

MEETING AW.10:0708
DATE 20:02:08

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held in the Shrubbery Hotel, Station Road, Ilminster on **Wednesday, 20th February 2008**.

(6.00 p.m. – 8.55 p.m.)

Present:

Members: Kim Turner (In the Chair)

Simon Bending	Ros Roderigo
David Bulmer	Angie Singleton
Geoff Clarke	Jean Smith
Nicci Court	Andrew Turpin
Nigel Mermagen	Linda Vijeh
Robin Munday	Martin Wale

Officers:

Andrew Gillespie	Head of Area Development (West)
Zoe Harris	Community Regeneration Officer
Fiona Tame	Community Development Officer
Paul Brazier	Area Support Team Leader
David Norris	Planning Team Leader (North/West)
Lee Walton	Planner
Andrew Blackburn	Committee Administrator

Also Present:

Carl Brinkman	Principal Planning Liaison Officer – Somerset County Council (Highway Authority)
---------------	---

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

127. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 16th January 2008, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

128. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Michael Best, Ric Pallister and Dan Shortland.

129. Declarations of Interest

Cllr. Kim Turner declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application no. 07/05241/COU (change of use from B1, B2 and B8 to D1 (children's nursery) including

internal and external alterations, Unit 4, Broadoak, Canal Way, Ilminster) as comments had been submitted by Ilminster Town Council on which she also served as a councillor.

Cllr. Nicci Court declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application no. 07/05241/COU (change of use from B1, B2 and B8 to D1 (children's nursery) including internal and external alterations, Unit 4, Broadoak, Canal Way, Ilminster) as comments had been submitted by Ilminster Town Council on which she also served as a councillor.

Cllr. Andrew Turpin declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application no. 07/04679/COU (change of use of premises from holiday let to residential, The Old Chapel, St. Margaret's Lane, South Chard) as comments had been submitted by Tatworth and Forton Parish Council on which he also served as a councillor.

Cllr. Robin Munday, declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 9 regarding the appointment of a member to replace Cllr. Jean Smith as one of the Council's representatives on the Chard and Ilminster Community Justice Panel as he was also one of the Council's representatives on the Panel.

130. Public Question Time

- a) Mr. H. Best referred to the Crewkerne Key Site and to the planning application, which was approved in November 2006 subject to conditions. He asked whether the approval was conditional on all the buildings being built to "BRE Eco-homes Very Good Standard" and whether it was possible to have an assurance that there would be no relaxation of sustainability standards. Mr. Best also referred to the percentage of affordable homes that would be provided as part of the development, which was normally 35%, but in this case the applicant had offered only 15%, a figure that he commented was deplored by the Committee at that time. He understood that negotiations were reaching a conclusion and asked how low the percentage of affordable homes would have to be for the application to be referred back to the Committee.

The Planning Team Leader (North/West) in referring to the development being constructed to sustainable standards commented that there was a general responsibility for the local planning authority to try and achieve such standards. He further mentioned that the BRE standards were now changing but it was hoped that the development would be built to at least the BRE Very Good Standard. In referring to the percentage of affordable homes to be provided he reported that the Committee had indicated that a figure closer to 35% should be aimed for. The Committee resolution, however, did not require that the application be brought back before the Committee. How contributions from developers were proportioned would be dealt with through an internal process involving the appropriate officers, portfolio holders and ward members. He referred to there having been a tendency for affordable homes to have the larger share of any planning gain but there was a cost element and no guarantee could be given about the proportion of affordable homes at this stage.

- b) Mr. J. Burlington, Chairman of South Somerset Climate Action, informed the Committee that Cllr. Paull Robathan had asked him to be present at the Local Strategic Partnership meetings to lead on climate change. He also referred to the large attendances of the public at meetings regarding climate change held at the Warehouse Theatre, Ilminster. He questioned whether the Area West Committee would recognise the need for bold action on climate change and referred to the need for publicity and a determination to meet the challenges. He asked whether the Committee would affect policies to make reductions in the area's emissions of

greenhouse gases and had anticipated the likelihood of continually increasing fuel prices. He also referred to the need to develop greater resilience to enable issues arising from power cuts, fuel shortages and the possible impacts of climate change to be dealt with more readily. He referred to there being support for action and to the dangers being serious.

In response, the Chairman commented that the District Council's Climate Change Officer was currently working on a carbon reduction strategy for adoption by the Council. She indicated that the strategy set out ways that the Council would reduce carbon emissions including through the planning process, the reduction of the District Council's own carbon emissions from buildings and through a travel plan. Education/awareness through carbon reduction awareness events and advice to householders was also mentioned. She indicated that the strategy was currently at a draft stage and that the Climate Change Officer was happy to have informal consultations with South Somerset Climate Action regarding the strategy. In referring to rising fuel prices, the Chairman indicated that the Community Plans in Chard, Crewkerne and Ilminster were all supported by the Area West Development Team and all three plans had projects that encouraged people to rethink their car use and adopt different means of travel. She gave details of a number of those projects for information. The Chairman further reported that the draft Carbon Reduction Strategy would include a number of policies designed to encourage greater efficiency in the use of oil and gas together with encouraging suitable renewable energy resources. The draft Carbon Reduction Strategy would also help address developing greater resilience to difficulties that might be caused by power cuts, fuel shortages or possible impacts of climate change.

The Head of Area Development (West) commented that the questions addressed to this Committee raised high-level strategy issues that were beyond its scope. He indicated that the Committee sought to promote community action and was happy to work with community groups with practical suggestions to improve the quality of life.

Mr. D. Gordon, a former County Councillor, commented that he felt that a good response had been made and was sure that the suggestion of the Head of Area Development would be taken up. He felt, however, that the item on the agenda for this meeting regarding the Area Development Plan did not reflect the issues of concern. The Head of Area Development indicated that appropriate issues would be dealt with in any individual reports to Committee on the projects within the Development Plan.

NOTED.

131. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman mentioned that arrangements were being made for a member workshop to be held in March 2008. If members had any items for discussion at the workshop, she asked that they inform her or the Head of Area Development (West).

132. Progress Report on the Frontline Councillors Grant Scheme (Agenda item 6)

The Area Support Team Leader summarised the agenda report, which updated members on the Frontline Councillors Grant Scheme. It was noted that this was the second quarterly progress report required to be made to Area Committees by full Council

AW09M0708

for members' information. The Area Support Team Leader further reported that since the agenda report had been published a grant of £255 had been awarded towards goal posts at Jocelyn Park, Chard, which left just under £21,000 in the scheme not yet awarded.

In response to questions, the Area Support Team Leader reported that any further grants from the Frontline Councillors Scheme would need to be approved by 31st March 2008 but could be paid to the organisation concerned after that date if necessary. He also confirmed that the future of the scheme was subject to review by the District Executive.

Members noted the projects that had been supported and the amount of the grants awarded.

NOTED.

*(Paul Brazier, Area Support Team Leader (West) – (01460) 260404)
(paul.brazier@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

133. Area West 2007/8 Budget Monitoring Report for the Period Ending 31st December 2007 (Agenda item 7)

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 December 2007.

The Head of Area Development (West) further mentioned that it was hoped to reduce the draw down from the Area Reserve as much as possible to try and keep capacity in the budget to enable the continuation of the Opportunity events, should members wish to do so.

The current financial position of the Area West budget as at the end of December 2007 was noted.

NOTED.

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

134. Area West Development Plan 2007/8 (Agenda item 8)

The Head of Area Development (West) referred to the agenda report, which updated members on the progress made to date together with any significant changes in respect of the Area Development Plan for 2007/8.

The Head of Area Development further commented that there had been a welcome period of stability with staffing in his team, which had been helpful in moving projects forward. He referred to trying to fund community aspirations through the Market Towns Investment Group (MTIG) and funding was being sought for priority projects from the South West of England Regional Development Agency (SWRDA). He also mentioned that he was taking a report to the next District Executive meeting regarding proposals for the provision of CCTV in Market Towns.

Reference was made to the Opportunity Crewkerne event that had taken place on the 13th February 2008 at Wadham School, Crewkerne and the Head of Area Development commented that a full report would be made to the next meeting of the Committee. In the

meantime, the Community Regeneration Officer gave a summary of the event during which she reported that the evening had been very busy with 365 voting packs having been handed out. She mentioned that 26 groups had made presentations, 8 of which had received funding, including 2 village projects, altogether totalling £32,101. Reference was made to more people being able to attend and vote because the event allowed for voting to take place one hour before the actual meeting started. The voting was then stopped whilst the presentations by the applicant organisations took place with half an hour allowed for voting afterwards. A total of 1,392 votes were placed. She further reported that 121 people had completed the evaluation forms that had been distributed at the event from which feedback had been largely positive. She informed members of some of the detailed comments made on the evaluation forms. She also commented that there had been favourable media coverage.

The Chairman referred to the arrangement whereby voting had been allowed for one hour before the actual meeting commenced and felt that perhaps it would be preferable for all the community voting to be held after the presentations made by the applicant organisations had taken place.

Members were pleased that the event had been successful. It was suggested that now a couple of these events had taken place it would be worthwhile for members to discuss informally the arrangements for the events, and the comments received from feedback, to see if any improvements could be made to the process. The Chairman suggested that a discussion could be held at the forthcoming workshop in March.

The Committee noted the progress, changes and achievements relating to the Area West Development Plan.

NOTED.

*(Andrew Gillespie, Head of Area Development (West) – (01460) 260426)
(andrew.gillespie@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

135. Chard and Ilminster Community Justice Panel – Member Representative (Agenda item 9) (Executive Decision)

Reference was made to the agenda report and the Committee considered the appointment of a member to replace Cllr. Jean Smith as one of the Council's representatives on the Chard and Ilminster Community Justice Panel.

Members thanked Cllr. Jean Smith for her work as one of the Council's representatives on the Panel.

RESOLVED: that Cllr. Kim Turner be appointed to serve as one of the Council's representatives on the Chard and Ilminster Community Justice Panel in place of Cllr. Jean Smith.

Reason: To appoint a member representative to serve on the Chard and Ilminster Community Justice Panel to replace Cllr. Jean Smith.

(Resolution passed without dissent).

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

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

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

137. 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)*

138. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 12)

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

NOTED.

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

139. 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 March 2008 at 5.30 p.m.

NOTED.

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

140. Planning Applications (Agenda item 13)

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

07/04679/COU (pages 1-4) – Change of Use of Premises from Holiday Let to Residential (GR 332809/105261), The Old Chapel, St. Margaret’s Lane, South Chard – Bethel Strict Baptist Chapel.

The Planner summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report and informed members that the recommendation was one of refusal solely for highway safety reasons.

In response to a question from a member regarding the comments of the Economic Development Officer, who had indicated that he could not support the application, the Planner reported that had the site been in the countryside the comments would have carried weight but as it was within the development area, the proposals were acceptable.

The representative of the Highway Authority answered a number of points raised by members questioning the reasoning that had led to their recommendation of refusal. During his response he mentioned that both junctions were substandard and that there were road humps and a 20 mph speed limit in place. He indicated that there should be 33 metre visibility at junctions but that was not achieved in this case. He further commented that there was the potential for an increase in use. In responding to a comment he felt that although local people may be familiar with the roads, there would be others who may not be, and with regard to whether any perceived increase in traffic movements would be significant, he was of the view that any increase would mean additional risk.

The Planning Team Leader commented that the recommendation was finely balanced. He referred to the junction being substandard and to the Highway Authority, upon being consulted, having made their recommendation of refusal. In response to a question from a member, the Planning Team Leader confirmed that it was a recommendation that was being made by the Highway Authority.

Cllr. Andrew Turpin, ward member, referred to there not having been an accident in the locality of this site in the 37 years that he had lived in the area and that included the time in which a 30 mph speed limit was in force. He accepted that the Highway Authority had to make their recommendations with reference to a code but he did not feel that it was applicable in this case. He expressed his view that the use would be reduced and not increased.

Although noting the comments of the Highway Authority, members agreed with the views of the ward member. Reference was also made to the slow speed of traffic in this locality and comment expressed that future residents of the property would be familiar with the local roads whilst holidaymakers would not. A member also questioned whether the residential use of the property would in fact produce more traffic movements than its use as a holiday let.

For the reasons mentioned above, the Committee did not concur with the recommendation of the Highway Authority and was of the view that the application could be granted.

The Planning Team Leader indicated that if the application were approved there would be no need for the inclusion of any conditions.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted.

(12 in favour, 0 against)

07/05241/COU (Pages 5-9) – Change of Use from B1, B2 and B8 to D1 (Children’s Nursery) including internal and external alterations (GR 334932/114808), Unit 4, Broadoak, Canal Way, Ilminster – Mrs. A. Jeffery and Mrs. L. Jay.

The Planning Team Leader summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He indicated that the application sought permission to use industrial premises as a children’s nursery. He also explained that permission for this use was granted last year but would have resulted in another industrial unit (Unit A) for which permission had been granted not being able to be built. This current application would enable a solution that would allow both the children’s nursery and the other unit to be provided. The Planning Team Leader further reported that the Highway Authority had raised an objection as they had concerns about the relationship between a children’s nursery and other commercial uses. The applicants had, however, offered to complete an agreement that would restrict unbuilt Unit A to B1 use only. The application was, however, recommended for refusal on the basis of the Highway Authority’s concerns.

The representative of the Highway Authority and Planning Team Leader answered members’ questions on points of detail regarding the layout, possible means of access to the site and the conflict between the proposed nursery and other commercial uses.

The Committee noted the comments of Mr. A. Faulkner who informed the Committee of the details contained in a letter from a local mother in support of the application. It was indicated that she had a lot of contact with parents and to their being in support of the proposed nursery. Child minders had also indicated their support. Reference was made to day nurseries often being the only avenue for childcare and to the population in Ilminster growing. It was also mentioned that the organisers had put in a lot of work and that the proposals would create employment opportunities and provide a much needed facility.

The applicants, Mrs. A. Jeffery and Mrs. L. Jay spoke in support of their application. Mrs. Jeffery referred to their vision for the nursery and commented that it would fulfil the potential for quality care and provide a warm, safe and friendly environment where the needs of the children could be catered for. The nursery would also bring employment with ten staff being taken on and enhance childcare provision in Ilminster thereby allowing people to go out to work. She commented that the need for childcare was paramount and that pre-school facilities were at capacity. It was indicated that they had already had ten names of parents who wished to use the nursery. Reference was made to their dealings with the Highway Authority who she felt had treated them unfairly and inconsistently. Mrs. Jay commented that there would be no compromise with safety, which was paramount. She felt that risk was within normal limits and commented that a risk assessment had been carried out with the Early Years Advisory Service. A full OFSTED inspection would also be carried out before the nursery opened. She further indicated that the children would be taught safety and how to recognise danger. Comparison was made with another operational site and comment expressed that she felt that there were fewer risks in relation to this site. She also mentioned that the traffic flow was minimal during the day with the heavier times being at the beginning and end of the day. Reference was also made to other bodies that supported the application and to statistics that showed a large shortfall of childcare places.

Cllr. Kim Turner, one of the ward members, commented that the previous application, which the Highway Authority had also recommended for refusal, had been approved last year so she felt that the principle had been set. However, it seemed that the previous application could not be moved forward because of the other industrial unit (Unit A) not being able to be built. She commented, however, that a solution had been found that would enable both the nursery and Unit A to be provided with the applicants also willing to relinquish B2 and B8 use of that unit and restrict it to B1 use only. She referred, however, to there still being a recommendation of refusal from the Highway Authority. She mentioned that the application for a children’s nursery on this site was important for Ilminster. She

referred to comparisons that had been made with a site that had been approved by the Area North Committee contrary to a Highway Authority recommendation of refusal. She felt that the site in Area North was a more open site compared to the one in Ilminster, which comprised a more private area. Reference was also made to the applicants' proposals also needing to go through an OFSTED inspection who were stringent in their requirements. She indicated her support for the approval of the application.

Cllr. Nicci Court, also a ward member, expressed her support for the application. She referred to other facilities that were situated on an industrial estate in Yeovil and also to the pre-school facility at Swanmead School in Ilminster, which was in a busy location with no incidents having occurred. She also felt that the applicants had done their utmost to ensure the best position in respect of their proposals.

During the ensuing discussion, varying views were expressed by members about the proposals. Some members, although agreeing totally with the need for the children's nursery facility in Ilminster, were concerned about the potential for conflict between children and vehicles on this site and felt that it should be refused on highway safety grounds.

The majority of members felt that adequate safeguards would be in place and that the proposals would not be prejudicial to children's safety. Comment was also expressed that an inspection would be made by OFSTED whose requirements were stringent and who would require safe facilities. Should OFSTED feel that the situation was not acceptable, they would be unlikely to give their approval in any case. A member also expressed her view that the staff would be present at the nursery before the children arrived and that parents would take their children into the nursery. It was also felt that the timing of vehicle movements in respect of the different uses would minimise any conflict.

The Planning Team Leader responded to suggestions of members about the possibility of making certain amendments to the entrance and access arrangements in addition to those proposed and he explained why they would not necessarily be appropriate. He also commented that a condition on any permission relating to gaining consent from OFSTED would not be appropriate as if that were not to happen the nursery would not be able to operate in any case.

The majority of members were of the view that adequate safeguards were in place and that the application could be granted subject to conditions.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to conditions, which shall include:-

- development being commenced before the expiry of three years from the date of the permission;
- traffic calming arrangements to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority;
- particulars of materials to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority;
- the nursery not being brought into use unless an agreement has been submitted and approved by the local planning authority to restrict Unit A to B1 use only and to restrict Unit 4 to nursery use only within Use Class D1.

(9 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention)

07/04736/FUL (Pages 10-27) – The erection of 114 no. dwellinghouses (GR 343850/108551), land at Maiden Beech, Cathole Bridge Road, Crewkerne – Persimmon Homes South West.

The Planning Team Leader referred to the agenda report, which set out the details of the application. In updating members, he indicated that Crewkerne Town Council had no objection to the amended plans. He also reported receipt of a letter from Maiden Beech School indicating that they did not agree to a fence being erected on their side of the boundary hedge but rather that it should be on the development side as they wished to retain control of their hedge. The receipt of a letter from a neighbouring resident making representations requesting a wall to be constructed on the boundary of his and adjoining properties was also noted. The Highway Authority had also confirmed that they had no objection to the scheme subject to some minor amendments to the road details.

The Planning Team Leader summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. In referring to the key issues to be taken into account he referred to the principle of the development having been established both by the previous grant by the Committee of outline planning permission and through the site being included in the Local Plan. The design and layout had been achieved as a result of discussions with the Conservation Manager, and the Highway Authority had no problem with the use of Kingswood Road for the additional units, which had been agreed previously and was contained in the Local Plan. The landscaping would be subject to a condition and he felt that sensitive planting had been shown, including additional planting on the southern boundary and the retention of hedgerows and trees where possible. He further reported that the play area had been located in an appropriate position and amenity issues had been addressed. In referring to the boundary treatment, he indicated that this had been the main area of contention with neighbours and he recommended that a condition be included on any permission requiring the developer to provide information on how the boundaries would be protected. He further reported that the application provided a range of planning contributions including the provision of affordable housing.

The Planning Team Leader further reported that the recommendation was one of approval subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation and to appropriate conditions as set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of condition 19 to remove reference to the position of the security fence on the school field to the west of the boundary and to include a requirement for details of boundary treatment to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

The Planning Team Leader and representative of the Highway Authority then answered members' questions on points of detail regarding the provisions made for cycling and on the design/types of dwellings. The representative of the Highway Authority commented that the estate road had been designed to 30 mph standards so speeds would be low and cycling would take place on the carriageway itself rather than as part of the footway. The applicant would be making a contribution towards highway improvements and produce a travel plan to encourage the use of forms of transport other than the car. The Planning Team Leader, in responding to the questions regarding the design of the houses (particular reference being made to false chimneys, central heating vents, meter cupboards and provisions for the disabled), commented that all dwellings would comply with the current regulations in respect of design, sustainability and provisions for the disabled. He also commented that the input of Crewkerne Town Council had been useful and he felt that their comments had been taken into account with the exception of two windows in the northern elevation of the bungalow being obscure glazed, as it was not considered that windows at ground floor level would be a problem. He further confirmed that the Environment Agency had no objections to the proposals subject to conditions.

The representative of Crewkerne Town Council, Mrs. H. Leamon, commented that the most contentious part of the application had been matters regarding Cathole Bridge Road,

which tended to be used by motorists as a bypass of Crewkerne. The Town Council were concerned that there should be no connection from the development to Lyme Road. She further referred to there being no assurance that the playing field would not be built on in the future. Reference was also made to the need for a secure fence at certain points of the boundary of the development and to the apparent absence of fencing for the play area. Assurances were sought that there would be an adequate water supply to serve the development and she queried whether there had been an archaeological survey of the site. It was hoped that the Town Council would be consulted regarding the materials to be used and that there would be no anti-social working hours during the construction period. The view was expressed that the new development would cause additional demand on medical facilities.

In response to comments made, the Planning Team Leader commented that access to the development would be from Kingswood Road and that there had been no suggestions otherwise. He indicated that he was not able to predict whether the playing field would be subject to development in the future but he was not aware of any plans at present. With regard to the play area being unfenced, he indicated that the issue could be dealt with when the details were submitted for approval. He also confirmed that an archaeological survey was carried out as part of the outline consent and that the adequacy of the water supply was covered by condition.

The Committee noted the comments of Mr. R. Griffiths who wished to make representations about the application. He referred to Cathole Bridge Road near Maiden Beech School and commented on the possible conflict between pedestrians and vehicles in this narrow road. He did not feel that any assessment had been made of potential pedestrian movements and to there being no request for a contribution from the developers for a footpath or cycleway on the southern boundary of the development. He felt that the development would increase the amount of pedestrian traffic and that more attention should have been given to traffic management flows.

Mr. R. Young, an objector to the application, expressed his concern about the possibility that a link road to Lyme Road could be created in the future. He also expressed his view that the provision of 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling would be insufficient to accommodate the likely number of cars per household.

The applicant's agent, Mr. S. Collier, indicated that he did not wish to address the Committee at this stage.

Cllr. Geoff Clarke, one of the ward members, commented that it was inevitable that this development would take place. He expressed some reservations about the quality of the design. He asked that officers monitor the scheme to ensure that appropriate standards were met.

Cllr. Angie Singleton, also a ward member, referred to the history of this site and of the long held desire for Crewkerne to have a relief road incorporating Ashlands Road, the "CLR" road and Kithill to join up with the A30 to enable there to be a loop around the town centre. She referred, however, to the adoption of the recent District Local Plan when policies changed and advice given that to insist on a relief road would blight this development and also that the number of houses did not warrant a road of this type. She expressed her disappointment that the construction of this relief road had not been achieved. However, given the situation as it stood, she was confident that the best deal possible had been achieved for Crewkerne at present.

During the ensuing discussion, the majority of members indicated their support for the officer's recommendation. In response to the comments of a member, who expressed concern about the design of the false chimneys, the Planning Team Leader commented

that a condition could be included requiring details of their design to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.

The Committee noted the comments of Cllr. Andrew Turpin who was concerned that there was no specific cycleway provisions on the site itself and to the need for links into the town centre. He was also concerned that there was nothing specific in the proposals to deal with the carbon footprint and effect on the environment. He spoke of the need to consider these issues in future and to take effective action to encourage developers to build sustainable developments. Cllr. Angie Singleton commented that through the scheme, contributions would be made to the alleviation of congestion in the town and to a travel plan, including bus passes. She expressed her view, however, that this was not the site for an exemplar project.

In response to a comment from a member, the Planning Team Leader reported that the emergency access to be provided onto Cathole Bridge Road would be gated and locked.

The Committee was of the view that the application should be approved as recommended by the Planning Team Leader. It was also agreed that a condition should be included regarding the approval of the design of the false chimneys.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- (1) the prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation(s) in a form acceptable to the Council's Solicitor(s) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued, the said planning obligation to cover the following items/issues:-
 - (i) contribution to highway works;
 - (ii) contribution to education;
 - (iii) contribution to off-site strategic sport facilities;
 - (iv) contribution to off-site playing pitches;
 - (v) provision of affordable housing;
 - (vi) provision of land for an on-site play area;
 - (vii) contribution to equip and maintain the play area;
 - (viii) travel plan;
 - (ix) contribution towards youth facilities;
- (2) conditions 1-23 as set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of condition 19 to remove reference to the position of the security fence on the school field to the west of the boundary and to include a requirement for details of boundary treatment to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, and the inclusion of an additional condition regarding the approval of the design of the false chimneys.

(11 in favour, 1 against)

07/02592/FUL (Pages 28-31) – Partial rebuild of redundant stone building and replacement of sub-standard outbuilding to form a home office ancillary to the use of Greenacre Cottage (GR 326545/115187), Greenacre Cottage, Blackwater Road, Buckland St. Mary – Linus Surguy.

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

The Committee noted the comments of the applicant's agent, Mr. N. Jillings, who referred to the previous recommendation of refusal when this application was last before the

Committee in September 2007, and commented that progress had been made since then through negotiations with the planning officers. He mentioned that the description of the application and the “red line” showing the boundary of the site had been amended. Also, the proposed building had been reduced in size. He referred to the proposals being acceptable in development plan terms and to the Council's Landscape Officer being content with the application. He further mentioned that the proposals would enable the applicant to contribute to the local economy and not require him to commute to work. Reference was made to the applicant being content with the recommended conditions including the development being ancillary to the use of Greenacre Cottage. He indicated that the Parish Council and the District Council ward member supported the application and that there were no objections from neighbours.

Cllr. Ros Roderigo, ward member, commented that she was pleased that agreement had been reached regarding this application and felt that the development would improve an untidy site.

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

(12 in favour, 0 against)

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

.....
Chairman