from the Civil Contingencies and Business Continuity Manager which included information about:

- Emergency planning
  - In partnership with Somerset County Council and the other borough and district councils in Somerset
  - Risk assessment and emergency plans
  - Operation response to major incidents
  - Rest centre provision
- Business continuity
- In-house health & safety
- Out of hours service
  - Streetscene – stray dogs, dangerous litter, response to incidents
  - Environmental Health – response to major incidents, noise issues

- Planning – respond to reports of illegal work on listed buildings, protected trees and hedgerows
- Major incidents – coordinate SSDC response to major incident

The Chairman introduced Peter Maltby, Chairman of the Parrett Internal Drainage Board, who gave a brief overview of the role of the drainage board and highlighted the responsibilities of the Environment Agency.

In response to queries and suggestions from members, the officers responded:

- Attempts to store flood bags (or their equivalents) locally in parishes had been unsuccessful in the past. Acknowledged it may be appropriate to contact parishes again as many now had a designated person for emergency planning incidents such as severe weather.
- There were discretionary powers available to Somerset County Council to make landowners undertake works.

Members also commented:

- Landowner responsibilities needed to be publicised more widely to landowners and parish councils.
- There needed to be more lobbying of the Environment Agency to do more dredging of rivers.
- County Division Members had access to a Community Fund which could fund provision of sandbags or similar. It was suggested that interested parishes be encouraged to approach their division member.

The Chairman thanked the officers and Peter Maltby for attending and providing an informative report.

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

*Roger Meecham, Engineer*  
*roger.meecham@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462069*  
*Pam Harvey, Civil Contingencies & Business Continuity Manager*  
*pam.harvey@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462303*

## **68. Supporting Local Economic Development – Area North Marketing Project (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 9)**

The Community Regeneration Officer (North) presented the report as shown in the agenda, and referred to a previous report regarding funding for marketing and interpretation at the Cartgate Picnic Area. Photographs were shown to indicate good and bad examples of signage. She explained that:

- more could be done to promote Area North to both business and pleasure visitors.
- there might be a need to rationalise signage in some places
- signage needed to be kept up to date and used to best advantage
- varying types of communication were needed in different locations
- advice and support needed to be easily accessible regarding the use of brown signs

To help address some of the issues it was proposed that Area North offered a short programme of support, both financial and advisory, to encourage the installation of well designed signage that promoted visits to local businesses, facilities and places of interest.

There was a short discussion during which members comments included:

- Some businesses struggled to get permission or advice for appropriate signage
- There were also issues with signage to hamlets and the associated businesses located there
- Good initiative, but also need to acknowledge some villages may want less signage or in a design more characteristic of the area.
- Business park signage needed to be kept up to date

Members were very supportive of the project and were content to approve recommendation 1. Multiple members expressed an interest in being on a working group. It was agreed that all interested members be appointed to a working group - Councillors Patrick Palmer, Shane Pledger, Pauline Clarke, Sue Steele and Derek Yeomans.

**RESOLVED:** It was resolved that:

- (1) That the detailed allocation of £20,000 held within the reserve schemes of the Area North capital programme including the proposed project management arrangements and grant criteria be approved.
- (2) An Area North Marketing Working Group be established to support the project and Councillors Patrick Palmer, Shane Pledger, Pauline Clarke, Sue Steele and Derek Yeomans be appointed to the working group.

**Reason:** To approve the detailed allocation of £20,000 within the Area North Capital Programme from the existing reserve fund for promoting local economic vitality.

*(Voting: unanimous)*

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

## 69. Area North Committee – Forward Plan (Agenda item 10)

The Area Development Manager had no updates to the Forward Plan.

**RESOLVED:** That the Forward Plan be noted.

*Becky Sanders, Committee Administrator  
becky.sanders@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462596*

## 70. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 11)

The agenda report was noted, which informed members of planning appeals that were lodged, dismissed or allowed.

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

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

## 71. Planning Applications (Agenda item 12)

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

### **12/01495/FUL – Application for the development of a foodstore, associated infrastructure, access, parking and landscaping at Paull & Co Ltd site, Coat Road, Martock. Applicant: Tesco Stores Ltd.**

The Area Lead introduced the application as shown in the agenda and reminded members that the application had been deferred from the August meeting, to enable late representations with regard to policy issues to be fully addressed. He noted that the Co-op had raised concerns about the non-requirement for a sequential test.

Referring to the Certificate of Lawfulness, the Area Lead explained that it was recognised there was a fallback position whereby a business could acquire the site and use the existing buildings for retail. It would therefore be unreasonable to insist that the applicant consider other sites for which a change of use would be needed. On that basis officers had not insisted that a sequential test be carried out to identify alternative sites. There was also reference to trading figures and catchment area, which appeared to cover an area to Marston Magna and High Ham, however the applicant had clarified that the area referred to in the retail impact assessment did not include the whole postcodes.

It was explained that the application site was within a commercial/business area of Martock and design of the proposal was not considered to be out of character. The foodstore would be situated to the rear of the site, parking to the front with the delivery yard to the west of the store. The delivery yard had caused concern to neighbouring residents and Environmental Protection had suggested conditions to safeguard residential amenity. Highway improvements were proposed at the site entrance and at the junction with North Street.

The Area Lead commented that the main considerations were:

- Retail use of the site – which had been established through the Certificate of Lawfulness.
- Design – which was not uncharacteristic of the area
- Highways – concerns had been raised about traffic along North Street, but Highways had not suggested any works
- Impact upon amenity – the Environmental Protection Unit advised this could reasonably be safeguarded by conditions
- Impact upon town centre – condition 9 and an informative restricted what could take place in the store.

The officer recommendation was for approval as the proposed development was considered to be of appropriate form, design and layout that would not have a serious impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre or be detrimental to visual or residential amenity. The access and parking provision were considered to be acceptable and off-site highway improvements were also proposed.

Mr R Powell, on behalf of Martock Parish Council, commented that the parish council, on balance, recommended approval subject to adequate pedestrian access and traffic flow

along North Street. Martock had grown over the years but lacked some retail facilities. Village surveys had highlighted the lack of retail facilities at the northern end of the village and the appearance of the trading estate. Impact upon existing retail businesses had been carefully considered but the parish council felt the proposals would not be detrimental but acknowledged there would be some impact due to traffic.

Mr M Morris, representing the Co-operative Group spoke in objection to the proposal and commented that he felt the Certificate of Lawfulness only applied to the current building. It was considered there was not enough retail expenditure locally to support the proposal, the proposed store was out of scale with town and was sited outside of the designated town centre area. He asked members to consider refusing the application.

At the request of the Chairman, the Legal Services Manager responded to some of the public comments. She commented the policy position indicated there should be a sequential test, but applications could be decided other than in accordance with the development plan if there were material considerations. The Council's planning policy unit had taken the view that a sequential test was not necessary, and that their reasons for taking that view were set out in the agenda report. The Certificate of Lawfulness had more weight depending upon whether the evidence suggested another retailer might use the site in its current form, and members needed to decide if the Certificate of Lawfulness had enough weight to grant permission for the proposal despite the lack of a sequential test.

The Area Lead clarified that the existing building on the site had been developed over the years and referred to the fallback position, which could be exploited by anyone running the site in the future.

Ward member, Councillor Graham Middleton, commented that the idea of a supermarket to the northern end of Martock was welcomed by many residents, but there were also some concerns locally that it was Tesco. He referred to traffic flow through Martock and that the proposal was likely to generate some additional traffic, and suggested that if the proposal were to be approved, highway improvements should be completed before the store was built. He commented that existing retail units were well supported and would rely on customers being loyal for their future. The present site had retail use and change of ownership would not change that; the recommended conditions would deal with many of the neighbour concerns.

Ward member, Councillor Patrick Palmer, commented that the proposal would probably reduce the need for many residents to travel into Yeovil for their shopping needs. He had researched nearby market towns where there were new Tesco stores, and noted that they had made little difference to quality shops in the towns. He felt quality shops would survive, and others would have to become more competitive.

During a short discussion members were generally supportive of the proposal and raised some comments including:

- Will bring jobs to Martock
- Proposal may generate more HGVs
- It wouldn't stop people using the existing shops for convenience
- Would make Martock more vibrant and bring people into the village
- Some traffic through Martock was generated by people travelling elsewhere for their supermarket shopping

Members acknowledged the local concerns, but were generally all supportive of the proposal and felt that it would not be overly detrimental to the area. It was proposed to approve the application as per the officer recommendation, subject to the conditions,



informatives, and prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement as detailed in the agenda report.

- RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/01495/FUL be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation, subject to:
1. The prior completion of a section 106 agreement (in a form acceptable to the Council's solicitor(s)) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued to ensure appropriate Travel Planning measures as agreed with the County Travel Plan Coordinator.
  2. imposition of the planning conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

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

*(A general overview of the following nine applications were presented together by the Area Lead, due to their similarity)*

**12/02763/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 1 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02762/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 3 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02761/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 4 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02779/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 8 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02780/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 9 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02769/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 10 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02766/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 11 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02765/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 14 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

**12/02759/COU – Change of use of dwelling from C3 (dwelling) to a mixed use of C3 (dwelling) and C1 (accommodation ancillary to hotel) (retrospective) at 15 Barton Close, Bower Hinton, Martock. Applicant: Mr T Walsh.**

The Area Lead gave a general introduction to the nine applications as indicated in the agenda report, which were all within a small development of 17 houses, the rest of the properties on the development were in private ownership. He explained that in planning terms there was some flexibility in the existing usage, with long term residential letting and holiday letting not requiring planning permission. However issues arose where the use became hotel accommodation.

As part of the presentation, the Area Lead indicated which residents on the development had indicated support or objections to the proposal, as supplied by the agent. The Area Lead reminded members that no physical alterations were proposed to any of the properties. The officer recommendations for numbers 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14 and 15 Barton Close were for approval. 8 Barton Close was recommended for refusal due to the external staircase and the detrimental impact upon residential amenity of the neighbouring property. He highlighted to members that the key considerations were the principle of the change of use, impact on residential amenity and highways.

It was explained that the cumulative impact of the change of use needed to be considered, although officers felt that the impact was not so detrimental as to warrant recommending refusal for all the applications.

Mr R Powell, on behalf of Martock Parish Council, commented that they had given the applications careful consideration but recommended refusal due to the cumulative impact upon Barton Close. He noted that residents felt there was a lack of community feel and respect for parking, as well as the potential for disturbance. He questioned if the hotel use had been subject of the original permission for the development if it would have been approved.

Dr R Roden, objector, felt the sprawl of the hotel was wrong, and that property transfer details for the Barton Close properties stated that the properties were to be for private dwellings and not for business or trade. He commented that the applications would in effect allow for 21 hotel rooms and suggested a compromise to localise the hotel operations to one end of Barton Close only at numbers 14 and 15.

Mr C Price, objector, commented that the development had originally been built as local housing for occupancy of at least six months or more, but nine dwellings were now being used as a hotel. Reference was made to the planning officer having indicated that there was no stipulation in the original permission for affordable housing in perpetuity. He commented that housing was needed. He acknowledged tourism was important but many of the residents in the concerned properties were workers rather than tourists. Reference was made to policy ST6 and the effect on neighbouring properties and also the Human Rights Act. He said it would be unreasonable to expect The Hollies to sell off the properties but they could be asked to use them only for long lets.

Mr R Pike, supporter, resident and representative for his neighbours in Barton Close, commented that some objectors did not live on the site. He commented that any issues with hotel residents could be addressed direct with the hotel. He further noted parking was very rarely an issue, and on the few occasions that it had been, The Hollies had dealt with promptly.

Mr P Dance, agent, commented that hotel type use represented about 10% occupancy of the properties. He commented that policy terms suggested it was acceptable. Occupants were people staying for a short rather than long time, so occupancy levels were likely to be less than if a long term resident. He responded to an earlier objectors comments, and noted that the details in property transfer details were a civil matter.



Mr R Walsh, as applicant, described the business operation of the properties. He explained it was a niche business for longer term lets and stays for corporate clients as well as tourists. Short term occupancy was often between the long lets in order to maximise potential. He commented that he chose to live in Barton Close himself, as it was peaceful environment, and that it was a relatively small number of people who had objected.

In response to comments made the Area Lead and Development Control Manager clarified that:

- The original permission for the 17 dwellings had not met the threshold to require affordable housing, and had not been approved on the basis of local need.
- Powers were available to the authority to deal with noise issues; however there was no reason to expect future problems just because of hotel use.
- Property transfer details and deeds were a civil matter and not a planning consideration.

Ward member, Councillor Graham Middleton, commented Barton Close was a pleasant development and well kept. The hotel status was a concern, but acknowledged it had been happening for some time.

Fellow ward member, Councillor Patrick Palmer, commented it was a difficult and unusual application. He acknowledged residents concerns about Barton Close losing its community identity, but also that the Hollies was a highly respected business locally and wished to expand.

The Legal Services Manager reminded members that it was the use of the properties and the extent of that use in the particular location that had to be considered, and the identity of the applicant was not relevant to their decision.

During the general discussion members raised several comments including:

- One of the business owners living in Barton Close would act as a safeguard for any issues involving hotel residents.
- Business was well run and added to the local economy
- Many of the objections appeared to be based on perception
- Acknowledge external staircase issues at No.8

The Area Lead commented that if members felt there should be a maximum threshold set for the number of properties that could be used for hotel use, that it would need to be evidenced.

The Chairman asked the Area Lead to very briefly present each application, after each application members were asked for any comments and to make a proposal. There were no further comments made by members. Individually it was proposed to agree the officer recommendation for each of the nine applications as detailed in the agenda report, and on being put to the vote all were carried.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02763/COU – 1 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

*(Voting: 8 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions)*

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02762/COU – 3 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

*(Voting: 8 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions)*

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02761/COU – 4 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

*(Voting: 8 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions)*

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02779/COU – 8 Barton Close be REFUSED as per the officer recommendation and reason as detailed in the agenda report.

*(Voting: 8 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions)*

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02780/COU – 9 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

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

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02769/COU – 10 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

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

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02765/COU – 14 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

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

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02759/COU – 15 Barton Close be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

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

**12/02772/FUL – The change of use of land for the siting of a holiday lodge (revised application) at Chilthorne Knapp, Chilthorne Hill, Chilthorne Domer. Applicant: Mr & Mrs R Ferguson.**

The Area Lead introduced the application and commented that the Highway Authority had raised objections due to the nature of the single track access road to the site and its junction with the main road between Chilthorne Domer and Tintinhull.

He explained that there had been concerns with the previous application due to the number of units and the location on site. The current application had addressed the concerns by reducing to a single unit nearer to existing buildings. He commented that the lane of concern to Highways served only a small number of properties and agricultural traffic. Highways comments were acknowledged but it was not considered that the lack of passing spaces along the lane was a major issue. It was noted there was strong policy support for tourist related development and that whilst there would be some additional traffic generation, it was unlikely to impact significantly on traffic users and the Highway Officer's reason for refusal was not supported.

The Area Lead updated members that since the agenda had been published, a response from the parish council had been received indicating that they had no objection pending landscaping. He informed members that landscaping had been included in the conditions.

During a short discussion members made several comments including:

- Highways comments difficult to accept as living in a rural area requires a vehicle
- Some concern regarding development in open countryside
- Acknowledge the proposal was now near to existing buildings

Most members expressed their support for approval of the application as per the officer recommendation detailed in the agenda report, and on being put to the vote was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02772/FUL be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and conditions as detailed in the agenda report.

*(Voting: 6 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention)*

**12/02571/FUL – Retention of stone reveals to the windows at Stable House, Hamdon Stables, Montacute. Applicant: Mr A Gillespie.**

The Area Lead introduced the application as detailed in the agenda report and commented that the only reason the application was before committee was as the applicant was a member of staff. He explained that the application sought retrospective permission for the retention of stone reveals that had been inserted into the windows of the property, which was against a condition of the original permission. The officer recommendation was for approval.

During a very brief discussion some members expressed their disappointment at the design of the windows but acknowledged that the window design itself was not a subject for consideration. It was proposed to approve the application as per the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 12/02571/FUL be APPROVED as per the officer recommendation and condition as detailed in the agenda report.

*(Voting: 6 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention)*

*(Councillor Shane Pledger left the room prior to the presentation of planning application 12/02940/LBCL having declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest)*

**12/02940/LBC – Internal and external repairs and alterations to property to include new roof structure and re-thatching, rebuilding of removed chimney and installation of replacement windows at Canterbury Farm, High Street, Aller. Applicant: Mr S Pledger.**

The Area Lead introduced the application as shown in the agenda and commented that it was before committee as the applicant was a councillor. This was the first of two applications and was for urgent works to the building to make it weatherproof and prevent the building deteriorating further - it was noted that the property was on the SSDC Register of Buildings at Risk. He updated members that the second application had now been received which was for the main refurbishment of the building but was not subject to consideration at this meeting. He updated members that the awaited

information, referred to in the agenda report by the Conservation Officer, had now been received. The Conservation Officer was satisfied with the information and had suggested additional conditions which had been discussed and agreed with the applicant and agent.

Mr S Travers, agent, commented that the application was the first phase of restoration of a building that had suffered from neglect for many years. The property was in a prominent building along the main road through the village - in recent years due to dilapidation rather than beauty. This phase of works was to keep the building dry and prevent it falling down.

During a short discussion members expressed their support for the application and raised several comments including:

- Influence on Conservation Officers was needed in situations such as this as quick decisions were required to buildings deteriorating further
- Property had required attention for many years, and urgent work was now required to save the building.
- Firm, strong and quick decisions were needed to save historic buildings.

Members were content to approve the application as per the officer recommendation and conditions indicated in the agenda report, and subject to the additional conditions suggested by the Conservation Officer.

**RESOLVED:** That Listed Building Consent be APPROVED for application 12/02940/LBC as per the officer recommendation, justification and subject to the conditions detailed in the agenda report, plus the following additional conditions (numbers 3 to 17 below) – for clarity all conditions are detailed below:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 this consent shall be deemed to have been implemented on 16 July 2012 as prescribed by Section 8 of the above Act.

Reason - To comply with section 8 of the above Act.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3195/100 A, 3195/101 A, and 3195/103 A received 31 August 2012, and 3195/102 B as amended by the applicant's agent 25 September 2012.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The works hereby granted consent shall be completed in all respects within 2 years of the date of this decision notice, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To ensure that the works hereby approved are completed and/or not left in a partially completed state for a protracted period detracting from the character and appearance of the listed building.

4. No further works to the rear wall shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has implemented a programme for recording of the rear wall, and roof to the rear wing in accordance

with a written scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall provide for a copy of all recording to be deposited with the Somerset Record Office within 12 months of the completion of the project.

Reason: To safeguard the historic record of the significance of the listed building and to ensure it is publically accessible in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

5. No rendering shall be carried out on site unless details of the external render to be used have been provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the finish, materials and colour of the render, and shall be supported by a sample panel, which shall remain available on site for the duration of the works.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

6. No new wall shall be constructed on site unless full details of the new walls, including the materials, coursing, bonding, mortar profile, colour, and texture along with a written detail of the mortar mix, have been provided in writing; this shall be supported with a sample panel to be made available on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details, and the sample panel shall remain available for inspection throughout the duration of the work.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

7. No re-pointing shall be undertaken on site unless the following details have been submitted and a sample panel provided on site for inspection and written approval of the Local Planning Authority:
  - a) Full details, including elevational drawings, to indicate the areas to be repointed.
  - b) Details of the method of removal of existing pointing. In this regard mechanical tools shall not be used,
  - c) Details of the mortar mix, and
  - d) A sample panel of new pointing that shall be carried out in the agreed mortar.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

8. No work shall be carried out to the roof or rainwater goods on site unless design details of all roof eaves, verges and abutments, including detail drawings at a scale of 1:5, and details of all new cast metal guttering, down pipes, other rainwater goods, and external plumbing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details once carried out shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

9. The area(s) of rebuilding shall be restricted to that defined on the approved plan(s) and shall not be enlarged without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. In the event that completion strictly in accordance with such approved plans shall become impracticable for whatever reason, work shall thereupon cease and only be re-commenced if and when consent has been obtained in regard to an amended scheme of works which renders completion of the scheme practicable.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

10. No work shall be carried with regard to any new window surrounds or lintels unless details of the lintels to all new openings, including those in any new build, and the treatment to the surrounds of the window and doorway openings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

11. The eaves and verge should be executed in the local vernacular; the ridge should be a flush butt-up ridge and there should be no ligger work other than on the ridge or at chimney abutments.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

12. No further works in relation to the demolition of the rear wall and the construction of the new roof shall be commenced until a method statement in relation to how the works will be carried out have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

13. No further works are to be commenced in relation to the repair to the cob until a detailed method statement of the works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

14. No works are to be undertaken to any structural timbers until details



of any alteration have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works will only be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details, and if found to be impracticable will cease until an alternative has been agreed. Any intervention into historic fabric will be minimal with the introduction of additional timber or steel to the structure always being preferred to the replacement of timber.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

- 15. No internal work shall be carried out on site unless details of all new and replacement plasters, renders, floor surfaces, ceilings etc, including any making good of any existing structure abutting any of those to be demolished, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such approved details, once carried out shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

- 16. Consent is hereby granted to the removal of the existing fireplace & surround as set out in the approved plans. Details of making good are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

- 17. No paint removal shall be carried out on site unless a method statement for the removal of the paint has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall give opportunity for the Local Planning Authority to inspect the exposed surface once the paint has been removed. Should it be considered necessary to repaint, details of the type of paint to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

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

.....  
*Chairman*