

MEETING AW.07:0809
DATE 19:11:08

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held in the School Hall, Swanmead Community School, Ditton Street, Ilminster on **Wednesday, 19th November 2008**.

(5.30 p.m. – 9.00 p.m.)

Present:

Members:	Kim Turner	(In the Chair)
Michael Best		Ros Roderigo
David Bulmer		Angie Singleton
Jenny Kenton		Andrew Turpin
Nigel Mermagen		Linda Vijeh (until 7.00 p.m.)
Robin Munday		Martin Wale

Officers:

David Stapleton	Corporate Director - Health and Wellbeing
Andrew Gillespie	Head of Area Development (West)
Alasdair Bell	Deputy Head of Service, Environmental Health & Community Protection
Steve Joel	Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure
Cheryl Lingard	Community Activity and Lifestyle Officer
Colin McDonald	Corporate Strategic Housing Manager
Kerry Plumb	Housing Development Officer
David Norris	Development Control Team Leader (North/West)
Andrew Gunn	Deputy Team Leader – Development Control
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Joy Streetin	Market Supervisor
Andrew Blackburn	Committee Administrator

Also Present:

Carl Brinkman	Somerset County Council – Highway Authority
Ian McWilliams	

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

82. Minutes (Agenda item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 15th October 2008, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

83. Apologies for Absence (Agenda item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Simon Bending, Geoff Clarke, Nicci Court, Ric Pallister and Dan Shortland.

84. Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 3)

Prior to the discussion of agenda item 9 regarding the Affordable Housing Development Programme, Cllr. Kim Turner declared her personal interest as developments involving South Somerset Homes had been mentioned as part of this item and she had been appointed by the Council to serve on the main board of South Somerset Homes. She did not consider the interest to be prejudicial as the report was only for information and no decisions were being made. She also mentioned that she had recently tendered her resignation from the board.

85. Public Question Time (Agenda item 4)

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

86. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 5)

No announcements were made by the Chairman.

87. Operation of Markets in Area West (Agenda Item 6) (Executive Decision)

Reference was made to the agenda report, which updated members on the operation of South Somerset markets in Chard, Crewkerne and Ilminster. The Committee was asked to review the operation of the markets and the pitch fees charged to market traders.

The officers answered members' questions on points of detail when particular discussion ensued on the operation of the market in Crewkerne. The Market Supervisor mentioned that there had been problems over the last year, partly due to the construction of the new Waitrose store, which had meant that the market in Crewkerne had not had a permanent site. In response to comments, she also indicated that the market traders in Crewkerne had been paying a reduced rent and that the market had reduced to two regular traders.

The Head of Area Development commented that there was a need to look at the costs and income trends of the three markets. With regard to Crewkerne he commented that now the Waitrose store had been opened and the situation in Crewkerne became more settled, it should be possible to take a longer term look at income trends. He suggested that a further report be submitted to the Committee in April 2009 to enable the longer term trends to be considered in respect of the markets in Area West.

Cllr. Angie Singleton, one of the ward members for Crewkerne, commented that although the current location of the market in the South Street Car Park meant that there was a loss of income to the Council from the parking spaces, it seemed to be a more favourable location for the market traders. She welcomed a more in depth report being submitted to the Committee and hoped that all options for future management would be considered.

In response to a question, the Head of Area Development agreed to let Cllr. Linda Vijeh know the cost of the safety audit that was to be carried out by an independent assessor of the option to locate the market in Market Square.

Comments were expressed generally that increasing fees was not the way to encourage more traders to the markets. In referring to encouraging traders, a member suggested that consideration could be given to perhaps making a reduction in fees to traders who booked a number of weeks in advance.

Members supported a more detailed report being submitted to the Committee.

RESOLVED: that the review of the operation of markets in Chard, Crewkerne and Ilminster, including pitch fees, be deferred pending a more detailed report being submitted to the Committee in April 2009 on the longer term trends and options available for the future operation of the markets.

Reason: To review the operation of the markets in Chard, Crewkerne and Ilminster.

(Resolution passed without dissent)

(Joy Streetin, Market Supervisor – (01935) 462987)
(joy.streetin@southsomerset.gov.uk)

88. Environmental Health and Community Protection Service – Update Report (Agenda item 7)

The Deputy Head of Service, Environmental Health and Community Protection, gave a presentation updating members on the work of the Environmental and Community Protection Service.

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

- details were given on the operation and funding of the "Warm and Well" scheme, which helped to tackle fuel poverty;
- a member referred to flood protection measures and to the delivery and use of sandbags to protect properties and thought that the use of floodboards was perhaps a better investment. The Deputy Head of Service commented that this was an issue that had been raised before and that the situation was being reviewed with regard to the areas at risk and whether people should have sandbags or be given advice on other forms of self help. Another member commented that arrangements had been made for the storage of sandbags, where appropriate, at village halls in some parishes in his ward;
- reference was made to whether there was any monitoring of home safety and the Deputy Head of Service mentioned that the Government had introduced a fitness and rating system for local authorities to look at certain properties, mainly within the rented sector. He mentioned that the Home Aid scheme could give help with doing appropriate work for elderly and vulnerable people;
- the Deputy Head of Service informed members that action could be taken in cases of smells from agriculture but only if they constituted a statutory nuisance. He further commented that it was to be expected that there would be some smells in the countryside;
- although the Food and Safety Team may occasionally carry out joint visits to premises in conjunction with Trading Standards, they did not work with them on a routine basis;

- reference was made to the recent water quality problem in Chard and the surrounding area and members were informed that there had been a good dialogue between Wessex Water and the Council's Environmental Protection Team;
- reference was made to Disabled Facilities Grants and it was confirmed that a referral from an Occupational Therapist/Social Services was needed in order to obtain a grant. In response to a suggestion that a public awareness campaign should perhaps be carried out, the Deputy Head of Service commented that the numbers of grants applied for already outstripped the funding available;
- a member thanked the officers for the work that was carried out by the Environmental Health and Community Protection Service, which was important and necessary work often carried out in the background.

The Chairman thanked the Deputy Head of Service, Environmental Health and Community Protection for his report, the details of which were noted.

NOTED.

(Alasdair Bell, Deputy Head of Service, Environmental Health & Community Protection – (01458) 257440)
(alasdair.bell@southsomerset.gov.uk)

89. Sport, Arts & Leisure – Service Update (Agenda Item 8)

Reference was made to the agenda report and the Head of Sport, Arts and Leisure gave a presentation updating members on the work of the Sport, Arts & Leisure Service in Area West. He also indicated that he would welcome suggestions to improve service delivery and of potential projects members wished to see incorporated into the 2009/10 service planning process.

During the ensuing discussion, the Head of Sport, Arts and Leisure responded to members' questions and comments. Points addressed included the following:-

- a member queried whether it would be possible to bring forward improvements to the swimming pool facilities and new football pitches in Chard especially bearing in mind the financial constraints on the District Council and Somerset County Council. He also asked whether there was an option to seek Government funding. The Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure commented that the District PPG17 Sport and Recreation Assessment Update report would set out the needs for facilities within the district. The report was currently in the process of being finalised. He indicated that the report highlighted amongst other things the need for the replacement of the swimming pool in Chard. He also mentioned that the opportunities for capital and revenue funding were changing all the time and there was a need to look at financial feasibility on a project by project basis;
- reference was made to the service usage statistics and to whether more recent figures were available. The Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure explained that the usage statistics were done on a three yearly basis and were due to be updated in 2009;
- it was confirmed that the Somerset PCT contributed funding towards staff resources for active lifestyles development;

- in response to a question, the Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure reported that there was a marketing programme for the services provided by the Community Resource Centre;
- a member queried whether the Octagon Theatre made money and the Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure commented that the Octagon was the lowest costing theatre in the region but in common with the similar professional theatres it did require a subsidy to operate;
- a member commented that in terms of sustainability it was not possible for people to access the Octagon Theatre by bus from this area;
- reference was made by a member to initiatives that had been provided, but may have been subject to a lack of interest, and it was questioned what was done to find out whether there would be interest in a given activity. The Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure responded confirming that the up front investment in new activities could be costly and so the service did assess need, potential outcomes and the cost of potential project opportunities before taking decisions to commence. Data was also available, which compared opportunities against population thereby indicating where access to services was low;
- a member congratulated the Community Play Officer for the work carried out in respect of the Play Day organised for Ilminster;
- a member commented that he was pleased with the facilities that had been improved in Chard. In referring to the Play Ranger scheme, which had started slowly this year, he hoped that the scheme would not be abandoned and that it would continue next year;
- concern was expressed that there was no reference to CRESTA in the officer's report and that there was a need for more detail on how the facility would fit in with future plans. The Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure reported that the Council was working closely with Somerset County Council to start the process of considering what happens on that site. He referred to having started to look at the strategic issues with an early scoping session;
- in referring to dual use arrangements, a member questioned whether the Council actually received value for money from those arrangements;
- with reference to the free swimming sessions for those people aged 60 or over, a member queried whether there was sufficient capacity to provide those sessions with the facilities that were available in the district. The Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure reported that he and the Council's partnership organisations were confident that the capacity existed to accommodate those sessions. It was indicated that the expectation was that this customer group would seek to use the daytime off peak periods;
- a member expressed the view that swimming was an activity that should be encouraged and commented that should any funding be available from the Government it should be channelled towards free swimming sessions. The Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure reported that District Executive had asked him to write to the Government setting out the Council's concerns especially regarding the inflexible way they were asking for the free swimming programme to be delivered. It was felt that there was a need for a more flexible local approach and some options had been suggested;
- the Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure confirmed that he was not aware of any future financial issues with the Sports Coaching posts, which were delivering good work.

The Chairman thanked the Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure for his report, which was noted by the Committee.

NOTED.

*(Steve Joel, Head of Sport, Arts & Leisure – (01935) 462278)
(steve.joel@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

90. Affordable Housing Development Programme (Agenda item 9)

The Housing Development Officer summarised the agenda report, which updated members on the final position of the Affordable Housing Development Programme for 2006/08. Members were also asked to note the current position with the Social Housing Development Programme for 2008/11.

In referring to the 2006/08 Programme Outturn, the Housing Development Officer clarified that there were 227 units completed in 2006/07 and not 153 as stated in error in the agenda report.

In response to a question regarding the delivery of the 2008/11 Development Programme, the Housing Development Officer commented that some discussions were taking place with developers with regard to the possibility of bringing forward affordable housing units on the key sites bearing in mind the current economic climate. She also commented on the schemes carried out in conjunction with the Council's Registered Social Landlord partners. She indicated that Registered Social Landlords cross-subsidised some affordable housing schemes with shared ownership units and that this had become more difficult because of leaseholders' ability to obtain finance. She also referred to some schemes in Area West being currently at the design stage.

The Corporate Director, Health and Wellbeing, commented that despite the current economic climate, there were opportunities that could be identified for the provision of affordable housing including private sector landlords offering properties and through the Housing Corporation. The Corporate Director, in putting affordable housing performance in perspective, referred to the Council being the best performing District Council in the South West region in 2006/07 in providing additional affordable housing and to having been second best District Council in 2005/06. He complimented the Corporate Strategic Housing Manager and his team, Planning Policy, Development Control and the partnerships with the Registered Social Landlords and the Housing Corporation for this achievement.

In response to the comments of a member, the Housing Development Officer and Corporate Strategic Housing Manager explained the action that could be taken where shared ownership properties became vacant and in circumstances where other empty properties were identified. The Corporate Strategic Housing Manager also referred to lenders being cautious about lending finance on shared ownership properties. He explained the reasons, however, for being of the view that shared ownership was a safer basis on which to lend money than a full mortgage.

The Chairman thanked the officers for their report, which was noted by the Committee.

NOTED.

*(Kerry Plumb, Housing Development Officer – (01935) 462040)
(kerry.plumb@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

91. Area West 2008/9 Budget Monitoring Report for the Period Ending 30th September 2008 (Agenda item 10) (Executive Decision)

RESOLVED: that consideration of the report updating members on the current financial position of the Area West budgets as at the end of September 2008 be deferred until the Committee's meeting to be held on 17th December 2008.

*(Catherine Hood, Management Accountant – (01935) 462157)
(catherine.hood@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

92. Reports from Members on Outside Organisations (Agenda item 11)

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

93. Feedback on Planning Applications Referred to the Regulation Committee (Agenda item 12)

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

NOTED.

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

94. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 13)

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

NOTED.

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

95. Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda item 15)

The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held at the Guildhall, Fore Street, Chard on Wednesday, 17th December 2008 at 5.30 p.m.

NOTED.

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

96. Planning Applications (Agenda item 14)

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).

08/02686/FUL (Pages 1 - 21) – Proposed demolition of agricultural buildings and erection of 20 holiday lodges and 1 administration lodge with associated access, car parking and landscaping works (Revised Application) (GR 338367/109592), London Lodge Farm, Windwhistle, Cricket St. Thomas – Cricket St. Thomas Estate.

The Deputy Team Leader, Development Control, referred to this application having been considered previously at the Committee's meeting on 15th October 2008 when members were minded to grant planning permission subject to the approval by the Committee of appropriate planning conditions.

The Deputy Team Leader summarised the details of each of the suggested conditions, which were set out in the agenda report and addressed issues/concerns that were raised by members at the last meeting together with others that had been requested by internal and external consultees.

In referring to condition 14, which required a Travel Plan to be submitted for approval before development took place, the Deputy Team Leader reported that some details had already been submitted. He further reported that the applicants had indicated that there were a number of permissive paths that could be used by residents of the holiday lodges. It was also indicated that an existing path along the northern edge of the site would be improved, which would enable residents to walk safely adjacent to the A30 and to cross to the nearby public house as well as access other paths. The Deputy Team Leader commented that the improvement and provision of the path on the northern edge of the site could either be included as part of the Travel Plan or be made subject to a specific condition.

In response to a comment from a member, the Deputy Team Leader reported that the Travel Plan would not solve any inadequacies in public transport services. He referred, however, to there being a bus stop at the main entrance to the estate and that the applicant could perhaps encourage more use of it. The Travel Plan could also encourage more use of footpaths and of other modes of transport.

In referring to condition 20, which restricted the occupation of the lodges for holiday purposes only, it was suggested by the officers that the occupation of the lodges by persons on a single visit should not exceed a continuous period of 28 days. He reported, however, that the applicant had requested that the period be 56 days.

The Deputy Team Leader further suggested the inclusion of an additional condition requiring that should the lodges cease to be used for holiday purposes in the future, they be removed and the site returned to grassland. He also asked members to consider whether they wished the improvement of the footpath link at the northern edge of the site to be included as part of the Travel Plan or as a separate condition and whether the restriction in the occupation of the lodges should be for the period of 28 or 56 days. It was noted that members could consider holiday use without a time restriction but that was not being recommended.

In response to a question, the Deputy Team Leader reported that the reference in condition 10 to no other buildings being erected within the application site without the prior express grant of planning permission would include garden sheds and greenhouses.

The Committee noted the comments of the applicant, Mr. S. Taylor, who indicated that he had no objections in principle to any of the suggested conditions. He explained, however, the reasons for requesting that a longer period of 56 days be allowed, rather

than the 28 suggested, in condition 20 in respect of the maximum continuous period of time of occupation of the lodges by people on a single visit. He indicated that the 28 day period could be a disadvantage for the proposed business and that it was not uncommon for families to want 7 or 8 weeks accommodation. He commented that a 56 day period would give flexibility as well as ensuring that lodges were used for holiday use only.

The applicant's agent, Mr. A. Preston, commented that the estate would welcome the opportunity for a Travel Plan, which fitted in with the aim of sustainable tourism. He referred to the modes of transport that could be looked at and to buses already stopping at the main entrance to the estate. The possibility of a stop at London Lodge was also mentioned. Reference was made to encouraging the use of footpaths, cycling, horses and walking and to the intention to extend and improve the footpath to the north of the site. He also referred to the site being located close to other leisure/tourism facilities in the vicinity. He further commented that bright halogen lamps were used for the previous agricultural use whilst for these proposals only low level subdued external lighting would be used to ensure safety at night. The applicant was content with the installation of tinted glass in the lodges and together with the use of curtains/blinds and landscaping he felt that light pollution would be kept to a minimum. Reference was also made to the applicant being content with the withdrawal of permitted development rights and other conditions except for the period of time stipulated in condition 20 relating to holiday use.

Cllr. Robin Munday, ward member, expressed his view that the only outstanding item with regard to this application was that relating to the period of let in condition 20 regarding holiday use and commented that he had no strong feelings one way or another regarding that matter.

During the ensuing discussion, the officers responded to the comments of a member who was concerned about the sustainability of the proposals in terms of the need to travel. The majority of members were of the view that the application should be granted subject to the conditions proposed by the officers as set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of condition 20 relating to holiday use to substitute the period of continuous occupation by a single person or group of persons from 28 days to 56 days together with the removal of the words "without the express prior consent of the Local Planning Authority" from the end of that condition. It was noted that there could be no extension of that period without the submission and approval of a planning application to vary the condition. Members also agreed that an additional condition should be included requiring the removal of the lodges if they ceased to be used for holiday purposes in the future. The Committee also indicated that the improvement and provision of the footpath on the northern edge of the site should be subject to a specific condition.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- (i) conditions 1-22 and notes 1-5 as set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of condition 20 to read as follows:-

"The holiday lodges hereby approved shall be occupied for holiday purposes only. The occupation of the lodges by any single person or group of persons on a single visit shall not exceed a continuous period of 28 days."

- (ii) the inclusion of additional conditions requiring:-

- the improvement and provision of a footpath link along the northern edge of the site;
- that should the lodges cease to be used for holiday purposes in the future, they be removed and the site returned to grassland.

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

07/01185/COU (Pages 22-64) – Change of use and conversion of barns to office use (Use Class B1) (GR 336016/111571), Manor Farm, Cricket Lane, Cricket Malherbie – T.S. Jeanes and Partners.

The Deputy Team Leader, Development Control, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. It was noted that the recommendation was one of refusal for highway reasons because of the nature of the approach roads, which were of restricted width and poor alignment and considered unsuitable to serve as a means of access for the proposed development. The Highway Authority had recommended that the application be refused on that basis as well as on sustainability grounds. The Deputy Team Leader felt, however, that the sustainability concerns were outweighed by the benefits of the scheme and based on the historical and current traffic movements to and from the site.

The Deputy Team Leader further reported that should members be minded to approve the application it would need to be subject to conditions. In terms of the proposed design, layout and impact on the listed buildings, the original scheme had been amended to take into account certain concerns raised by the Landscape Architect and Conservation Officer and were now considered to be generally acceptable in that respect, although there was still some concern regarding the treatment of a wall at the western end of the site, which provided separation from the converted buildings and an existing dwelling.

The Deputy Team Leader also referred, for members' information, to the views that had been submitted by the Highway Authority when the application for the former farm shop on the site had been considered in 1979 and with regard to a separate application for a site at Moolham.

The representatives of the Highway Authority commented that they had concerns both on sustainability grounds and because of the sub-standard nature of the approach roads. In terms of sustainability reference was made to the three main towns being some way off and to there being an infrequent bus service with the bus stop not being near to the site. Reference was also made to the sub-standard nature of the approach roads to the site, which were restricted in width with limited passing places and poor alignment and given the topography of the area. They illustrated those concerns by reference to photographs of three approaches to the site. It was also felt that the Highway Authority had been consistent in its approach with this application. Reference was made to the proposals being bigger than the farm shop and to the potential for 30 staff plus visitors to the site if the application were approved. It was commented that once granted, there would be little control over any expansion and the Highway Authority felt that this was an inappropriate location for a commercial activity with the potential for conflict on inappropriate approach roads.

In response to a question from a member, it was reported that the Highway Authority were not aware of any accidents on these roads.

The officers then answered members' questions on points of detail including whether residential development had been considered, whether there was evidence of need for offices in this location, and the length of time the farm shop had been closed.

The applicant, Mr. A. Jeanes, referred to his primary business being in agriculture, the details of which he explained. He also indicated that the farm shop had run for 20 years but had closed in 2001 because of the foot and mouth outbreak. He referred to the barns being of 17th, 18th and 19th century build and to them being no longer useful for agricultural purposes. He mentioned that they would be converted in a sympathetic way

into offices rather than residential. He referred to policies supporting economic activity and to well-conceived schemes being encouraged. Reference was made to the Council's Economic Development Team Leader being in support of the application and to the only objections being from the Highway Authority. With regard to the issue raised about the approach roads being sub-standard, he commented that his consultant's report had concluded that the proposals would only generate 11 vehicle movements in the weekday peak hours, which were considered to be so small as to be insignificant. He believed that the proposals complied with policies on providing employment opportunities in rural areas and to there being a need for the development.

Cllr. Robin Munday, ward member, referred to farmers being obliged to diversify. In referring to the proposals for a suite of offices he mentioned that the planning officers had not raised any major difficulties with the application but referred to concerns having been raised by the Highway Authority. Although on paper the scheme would seem to be at odds with certain policies, he felt that they were not cast in stone and were open to interpretation and that the application must be judged taking into account all aspects. He referred to his ward having many country lanes, similar to those approaching this site and felt that if policies on alternative methods of travel were applied rigidly at all times, villages would not have any form of development. He further commented that the proposals would bring back into use several buildings and that the concerns of the Conservation Officer had been addressed except for the treatment of the wall at the western end of the site. He further referred to the previous farm shop, which had been frequented regularly by people and commented that it was possible for the shop to be re-opened, whilst if this application was approved the ability to re-open the shop would be removed. He referred to other consultees not having objections to the proposals and felt that there was more than the roads to be taken into account. He also referred to the road distances to Chard and Ilminster quoted in the agenda report and commented that the total mileages were not all on sub-standard roads.

During the ensuing discussion, varying views were expressed by members. Some members, although having sympathy with farm diversification and feeling that the development would be carried out in a sensitive manner, were of the view that the roads were sub-standard and that the application should be refused. Concern was expressed about the amount of traffic the proposals could generate at one time. In referring to the previous farm shop, the view was expressed that there would have been less traffic generally at that time than there was at present. A member also questioned the need for office space in this location and comment expressed that this was not perhaps the best use for the buildings. Reference was made to the proposed development being car dependent and therefore not sustainable and to the need to look at alternative methods of transport.

Other members indicated their support for the application to be granted. The view was expressed that the previous farm shop would have generated more traffic movements than this proposal and that the development would safeguard the buildings. It was also commented that it was part of the Council's Corporate Plan to support farm diversification and that the economic need was there.

The majority of members were of the view that the proposed development, by reason of its scale, design and use, would have a beneficial impact upon the rural economy and would provide an appropriate alternative use for these important listed buildings. It was not considered that the scheme would have a prejudicial impact upon highway safety, or on the amenity of the area or the character and setting of the listed buildings. It was also felt that the development was in accordance with policies ST5, ST6, EH1, EH3, EH6 and TP6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and guidance in PPS7 and PPG15. On that basis, it was felt that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

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

- standard time limit;
- no additional windows, including dormer windows, or other openings (including doors) shall be formed in the buildings, or other external alteration made without the prior express grant of planning permission;
- scheme of landscaping to be submitted for approval;
- a bat and bird survey to be submitted for approval and in the event of the survey concluding any potential impact on bats or other protected species, or significant impact on birds, full details of a mitigation plan shall be submitted for approval;
- if the development does not commence within one year from the date of the last bat and bird survey and any corresponding approved mitigation plan, a further survey and mitigation plan shall be undertaken and submitted for approval;
- details of materials to be used for external walls and roofs to be submitted for approval;
- details, including elevational drawings, to be submitted for approval indicating the areas to be re-pointed, the method of removal of existing pointing, details of the mortar mix and a sample panel of new pointing to be carried out in the agreed mortar;
- details of the design, materials and external finish for all new doors, windows, boarding and openings to be submitted for approval;
- details of all new cast metal guttering, downpipes, other rainwater goods and external plumbing to be submitted for approval;
- details of the lintels to all new openings, including those in any new build, and the treatment of the surrounds of the window and doorway openings to be submitted for approval;
- all electrical and telephone services to the development shall be run underground. All service intakes to the units shall be run internally and not visible on the exterior. All meter cupboards and gas boxes shall be positioned on the units in accordance with details to be approved by the local planning authority. All soil and waste plumbing shall be run internally and shall not be visible on the exterior unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority;
- no extensions to the buildings without the prior express grant of planning permission;
- the area allocated for parking on the submitted plan shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development approved;
- the proposed access over the first 5 metres of its length, as measured from the edge of the adjoining carriageway, shall be properly consolidated and surfaced in accordance with details to be submitted for approval;
- any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards and shall be set back a minimum distance of 4.5m from the carriageway edge;
- provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which to be submitted for approval;
- details of both hard and soft landscape works to be submitted for approval;
- details of materials to be used for the stone boundary wall to be submitted for approval;

- the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted plans and specifications as amended by plans submitted by the agent received 14th May 2007;
- a travel plan to be submitted for approval;
- the development shall not be used other than for those activities which fall within the definition of Use Class B1.

(5 in favour, 4 against).

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

.....
Chairman