

MEETING AW.02:0910  
DATE 17:02:10

## South Somerset District Council

**Draft Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held in the Guildhall, Fore Street, Chard on **Wednesday, 17th February 2010.**

(5.30 p.m. – 8.40 p.m.)

### Present:

**Members:** Cllr. Kim Turner (in the Chair)

Michael Best	Robin Munday
David Bulmer	Angie Singleton
Geoff Clarke	Andrew Turpin
Carol Goodall	Linda Vijeh
Jenny Kenton	Martin Wale
Nigel Mermagen	

### County Council Members:

Cathy Bakewell (until 6.45 p.m.)  
John Dyke

### Officers:

Andrew Gillespie	Area Development Manager (West)
Zoë Harris	Community Regeneration Officer
David Norris	Development Manager
Adrian Noon	Major Applications Co-ordinator
Nick Whitsun-Jones	Legal Services Manager
Andrew Blackburn	Committee Administrator

### Also Present:

Ian McWilliams Planning Liaison Officer (Highways), Somerset County Council

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

## 16. Minutes (Agenda item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 20th January 2010, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

## 17. Apologies for Absence (Agenda item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Simon Bending, Ric Pallister, Ros Roderigo and Dan Shortland and County Councillors Anne Larpent and Jill Shortland.

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

Cllr. Mike Best declared his personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application no. 08/04348/FUL (Erection of 100 no. dwellings together with associated roads, parking, sub-station, open space and affordable housing provision, Bradfords Site, Station Road, Misterton) as comments had been submitted by Crewkerne Town Council on which he also served as a councillor.

Cllr. Mike Best also declared his personal and prejudicial interest in planning application no. 08/05302/R3D (The retention of part of Henhayes temporary car park for a period of two years, Recreation Ground, Henhayes Lane, Crewkerne) as he also served as a councillor on Crewkerne Town Council who were the owners of the land subject of this application.

---

## **19. Public Question Time (Agenda item 4)**

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

---

## **20. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 5)**

No announcements were made by the Chairman.

---

## **21. Budget Monitoring Report for the Period Ending 31st December 2009 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 6)**

The Area Development Manager (West) summarised the agenda report, which updated members on the current financial position of the Area West budgets as at the end of December 2009.

The Area Development Manager referred to the recommendation to return the £25,000 currently allocated to the 2008/09 Community Forum Projects to the unallocated balance in the Area Reserve, the reason for which was set out in the agenda report. The Area Development Manager informed members of the expected outcome with regard to the spend on the Opportunity Events during which he outlined the latest position in respect of the award of the grants to the successful local improvement projects. It was noted that 33 of the projects had been completed whilst 6 had been partially completed. He also reported that one of the grant awards would not now be made because the project concerned did not go ahead. The overall outturn on the expenditure for the Opportunity Events was expected to be £89,674, which was within the £90,000 budget originally allocated.

In response to the request of the Committee, the Area Development Manager agreed to e-mail members the detailed information with regard to the spend on the Opportunity Events.

In referring to the Capital Programme, the Area Development Manager particularly mentioned the Mitchell Gardens Play Area Scheme in Chard and was pleased to report that the scheme was now moving forward at greater speed with the build planned to start in Spring 2010 with completion in the summer.

During the ensuing discussion, the Area Development Manager responded to members' comments on points of detail including the following:-

- it was confirmed that partially completed projects in respect of grants awarded at the Opportunity Events should be completed by the end of the financial year unless there were extenuating circumstances;
- the adverse variance of £10,000 due to a fall in market income was a revised forecast and slightly better than that reported earlier in the year. Discussions were taking place with the Area Development Manager (South) to try and find a way to improve the markets and revitalise town centres. The Chairman mentioned that the new Area Development Manager (South) had only recently taken up her post and would be addressing this matter in due course;
- the Area Development Manager confirmed that the transfer of the Equalities and Diversity budget to the Assistant Director - Communities had resulted from the recent management restructure, which had meant that he was no longer responsible for that service.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that the current financial position of the Area West budgets for the period ending 31st December 2009 be noted;
- (2) that the £25,000 currently allocated to the 2008/09 Community Forum Projects be returned to the unallocated balance in the Area Reserve.

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

(Resolution passed without dissent).

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

## **22. Area West Rural Community Transport – Community Cars Scheme (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 7)**

The Community Regeneration Officer summarised the agenda report, which provided details of a project that had arisen through the South Somerset Together Local Strategic Partnership to develop a network of community cars schemes across South Somerset.

The Community Regeneration Officer explained the reasons for the proposal to develop and promote community cars schemes, which would provide a valuable service for local residents with access issues living in rural locations. Reference was also made to a Development Worker being required to carry out the development of such schemes. The Community Regeneration Officer further summarised the costs of the project, which amounted to £25,000 to which the Committee was asked to consider making a financial contribution of £5,000. The Committee also noted the other potential funding partners, details of which were set out in the agenda report.

During the ensuing discussion the officers responded to a number of issues raised by members. Points addressed included the extent of any involvement of parish councils in the scheme, the recompense and skill of drivers, sustainability of the scheme compared with other public transport services, responsibility for the payment of fees for CRB checks, impact on drivers' car insurance policies, whether a log would be kept of journeys undertaken, whether it would be better for schemes to become a registered charity, length of the appointment of the Development Worker, the potential for setting up the scheme as a community car club, whether schemes would generate complaints from

taxi firms, the possibility of a contract with taxi firms to provide this service, the need for suitable vehicles to enable elderly people to get in and out, the level of bureaucracy that may be required to run schemes, reasons for the cost of £25,000 to develop the project, whether there was a demand for such schemes, comparison with hospital car schemes and concerns about the possibility of receiving funding from the County Council. It was also suggested that it would be worthwhile considering the details of those Community Cars Schemes that operate already.

The Area Development Manager (West) acknowledged that there were a number of issues that had been raised by members but asked that the Committee agree in principle at this meeting to support the project to enable officers to explore it further and bring additional details back to the Committee. In response to comments, the Area Development Manager reported that the funding would be a one-off provision and that there was no suggestion of ongoing funding.

The majority of members were of the view that the scheme should be supported in principle but that further consideration be deferred pending a report being submitted to the Committee giving more information on issues raised.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) that it be agreed in principle to support a project to develop Community Cars Schemes across South Somerset subject to match funding from all other partners;
  - (2) that £5,000 be allocated towards the Community Cars Project from the Area West Service Enhancement Budget 2009-10;
  - (3) that further consideration of the project be deferred pending a report being submitted to the next meeting of the Committee giving information on issues raised by members including details on car insurance cover, CRB checks, type and condition of vehicles, community car clubs and on those community car schemes that operate already.

**Reason:** To consider a request to develop Community Cars Schemes across South Somerset.

(Cllr. Geoff Clarke wished his dissent to the proposals to be recorded.)

*(Zoë Harris, Community Regeneration Officer - 01460 260423)  
(zoe.harris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

## 23. Area West Committee - Forward Plan (Agenda item 8)

Reference was made to the agenda report, which informed members of the proposed Area West Committee Forward Plan.

The Area Development Manager (West) further reported that a report would be submitted to the March 2010 meeting regarding the Community Grants Strategy.

**RESOLVED:** that the Area West Committee Forward Plan as attached to the agenda be noted including the additional report referred to above.

(Resolution passed without dissent).

*(Andrew Gillespie, Area Development Manager (West) - 01460 260426)*  
*(andrew.gillespie@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

## **24. Reports from Members on Outside Organisations (Agenda item 9)**

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

---

## **25. Feedback on Planning Applications Referred to the Regulation Committee (Agenda item 10)**

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

**NOTED.**

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

---

## **26. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 11)**

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

**NOTED.**

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

---

## **27. Date and Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda item 13)**

Members noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held in the Henhayes Centre, Crewkerne on Wednesday, 17th March 2010 at 5.30 p.m.

**NOTED.**

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

---

## **28. Planning Applications (Agenda item 12)**

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).

**08/04348/FUL (Pages 1 - 10) - The erection of 100 no. dwellings together with associated roads, parking, sub-station, open space and affordable housing provision (GR 345407/108646), Bradfords Site, Station Road, Misterton - Betterment Properties (Wey) Ltd.**

Prior to consideration of the application, the Legal Services Manager referred to a letter that members would have received from the applicant about their perception of the way in which the application had been dealt with by the planning unit. He advised members that if the applicant wished to pursue a complaint, it would need to be dealt with under the complaints procedure and was not a matter that was relevant to the determination of the planning application at this meeting.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report, during which he confirmed that the application had been amended to address concerns raised by officers regarding the design and layout. He referred to the extant permission from 2004, which was subject to the sole obligation of 16.97% affordable housing, having now expired. The application before the Committee, however, was subject to current planning policies under which additional obligations were required. The applicants had stated, however, that they were not able to offer the obligations in respect of sports, leisure and arts facilities, additional affordable housing, education facilities, highway improvements and travel planning as they claimed it would make the development unviable. He further reported that the Council had sought an independent appraisal of the viability of the proposed development from the District Valuer who suggested that the development would be viable with the financial obligations sought and 20% affordable housing if grant funding were available, or 10% without grant funding. The Major Applications Co-ordinator also indicated that the applicant had declined to negotiate further with regard to the requested planning obligations.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator further reported that the final comments of Network Rail regarding the foot crossing over the railway line had now been received, the details of which he read out to the Committee. Members noted the reasons for Network Rail being of the view that the provision of a footbridge at the rail crossing should be provided and that a planning approval conditional upon the provision of a footbridge would be appropriate. The Major Applications Co-ordinator pointed out that although this constituted a reversal of opinion in the context of this application, these latest comments were consistent with Network Rail's previous position. As an alternative it was suggested by Network Rail that the applicant may wish to explore the diversion of the footpath to the east and the underpass at the other side of the field.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator also reported the comments of the Council's Portfolio Holder for Housing who was of the view that as this was not a strategic site the District Council should not accept anything less than the full planning gain obligations without the support of the District Valuer. He also felt that any lesser contributions should be a matter for discussion as part of the District Council/County Council brokering process.

In conclusion, the Major Applications Co-ordinator reported that although the applicants had provided all the necessary changes to the detail and layout the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds of the failure to satisfactorily provide for the necessary planning obligations set out in the agenda report. He also asked that, in light of the comments of Network Rail, the reasons for refusal be amended by adding an additional reason (e) to the second reason for refusal relating to the failure to make provision for improvements to the foot crossing over the railway line and consequently that the proposal would also be contrary to Policy TP1 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policy 42 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan.

The officers then responded to members' questions on points of detail. Points addressed included whether there was any mention of a compromise in respect of the provision of a



rail head, the arrangement between the developer and Network Rail regarding the station car park facilities, whether cycling provisions could be specified, the extent of evidence of misbehaviour at the rail crossing and whether the provision of housing on the site may actually reduce less desirable behaviour, matters regarding the footpath and possible use of the existing underpass, confirmation that the policies mentioned to support the additional reason for refusal were the most relevant to safe pedestrian links and clarification that the Council's Housing Unit would ensure a spread of affordable housing provision throughout a development. With reference to a comment about financial costs to the applicant of providing the development, the Major Applications Co-ordinator reported that there was a need for negotiations to take place but the applicant had declined to do so.

The Committee then noted the comments of the representative of Misterton Parish Council, Ms. D. Bradly, who indicated that the application for 100 homes was broadly supported, which had been demonstrated at a public meeting. It was felt, however, that a safe crossing of the railway should be provided. Reference was made to the concerns about the rail crossing and to the natural route for pedestrians to certain parts of the village being via the footpath crossing in comparison to the longer road route, which could also lead to more car use. She further indicated that the Parish Council felt that there could be a tragedy if a safe rail crossing was not provided and to the considered view being that the level of risk was unacceptable. Reference was also made to a possible solution being the use of part of the play area at the south east of the proposed development being used for more housing. If an appeal was submitted by the applicant and the application allowed, the Parish Council would like the affordable housing units to be mixed within the development.

Mr. P. Smith, a supporter of the application, commented that he acted for Bradfords and that it had taken 14 years to achieve the previous planning consent for this site. He indicated that the scheme that was agreed had been welcomed by people in the village. He also referred to having had intensive discussions with Network Rail and to their having acknowledged that the existing crossing was not acceptable. Reference was also made to the Area West Committee at that time having indicated that it was not acceptable to put the burden of the cost of improvements to the rail crossing on the developer. He felt that the only thing that had changed was the increase in the train timetable. The view was expressed that this was a well-used crossing point at present and that Network Rail should improve it. He referred to it being unlikely that a footbridge would be provided as he had looked at it with Network Rail and the cost was enormous. Reference was made to the proposed development bringing forward much needed housing and improvements to the station car park and access. He further commented that the market had changed and that the amount of contributions being sought by the Council was unreasonable. He urged the Committee to grant the application, which would tidy up the area.

The applicant's agent, Mr. M. Brown, felt that his clients had gone to considerable efforts to negotiate. He commented that the application had been submitted in 2008 but to having only recently had information on the contributions towards planning obligations. He also took issue with the comments of the District Valuer, which he felt were academic and ignored the real costs of providing housing on the site. He further commented on the costs incurred by his client relating to this site and felt that doubling the affordable housing provision together with the other contributions including the unknown costs for the rail crossing would make the scheme totally unviable. He also felt that recreational facilities were good in Misterton and that improvements being talked of would not benefit home owners on the site. He further understood that there was enough provision for education at present. Comment was also expressed that if the applicant went to appeal the Council would need to substantiate its requirements in respect of the affordable housing and planning obligations. He referred to the application providing improved access, visual improvements and the maintenance of employment during construction.

In responding to comments made, the Major Applications Co-ordinator reported that he did not feel that there had been any delay in notifying the applicant of requests for contributions

and cited the example that they had been notified on the day the leisure contribution was known in March 2009. He also referred to the 35% affordable housing requirement being known very early on. The Major Applications Co-ordinator further indicated that the full costs of the obligations requested by the Council's specialist units were not necessarily being sought and could be subject to negotiations based on the District Valuer's report but the applicant had declined. The Development Manager mentioned that the lack of negotiations was the issue and also referred to there being a protocol in South Somerset for the discussion of the provision of affordable housing under which the Council must be satisfied that the amount provided was the best that could be achieved.

Cllr. Angie Singleton, one of the ward members, expressed her view that the Council would not be doing its job if it did not take account of the District Valuer's appraisal of the application. She referred to trying to achieve a development that would be integrated within the community. The focus seemed to have been on the rail crossing, and the comments of Network Rail about the increased timetable were noted, but she felt that there were other issues that were equally important. She referred to 100 homes meaning a lot of families and to the village having a vibrant school, which it was hoped new residents would take advantage of together with leisure facilities. She remarked that she was disappointed with the lack of negotiations, including with Network Rail, and proposed the officers recommendation that the application be refused.

Cllr. Mike Best, also a ward member, supported the comments of Cllr. Singleton. He commented that this development in Misterton was significant and deserved to have a supporting structure. He also was disappointed that the applicants would not negotiate and seconded the proposal that the application be refused.

The Committee then noted the comments of County Councillor John Dyke who felt that this was a significant application for the village, which would increase the housing by about one third. In referring to the rail crossing he felt that few people used it currently unless they needed to. If 100 houses were built on this site, he felt that the natural route would be for people to cross the railway for the village hall, recreation field, children's playground, tennis and football clubs. If a good crossing was provided he felt that it would be a better and safer route than the road. Reference was also made to the increase in trains including non-stopping trains and he was of the view that a thorough risk analysis should be undertaken of the rail crossing. He further commented that if the proposed development was to be a part of the village there would be a need to have an access to those facilities. He also commented on the lack of negotiations.

Cllr. Geoff Clarke, also a ward member, referred to there being a number of issues with this application and expressed his view that there was insufficient information to enable it to be discussed at this meeting. He felt that the application should be deferred for more information.

The Development Manager advised members of his view that the necessary information was available to enable the Committee to determine the application at this meeting.

In response to a comment from a member, the Legal Services Manager advised that any 'ransom strip' payment received by Network Rail in relation to the proposed development was not a relevant planning consideration and should be discounted when determining this application.

A member, in indicating that she could not go along with the recommendation of refusal, commented that taking into account the probable economic position of people who would occupy the proposed houses, she presumed that they would pay to use facilities. She also understood that schools were under threat of falling rolls and questioned the justification for an education contribution. Although a contribution to a rail crossing may be necessary she did not feel that the applicants should be wholly responsible. As this was not a key site, the



view was expressed that the authority should not be looking for contributions towards education and leisure facilities.

In response to comments made, the Major Applications Co-ordinator reported that the authority was willing to move to a position in line with the District Valuer's appraisal of the viability of the development but the applicant was not willing to enter into negotiations. He also indicated that not seeking a contribution would not comply with the Council's usual protocol in dealing with such applications and that there were deficiencies in the facilities in the village that had been identified.

The majority of members indicated that they could not support the application and were of the view that it should be refused for the reasons set out in the agenda report together with the amendments suggested by the Major Applications Co-ordinator relating to no acceptable justification having been put forward for the failure to make provision for improvements to the foot crossing over the railway line and also that the proposal would be contrary to Policy TP1 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policy 42 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan. In addition, it was considered that the first sentence of the second reason for refusal should be amended to read "This development of 100 residential units makes no appropriate provision for infrastructure improvements necessary to reasonably mitigate the impact of the development on the community", the word "appropriate" having been added. Comment was expressed by a member that, as an authority, the advice of the District Valuer could not be ignored and negotiations should take place, which did not seem possible given the current stance of the applicants.

**RESOLVED:** that planning application no. 08/04348/FUL be refused for the following reasons:-

1. This development of 100 residential units with 17 affordable units would fail to adequately provide for affordable housing. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the development cannot provide nearer to 35% affordable housing justified by the evidence available to the District Council. As such the proposal would fail to contribute to a sustainable and balanced community and is therefore contrary to policy HG7 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Goal 9 of the South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy.
2. This development of 100 residential units makes no appropriate provision for infrastructure improvements necessary to reasonably mitigate the impact of the development on the community. No acceptable justification has been put forward for this failure to make provision for:-
  - (a) a road crossing within the village;
  - (b) improvements to local education facilities;
  - (c) improvements to sports, arts and leisure facilities;
  - (d) robust travel planning;
  - (e) improvements to the foot crossing over the railway line

and as such the proposal would fail to contribute to a sustainable community contrary to policies ST5, ST10, TP1, TR2, CR2 and CR3 of the South Somerset Local Plan, Goal 3 of the South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy and policies 42, 49 and 50 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan.

(9 in favour, 2 against)

**08/05302/R3D (Pages 11 - 15) - The retention of part of Henhayes temporary car park for a period of two years (GR 344363/109664), Recreation Ground, Henhayes Lane, Crewkerne - South Somerset District Council.**

Cllr. Mike Best, having declared his personal and prejudicial interest in this application, withdrew from the meeting during its consideration and determination.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He confirmed that the application had been submitted before the previous temporary permission had lapsed and to negotiations having taken place between the Highway Authority and District Council Engineering unit as a result of which an assessment would be made of any highway impact by monitoring the usage of the parking spaces.

In updating members, the Major Applications Co-ordinator reported the details of further comments received from Crewkerne Town Council who supported the retention of the car park but stressed that it was a temporary solution and that all efforts must be made to find alternative long term parking and the playing fields reinstated once the temporary period was over.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator reported that the recommendation was one of approval subject to the condition set out in the agenda report, which included requiring the use of the land as a car park to cease by 1st February 2011.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr. M. Fox in objection to the application. He referred to no reference having been made to a travel plan for Crewkerne and to how this car park would fit in with such a plan. He felt there was a need to consider why another area could not be redesignated for car parking and commented that the current location was taking over part of a green space. He also spoke of a need for a plan incorporating cycling facilities, car parks and public transport.

Mr. B. Hartshorn, also spoke in objection to the application and referred to there being a presumption that there was a need for additional car parking but he believed that the presumption arose from circumstances that existed in 2006 when certain large housing developments were expected to happen. He referred to figures that he had received from the Council's Engineering unit, which showed under capacity in some car parks. He also referred to his own inspection of the car parks, which showed that they were at no more than 50% of their capacity at the time of his survey. He expressed his view that there were plenty of car parking spaces that could be redesignated. He further mentioned that the Waitrose store had now been built and consequently there was no need for additional spaces arising from that development. Reference was also made to a letter from Crewkerne Town Council in 2004 relating to the need to find additional parking spaces and to the lengthy time period for discussions that had since elapsed. He referred to there being a covenant on the land on which the temporary car park was situated relating to it being used for recreational purposes only, which he hoped would be upheld.

In response to comments, the Legal Services Manager advised that the covenant was a private legal matter, which should be disregarded in determining this planning application. The Major Applications Co-ordinator commented that the Council had evidence from parking fee records on the use of the car parks. He also indicated that the application was submitted before the permission had lapsed and that there were a lot of unknowns about the impact of the Waitrose development at that time. He also referred to monitoring of the temporary car park being asked for by the Highway Authority.

Cllr. Geoff Clarke, one of the ward members, commented that he remembered that there was a covenant but at the time there was a need for the provision of additional parking

spaces during the Waitrose development and he felt that the action taken had been the correct thing to do. As far as car parking was concerned he commented that the provision of short-term parking had been solved but long term parking was still an issue. He supported the recommendation to grant permission but only until February 2011.

Cllr. Angie Singleton, also a ward member, referred to the issue being not just the present situation. She mentioned that a Lidl foodstore would be opening shortly and that M & Co would be opening a shop in the future, both of which would attract people to the town. Although she did not dispute the figures given by Mr. Hartshorn, she referred to the Council having information over a longer period of time from the car park ticket machines upon which usage was based. She felt that it would be short-sighted to go against the Planning Officer's recommendation now until it was seen how things worked out. She welcomed the suggestion that a travel plan be drawn up and felt that this was something that could be discussed by the ABCD (A Better Crewkerne and District) community group.

During the ensuing discussion, varying views were expressed by members. Some members were of the view that there was not sufficient evidence presented at this meeting on the need or to justify the granting of the application. Concern was also expressed about the length of time that discussions had already been going on with regard to identifying an alternative location for the provision of long-term parking spaces.

The majority of members, however, indicated their support for the application to be granted for the temporary period ending 1st February 2011. Comment was expressed that granting the application would effectively give a further year to enable the position with regard to finding an alternative permanent solution to be dealt with. Reference was also made to evidence of need being available from the car parking receipts and the District Council's car park strategy. The Chairman hoped that the Town Council and District Council could work together to find an alternative for the provision of the long term car parking. She also supported the suggestion that work be undertaken with ABCD to look at a travel plan for Crewkerne.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to condition 1 as set out in the agenda report.

(6 in favour, 4 against)

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

.....  
 Chairman