

Area West Committee - 21st March 2012

Officer Report on Planning Application: 11/01082/FUL

| | |
|---|--|
| Proposal: | The erection of an agricultural workers dwelling. (GR 332965/106878) |
| Site Address: | Land At Barleclose Farm Two Ash Hill Tatworth |
| Parish: | Tatworth and Forton |
| TATWORTH AND FORTON Ward (SSDC Member) | Mr A Turpin (Cllr) |
| Recommending Case Officer: | John Millar Tel: (01935) 462465 Email: john.millar@southsomerset.gov.uk |
| Target date : | 4th May 2011 |
| Applicant : | Mr Keith Robbins |
| Agent: (no agent if blank) | Mr Robert Rhys Ash Barn Station Road Charlton Mackrell Somerton TA11 6AG |
| Application Type : | Minor Dwellings 1-9 site less than 1ha |

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application is to be considered by Area West Committee at the request of the Ward Member, with the agreement of the Area Chair. It is felt that the application should be given further consideration by members, to consider the agricultural justification for the erection of a dwelling in open countryside.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL



Barleclose Farm is sited on the south side of Two Ash Lane, to the west of the village of Forton and to the north of Tatworth. The application site is a farmyard comprising a group of agricultural buildings, with associated land of 15.14 acres, which together with other land farmed under a business tenancy agreement and freehold land in the immediate vicinity, forms a holding of approximately 140 acres. The site is located beyond any defined development area, in open countryside. There is one dwellinghouse immediately adjacent to the group of farm buildings, which was formerly associated with the unit but is now under different ownership being sold by the County Council in 2009.

The proposal is made for the erection of an agricultural workers dwelling with detached garage on land immediately to the east of the farm buildings and a former slurry lagoon. The proposed dwelling is a 3 bedroom, two-storey house to be finished with local natural stone and double Roman tiles.

HISTORY

04/01224/R3C: Erection of an agricultural general purpose building to replace fire damaged building - No objections.

20715 (1953): Proposed dwellinghouse and farm building - Approved.

POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 repeats the duty imposed under S54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and requires that decision must be made in accordance with relevant Development Plan Documents unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant Development Plan Documents

Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan:

STR1 - Sustainable Development

STR6 - Development outside Towns, Rural Centres and Villages

Policy 5 - Landscape Character

Policy 49 - Transport Requirements of New Development

South Somerset Local Plan 2006:

ST3 - Development Areas

ST5 - General Principles of Development

ST6 - The Quality of Development

EC3 - Landscape Character

EP9 - Control of Potentially Polluting Uses

HG15 - Agricultural and Forestry Dwellings

Policy-related Material Considerations:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy

Goal 5 - A competitive high performing economy that is diverse and adaptable.

Goal 8 - Sustainably sited and constructed high quality homes, buildings and public spaces where people can live and work in an environmentally friendly and healthy way.

Goal 11 - Protection and enhancement of our natural environment and biodiversity.

CONSULTATIONS

Parish Council:

December 2011: The Council had no further comments on this application.

3rd June 2011: The Parish Council does not support this application on grounds of: The application does not fulfil the required criteria of an agricultural dwelling.

3rd May 2011: The Council deferred this application as we are awaiting an answer on the ownership of sheep by the applicant. Although, the Council have changed this to ownership of livestock.

11th April 2011: The Council deferred this application as information in the appraisal does not concur with information, some of the councillors had previously been told.

The Council would like to be informed the ownership of the sheep, as stated in the appraisal, as it is believed that Mr Robins does not own the sheep.

The Council would like you to note that the council has not been previously consulted and the adjacent neighbour stated that she had not been previously consulted as stated in the Application for Planning Permission; No 8 Neighbour and Community Consultation.

SSDC Technical Services:

Surface water disposal via soakaways.

County Highway Authority:

The proposed development site is remote from any urban area and distant from adequate services and facilities, such as, education, employment, health, retail and leisure. In addition, public transport services are infrequent. As a consequence, occupiers of the new development are likely to be dependant on private vehicles for most of their daily needs. Such fostering of growth in the need to travel would be contrary to government advice given in PPG13 and RPG10, and to the provisions of policies STR1 and STR6 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review (adopted policies: April 2000).

Notwithstanding the aforementioned comments, as this proposal is for the erection of an agricultural workers dwelling it must be a matter for the Local Planning Authority to determine whether there is sufficient justification/agricultural need or any other overriding planning need that outweighs the transport policies that seek to reduce reliance on the private car.

In detail, the proposal is seeking to make use of the existing access on to Two Ash Lane. It is clear that the visibility currently achieved by emerging vehicles is limited due to the presence of boundary hedges that front the highway in both directions. However, it appears that the applicant has ownership of sufficient land either side of the access and as such improvements can be made.

It is clear that there is sufficient room within the site for the turning and parking of vehicles in connection with the proposed residential unit.

The one area of concern is the standard of the junction of Two Ash Lane with the A358. The junction is restricted to single vehicle width not enabling two vehicles to pass and the level of visibility achieved is also restricted in both directions. As a consequence the Highway Authority would not wish to see a proposal that is likely to result in a significant increase in the use made of this junction. Whilst the proposal is likely to result in some additional traffic at this point it is considered that the increase is unlikely to be significant given the existing traffic movement in connection with the operational farms and recreational ground currently served off Two Ash Lane.

As a result, I would advise you that from a highway point of view there is no objection to the proposal. However, in the event of permission being granted I would recommend that the following condition be imposed:

1. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900mm above adjoining road level forward of a line drawn 2.4m back and parallel to the nearside carriageway edge over the entire site frontage. Such visibility shall be fully provided before works commence on the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

SSDC Principal Landscape Officer:

I have reviewed the above application seeking the construction of an agricultural workers dwelling, and recollect pre-application discussion relating to this site.

This farm group is already characterised by the presence of an adjoining farmhouse, though the house and holding are no longer in the same ownership. Hence this application would seek to place a second house on the site. Whilst the placement of the house proposal is in close proximity to the farm building group, I am wary of the prospect of a second house in this location, and I am also mindful that this is countryside, thus PPS7 and policy ST3 apply, which seek to safeguard the countryside for its own sake, and requires that development, where it is permitted, should maintain or enhance the environment. Consequently, unless you believe the case for the farmhouse to be both justified, and convincing, to thus support the application, there is otherwise no landscape support for this proposal.

SSDC Economic Development Officer:

6th February 2012: I have now had the opportunity to read the most recent submission by the applicant's agent in respect of the application for a farm workers dwelling at Barleclose Farm, Forton. You will recall that my original concerns focussed predominately around the absence of a business plan and focussed information predicting the profit and loss of the business for the next three years (to March 2015), I can report now that this information has now been provided. This informs that the business will remain in profit for each of these years. Of particular note is that the applicants agent has taken a conservative view on income from stock sales based on the lower less profitable years leading up to the predicted period. Having read these accounts, business plan and predicted profit and loss estimates, I am now comfortable that the business will remain profitable and my original concerns on viability have been appeased.

If you recall, I also raised an original concern over the ownership of stock, particularly the flock of sheep. Whilst there has not been any evidence of ownership submitted, the inclusion of the stock in the profit and loss account in part demonstrates that the flock is owned by the applicant. Also to note is that it is not an uncommon practice for farmers to 'rent' stock, or farm other people's animals. This practice is often associated with

intensive rearing of pigs or poultry where the animals/birds are owned by the feed merchant and a fee is paid to the farmer based on low mortality rates, feed conversion rates etc. I do know of examples where cattle are owned by third parties. Not that the ownership of stock is questioned in this application. In the event that the ownership of stock is raised again through the consultation process, it should not form the basis of opposing this application.

I do not require any further information and am now content with the answers provided to my questions.

23rd December 2011: Having met yesterday with the applicant and his agent, I now provide you with a revised economic development summary of the application to build a permanent agriculturally tied dwelling at Barleclose Farm, Forton.

The economic concerns that I had initially raised were discussed in turn. The largest of these concerns related to the very small sums allocated to labour. The implication deduced from the accounts was that there is approximately only 200 hours of paid labour on the farm for each of the past three years. I had deduced from this that it was questionable if there was a need for a full time worker on the farm and therefore the need for a dwelling to support the needs of the worker. In response, the applicant's agent informed that there had been a bartering arrangement between a third party and his client, for which the payment was in stock, not cash.

I acknowledged that it is not unusual for farmers to 'rear' livestock for a third party. Many of the larger feed companies own stock, provide the feed and use the expertise of the farmer and his buildings to rear the animals. The explanation that this arrangement was practiced at Barleclose Farm helped me to understand the relationship between the applicant and the third party who has until recently been the owner of the sheep. I am informed that this arrangement has now ceased and the applicant now owns the sheep. What would prove incredibly helpful would be to have evidence of the fact that ownership of the sheep is with the applicant now and that the third party arrangement no longer exists. I can use this evidence to appease any concerns that councillors or members of the public may raise should the application be referred to Area West committee.

The absence of audited accounts, which clearly defines the functions of the farm, without the confusion of other enterprises owned by the applicant has also taken a little understanding. I would encourage the applicant to submit audited accounts for the activities of the farm from which it can be deduced that the farm is profitable and can afford the additional labour proposed. I would further encourage the applicant to submit projected forecasts for the next three years in the form of a business plan. This I would anticipate will demonstrate that the farm is likely to remain profitable, even though the bartering arrangements have ceased and the stock is now owned by the applicant. The business plan I would hope will include realistic labour requirements and costs and also help to appease the concerns raised, particularly if speaking to the application at committee.

Although the observations and concerns that I raised have been addressed. I would very much appreciate the supporting evidence that I have requested. Whilst both bartering arrangements and third party ownership of stock is not unusual, it would have helped me enormously with understanding this application if this information had been shared with the economic development service from the outset. Whilst my objections to this application have been removed, to assist me should this application be referred to Area Committee, I would appreciate receiving the additional information requested.

18th November 2011: On having read all of the information submitted in support of the planning application for a new farm workers dwelling at Barleclose, there are a number of discrepancies and concerns that I have identified.

The amount of land owned or tenanted by Mr Robbins is identified in the original planning application as being a total of 125 acres. Yet in the supporting appraisal, there is an amount of 83 acres identified as owned by the applicant and a further 24 acres on a ten-year farm business tenancy. This totals 107 acres! Further, there is an amount of 44 acres (total) purchased at annual grass keep auctions. Whichever combination I apply, I fail to arrive at the 125 acres claimed to be farmed in the original application. There is also mention of 70 - acres farmed by Mrs Robbins and whilst this has little bearing on the land farmed by the applicant, I am curious to know if this is within reasonable proximity and how it is farmed, by whom and why it was not included.

The accounts submitted in confidence also identify a few discrepancies, which concern me. In the last full year, the amount paid for labour/wages is shown as £1,200. At £6.10 (minimum wage) per hour, this suggests there was only 200 hours of paid labour used on the farm. This confuses me as it falls way short of demonstrating there to be a labour requirement, which indeed needs accommodating. Also in the accounts, there is a significant amount paid out for postage/telephone/subscription, totalling £2,600. Whilst there may be an explanation for this, it seems unjustifiably high, particularly when compared to sprays and fertiliser at only £845, less £263 application cost. The implication here is that less than 3 tons of fertiliser was applied to the whole farm, which seems incredibly low.

Another confusion in the accounts is an amount shown for the sale of mowing grass/keep of 32 acres. This seems strange that the applicant is purchasing grass keep and also selling grass keep. Whilst there may well be a perfectly reasonable and logical explanation for this, the fact that an explanation was not provided in the supporting appraisal raises concerns.

The Parish Council have raised an objection to the application in part based on doubts over the ownership of the sheep and cattle. The implication is that these are owned by a third party, which may explain in part the income from grass keep sales as shown in the accounts. I undertook a little research of my own and could not find any reference to Mr Robbins, the applicant as being registered with the relevant breed society.

This authority has to my knowledge always tried to be supportive of genuine applications from people who are trying to get a 'foothold' on the farming ladder. I accept that the sale of Barleclose farmhouse has denied the applicant a dwelling from which to manage stock etc at this location. However, I consider there to be too many discrepancies within the application to support the building of a permanent dwelling based on the detail provided. I would however recommend that consideration be given to permitting a temporary dwelling on the site of Barleclose Farm for a period of no more than three years. In that period, I would expect the applicant to demonstrate that the intention to grow stocking numbers of cattle and sheep is in keeping with the projections submitted with the application. I would also request that the question of ownership of stock is proved 'beyond all reasonable doubt', possibly through purchase receipts from market/private vendors. Also, evidence in the form of copies of Defra movement certificates would prove helpful.

I recommend refusal of this application based on the detail provided with this application. I would however look favourably on an application for temporary accommodation for a maximum of three years to allow time for the applicant to build his business up to the point of where a permanent dwelling is unquestioningly required.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been advertised by site notice for the requisite period. Two contributors have commented on the application, raising objections and questioning the supporting information provided. The main points are as follows:

- There is no justification for a permanent dwelling, based on either the appraisal submitted or the activity, which actually takes place. It is implied from the appraisal that Mr Robbins owns a number of sheep and cows, employs at least one full time farm worker and requires a full-time dwelling in order to operate.
- Any occasional need for overnight accommodation could be met by a caravan or similar temporary structure. Permission for a temporary mobile home should be given, if the applicant can prove his business need.
- The application form is filled in incorrectly, as the Parish Council have not been consulted prior to the application being submitted, as indicated.
- The applicant doesn't own the animals referred to in the appraisal and his main business is actually renting out houses. The applicant should submit details of his unique herd/flock numbers and the list of individual ear tags. DEFRA can identify the individual animals which he owns. Mr Robbins has only owned Barleclose Farm for a year and it was vacant before this time so the movement records will be available.
- The appraisal provides theoretical labour numbers based mainly on sheep. The actual owner of the sheep tends the sheep everyday and Mr Robbins does not employ any farm workers, undertaking the limited amount of farm work needed for his cows and horses himself from his existing farmhouse.
- Who will live in the house as Mr Robbins does not currently employ the farm manager, he suggests it will be for.
- Barleclose Farm has been owned by Mr Robbins for just over a year, before which it was vacant for 6 months. It cannot therefore be demonstrated that the unit indicated in the appraisal has been operating for at least 3 years, as required to show that the enterprise has been profitable for at least 1 of 3 years.
- The applicant owns two dwellings close by in Forton, which could be occupied. Also the former farmhouse adjacent to the site was bought by Mr Robbins at auction, along with the land, before being sold to the current owner. This is currently empty and may be available.
- The applicant's cows often escape but this is not justification for a new dwelling but as a result of poor fencing.
- How can the business be shown to be viable without fully audited accounts? The appraisal states that the accounts have been extracted from 'wider business activities' and that the cost of providing fully audited accounts would be unreasonably costly. The proposed dwelling is very large internally and in excess of houses that the County Council build to serve their holdings. The cost of this dwelling could be considered expensive to build in relation to the average wages earned by an agricultural worker.
- A site immediately next to the fields to the north of Two Ash Lane has come onto the market. With an existing bungalow and outbuildings, as well as permission for a new dwelling, this could be available to fulfil any proven need.

CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

The application is made for the erection of a detached dwelling house to provide accommodation for a full-time agricultural worker at Barleclose Farm.

The main planning considerations in this case relate to the impact of the proposal on the local landscape character and the proposal's ability to meet the requirements of Annex A of Central Government Guidance Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7).

In regard to the requirements of PPS7, to justify a permanent agricultural dwelling, it has to be shown that it is supporting existing agricultural activities on well-established agricultural units. The following criteria, among others, have to be met:

- There is a clearly established existing functional need
- The need relates to a full-time worker
- The unit and the agricultural activity concerned has been established for at least three years, have been profitable for at least one of them, are currently financially sound and have a clear prospect of remaining so.
- The functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling on the unit or any other existing accommodation in the area, which is suitable and available for occupation by the workers concerned.
- Other planning requirements e.g. in relation to access, or impact on the countryside, are satisfied.

A functional and financial test is necessary to establish whether it is essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for one or more workers to be readily available at most times and to ensure that the farming enterprise is economically viable.

The applicant contends that there is an existing identified need on the existing farm enterprise, which forms a holding of approximately 140 acres, made up of freehold land and land farmed under a tenancy agreement. As of January 2012, the breeding numbers of livestock amounts to 56 suckler cows and 37 stores, as well as 167 breeding ewes and 25 chilvers. On average it is intended to retain a suckler herd of approximately 60 cows and a flock of 150 ewes.

The appraisal has used two recognised labour calculations, Standard Man Day (SMD) and Farm Business Survey (FBS). The SMD calculation indicates a requirement for 1.77 full-time workers for farming purposes at the current levels of stocking and cropping and FBS indicates an equivalent requirement of 1.98 full-time workers. This in itself identifies the labour needs of the holding, in line with the requirements of Annex A. There have however been objections received in regard to both the ownership of the animals forming the assessment and also towards the existing labour arrangements.

At the time of the application being made, it is noted that the applicant was not the sole owner of the sheep referred to in the appraisal and it is advised that the necessary labour was provided by the other identified party, the applicant himself and additional labour by two workers also employed in the applicant's wider business interests and paid as such. Another consequence of this arrangement was very low labour costs in the submitted accounts. In assessing the appraisal and the submitted supporting information, the Council's Economic Development Officer identified some other issues/discrepancies needing clarification. These relate to the details of the land holding and other costs included within the accounts. Initial advice to officers was to recommend refusal or to consider a temporary permission for accommodation for a period of three years pending. The applicant has provided additional supporting information and clarification for points raised by the Economic Development Officer, which have satisfied the questions raised. In terms of labour provision provided by the identified third party, it is advised that a bartering arrangement takes place, which is quite common in agricultural practice. The Economic Development Officer has also confirmed that the actual ownership of the sheep is not an issue in this case as it is not unusual for farmers

to rear livestock for third parties. Notwithstanding this information, the applicant has now informed the Local Planning Authority that he is now the sole owner of all the stock, with the previous arrangements ceasing. Over the course of this application, it is advised that the general labour provision has altered from the original arrangement, particularly as a result of a period of the applicant's ill health during 2011. Since this occurrence, the applicant has used the services of a farm contracting business to provide the additional labour requirement as a result of Mr Robbins health and a reduced labour provision by the third party. This arrangement is advised to continue since Mr Robbins became the sole owner of the livestock, until a full-time worker is employed. Ultimately, the Economic Development Officer has considered the submitted information, including an updated business forecast for the coming years and is satisfied that the requirements of Annex A have been met. Despite labour provision being provided by various sources, it has been shown that the requirement for a full-time worker has been properly identified. It should also be noted that despite the limited layout for labour shown in the accounts, they do indicate that there is adequate net profit to pay an agricultural wage of approximately £16,000 per annum.

Consideration has been given to whether a three-year permission for temporary accommodation should be granted at this stage. Paragraph 12 of PPS7 Annex A states that "if a new dwelling is essential to support a new farming activity, whether on a newly-created agricultural unit or an established one, it should normally, for the first three years, be provided by a caravan, wooden structure which can easily be dismantled, or other temporary accommodation". In this case, it is contended that the agricultural enterprise is not a new farming activity on an established unit but the continuation of a long established activity. The business was slowed down up to and around 2009 due to uncertainty over the future of the County Council land and buildings held under a business tenancy agreement and forming a large part of the overall holding. Despite this, the business did not discontinue and is currently being grown again. The Economic Development Officer notes that the submitted accounts show profit for at least one year of the last three years, as required under Annex A. Furthermore, a more recently submitted business plan and projected forecasts give a clear indication that the enterprise is financially sound and has a clear prospect of remaining so.

Alternative Accommodation

As well as needing to satisfy the required functional and financial tests, it is appropriate to consider whether there are other available dwellings locally that can meet the required need. Observations have been made in relation to dwellings owned by the applicant within Forton and other available properties that may potentially be available, including the former farmhouse, previously associated with the unit. Firstly, the dwellings referred to in Forton are close by but not 'within sight and sound', as is generally accepted as being necessary. The applicant's existing dwelling is also not well related to the agricultural buildings at Barleclose Farm.

In reference to the former Barleclose Farm dwelling, consideration has been given as to whether this may have been disposed of, as it is suggested that the applicant purchased it before selling it on. In response to this, it is noted that the County Council owned the dwelling, not the applicant and it was sold at auction on the open market. In bidding for the land and buildings, the applicant has advised that a bid was made in conjunction with a third party, as the lot included the house also. Ultimately the final lot price was over what the applicant had assessed to be an appropriate amount, taking into account cost of the dwelling and the price for building a replacement dwelling or carrying out renovation works, it is felt that these costs would push the project beyond what may be expected to be reasonable in relation to the income the unit may be able to sustain in the long-term. Due to the circumstances of the land and buildings being sold on the open

market and the applicant not being the previous owner, it would be unreasonable to infer that the property was readily available to the applicant or has been deliberately disposed of to circumvent the planning system to acquire a new dwelling in the open countryside.

Design and Appearance

The dwelling is proposed to be sited within the boundaries of the existing farmyard, to the east of the former slurry pit. This is well located to the existing group of buildings and will have a minimal impact on local landscape character. The Council's Landscape Architect has raised no objections to the appearance and layout of the proposal, other than echoing local and national guidance that, unless the need for a new dwelling can be adequately justified, there is no 'in principle' support for new development in the open countryside. In this case, the Local Planning Authority has accepted the need and as such no landscape objection is raised. The proposed dwelling is to be constructed from local natural stone with Double Roman roof tiles, which are considered to be acceptable and appropriate for the location.

In terms of size of the dwelling, it appears relatively large, however the total internal floor area is about 160 square metres, which is well within the generally expected size for a new agricultural worker's dwelling, which are typically sized between 150 to 200 square metres in floor area.

Other Issues

There are no objections on highway grounds, subject to a condition relating to visibility at the site entrance. The Highway Authority have raised concerns in relation to the access from Two Ash Lane onto the A358 but it is considered that the proposal will not result in significant additional vehicle movements. Therefore subject to minor improvements to the access from the site onto Two Ash Lane, the proposal is considered to have no detrimental impact on highway safety.

The site is in a relatively isolated location with no immediately adjoining residential units and as such there are no residential amenity issues.

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the application has satisfied all the relevant criteria of PPS7 Annex A, in respect to the provision of a permanent agricultural worker's dwelling, and that the proposed dwelling will meet the functional and financial requirements of the existing agricultural enterprise. The size, scale, design and siting of the proposal is also considered to respect and relate to the surrounding area and have no adverse impact on local landscape character, residential amenity or highway safety. Therefore, the recommendation to Members is to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out below.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with conditions.

JUSTIFICATION

The proposal, by reason of its size and scale and proven need, respects the character of the area and satisfies the criteria for agricultural workers dwellings in accordance with the aims and objectives of policies STR1, STR6, 5 and 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor

National Joint Structure Plan Review, saved policies ST3, ST5, ST6, EC3 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and guidance as set out in PPS7 - Annex A.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed, or last employed, in the locality in agriculture or in forestry, or a dependent of such a person residing with him or her, or a widow or widower of such a person.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority would not have been prepared to grant planning permission but for this special need which is in accordance with the aims and objectives of PPS7 - Annex A and saved policy HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: `3221/01' and `3221/02', received 9th March 2011.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the development authorised and in the interests of proper planning.

4. No development shall be carried out on site unless particulars of materials (including the provision of samples) to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

5. No development shall be carried out on site unless a sample panel of the local natural stonework, indicating colour, texture, coursing and bonding, has been provided on site for inspection and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The sample panel shall remain on site until building works are complete.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

6. No development shall be carried out on site unless details of the colour and finish for all new doors, windows, boarding and openings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

7. No development shall be carried out on site unless details of all new guttering, down pipes, other rainwater goods, and external plumbing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

8. No development shall be carried out on site unless details of the finished floor levels of the dwelling to be erected on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such level shall be relative to an ordnance datum or such other fixed feature as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

9. No development shall be carried out on site unless foul and surface water drainage details to serve the development, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such approved drainage details shall be completed and become fully operational before the dwelling hereby permitted is first brought into use. Following its installation such approved scheme shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to protect the local water environment, in accordance with STR1 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policies ST5, ST6 and EP9 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

10. No development shall be carried out on site unless there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of the development, as well as details of any changes proposed in existing ground levels; all planting, seeding, turfing or earth moulding comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the dwelling or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

11. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900mm above adjoining road level forward of a line drawn 2.4m back and parallel to the nearside carriageway edge over the entire site frontage. Such visibility shall be fully provided before works commence on the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and saved policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no extensions to the dwellings or outbuildings erected without the prior express grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to reserve to the Local Planning Authority control over the size of the dwelling in relation to the needs of the agricultural holding, in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and policies ST5, ST6, EC3 and HG15 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, including dormer windows, or other openings (including doors) shall be formed in the dwelling without the prior express grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 5 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Joint Structure Plan Review and policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.
