

Meeting AN 06M 13/14
Date 25.09.13

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held in the Village Hall, Norton Sub Hamdon on **Wednesday 25 September 2013**.

(2.00pm – 6.33pm)

Present:

Members: Shane Pledger (in the Chair)

Pauline Clarke	David Norris	Barry Walker
Graham Middleton	Patrick Palmer	Derek Yeomans
Roy Mills (to 4.45pm)	Sylvia Seal	
Terry Mounter	Sue Steele	

Officers:

Charlotte Jones	Area Development Manager (North)
Teresa Oulds	Neighbourhood Development Officer (North)
Sergeant Rob Jameson	Avon and Somerset Police
Tracey Smith	Martock Job Club Co-ordinator
David Norris	Development Control Manager
Lee Walton	Planning Officer
Linda Hayden	Planning Officer
Alex Skidmore	Planning Officer
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Angela Cox	Democratic Services Manager

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 28 August 2013, 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)

There were no declarations of interest.

63. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda item 4)

Members noted that the next meeting of Area North Committee would be at 2.00pm on Wednesday 23 October 2013 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)

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

66. Reports from Members (Agenda item 7)

Councillor Sylvia Seal reported that she had attended the opening of the Artificial Grass Pitch at the Recreation Ground in Yeovil the previous Saturday, which she said was a superb facility for all the community and for local schools.

Councillor Sue Steele said that she had attended a meeting of the Musgrove Park NHS Trust that morning and had found the Care Quality Commission making an inspection of the hospital. She said the governors had been closely questioned as to their role in making a difference at the hospital and a public meeting the previous day had also been well attended.

Councillor Patrick Palmer reported that members of the Somerset Water Management Partnership were closely involved in the development of proposals to dredge the rivers Parrett and Tone in order to alleviate future flooding in the district. The cost of dredging the rivers had been estimated at £4.1 million with on-going maintenance of £600,000 over the following 20 years. Although there was a commitment by various agencies to fund the work there was still a funding shortfall and it was hoped the Government would assist. The worst areas in the rivers had been identified and they would be dredged first.

During a brief discussion, several Members regretted that the dredging work had yet to start and felt that the cost of the work was unnecessarily high. It was also noted that there were issues around the disposal of the silt once it had been taken from the rivers.

Councillor Palmer undertook to update Members at the next Area North Committee.

67. Neighbourhood Policing (Agenda item 8)

Sergeant Rob Jameson of Avon and Somerset Police provided Members with a verbal update on several crime statistics within the SSDC Area North area. He confirmed that whilst house burglaries were lower than the previous 12 month period, other crimes such as non-dwelling burglaries (rural crime), thefts from motor vehicles, thefts of motor vehicles and assaults remained about the same level as previous years.

The Police Crime Commissioner, Sue Mountstevens, would be visiting Martock on 30th October and Stoke Sub Hamdon on 4th December and she was also currently conducting an on-line public consultation to ask what local people wanted from the police and

whether they would support a rise in Council Tax to maintain the level of policing as Government funding for the service continued to reduce.

The Area North SSN team (as part of the South Somerset area team) had also recently launched a Twitter account ASP South Somerset@ASPSSomerset for the public to follow, which was in addition to other traditional methods of communication.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Sgt Jameson confirmed that he would be attending the Annual Meeting with Town and Parish Councils on 24th October at Long Sutton.

RESOLVED: That the presentation of Sergeant Jameson of Avon and Somerset Police be noted.

www.avonandsomerset.police.uk

68. Presentation – Martock Job Club (Agenda item 9)

Tracey Smith, Co-ordinator of the Martock Job Club, provided Members with a verbal update on the work of the Club. She said that during the period they had been operating, they had helped over 129 people seeking employment and had successfully assisted 47 of those in securing employment. Along with 4 volunteers, she helped people to compile their CVs, complete job application forms and provided advice on interview techniques. She confirmed that the Club was open on Tuesdays and Fridays between 10.00am and 1.00pm. They worked closely with the youth project in the village and were forging links with local businesses to help them with recruitment. It was also planned to hold a job fair shortly.

In response to a question, the Job Club Co-ordinator confirmed that funding for the project would cease at the beginning of December 2013, however, Martock Parish Council were expected to assist in its continuation.

RESOLVED: That the report and presentation of the Co-ordinator of the Martock Job Club be noted.

*Tracey Smith, Co-ordinator of the Martock Job Club
tracey@martock.org.uk*

69. Grant to Roundabout Pre-School, Somerton (Executive Decision) (Agenda item 10)

The Neighbourhood Development Officer advised that the existing pre-school building, although well maintained, was out of date and in great need of replacement. Somerset County Council (SCC) had agreed to give an area of land adjoining the site to enlarge the outdoor play area and although they had also offered a substantial grant towards the project, (£70,000 of which was time-limited to March 2014) there was still a shortfall in funding which would be addressed through a loan for the remaining amount.

Both of the Ward Members spoke in favour of funding the project.

During discussion, some Members felt that the amount of funding from the Town Council was low relative to the size of the project and its importance to the community and recommended that the pre-school group reapply to them for more funding. It was

confirmed by the pre-school representative that many quotes had been sought for the replacement building and that the preferred supplier had provided the lowest tender and was an approved contractor by SCC.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members were unanimous in their support to award £10,000 towards the new building for the Somerton Roundabout Pre-School.

RESOLVED: That a grant of £10,000 be awarded to Somerton Roundabout Pre-School towards their new building, from the Area North Capital Programme (Local Priority Schemes) subject to SSDC standard conditions for Community Grants detailed in Appendix A to the Agenda report.

Reason: To facilitate the purchase and installation of a suitable replacement building for the Roundabout Pre-School in Somerton.

*Teresa Oulds, Neighbourhood Development Officer
Teresa.oulds@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462254*

70. Area North Committee – Forward Plan (Agenda item 11)

The Area Development Manager (North) confirmed that the expected update report on the SSDC Community Offices service would be presented to the October meeting of the Committee. Also, the report from the South Somerset Disability Forum would be postponed until December or January 2014 to allow the Community Cohesion Officer to attend the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Area North Forward Plan be noted.

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

71. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 12)

Members noted that there were no current 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*

72. Planning Applications (Agenda item 13)

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).

Planning application: 13/02925/FUL – Installation of ground mounted photovoltaic solar array to provide 6 MW generation capacity together with inverter systems; transformer stations; sub-station; internal access track; landscaping; security fencing; associated access gate and removal of one Ash tree protected by Tree Preservation Order on land adjacent to the A303, Tintinhull Forts, Tintinhull. Applicant: Luminosity Energy.

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. He noted that since writing his report one further letter of objection had been received. A copse of trees was proposed to be planted to the north of the site to reduce the views of the panels from the bridge crossing the A303 road and a bund would be constructed alongside the A303. Although the site would be visible from Ham Hill, screening and a break in the middle of the site should help to reduce the overall bulk. His recommendation was to approve the application.

The Committee were then addressed by Mr T Blunt of Tintinhull Parish Council, Mr M Sampson of Stoke Sub Hamdon and Montacute Parish Councils, Mr R Le Fleur of Tintinhull Parish Council and Mr P Dance, representing Mr Priest of Halfway House (immediately adjacent to the site). Their comments included:-

- The public consultation was not satisfactory.
- The proposal would be clearly visible from Ham Hill.
- It would result in industrialisation of the landscape.
- The application ignores a public footpath crossing the field.
- There are more appropriate and less visible places to place these panels.
- The National Planning Policy Framework guidance says that all communities have a responsibility to help increase the use and supply of green energy, but this does not mean that the need for renewable energy automatically overrides environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities.

Mr T Fischer, the Chief Executive of Luminosity Energy, said he had been involved in this type of environmental project for many years and following public consultation, the number of solar panels had been reduced by 25%. The land was flat and there would be room for sheep to graze beneath the panels, which would be removed after 25 years. He noted that English Heritage, Natural England and the Highway Authority, among others, raised no objections and he asked that the officers recommendation be supported.

The Ward Member, Councillor Jo Roundell Greene, was not present at the meeting but a statement expressing her concern at the size and scale of the development and the significant impact it would have on the views from Ham Hill was read out to Committee.

During discussion, varying views were expressed. Some Members felt the need for renewable energy was important and should be supported whilst others expressed concern at the considerable visual impact from Ham Hill and St Michaels Hill and the possible effect on the local economy.

Councillor Terry Mounter proposed that the application be granted permission with two additional conditions to prevent the stripping of the topsoil from the site and for a cash

bond to be held to ensure removal of the panels at the end of their useful life. This was seconded, however, on being put to the vote, was lost (voting: 3 in favour, 9 against).

It was then proposed to refuse the application on the basis that it was a large scale proposal that would have a significant detrimental impact upon the character of local and nationally recognised historic assets and an adverse impact upon the local landscape character. This was seconded and on being put to the vote, was carried (voting 8 in favour, 3 against)

RESOLVED: That Planning Application 13/02925/FUL be **REFUSED** permission for the following reason:

01. The solar farm, by reason of its size and scale, would have a significant detrimental impact upon the character of local and nationally recognised historic assets and an adverse impact upon the local landscape character.

(Voting: 8 in favour, 3 against)

Planning application: 13/01500/OUT – Outline application for residential development for 35 dwellings on land off Lyndhurst Grove, Martock. Applicant: Mr R Frankpitt.

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. He noted that since writing the report the Parish Council had responded saying they had no objections to the application provided the Highway Authority raised no objections. The Highway Authority had now confirmed that they owned the area of land designated for a footpath and therefore the officer proposed a further condition of approval that no dwelling be occupied until the footpath into the village was completed.

The Committee were then addressed by Mr P Robinson and Mr S Travers (representing Unwin Safety Systems). Their comments included:-

- The number of additional vehicle movements estimated in the report was incorrect.
- The garden of No 17 Lyndhurst Grove had been flooded more than once within the previous 4 years.
- The nearby sewage station had to have pumping equipment installed recently.
- The local doctors surgery were already having difficulty coping with the existing population.
- The proximity of the Unwin Safety Systems factory to the site would impact on the residents of the proposed houses.
- Unwin's were a major employer in the village with 55 employees and any increase in business would result in an increase in shift work at the factory which could impact on the residents of the proposed houses.
- The land was more suited to employment and there were many other more suitable residential sites within the village.
- The development could force Unwin's to relocate their business.

The Committee were then addressed by Mr A Preston, Agent for the applicant, who said that the development was needed at both district and a local level and it would provide 12 affordable homes for local people. The proposed footpath to the village would be of

benefit to all residents and the land would be suitably drained. The applicants had commissioned an acoustic report which stated that any noise from nearby industrial units could be mitigated, both at night and in the future.

The Development Control Manager confirmed that saved policy ST3 of the 2006 Local Plan relating to visual impact of the development could be used as a reason to refuse the application but should not be used as a reason to object to the principle as Martock had been identified as a sustainable location.

One of the Ward Members, Councillor Patrick Palmer, expressed his concern that the existing nearby factory, which had within the last two years built an additional crash centre facility, would not be able to expand in the future as the only land available was the site proposed.

The other Ward Member, Councillor Graham Middleton, said that the application should secure funding to increase traffic safety at the junction of Coat Road and Station Road. He also said that people purchasing houses in this location must accept their purchase knowing that the business park and any noise associated was already there.

During discussion, varying views were expressed. Some Members expressed concern at the indicative road layout and the problem it could pose for refuse collection vehicles. It was also noted that planning permission had previously been refused for both 6 and 14 houses on the same site and therefore to now propose 35 was overdevelopment. Other Members felt that the proposal was acceptable as it provided 12 affordable dwellings and Martock offered many local facilities.

The officers recommendation to grant permission was proposed and seconded, however, on being put to the vote, was lost (voting: 3 in favour, 8 against).

The Senior Legal Executive cautioned Members that they must provide clear planning reasons to refuse the application in case of any subsequent appeal by the applicants.

Members then discussed the proposal further and it was felt that the application should be deferred for further information on the impact of the development on the nearby factory (Unwins), the density proposed compared to other similar developments, necessary highway improvements, the capacity of the nearby sewage system, the flood risk of the area and the proposals for waste collection from the site. This was proposed and seconded and on being put to the vote, was carried (voting: 10 in favour, 1 against).

RESOLVED: That Planning Application 13/01500/OUT be **DEFERRED** to allow further information to be submitted in relation to:-

1. Impact upon nearby factory premises (Unwins).
2. Density proposed compared to other similar developments.
3. Highway improvements that will be required.
4. Disposal of sewage and capacity of the nearby sewage system.
5. Waste collection from the site.

(Voting: 10 in favour, 1 against)

Planning application: 13/02239/FUL – the erection of 49 No. dwellings (including 17 No. affordable homes), new vehicular access, public open space and associated works on land Os 7715 and 8129 (part) Hospital Lane, South Petherton. Applicant: Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd

The Senior Legal Executive advised that the application was recommended for approval subject the prior completion of a section 106 agreement. She had received a draft section 106 agreement from the applicants and it covered the heads of terms detailed in the recommendation to approve and would also secure the use of the footpaths within the site as Bridleways so that they may be accessed by cycles, pedestrians and horses.

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. She advised that since writing her report a further 30 letter of objection and one letter of support had been received. The Parish Council had submitted further comments reiterating their concerns with the application. She confirmed that the proposed one bedroom flats would comply with relevant housing standards and she asked that the approved plans condition be amended to take account of these changes.

The Committee were then addressed by Ms S Beaufoy, representing South Petherton Parish Council, Mr D Sapp and Mrs J Woodruffe-Peacock. Their comments included:-

- The Parish Council strongly object to the proposal on the grounds of sustainability and departure from the Local Plan.
- The Parish Council are not against development but it must be in the correct place.
- Given the Government's promotion of localism, Parish Council comments should carry more weight.
- The report states that there will be 122 car parking spaces but there are only 121 on the amended plans.
- There are already an additional 40 vehicle movements per hour from the first phase of development using Lightgate Road.
- The development is outside the established boundary of South Petherton.
- There is no fact based evidence that there is no 5 year land supply in the district.
- No traffic assessment has been made in Lightgate Road which is not wide enough to support any additional traffic and no money is proposed to upgrade it.

The Ward Member, Councillor Barry Walker, said there was strength of opposition to the application locally and he questioned who the houses would be built for. He also questioned how the Highway Authority could accept the traffic from an additional 49 dwellings along Lightgate Road as he felt the site needed a new access. He further questioned how the calculation had been made which stated that 49 houses would only generate the need for an additional 6 junior school places.

The Development Manager advised against citing a lack of education provision as a reason for refusal bearing in mind the comments of the County Council. Cllr Walker also indicated that the Junior School Headteacher may be willing to attend an appeal to defend this point.

During discussion, several Members voiced their concern at how the calculation of the additional junior school places had been arrived at as they felt that 49 new homes would generate a greater number of school places. Concern was also expressed at the additional traffic which the application would generate along Lightgate Road and the sustainability of the site due to its distance from the village centre.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused permission because of the unsustainability of the site, the narrow highway access and the flawed calculation of the additional junior school places proposed, however, on being put to the vote this was tied

equally and the Chairman's casting vote was to abstain (voting: 4 in favour, 4 against, 2 abstentions).

It was then proposed that the application be approved, however, this fell for the lack of a seconder.

It was then proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for further detail on the calculation of the additional junior school places required, the ability of Lightgate Road to safely accommodate the additional traffic generated by the site and also the sustainability of the site. On being put to the vote, this was carried (voting: 8 in favour, 2 against).

RESOLVED: That Planning Application 13/02239/FUL be **DEFERRED** to allow further information to be submitted in relation to:-

1. The ability of the access road to accommodate the extra traffic, and the clarification of parking at the site.
2. Further clarification of the Education contributions proposed.
3. Sustainability of the site due to its distance from the village centre.

(Voting: 8 in favour, 2 against)

Planning application: 13/02709/OUT – Outline application for up to 16 dwellings on land off Heale Lane, Curry Rivel. Applicant: WOE Heale Lane Curry Rivel

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. He noted that since writing his report two further letters of objection had been received. He stressed that the application was for up to 16 dwellings and all other matters were reserved, although the applicants had offered up to 50% affordable homes at the site.

The Committee were then addressed by Mr R Atkins, representing local residents, and Mr J Whitehouse. Their comments included:-

- The report does not demonstrate that the affordable housing proposed are necessary.
- If the hedgerows surrounding the site were retained then there would only be space for 11 dwellings.
- Policy ST3 should be upheld until the new Local Plan is in place.
- In April 2006 the Burton Close development was refused planning permission by the Area North Committee as they said there was no proven need, it was overdevelopment of the site and it was not compatible with the semi-rural site. This application should be likewise refused permission.

Mr A Lehner, Agent for the applicants, said the site was in a very sustainable location and rounded off the area. A local needs survey had indicated that there was need for affordable housing for local people. There were no objections from the Highway Authority and the applicants would be happy to discuss housing density at the Reserved Matters stage of the application.

The Ward Member, Councillor Terry Mounter, said that Curry Rivel had not been allocated any housing in the emerging Local Plan and he felt that planning Policy ST3 was still relevant. He said the village could accept some small scale development but he

did not think that this was a small development. The report had not defined what an affordable house would cost and he proposed that planning permission be refused.

The Planning Officer confirmed that affordable homes included those for rent, shared ownership and those managed by Housing Associations. The area of land was just under the size to trigger the mandatory 35% affordable homes so the applicant was making an offer, however, the application for the Committee to determine was for the principle of development at the site and all other matters were reserved.

During discussion some Members expressed concern that if fewer houses were proposed in the Reserved Matters application then there may be no affordable housing provided. Also concern was expressed at the lack of a current Local Plan.

The Ward Members proposal to refuse permission was seconded and on being put to the vote, was carried (voting: 6 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That Planning Application 13/02709/OUT be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. Unsustainable site for 16 dwellings in terms of distance from essential services
2. 16 dwellings would be an over development at this semi-rural location

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

Planning application: 13/02322/FUL – Erection of a new three bedroomed detached dwelling house with link attached garage designed to the ‘Code for Sustainable Homes’ level 4 on land South of the old Barn Owl Inn, Westport, Hambridge. Applicant: Mr J Lock**

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. He said there was no pavement which forced the use of a car and the Highway Authority recommended refusal because of lack of visibility at the entrance. Also there was no exception policy to justify acceptance of the proposal.

Mr M Williams, Agent for the applicant, said the applicant was a young local tradesman who wished to return to the area he had grown up with his young family. The revised vehicle plan submitted overcame turning arrangements on the site and local facilities were only 1 mile from the site. There were no objections from neighbours nor on landscape or design of the proposed property. He noted that planning officers had stated Policy ST3 could not be relied upon in previous applications but it had been cited in the reason for refusal. He concluded there could be no reasonable objection to a small infill property on the site.

The Ward Member, Councillor Sue Steele, said the site had previously been used for abandoned vehicles and getting them removed had been a problem. The site was very close to the vibrant community and school in Hambridge and there were nearby local employment units. She felt there were no objections to the application.

During discussion, Members commended a local person addressing their own housing needs. They felt the road was straight, within the 40mph speed limit and the applicant could create a wide visibility splay in common with other existing properties along the road. It was proposed and seconded that planning permission be granted as the site was in a sustainable location, as it was fairly well related to facilities, was infilling a

problem site and the applicant had demonstrated a local connection. The Development Manager suggested that a local connection could be ensured through the use of a legal agreement but members did not consider this to be necessary. On being put to the vote this was carried (voting: 9 in favour, 1 abstention). Councillor Seal noted that she had abstained from voting as she was a member of the Regulation Committee which the application would now be referred to.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application 13/02322/FUL be **REFERRED** to Regulation Committee with a recommendation for APPROVAL from the Area North Committee for the following reasons:

- The site was in a sustainable location.
- This was infilling a problem site.
- The applicant had demonstrated a local connection.

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

Planning application: 13/02468/OUT – Outline application for the residential development of land West of The Gammons, Ham Lane, Compton Dundon. Applicant: Mr J Lovell.

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. She noted that since writing her report the adjoining neighbour had confirmed that did not object to two dwellings on the site. The Parish Council had requested that the historic church path to the front of the site be restored and that the site be limited to two bungalows. She said there were no substantive Highway Authority objections and she recommended approving the application.

Mrs H Lazenby, Agent for the applicant, confirmed the applicants were long standing residents of the village and they would occupy one of the properties. The church path would be restored and the design of the units would not affect the living conditions of the neighbours, which would be addressed at the Reserved Matters application.

One of the Ward Members, Councillor Pauline Clarke, spoke in favour of the application. She said that outline permission for development had been granted in 1999 for two houses at the site and a recent parish survey had confirmed that 2 or 3 bedroomed houses for local people were needed in the village. Also there were in excess of 20 buses per day only 100 yards from the site.

The other Ward Member, Councillor David Norris, asked that an informative be added to the planning permission to restrict the site to two 3 bedroomed dwellings and the restoration of the historic church path at the completion of the development.

Members briefly discussed the application and were unanimously in favour of approving it, with the additional informatives proposed by the Ward Member. (voting: unanimous in favour)

RESOLVED:

That Planning Application 13/02468/OUT be **APPROVED** for the following reason:-

The proposed development would contribute towards the council's

housing supply without demonstrable harm to residential amenity, highway safety or visual amenity or causing any significant increased risk to flooding, as such the proposed development is considered to accord with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies ST5, ST6, EC3, EC7, EC8, EP1 and EU4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: As required by Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. Application for approval of the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping of the site, referred to in this permission as the reserved matters, shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, and before any development is commenced on site.

Reason: As required by Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

03. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans location plan and block plan received 18/06/2013.

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

04. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, foul and surface water drainage details to serve the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such approved drainage details shall be completed and become fully operational before the development hereby permitted is first brought into use. Following its installation such approved scheme shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of environmental health and to ensure the site is adequately drained in accordance with Policies ST5 and EU4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

Informatives:

01. The developer's attention is drawn to the comments made by the Council's Landscape Architect and Tree Officer dated 12/07/2013 with regard to the road frontage hedge and trees.
02. Having regard to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that a Section 184 Permit must be obtained from the Highway Service Manager,

Yeovil Area Office, tel 0845 3459155. Application for such a permit should be made at least three weeks before access works are intended to commence.

- 03. If soakaways are to be used to prevent discharge of water onto the highway, they will need to be constructed in line with BRE365 and must be a minimum distance of 5m from any structure including the highway.
- 04. The restoration of the historic church path to the front of the site be restored at the completion of the development.
- 05. The Parish Council request that the site be restricted to two 3 bedroomed bungalows.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

.....

Chairman