

MEETING AW.04:0708
DATE 15:08:07

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held in the Shrubbery Hotel, Station Road, Ilminster on **Wednesday, 15th August 2007**.

(5.30 p.m. – 9.10 p.m.)

Present:

Members: Robin Munday (In the Chair)

Simon Bending	Ric Pallister
Michael Best	Ros Roderigo
David Bulmer	Jean Smith
Geoff Clarke	Andrew Turpin
Nigel Mermagen	Linda Vijeh (until 6.30 p.m.)

Officers:

Andrew Gillespie	Head of Area Development (West)
Zoe Harris	Community Regeneration Officer
Simon Fisher	Community Planning Support Officer
David Julian	Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism
David Norris	Planning Team Leader (North and West)
Stephen Banks	Planning Officer
John Millar	Planning Assistant
Francis Jones	Arboricultural Officer
Andrew Blackburn	Committee Administrator

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

39. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 18th July 2007, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

40. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Nicci Court, Dan Shortland, Angie Singleton, Kim Turner and Martin Wale.

41. Declarations of Interest

Cllr. Mike Best declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application nos. 07/01101/FUL (Erection of a dwellinghouse and garage, land adjacent The Elms, 18 South Street, Crewkerne) and 07/02523/FUL (Alteration and conversion to two dwellings, Liberal Hall, Court Barton, Crewkerne) as comments had been submitted by Crewkerne Town Council on which he also served as a councillor.

Cllrs. David Bulmer and Jean Smith declared personal but non-prejudicial interests in planning application nos. 07/01792/TPO (Application to fell 6 trees shown as being within Group G1 of the South Somerset District Council (Chard no. 4) Tree Preservation Order 2006, 49 Thorndun Park Drive, Chard) and 07/02031/FUL (Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and the erection of a garage, Eastlands, Lyddons Mead, Chard) as comments had been submitted by Chard Town Council on which they also served as councillors.

42. Public Question Time

No questions or comments were raised by members of the public, representatives of parish/town councils or county councillors.

43. Chairman's Announcements

No announcements were made by the Chairman.

44. Annual Report Outlining the Past Year's Work of the Countryside Service (Agenda item 6)

The Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism referred to the agenda report, which informed members on the past and forthcoming year's work of the Countryside Service with a particular focus on public rights of way and Chard Reservoir.

In addition to the information contained in the agenda report, he mentioned that he had been seconded to his post for a 12 month period until May next year following the previous Head of Service having taken up a post with another local authority. He referred to the secondment having taken place because of the then uncertainty over Local Government Reorganisation. He also referred to the Parish Paths Stewardship Scheme and explained what it was, its aim and what the scheme offered. In mentioning the Chard Reservoir Nature Reserve he made particular reference to the refurbishment of the Bird Hide, management of the water levels for nesting birds, development of a management plan and the new volunteer scheme. Birding mornings would also take place during October. He further informed members that it was hoped to get the Reserve to a standard to enable Green Flag status to be applied for. Reference was made to two forthcoming events, Chard Countryside Day on 15th September 2007 and the South Somerset Food Festival, which would be held between 29th September and 7th October 2007.

During the ensuing discussion, the Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism responded to members' questions and comments. Points addressed included the following:-

- members paid tribute to the work of David Lester who had recently retired from the post of Countryside Ranger at Chard Reservoir;
- Cllr. Jean Smith was thanked for her assistance, together with Action for Chard Town, with the Chard Countryside Day;
- members hoped that it would be possible to apply for Green Flag status for Chard Reservoir. The Committee noted the comments of the Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism who indicated that the Green Flag award put emphasis on community

involvement and expertise. He further reported that when everything was in place, an application for the award could be made;

- in response to a question about the involvement of schools, the Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism informed members that the involvement of young people was most important and that he would like to be able to offer educational outreach programmes taking in Chard Reservoir;
- the comments of a member regarding the possibility of other smaller parks being looked at for possible Green Flag status were noted.

The Chairman thanked the Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism for his report, the details of which were noted.

NOTED.

*(David Julian, Head of Countryside, Heritage and Tourism – (01935) 462279)
(david.julian@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

45. Progress of the Ilminster Forum and Community Plan (Agenda item 7) (Executive Decision)

Prior to consideration of this item, the Community Planning Support Officer introduced Zoe Harris, who had been appointed recently to the post of Community Regeneration Officer.

The Community Planning Support Officer then summarised the agenda report, which updated members on the Community Plan for Ilminster and surrounding area and the progress of Ilminster Forum.

The Chairman of Ilminster Forum, Carol Goodall, made a presentation during which she informed members of projects that were moving forward including those of the Ilminster and District Disability Group, the Local Action Group (including Speedwatch, a Neighbourhood Watch event, Shopwatch, Anti-Social Behaviour and Drug and Alcohol Abuse), and completion of the review of town signage by Ilminster Forum. A survey was also being undertaken into the need for another community facility in Ilminster and, in conjunction with other stakeholders, projects were progressing in respect of CCTV, notice boards and the provision of new footpaths. Other projects included Ilminster Heritage Trail and tourism brochures.

Carol Goodall then responded to members' questions regarding the part played by the Ilminster Forum in respect of the town guide and on the information available from, and status of, the local information centre. In response to a comment about there seeming to be no overall plan for Ilminster, she informed the Committee that the Town Council had recognised the content of the Community Plan as part of plans to form a strategic vision for Ilminster for the next 10 to 15 years.

Arising from discussion of this item, reference was also made to the need for some form of master plan for Chard and the Head of Area Development noted the request of members for an item to be included on a future agenda to enable that matter to be discussed.

The Committee thanked Carol Goodall for her presentation and members were pleased to note the progress being made.

RESOLVED: that the developments of the Ilminster Forum and Community Plan projects be noted and supported.

Reason: To note and support the developments of the Ilminster Forum and Community Plan projects.

(Resolution passed without dissent).

*(Simon Fisher, Community Planning Support Officer – (01460) 260373)
(simon.fisher@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

46. Community Speedwatch Report (Agenda item 8) (Executive Decision)

The Head of Area Development summarised the agenda report, which informed members of the current status of the Community Speedwatch programme across South Somerset and in Area West in particular. The Committee was also asked to consider the officer's recommendation that the remaining balance of £7,900 be no longer ring-fenced for Community Speedwatch within the Area West Reserve. He also informed the Committee of some minor corrections to the agenda report, which were noted by members.

The Head of Area Development further reported that a meeting of the Area West Community Safety Action Panel was to be held on the following day when a report on Community Speedwatch was to be considered. He indicated that any comments of members regarding the scheme could be forwarded to that meeting of the Panel.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr. John Goodall who spoke on behalf of the South Somerset Community Speedwatch Co-ordinators Group. He gave a number of details to indicate that the Speedwatch Scheme was expanding and referred to that growth requiring funding. He commented that the Co-ordinators Group were of the view, therefore, that the remaining balance of the funding allocated to the scheme should be retained specifically for Community Speedwatch groups.

During the ensuing discussion, a number of comments were made including the following:-

- members were disappointed that the warning letters to people who had been found to be speeding were not being sent within the target time of two weeks. Members felt that sending the letter out later did not have the necessary impact;
- comment was expressed that the positive support of the Police Authority was needed to engender the enthusiasm of the Speedwatch Groups, including the Police following up instances of speeding identified by the volunteers as well as generally overseeing the initiative. Members were of the view that the performance of the Police could be improved in that respect. It was felt that Speedwatch Groups may become disillusioned if the necessary support was not forthcoming;
- concerns were expressed that some Speedwatch Groups had become disillusioned because they had been asked to look for other offences, such as whether vehicles had road tax discs, which they did not consider to be part of their role;
- in response to a question from a member, the Head of Area Development reported that equipment used by Speedwatch teams was re-used where appropriate;

- a member commented that he was heartened by the increased interest in the Speedwatch Scheme from people in his ward and indicated his preference for the balance of the funding to remain ring-fenced.

The Head of Area Development commented that he was unable to give a detailed response on the issues raised by members but would report their concerns to the Area West Community Safety Action Panel. In referring to the funding, he commented that he was not suggesting that Speedwatch Groups would be prevented from accessing the funding in the future but merely that it would not be earmarked specifically for the Speedwatch Scheme.

The Committee was of the view that the balance of the funding should remain ring-fenced for the time being pending the outcome of the consideration of the issues raised by members at the Area West Community Safety Action Panel and the response of the Police.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) that the Committee note the current status of the Community Speedwatch programme across South Somerset and in Area West in particular;
 - (2) that the balance of £7,900 remain ring-fenced for Community Speedwatch schemes within the Area West Reserve for the time being, pending the outcome of the consideration of the issues raised by members at the Area West Community Safety Action Panel and the response of the Police;
 - (3) that the Head of Area Development submit a report to a future meeting of the Committee to update members on the outcome of the above action.

Reason: To note the current status of the Community Speedwatch programme and to review the allocation of funding to the scheme.

(10 in favour, 0 against).

*(Bob Chedzoy, Community Development Officer – (01460) 260359)
(bob.chedzoy@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

47. Area West 2007/8 Budget Monitoring Report for the Period Ending 30th June 2007 (Agenda item 9) (Executive Decision)

Reference was made to the agenda report, which updated members on the current financial position of the Area West budgets as at the end of June 2007.

The Head of Area Development further indicated that as the report only gave the financial position as at the end of June 2007, it did not include recent spending on the Community Speedwatch Scheme.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Area Development commented that there would be an update report on the Healthy Living Centre at the December meeting of the Committee. He also noted the comments of a member who referred to the need to follow up the issue regarding funding for the provision of a fence at Millfield, Chard on the route of the Chard/Ilminster cycleway.

Members noted the comments of Cllr. Ric Pallister who informed the Committee that a small working group had been established with the Somerset County Council to look at

the feasibility of the District Council's Area Committees and the County Council's Area Panels working on a combined basis.

RESOLVED: (1) that the current financial position of the Area West budgets as at the end of June 2007 be noted;

(2) that the current and future spend on the Area West Capital Programme, as shown in the agenda report, be agreed.

Reason: To review the allocation of resources as part of the monitoring of the Area West Development Revenue budget, Area West Capital Programme and Area West Reserve.

(Resolution passed without dissent).

*(Jayne Beevor, Principal Accountant – (01935) 462320)
(jayne.beevor@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

48. Reports from Members on Outside Organisations (Agenda item 10)

No reports were made by members who represented the Council on outside organisations.

49. Feedback on Planning Applications Referred to the Regulation Committee (Agenda item 11)

There was no feedback to report as there were no planning applications that had been referred recently to the Regulation Committee.

NOTED.

*(David Norris, Planning Team Leader (North/West) – (01935) 462382)
(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

50. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 12)

The Committee noted the details contained in the agenda report, which informed members of planning appeals lodged, dismissed and allowed.

NOTED.

*(David Norris, Planning Team Leader (North/West) – (01935) 462382)
(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

51. Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda item 14)

The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held at Crowshute House, Crowshute Link, Chard on Wednesday, 19th September 2007 at 5.30 p.m.

NOTED.

*(Andrew Blackburn, Committee Administrator – (01460) 260441)
(andrew.blackburn@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

52. Planning Applications (Agenda item 13)

The Committee considered the applications set out in the schedule attached to the agenda and the planning officers gave further information at the meeting and, where appropriate, advised members of letters received as a result of consultations since the agenda had been prepared.

(Copies of all letters reported may be inspected in the planning applications files, which constitute the background papers for this item).

07/01028/FUL (pages 1-4) – The erection of a garden room ancillary to existing public house (GR 335119/114862), The Stonemasons, Harts Close, Ilminster – Wolverhampton and Dudley Breweries plc.

The Planning Assistant summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. In updating members he reported the details of a letter received from the applicants in which it was explained why they felt that the scheme applied for was the most appropriate and that they did not wish to amend the application. The Committee noted that the officer's recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

In response to questions from members, the Planning Assistant confirmed that negotiations had taken place with the applicants since the application was last discussed by members at the June meeting of the Committee. It was also confirmed by the Planning Team Leader that whether or not the proposed development was used as a smoking room was not relevant in planning terms. With reference to noise, he indicated that, as the site was a Class A3 use, people could stand within the curtilage of the pub in any case. It was also noted that the Environmental Protection Unit had not received complaints about noise other than when people were actually leaving the premises. The Planning Team Leader further commented that it would not be appropriate to include a condition regarding hours of opening as that would fall within the licensing regulations.

During the ensuing discussion, comment was expressed that there were no planning grounds on which to refuse the application. It was suggested, however, that a condition be included in any permission requiring the provision of appropriate screening.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to conditions 1-3 as set out in the agenda report and to an additional condition requiring the provision of appropriate screening.

(9 in favour, 0 against)

07/01101/FUL (pages 5-7) – The erection of a dwellinghouse and garage (GR 344156/109509), land adjacent The Elms, 18 South Street, Crewkerne – J. Boyd.

The Planning Team Leader summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report and reported that the recommendation was one of refusal because of concerns raised by the Highway Authority about the increased use of a substandard access being prejudicial to highway safety.

In response to questions from members, the Planning Team Leader reported that the access was not wide enough for two cars to pass and that the proposed development could create an increase of 50% in traffic movements.

The representative of Crewkerne Town Council, Mrs. S. White, commented that it was considered that the proposed development in terms of design and size would complement The Elms. She mentioned that the site would be accessed via the existing drive and, in referring to the yellow box highway markings, she mentioned that entry/exit from the

access was still possible. Reference was made to the Highway Authority's comments on this application being inconsistent with views they had given on an earlier application relating to the Methodist Church, which was situated in the locality. She indicated that the Town Council supported the application and asked that it be approved.

Cllr. Mike Best, one of the ward members, referred to the apparent inconsistency in the comments of the Highway Authority. He referred to the Highway Authority not having objected to an application relating to the Methodist Church, which was within 100 yards of this site. He was of the view that visibility was limited from the access to the Methodist Church, whilst the exit from this site was much easier with better visibility. He indicated that he could not support the officer's recommendation of refusal in this case.

Cllr. Geoff Clarke, also a ward member, concurred with the comments of Cllr. Best. He also expressed his view that the gradient of the access was not excessive and questioned the need for it to be wide enough for two cars.

During the ensuing discussion, support was shown for the comments of the ward members. A member expressed the view that the extra traffic generated would be insignificant compared to the general traffic movement in the vicinity. It was also commented by members that the Highway Authority's views on applications seemed to be inconsistent.

The majority of members were of the view that the increase in traffic movements associated with the proposed development was not significant enough to be a hazard to highway safety and that the application should be approved.

In referring to the apparent inconsistencies in the views of the Highway Authority, the Committee concurred with the comments of a member who suggested that a representative from the Highway Authority should attend the meeting when applications that were likely to be contentious in respect of highway issues were being considered. The Planning Team Leader noted the wishes of the Committee.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted and the inclusion of conditions be delegated to the Head of Development and Building Control in consultation with the ward members.

(8 in favour, 1 against)

07/01792/TPO (pages 8-9) – Application to fell six trees shown as being within Group G1 of the South Somerset District Council (Chard No. 4) Tree Preservation Order 2006 (GR 332546/109615), 49 Thorndun Park Drive, Chard – Susan King.

The Arboricultural Officer summarised the details of the application and showed photographs of the trees concerned. He reported that the recommendation was one of refusal for the reason set out in the agenda report.

The Committee noted the comments of Mr. T. Barnes, who also spoke on behalf of other local residents, in objection to the application. He indicated his support for the retention of the trees and did not feel that there was any justification to fell them. He referred to the Tree Preservation Order having been placed on the trees a year ago and to the ownership of the trees and boundaries not being clear. He also commented on the amenity and wildlife benefits of the trees and mentioned that they could be maintained. He also felt that the trees were closer to dwellings in Bonds Close than to this property.

The applicant's agent, Mr. C. Rolfe, referred to the applicant not having been able to appeal to the Committee before the Tree Preservation Order was confirmed. He mentioned that the trees needed to be maintained correctly for safety reasons and to the trees subject

of this application being only a third of those that were situated on the property. He also referred to one of the trees overlooking the road and a bus stop. He mentioned the applicant's responsibility to maintain the trees and further commented that if she was allowed to fell the trees subject of this application, she would be able to maintain those that remained. He commented that the trees would grow taller and that they overlooked property and could be a danger to safety. He questioned the relevance of one of the objector's comments in the agenda report referring to the applicant having only lived at the property a short time.

The applicant, Mrs. S. King, commented that she had been trying to get this matter heard by the Committee since July last year. She referred to the person who had requested the Tree Preservation Order to be placed on the trees having only lived in the locality for a short time. She mentioned that she did her utmost to maintain the trees but could not reach the tops. She was of the view that the trees were nearer 15-18 metres high and not 9 metres as stated in the agenda report. She referred to the trees being too big and to them being forest trees rather than garden trees. She indicated that she would not have bought the property had she known that a Tree Preservation Order would be placed on the trees. Reference was made to branches falling onto the road and to concerns about liability.

In response to a question from Cllr. Jean Smith, ward member, the Arboricultural Officer explained the background to the placing of the Tree Preservation Order on these trees including the confirmation of the order, which had been dealt with under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. Cllr. Jean Smith further commented that she had sympathy with the applicant because of the duty she had to protect the trees but she was not sure of the best way forward with this application.

In response to a question from a member, the Arboricultural Officer confirmed that the trees were in a healthy condition and were not a danger. He also indicated that they did not shade the garden and the trees should survive for many years.

During the ensuing discussion, the view was expressed that the trees formed an important feature in the area and softened an urban landscape. The felling of the six trees was not supported by the Committee. A member suggested that perhaps some thinning of the trees could take place whilst still retaining the feature they created. The Arboricultural Officer reported that appropriate thinning had been discussed but the applicant wished to fell the six trees.

The Committee was of the view that the application should be refused but comment was expressed that if the applicant wished to submit an application to thin the trees in the future it would be considered on its merits.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be refused because the applicant has failed to clearly demonstrate why it is essential that the protected trees are felled and therefore their loss would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area.

(9 in favour, 0 against)

07/02031/FUL (pages 10-12) – Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse and the erection of a garage (GR 333304/108903), Eastlands, Lyddons Mead, Chard – Mr. R. Cridge.

The Planner summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. The Committee noted that the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

The Committee noted the comments of Mr. T. Hayball in objection to the application. He referred to the scheme that was originally approved being different from the one that was being built. He also mentioned that the en-suite window in the north west elevation would overlook his property and referred to alternatives that could be used instead of a window, which he described to the Committee. He further commented that the owners of properties in Lyddons Mead had not wanted windows that overlooked their properties when he had made a planning application in the past. He also expressed concern about the introduction of a Juliet balcony in the north east elevation, which would overlook another neighbouring property.

The applicant's agent, Mr. P. Rowe, explained why the original plans had been changed. He referred to the applicant having previously intended to erect a detached garage but that would have necessitated work to an electricity cable, which had proved to be too expensive. Had the applicant realised that at the time of the earlier application, the proposals that were now being considered would have been submitted. He mentioned that enforcement action had not been taken as had been suggested. In referring to the window in the north west elevation he was of the view that any overlooking would be minimal. Although it could be fixed closed, the applicant would prefer it to be opening. He further commented that the original plans had been followed except for the en-suite window and the blockwork on the north west elevation, which could be removed.

Cllr. Dave Bulmer, ward member, expressed his support for the officer's recommendation to grant permission subject to conditions. In referring to recommended condition 4, however, he did not feel that it was necessary for the en-suite window in the north west elevation to be fixed closed.

Cllr. Nigel Mermagen, the adjoining ward member, referred to an application having been approved for this site a few months ago, which he supported. He expressed his view, however, that the development that was taking place was far removed from what had been approved and commented that the Enforcement Officer had been involved at one stage. He also referred to the amended application having been largely built without approval. In referring to recommended condition 2 requiring the materials on the external surfaces to match those used in the existing building, he expressed his view that the materials that had been used did not match. In making reference to the neighbouring property at 10A Cerdic Close he mentioned that it had been stated in the planning permission for that dwelling that no windows should face Lyddons Mead and he felt that a similar condition should apply equally in this case, i.e. that windows in properties in Lyddons Mead should not face Cerdic Close. He referred to the boundary hedge, which helped to screen houses in Lyddons Mead from Cerdic Close, and mentioned that it was in the ownership of 10 and 12 Cerdic Close except for a gap in between the two properties where the ownership was unclear. He was of the view that the hedge should be protected. He also commented that the hedge would help to screen the proposed Juliet balcony.

During the ensuing discussion, members generally felt that the application could be approved. Varying views were expressed, however, about the materials that had been used, it being commented that they did not match those existing, whilst other members felt that they were not significantly different. Varying views were also expressed about whether the en-suite window in the north west elevation should be fixed closed or opening, perhaps by way of being bottom hung. All members agreed that it should be obscure glass. It was generally felt that there should be protection for the hedgerow.

The Planning Team Leader, in referring to the condition about materials, indicated that it could be amended to require the materials to be agreed. He also commented that a condition could be placed on any permission requiring a management plan to ensure that the hedgerow was maintained.

The Committee agreed that the application be granted subject to the amendment of the recommended conditions and inclusion of an additional condition as set out below.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- (1) conditions 1 and 3 as set out in the agenda report;
- (2) the amendment of condition 2 to require that the materials be approved by the Local Planning Authority;
- (3) the inclusion of an additional condition requiring a management plan to ensure that the hedgerow was maintained;

(9 in favour, 0 against)

- (4) the amendment of condition 4 to require the en-suite window in the north west elevation to be of obscure glass and the opening to be bottom hung.

(7 in favour, 2 against)

07/02523/FUL (pages 13-16) – Alteration and conversion to two dwellings (GR 344000/109744), Liberal Hall, Court Barton, Crewkerne – Charles Hickey.

The Planning Team Leader summarised the details of this application as set out in the agenda report. The Committee noted that the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

In response to questions raised by the ward members regarding difficulties with parking in this locality, the Planning Team Leader commented that he understood that the Highway Authority were of the view that, given the current permitted use of the premises as a meeting hall (albeit currently unused) and the close proximity to a public car park and the town centre, the proposed conversion of the building would not exacerbate parking problems.

The representative of Crewkerne Town Council, Mrs. S. White, referred to the hall being very close to the A30 road on an S bend. Concern was expressed that, with the two dwellings proposed, there could be 4 to 6 persons on the pavement close to heavy goods vehicles. It was also felt that the amenity space was small in terms of two dwellings and that living space was overcrowded. Concerns were also expressed about the parking situation in the locality with on-street parking being over-subscribed and the nearest car park being only for long term parking.

Cllr. Geoff Clarke, one of the ward members, indicated that he could not accept that the proposed development was satisfactory in any respect. He commented that it would be preferable if only one dwelling were to be provided, which would enable more amenity space to be created and the provision of car parking. He felt that the application should be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and the lack of car parking provision.

Cllr. Mike Best, also a ward member, concurred with the comments of Cllr. Clarke. He felt that it would be difficult to park in the car parks as they were over-subscribed and that people would tend to park on-street and make an already difficult situation worse.

During the ensuing discussion, the majority of members were of the view that there were no planning grounds on which the application could be refused. It was commented that, although sharing the concerns with regard to the car parking position, as there were no Highway Authority objections and bearing in mind Government guidelines on housing development in town centres, it was not felt that the Council would win any appeal against a refusal. It was also commented that lack of amenity space was not a planning consideration and that the proposed dwellings would suit certain people.

The Planning Team Leader commented that potential occupiers would decide whether the amenity space provided was what they wanted and concurred with the comments of members that the Council could lose any appeal against a refusal given the Highway Authority's comments.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to conditions 1-5 as set out in the agenda report.

(7 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention).

(David Norris, Planning Team Leader (North/West) – (01935) 462382)
(david.norris@southsomerset.gov.uk)

.....
Chairman