

MEETING AW.05:1011
DATE 15:09:10

South Somerset District Council

Draft Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held at the Henhayes Centre, off South Street, Crewkerne on **Wednesday, 15th September 2010**.

(6.00 p.m. – 10.30 p.m.)

Present:

Members: Kim Turner (in the Chair)

| | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Simon Bending | Ric Pallister |
| Michael Best | Ros Roderigo |
| David Bulmer | Dan Shortland (until 10.00 p.m.) |
| Geoff Clarke | Angie Singleton |
| Carol Goodall | Andrew Turpin |
| Jenny Kenton | Linda Vijeh (until 7.05 p.m.) |
| Nigel Mermagen | Martin Wale |

Also Present:

Tim Carroll

Officers:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Andrew Gillespie | Area Development Manager (West) |
| Zoë Harris | Community Regeneration Officer (West) |
| Alice Knight | Third Sector and Partnership Manager |
| Andrew Gunn | Area Lead West – Development Control |
| Adrian Noon | Area Lead North/East – Development Control |
| John Millar | Planning Officer (West) |
| Colin McDonald | Corporate Strategic Housing Manager |
| Amy Cater | Solicitor |
| Andrew Blackburn | Committee Administrator |

Also Present:

Carl Brinkman Team Leader, Highway Development Control, SCC

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

48. Minutes (Agenda item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 18th August 2010, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

49. Apologies for Absence (Agenda item 2)

An apology for absence was received from Cllr. Robin Munday.

50. Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 3)

Cllrs. Dave Bulmer, Jenny Kenton and Martin Wale declared their personal but non-prejudicial interests in planning application no. 10/02904/FUL (Demolition of existing dwellings and the erection of 21 new dwellings with associated parking facilities, land at Ken Close, Chard) as comments had been submitted by Chard Town Council on which they also served as councillors.

Cllr. Kim Turner declared her personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application no. 09/00051/OUT (Demolition of factory complex, mixed use employment development consisting of B1, B2 and B8 uses, formation of vehicular accesses, public highway, flood mitigation and related works, Horlicks Farm Land at Hort Bridge, Station Road, Ilminster) as comments had been submitted by Ilminster Town Council on which she also served as a councillor.

Cllr. Andrew Turpin declared his personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application no. 10/01982/FUL (The erection of a replacement dwelling and garage, Pipping Hill, Tatworth Street, Tatworth) as comments had been submitted by Tatworth and Forton Parish Council on which he also served as a councillor.

Cllr. Ros Roderigo declared her personal interest in agenda item 6 regarding Crowshute House, Chard as she had been appointed by the District Council to serve on that organisation. As the item on the agenda was for noting only it was not considered that the interest was prejudicial.

Cllr. Angie Singleton declared her personal interest in agenda item 7 regarding the progress of ABCD (A Better Crewkerne and District) and the Crewkerne Community Plan as she was a member of ABCD. As the item on the agenda was for noting only it was not considered that the interest was prejudicial.

Cllr. Mike Best declared his personal interest in agenda item 7 regarding the progress of ABCD (A Better Crewkerne and District) and the Crewkerne Community Plan as he had been appointed by the District Council to serve on that organisation. As the item on the agenda was for noting only it was not considered that the interest was prejudicial.

51. Public Question Time (Agenda item 4)

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

52. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 5)

The Chairman referred to this year's planning tour in Area West and mentioned that members would be informed of the date once arrangements had been made. Members were asked to let the Development Manager know of any sites that they would find of interest to assist him in drawing up an itinerary for the tour.

53. Crowshute House, Chard (Agenda item 6)

The Third Sector and Partnership Manager referred to the agenda report, which informed members of the potential transfer of Crowshute House, Chard to Crowshute Centre Ltd. She further reported that the Council had recently updated its asset transfer policy and that the transfer of Crowshute House was a pilot project using the revised procedures. She also

mentioned that although it was not part of the policy for this matter to come to the Area West Committee it was felt that it would be useful for representatives of the organisation to inform members of their vision for the future in respect of the development of Crowshute House as an asset for the community.

Members welcomed John Phillips, Secretary of the Crowshute House Committee and Dave Hill, Chairman. Mr. Phillips gave a presentation during which he informed members of the background and history of Crowshute House together with details of the organisations that made up and used the centre. It was noted that the building was also let out to other groups. Reference was made to their being a passion to provide the local community with an affordable centre for recreation and the performing arts accessible to all areas of the community. He further informed the Committee of the current situation and detailed the strategic aims and the work that was being carried out to produce coherent plans in the short and medium term for the future of Crowshute House under a restructured organisation and to ensure that the centre was a viable concern. Reference was also made to the potential risks involved. In summary he referred to the wish to see the building as Chard's community centre.

During the ensuing discussion, members thanked the representatives for attending the meeting and congratulated the organisation for having the passion and courage to grasp this opportunity and wished them every success in providing this asset for the community.

The Third Sector and Partnership Manager further reported that there had been an interest shown from other areas in this process and that a list had been collated of other Council assets, which may be able to follow a similar route. A member referred to all the work that had been done in respect of Crowshute House and suggested that it be used as a good practice example for any similar situations. The Third Sector and Partnership Manager reported that a good practice plan was being drawn up.

The Committee concurred with the comments of the Chairman who suggested that the Council's asset transfer policy should be amended to ensure that in future Area Committees are consulted prior to any District Executive decision on transfer of assets in their area.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that the Crowshute Centre Ltd. vision for development of Crowshute House as an asset for the community be noted;
- (2) that it be recommended to District Executive that the asset transfer policy be amended to ensure that in future Area Committees are consulted prior to any decision being made on the transfer of assets in their area.

(Resolution passed without dissent).

(Andrew Gillespie, Area Development Manager (West) – 01460 260426)

(andrew.gillespie@southsomerset.gov.uk)

(Alice Knight, Third Sector & Partnership Manager – 01963 435061)

(alice.knight@southsomerset.gov.uk)

54. Progress of ABCD (A Better Crewkerne and District) and the Crewkerne Community Plan (Agenda item 7)

Reference was made to the agenda report, which provided members with an update on the work of ABCD and the progression of projects identified in the Crewkerne Community Plan. The Community Regeneration Officer referred to this being a good example of what could be achieved by working in partnership in the community.

Diane Butler, Chairman of ABCD and Martin Pakes, who chaired the Urban Design Framework Group, which was a sub-group of ABCD, were welcomed to the meeting.

Diane Butler gave a presentation during which she informed members that all the projects that had been developed had arisen from the Community Plan and fitted in with its themes. She indicated that the project list had been reviewed and informed members of the details of a number of projects including the "Crewkerne in Motion" booklet, which gave information about the wide variety of transport services available in the town. It was noted that the booklet was kept up to date and was in its third reprint. Reference was also made to the Crewkerne Arts Exhibition and Arts Trail, including a jazz gathering, and to a leaflet that had been produced giving details of all the shops located in the town centre. She also mentioned that work was being undertaken to provide a street map board in the town.

Martin Pakes also gave a presentation during which he referred to an appraisal of the Crewkerne Conservation Area having been carried out and to work being undertaken with the District Council to extend the conservation area of the town. He also referred to the "Crewkerne Clutter Clear Out" involving the removal of a number of redundant poles and signs, refurbishment of finger posts and the replacement and relocation of litter bins. A second phase involving rationalising and resiting traffic directional signs was also taking place. A community noticeboard was also to be provided. He referred to traffic problems in the town and to work that was ongoing to produce a draft traffic management scheme, which included discussions with the County Council and public consultation, and hoped that it would provide a fresh approach to the use of shared space and traffic management in the town. Reference was also made to a scheme to provide a pedestrian link between Falkland Square and the George Precinct to which three landowners had agreed to contribute in addition to grants received from the District Council's Market Towns Investment Group and local County Councillor. He further referred to other matters needing attention and to wishing to have a blueprint for the future.

Both speakers acknowledged the assistance received in progressing these projects through partnership working with Crewkerne Town Council, South Somerset District Council, Somerset County Council and other local voluntary and community groups.

In response to the comments of a member, the Community Regeneration Officer reported that the pedestrian link between Falkland Square and the George Precinct was too narrow at one end to accommodate its use as a cyclepath.

Cllr. Angie Singleton, one of the ward members, commented that the projects that were being carried out were good examples of the use of Market Towns Investment Group funding and showed what could be done with a relatively small amount of money. She also commented that it was fortunate that there were volunteers who were willing to give so much of their time. She referred to ABCD feeling that there was a need to refresh the Community Plan and were looking at other ways of funding and supporting it. To help sustainability, she felt that there was a need for the local authority to invest in those things that the community did not have the resources to carry through. She further commented that when the original Community Plan was put together, many local organisations were consulted. She referred to the need for help with reviewing the plan but as the Council's officers were becoming more stretched she felt it was difficult to know where the help would come from.

The Area Development Manager (West) commented that new ways were being looked at to engage people in community plans and to build on the existing good practice and the work already done, which he felt was about bringing this form of planning work into the mainstream.

Reference was made by a member to the benefits to the community of this form of working. The Chairman also referred to working in partnership being really important and that she would fight to get continuing funding for the Market Towns Investment Group.

The Committee thanked Diane Butler and Martin Pakes for attending the meeting and for their continuing work. Members were pleased to note the progress being made.

NOTED.

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

55. 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.

RESOLVED: that the Area West Committee Forward Plan as attached to the agenda be noted.

(Resolution passed without dissent).

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

56. Reports from Members on Outside Organisations (Agenda item 9)

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

57. 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)*

58. Planning Appeals (Agenda item 11)

The Committee noted the details contained in the agenda report, which informed members of a planning appeal that had been lodged.

NOTED.

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

59. Date and Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda item 13)

Members noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held at the Shrubbery Hotel, Station Road, Ilminster on Wednesday, 20th October 2010 at 5.30 p.m.

NOTED.

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

60. 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).

10/02904/FUL (Pages 1-13) – Demolition of existing dwellings and the erection of 21 new dwellings with associated parking facilities (GR 332545/108141), land at Ken Close, Chard – Yarlington Housing Group

The Chairman asked if any members had viewed the site independently and ten members indicated positively.

Prior to summarising the details of the application, the Area Lead West updated members. He reported the comments of Chard Town Council who were of the view that the application should be refused. The Town Council felt that the density was too high and that there was insufficient parking provision for new residents and for those residents whose parking had been displaced. Concerns were also expressed regarding potential disturbance by construction traffic and with regard to the implementation of the proposed Construction and Environmental Management Plan, the design and layout of the north west part of the site and traffic/pedestrian safety. The Area Lead West also indicated that he had sought clarification from the applicants regarding the location of the contractor's compound, (which would be within the application site); location of displaced parking during construction works (six spaces would be provided within the site); and whether the proposed parking places would be allocated to specific properties (parking for new residents would be differentiated from that for residents who were displaced).

The Area Lead West then referred to page 5 of the agenda report and clarified that the reference to the Area Development Team related to the Area West Development Team. He also referred to page 9 of the agenda and clarified that the last sentence of the second

paragraph under the sub-heading “Impact on Amenity” should have read “With regard to the Police Architectural Liaison Officer’s previous comments, the applicant has provided amended drawings that show the requested adjustments to plots 5 and 6”. The Area Lead West also mentioned that the plans referred to in condition 2 were those relating to the previous application and were not relevant as far as the current application was concerned. The condition would therefore need amending to include the correct references to the submitted plans in respect of the current application. He also wished to amend the last sentence of condition 3 regarding the submission of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan to read “The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with such details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority”, the word “strict” having been added.

The Area Lead West, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He referred to the key considerations to be taken into account including design and detailing, layout and landscaping, impact on amenity and access and parking. He referred particularly to the parking provision and the potential level of disruption during construction works being matters of contention. He fully explained how the number of parking spaces had been determined and how they were to be accommodated. He also mentioned that the current application included one extra parking space from that shown on the previous application. With reference to disruption during construction works he mentioned that there were limited powers. A condition was recommended to be included requiring the submission of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan and he indicated that such a plan would form a key part of the tender process, which he felt should overcome some of the previous experiences.

With reference to the recommended Section 106 Planning Obligation, the Area Lead West confirmed that, as the proposals involved 14 replacement dwellings and only an uplift of 7 new dwellings, the threshold for the provision of sports, arts and leisure contributions and affordable housing was not exceeded and therefore such contributions would not be sought as part of the planning obligation. A contribution would, however, be sought towards junction improvements to the A30/A358 junction as part of the Chard Regeneration Plan.

The Corporate Strategic Housing Manager referred to the growing numbers of households on the housing register (6,000) and that approximately 12% of these needed to be re-housed in Chard, of which 207 had expressed a preference to be housed in the Jocelyn Ward, which clearly identified the need for social housing in this locality. He also referred to this application being the final phase of social housing development in Chard and to the continuing need for this type of housing. The Corporate Strategic Housing Manager stressed that his comments were not material in planning terms but that the wider context was germane to the matter in hand.

The Solicitor confirmed that although the Corporate Strategic Housing Manager had shown that there was a need for social housing, the Committee must consider the planning application on its own merits.

It was noted that the recommendation was one of approval subject to prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation and to a number of conditions.

The Area Lead West then responded to members’ questions and comments on points of detail. Points addressed included the history of the parking provision in the locality and how the number of parking spaces to be provided as part of this application had been determined, noting that recommended condition 10 would cover details of the allocation, marking out, signage and future management of the parking spaces; the reasons for the mix of semi-detached and terraced houses rather than just terracing; reference to the dwellings complying with the code for sustainable homes it being noted that the type of renewable energy to be used in the dwellings would be subject to a condition; the value and enforceability of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan; an explanation

of the preferences of the Conservation Officer in respect of the layout of the northern end of the site and reasons why they were not considered suitable; accessibility of the nearest bus stop and whether there were any provisions for safer cycling into the town. In response to a comment from a member, the Area Lead West confirmed that a condition could be included on any permission requiring the first floor window in the side elevation of plot 21 to be obscurely glazed with restricted opening.

The Committee then noted the comments of Ms. T. Thackeray, who also represented Mr. D. Fox, in objection to the application. Concern was expressed about the way the applicants had consulted residents and responded to comments regarding the impact on existing residents whose parking would be displaced as a result of the proposed development. She further referred to the number of parking spaces to be provided for those residents being inadequate. She also commented on other developments undertaken by the applicants where residents had been moved out of properties, including elderly persons bungalows, which had then remained empty for many months yet people were being told that there was a shortage of housing. Concerns were also expressed about overlooking from plot 21, which adjoined her property.

Ms. C. Sweet also spoke in objection and referred to the need for existing residents to be considered. She further referred to the need to ensure that there were sufficient parking places and queried where visitors were meant to park. Reference was also made to previous housing developments carried out by the applicants and to problems experienced with contractors' vehicles and concern expressed about the safety of children in the area.

The representative of the applicants, Mr. J. Shaw, commented that he felt that the Planning Officer's report was thorough. He referred to having spent two years negotiating with officers and to having tried to accommodate the matters that had been raised and answered their queries. In response to comments made, he indicated that cycle storage with a secure locking point was to be provided and the properties were to be built to sustainability code level 3, which was more efficient than those provided by most private developers. He referred to social housing always being built to a higher standard with regard to climate change issues and space. He also referred to terrace 'tunnels' not being suitable for communities and not being favoured by the Police. He also mentioned that he was aware of the problems that had arisen in respect of the impact of the construction process at the Bradfield Way development and commented that it was not in their interest to have this happen again. He indicated that any contractor would have to agree to a way of working in respect of this development. He hoped that the Committee would support the officer's recommendation of approval. He also responded to the comments of the Chairman with regard to the withdrawal of the previous application and the difference between that and the current application.

Cllr. Dave Bulmer, ward member, commented that the housing need was not in question. He was, however, alarmed about the parking issues that had arisen in respect of the proposed development. He referred to the units being for rental and low cost purchase. He also spoke of previous developments carried out by the applicants where problems had been experienced in their liaison with tenants. He felt that the residents favoured some form of development but that this particular scheme needed to be reconsidered and that parking should be provided for those residents whose parking had been displaced on the basis of 1.5 spaces per property. He also referred to the small piece of District Council land, part of which belonged to Somerset County Council, which would be needed for the development, concerning which there seemed to be no agreement as yet. He referred to there being a lot of unanswered questions about the proposals. Although noting there was a condition recommended regarding the allocation of parking spaces he was concerned that the information was not available now. He also expressed his view that there was a need for the spaces to be clearly defined. He felt that if the comments of the Conservation Officer on the layout of the scheme were adopted there would be an opportunity to provide more parking. He also explained why he had doubts about the effectiveness of a

Construction and Environmental Management Plan bearing in mind the problems experienced previously on other developments. With reference to comments about the provision of rear access for bins etc. he commented that Montague Way did not have rear access. In summary, although he felt that the concept of development could be accepted he had serious concerns about the layout and felt that the scheme should have been redesigned totally after the withdrawal of the earlier scheme.

Cllr. Martin Wale, a local member, supported the comments of the ward member and those of the Town Council. He was of the view that the proposals constituted overdevelopment and that they may not be suitable for purpose. He was also concerned about the parking provision. Although appreciating that the development was for the provision of social housing he did not feel that standards should be dropped for future generations.

Cllr. Nigel Mermagen, also a local member, felt that too many dwellings were being crowded in and that the plans constituted overdevelopment. He also considered that there was insufficient parking, which he felt should be taken into account and that the applicants should come back with another scheme rather than a resubmission of the earlier withdrawn application with one parking space added.

Cllr. Dan Shortland, also a local member, expressed concern regarding the road junction to the development, which he felt could be a problem because of visibility and referred to traffic not necessarily travelling slowly at this point. The Area Lead West reported that the Highway Authority had fully assessed the road layout and was satisfied that it was safe.

During discussion, varying views were expressed by members. Comment was expressed that although understanding the concerns that had been raised, it was not felt that there were any planning reasons to refuse the application. It was considered that the proposed development was acceptable and that, although issues had been raised about parking provision, it met the relevant requirements. Reference was also made to recommended condition 10 covering the details regarding the provision of parking and to the applicants making provision for existing residents. With reference to problems that had been experienced during the construction works on previous developments, a member commented that there would be a contracted arrangement in this case and expressed his view that, although there would inevitably be some disruption, it would be minimised this time. It was felt that it must be ensured that all conditions were complied with but that there were no valid reasons to refuse the application.

Other members concurred with the views of the ward and local members and could not support the application.

A member further commented on the desirability of making provision for a safe route for cyclists and access to bus routes. The Area Lead West advised that it would be unreasonable to require such a travel plan bearing in mind there were only 7 new dwellings to be provided. The suggestion of a member that consideration of the application be deferred to see if this could be achieved was not supported by members.

During the debate, the officers further clarified the reasons why the proposals were considered to be acceptable in planning terms, reference also being made to the Highway Authority having assessed the layout and indicated its support for the application, subject to conditions.

After further debate, it was proposed and seconded that the application be refused because of the unsatisfactory layout of the northern part of the site as highlighted by the Conservation Officer in his comments in the agenda report and the need for 1.5 parking spaces to be provided for those residents whose parking had been displaced. On being put to the vote 6 members voted in favour of refusal and 6 against with one abstention. The Chairman exercised her casting vote against the application being refused.

It was then proposed and seconded that the application be granted subject to the conditions and informative note set out in the agenda report but with the amendment of conditions 2 and 3 and the inclusion of additional conditions regarding renewable energy requirements and the treatment of the window in the side elevation of plot 21. It was also asked that the Area Chairman and ward member be consulted about the discharge of conditions 3 and 10. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried (7 in favour, 5 against, 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- (1) the prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation (in a form acceptable to the Council's Solicitor(s)) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued to ensure that a contribution of £2,520 is made towards junction improvements at the A30/A358;
- (2) conditions 1 and 4-19 and informative note 1 as set out in the agenda report;
- (3) the amendment of condition 2 to reflect the drawings submitted with this application as follows:-

"The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following approved plans: SK05 Rev H, SK06 Rev B, SK12 Rev A, SK15 Rev A, SK18, SK21, SK24, SK27, SK30, SK10 Rev A, SK13 Rev A, SK16, SK19, SK22, SK25 and SK28.

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

- (4) the amendment of the last sentence of condition 3 regarding the submission of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan to read "The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with such details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority", the word "strict" having been added;
- (5) the inclusion of additional conditions requiring the first floor window in the side elevation of plot 21 to be obscurely glazed and only operable in a manner to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and to require the applicant to agree details of renewable energy to be installed in each property prior to the erection of the dwellings;
- (6) that the Chairman and ward member be consulted regarding the discharge of conditions 3 (relating to the Construction and Environmental Management Plan) and 10 (relating to the management of parking spaces).

(7 in favour, 5 against, 1 abstention)

09/00051/OUT (Pages 14-32) – Demolition of factory complex, mixed use employment development consisting of B1, B2 and B8 uses, formation of vehicular accesses, public highway, flood mitigation and related works (GR 334579/115198), Horlicks Farm Land at Hort Bridge, Station Road, Ilminster – Alchemy Properties.

Prior to summarising the details of the application the Area Lead West, in updating members, referred to 12 conditions and 2 informative notes recommended to be included in any permission by the Highway Authority, details of which had been forwarded to members. He advised members of the content of the conditions and indicated that two had already been included within the recommended conditions set out in the agenda report. He further reported that the applicant's agent had indicated his agreement with the conditions except for one relating to the provision of the vehicular accesses to the site, which were split on different plots on either side of Station Road. The applicant had asked that the condition allow the accesses to come forward on a phased basis in order to make the proposals economically viable. The Area Lead West indicated that he considered this to be reasonable.

The Area Lead West then, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the history of the site and details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He referred to the key considerations to be taken into account including the principle of the development, highway issues, flooding issues and landscape impact. The Area Lead West referred particularly to recommended condition 1, which required the development to be commenced before the expiration of five years from the date of permission or before the expiration of three years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever was the later. He reported that the applicant, given the current economic climate, had requested that consideration be given to amending the condition to require the development to be commenced before the expiration of ten years rather than five. The Area Lead West was of the view, however, that the five year period would be sufficient.

It was noted that the recommendation was one of approval subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation and to a number of conditions.

The officers then answered members' questions on points of detail. Points addressed included the location of the Stop Line Way cycleway in relation to the site; confirmation that the applicant was content to provide reasonable cycle links to the boundary of the application site; the strength of one of the highway conditions; the impact of the development on the residential caravan park to the east of the site, it being noted that the height of the buildings would be covered by a design code, which would be dealt with when the reserved matters application was submitted. It was also clarified that it was for members to decide whether the period within which the development commenced should be amended.

A number of questions and concerns were raised about the flooding and drainage issues. The Area Lead West reported that the Environment Agency and the applicant's agent had worked closely to address those matters and that the Environment Agency was satisfied with the details and that the measures to be taken would adequately deal with the drainage issues. It was noted that the site would have a major attenuation scheme. A member expressed his view that there was a need to ensure that watercourses were maintained and the Area Lead West reported that a requirement could be included in the Section 106 planning obligation. A member queried whether the officers were satisfied that the details mentioned in the informative notes were covered by recommended condition 9. The Area Lead West indicated that the informative notes were all concerned with flooding and that he was satisfied that the conditions dealt with the issues that may arise. In response to a further comment, however, it was felt that the provision of sustainable water surface drainage works could be included within a condition.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr. H. Best, representing the Campaign to Protect Rural England. He deplored the loss of agricultural land but accepted that the application conformed to the adopted Local Plan. He felt that the application stressed the importance and dependence on the dualling of the A303/A358 but commented that the last Government had taken the dualling scheme out of the Regional Spatial Strategy and, given the current economic situation, he did not feel that the scheme would go forward. He further referred to it being important that the site did not flood or cause flooding to other areas and that zero run-off should be sought. If the development went ahead he felt it could be a fine gateway to Ilminster.

The applicant's agent, Mr. K. Scholz, commented that the development had been carefully considered since 2006. He referred to assessments having been submitted regarding environmental impact, transport, archaeology and flooding. With regard to the flooding issues he mentioned that a full assessment had been made with the Environment Agency and explained the details of the action that would be taken. He also referred to further ecology work to be done. Reference was made to the phasing of the development and to the site being significant in size. Given the economic constraints he indicated that it would be a difficult site to deliver hence the need for phasing and the request for a ten year period within which the development could be commenced. He felt that the issues had been dealt with regarding the application and commented that he was keen to work with the Council to bring it forward.

The Chairman asked if any members had viewed the site independently and 8 members indicated positively.

Cllr. Kim Turner, one of the ward members, referred to the application being with the Council for some time and to having had to wait for the Highways Agency to withdraw their holding direction. She also referred to this being a prime site and to the applicant's agent having worked hard with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to achieve an acceptable scheme. She felt that this scheme was preferable to the previous application and to a lot of work having been carried out with the agent. She understood the concerns about flooding and felt that, with the work that had been carried out with the Environment Agency, these matters would be resolved. She referred to this being an outline application rather than detailed but drew attention to the B1 use on the northern part of the site and its proximity to the residential caravan park, which she felt should be given consideration at the appropriate time. She concurred that the maintenance of watercourses should be a requirement to be included in the Section 106 planning obligation. She also commented that bearing in mind that this was a prime site she did not agree with amending the period within which the development should commence from five years to ten years.

Cllr. Carol Goodall, also a ward member, commented that the site needed to be developed and that it would make a fine gateway to Ilminster. She referred to having concerns about flooding and the impact of the B1 use on the residential caravan park but indicated her support for the application.

During the ensuing discussion, members indicated their support for the application to be granted. Further discussion ensued, however, on whether the period within which the development should commence should be amended to allow a longer time. Consideration was also given to the suggestion of the Area Lead North/East that a period of five years could be allowed for the submission of the reserved matters application and a longer period, say seven years, within which the development should commence and this was supported by members. With regard to the drainage issues it was agreed that an additional requirement be included within the Section 106 planning obligation relating to the maintenance of the watercourse and surface water drainage scheme and also the inclusion of the provision of sustainable surface water drainage works within recommended condition 8. The inclusion of the conditions as recommended by the Highway Authority was also agreed excluding the two (i.e. nos. 4 and 7 on the list of highway conditions circulated to

members) that were already covered by conditions set out in the agenda report. It was further agreed that the condition recommended by the Highway Authority relating to the vehicular accesses to be provided as part of the development be amended to allow the accesses to come forward on a phased basis.

The Committee noted the comments of a member who referred to the Council having a development management system for major applications, which should be applied to this site.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to:-

- (1) the prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation (in a form acceptable to the Council's Solicitor(s)) before the decision granting planning permission is issued, the said planning obligation to cover the following items:-
 - (i) a sum of £400 to be paid by the developer for bus travel vouchers for every 5 employees employed on the application site;
 - (ii) maintenance of watercourse, including floodbanks, berms, wetland area and in-channel structure, and the surface water drainage scheme;
- (2) conditions 2-7 and 9-31 and informative notes as set out in the agenda report;
- (3) the amendment of condition 1 to read as follows:-

“The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of seven years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of three years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.”
- (4) the amendment of condition 8 to read as follows:-

“No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of sustainable surface water drainage works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed.”
- (5) the inclusion of an additional condition as follows:-

“Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.”
- (6) the inclusion of the additional conditions and informative notes recommended by the Highway Authority excluding the two conditions that were covered by conditions already set out in the agenda report (i.e. nos. 4 and 7 on the list of highway conditions circulated to members) subject to the condition relating to the vehicular accesses to be provided as part of the development being amended to allow the accesses to come forward on a phased basis.

(Resolution passed without dissent)

10/01982/FUL (Pages 33-40) – The erection of a replacement dwelling and garage (GR 332858/105942), Pipping Hill, Tatworth Street, Tatworth – Mr. & Mrs. Alan Elmes.

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. He referred to the key considerations to be taken into account including the size and scale of the dwelling and the siting and height of the garage, about which concerns had been expressed by the Parish Council and some local residents. The Planning Officer explained the reasons why he considered the proposals to be acceptable and it was noted that the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

The Chairman asked if any members had viewed the site independently and five members indicated positively.

The Planning Officer then responded to members' questions on points of detail. Points addressed included confirmation that the existing property was to be demolished, clarification regarding the visibility of one of the adjoining houses, the layout and relationship with other properties and boundaries.

The applicant's agent, Mr. C. Hurt, referred to the history of the site, its built form and layout including details of the existing garage and its relationship in respect of the boundary of the site. It was recognised that the street scene was important and he indicated that he did not want a development that would be out of scale. He further mentioned that the proposals had been formulated in consultation with the Planning Officer.

Cllr. Andrew Turpin, ward member, commented that the street scene in this locality was deceptive. He indicated that the house to the right of the site was well recessed and could not be seen from one direction and was not evident in the street scene from the other. He referred, however, to there being a predominance of bungalows in the locality. He expressed his view that to have a dominating building next to a bungalow was out of keeping and agreed with the views of the Parish Council that the proposed development was too domineering in size and roof height. He also felt it was inappropriate in terms of layout and bulk.

During the ensuing discussion, some members indicated their sympathy with the views of the ward member. The majority of members, however, found the proposals acceptable and indicated their support for the officer's recommendation of approval.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to conditions 1-12 and informative note 1 as set out in the agenda report.

(9 in favour, 3 against)

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

.....
Chairman