

AW.04:13/14  
DATE 21:08:13

## **South Somerset District Council**

**Draft Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held at Holyrood Academy, Zembard Lane, Chard on **Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> August 2013**.

(4.45 p.m. – 9.30 p.m.)

**Present:**

<b>Members:</b>	Cllr. Angie Singleton	(in the Chair)
	Mike Best	Sue Osborne
	Dave Bulmer	Ric Pallister
	John Dyke	Ros Roderigo
	Brennie Halse	Kim Turner (from 5.15pm)
	Jenny Kenton	Andrew Turpin
	Paul Maxwell	Martin Wale
	Nigel Mermagen	

**Officers:**

Andrew Gillespie	Area Development Manager (West)
Zoe Harris	Neighbourhood Development Officer
Paul Philpott	Neighbourhood Development Officer
David Norris	Development Control Manager
Andrew Gunn	Area Lead (West) (Planning)
John Millar	Planning Officer
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
David Julian	Economic Development Manager
Robert Murray	Economic Development Officer
Helen Vittery	Somerset County Highway Authority
Angela Cox	Democratic Services Officer

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

**33. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

**34. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Carol Goodall and Linda Vijeh.

**35. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)**

Cllrs. Dave Bulmer, Brennie Halse, Jenny Kenton and Martin Wale declared a personal interest in Agenda item 8, Chard Street Market, as members of Chard Town Council.

Cllr. Ros Roderigo declared a personal interest in Planning Application 13/01535/OUT (Land East of Crimchard), as the Ward Member for the application.

Cllrs. Angie Singleton and Martin Wale declared a personal interest in Planning Application Nos. 12/04518/OUT (Land East of Mount Hindrance Farm, Chard) and 13/01535/OUT (Land East of Crimchard) as members of the Chard Regeneration Board.

Cllr. Sue Osborne declared a personal interest in Planning Application 13/01334/FUL (The Cattle Barton, Allowenshay) as one of the objectors was known to her.

Cllr. Kim Turner, at the time the item was discussed, declared a personal interest in Planning Application 13/01334/FUL (The Cattle Barton, Allowenshay) as the applicant was known to her.

Cllr. Andrew Turpin declared a personal interest in Agenda item 9, Request for a Community Grant – Forton Community Association, as a member of Forton Parish Council who had submitted the application on behalf of the Forton Community Association.

---

**36. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 4)**

No questions or comments were raised by members of the public present.

---

**37. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 5)**

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

---

**38. Area West Committee - Forward Plan (Agenda Item 6)**

The Area Development Manager (West) advised that the Crewkerne Community Planning update and Historic Buildings at Risk reports would be rescheduled to the October meeting of the Committee to allow Councillors to report at the same time as the officer report.

Members were content to note the Area West Forward Plan as amended.

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

*(Resolution passed without dissent)*

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

---

### 39. Community Right to Bid – Nomination Received for Assets of Community Value (Agenda Item 7)

The Area Development Manager (West) advised that the procedure for agreeing to place assets on the Register of Assets of Community Value had recently been amended by the District Executive and in future, the assessment and registration would be carried out by the Area Development Managers, in consultation with the relevant Ward Member and Area Chairman. However, as this had been a very recent decision, he felt it was appropriate that the report be presented to the Committee.

In response to a question, the Area Development Manager (West) confirmed that any future nominations would be reported to the Committee for information.

There was no debate and Members were in agreement that the application to place the Public House, car park and beer garden known as Dinnington Docks, Dinnington onto the SSDC Register of Assets of Community Value be confirmed.

**RESOLVED:** That the Public House, car park and beer garden known as Dinnington Docks, Dinnington, in the current ownership of Mrs Hilary Hardisty, be placed on the SSDC Register of Assets of Community Value.

**Reason:** To consider a nomination received from Dinnington Parish Meeting to place the Public House, car park and beer garden known as Dinnington Docks, Dinnington onto the SSDC Register of Assets of Community Value.

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

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

### 40. Chard Street Market (Agenda Item 8)

The Neighbourhood Development Officer advised that Chard Town Council had been successfully operating the Chard street markets for almost 12 months and now wished to transfer the ownership of the Market Charter to themselves. Under the current SSDC Financial Procedure Rules, the final decision to agree the transfer had to be confirmed by the District Executive.

In response to a question, the Area Development Manager (West) confirmed that although SSDC would not receive any income from the Market, neither would there be any outlay in staffing costs etc or any need for a growth bid to cover any lost income from the market.

During a brief discussion, Members were fully supportive of the request to transfer the Market Charter to Chard Town Council and unanimously supported the recommendations of the report.

**RESOLVED:** That the Area West Committee recommends to the District Executive:-

1. To agree the formal transfer of the Market Charter for Chard from South Somerset District Council to Chard Town Council, at no cost which is less than best consideration;

2. To agree that the revenue savings to South Somerset District Council resulting from the reduction in Markets Management costs are used to offset the reduced income and budgets are adjusted accordingly.

**Reason:** To agree the formal transfer of the Market Charter for Chard from SSDC to Chard Town Council.

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

*(Zoe Harris, Neighbourhood Development Officer - 01460 260423)  
(zoe.harris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

#### **41. Request for a Community Grant – Forton Community Association (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 9)**

The Neighbourhood Development Officer reminded Members that they had agreed funding towards a new Community Centre in Forton in August 2012. As their original bid for funding from Sport England had been unsuccessful, there was a need to extend the SSDC grant offer to allow a second bid to be submitted to Sport England. The Community Association had achieved charitable status in the meantime which would exempt all building materials from VAT.

In response to questions from Members, the Neighbourhood Development Officer advised that:-

- There was no advantage in applying early for Sport England funding as all applications were considered at the same time.
- It was hoped that the second bid for funding from Sport England would be successful as greater emphasis would be placed on facilities such as the toilet block and a forward plan of activities for the centre.
- If the bid to Sport England was unsuccessful then further fundraising would be held by the village.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members were content to agree that the grant offer for Forton Community Association towards the construction of a new community centre be extended until March 2014.

**RESOLVED:** That the provisional grant offer of £12,500 from the Area West Community Grant Scheme budget to the Forton Community Association towards the construction of a new community centre be extended until March 2014.

**Reason:** To enable the Forton Community Association to resubmit a revised grant application to Sport England.

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

*(Paul Philpott, Neighbourhood Development Officer – 01460 260359)  
(paul.philpott@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

#### 42. Merriott Pavilion (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 10)

Mr Wallis, Chairman of Merriott Parish Council spoke in support of the grant application. He said that they were aware of the SSDC grants policy not to fund projects where the work had already commenced, however, they had been driven by the builders availability and the need to have the building ready for the new football season. He said the building would be run by the Parish Council in partnership with the football club and it would be open for use by community groups as well.

The Ward Member, Councillor Paul Maxwell said that there had been a long held aspiration for a pavilion on the recreation ground. Both the football and cricket clubs were very successful and there was a lot of local support for the building. He asked that Members approve the grant application.

In response to questions, the Neighbourhood Development Officer confirmed that:-

- The grant scoring assessment of the capacity of the project was low due to concerns on the business plan submitted and therefore the grant offer was conditional on the submission of a further robust business plan.
- The Parish Council wished to keep operational control of the building and therefore would be responsible for the payment of business rates.

During discussion, the majority of Members were supportive of the project although it was acknowledged that it was already under construction. Some concern was expressed at the size of the Public Works Loan taken by the Parish Council but it was confirmed that this had been supported by local residents. It was proposed and seconded to agree the recommendations and on being put to the vote, were confirmed (voting: 10 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention).

**RESOLVED:** That the Area West Committee:-

1. Agreed to set aside the SSDC Grants Policy which stated that SSDC would not fund projects where the work had already started;
2. Approved a grant of £12,500 from the Area West Capital Programme to Merriott Parish Council towards the construction of a new pavilion, to be released only when the following conditions had been met by the applicant;

By 31<sup>st</sup> October 2013 Merriott Parish Council should submit a robust business plan giving detailed information on the following points:

- Full funding package including detail of what element of the project would be funded by Merriott Youth Football
- Full costs of the project with an explanation of how any contingency costs would be covered
- Future management of the building, detailing the formal structure of the group managing the building, how user groups could have their say and influence decision making and a copy of the written terms of reference or other similar governing document.
- A revised 5 year revenue plan taking into account the business rate figure and providing detail on how all the figures had been decided.

- Letters of support, including an indication of their future use of the facility, from Merriott adult football club and the Cricket Club.
- Any evidence of legal correspondence relating to retrospective S106 contributions and the pavilion project.

The Business Plan would need to be approved by officers in Area Development (West) and Community Health and Leisure before any monies are released.

**Reason:** To agree an application for funding towards a sports pavilion with public toilets at Merriott Recreation Ground.

*(Voting: 10 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention)*

*(Zoe Harris, Neighbourhood Development Officer - 01460 260423)  
(zoe.harris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

---

#### **43. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 11)**

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

**NOTED.**

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

---

#### **44. Planning Applications (Agenda Item 12)**

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

##### **13/01334/FUL – Change of use of land to equestrian and formation of a manège at The Cattle Barton, Ludney Lane, Allowenshay - Mr N Rutter**

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the report. He noted that since writing his report, 3 further letters of support had been received. No formal Parish Meeting had been held to discuss the application therefore only individual residents comments were taken into account and his recommendation was to approve the application.

In response to questions from Members, the Planning Officer confirmed that:-

- The site was Grade 1 agricultural land.
- Although some letters of support mentioned a potential for business use, the current application was for the private use of the applicants.
- The site was 75m from the applicants dwelling and was 25m x 45m in size.

Mr J Fox, Agent for the applicant, said they had considered 3 sites for the manège in the field and the site was chosen as it would only be visible to one property. No excavations were necessary and so the land could easily be restored in the future. The only visible structure would be the surrounding fence which did not require planning permission.

The Ward Member, Councillor Sue Osborne, said she had referred the application to committee because of the concerns expressed in the village, the use of Grade 1 agricultural land and the proposal to plant trees which she felt would draw attention to the manège. She also expressed concern at a possible future business use at the site.

During a brief discussion, the majority of Members were in favour of the application and it was proposed and seconded to approve as per the Officer's recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried 13 in favour and 1 against.

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Application 13/01334/FUL be **APPROVED** for the following reason:

01. It is considered the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact upon the local amenities or landscape character of the area. As such the proposal is considered to accord with Policies ST5, ST6, EC3 and CR6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:**

01. 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.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan (1:1250) received 16 May 2013; fence details (1:500) and site plan (1:500) received 28 March 2013; and planting scheme (1:20) received 3 June 2013.

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

03. The landscaping scheme (planting scheme received 3 June 2013) shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development, or as otherwise extended with the agreement in writing of the Local Planning Authority. For a period of five years after the completion of the landscaping scheme, the trees and shrubs shall be protected and maintained in a healthy weed free condition and any trees or shrubs that cease to grow shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species, or the appropriate trees or shrubs as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development makes a satisfactory contribution to the preservation and enhancement of the local character and distinctiveness of the area in accordance with South Somerset Local Plan Policies ST6 and EC3.

04. The manège hereby permitted shall be used for private and domestic purposes associated with the occupiers of The Cattle Barton only and shall not be used for any business of commercial use.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and highway safety, in accordance with Policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

05. There shall be no floodlights/external lighting installed or used at the site.

Reason: To protect residential amenity and to protect the dark skies in accordance with saved Policies ST6 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

**Informatives:**

01. The applicant is advised that this consent does not imply any acceptance/approval of the site for future stables.

*(Voting: 13 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions)*

---

**13/00828/FUL – Demolition of garage and the erection of 1 No. single storey dwelling with associated parking at 47 Glynswood, Chard – Mr S Hill**

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda with the aid of a power point presentation of the site and proposed plans. He noted that several letters of objection had been received mentioning loss of amenity, overlooking and loss of light but the Highway Authority had raised no objections. A similar application nearby had been granted planning permission on appeal and therefore it was difficult to argue that the application was out of character with the area. He confirmed that his recommendation was to approve the application with the removal of all permitted development rights.

In response to questions from Members, the Planning Officer advised that:

- The proposed bungalow would be 1.2m from the nearby property at its closest point.
- The access to No 47 Glynswood would be via an adjacent public footpath.
- Windows to the North East and South West of the proposed bungalow were very small to limit any overlooking of the neighbouring property.
- The existing garage for No 47 Glynswood would be demolished and two parking spaces were provided for each dwelling at the front of the proposed bungalow.

Mr I Pamplin, Agent for the applicant, said the proposed bungalow was angled on the plot to minimise any overlooking and also it would be lower than the surrounding properties. The removal of the existing garage would allow for easier vehicle turning.

The Ward Member, Councillor Martin Wale, noted that the proposed bungalow would be close to more than one property. He said there had been a number of similar applications in the area, which had once been a watercress field and was well known for its flooding issues. He felt that the Town Council's reasons for refusal were valid and he proposed that the application be refused because of its impact upon No 47 Glynswood, overlooking and lack of amenity space. This was seconded by Cllr Nigel Mermagen.

During discussion, varying views were expressed. Some Members agreed with the Ward Member that the site was unsuitable and the access road was only meant to serve

garages whilst others felt that there were no particular design issues and were cautious of refusing without sound reason.

The Senior Legal Executive cautioned Members that if they were minded to refuse the application then they should have clear, precise and relevant reasons to refuse it.

The Ward Member's proposal to refuse the application because the dwelling would be cramped and contrived resulting in a poor layout and would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties was put to the vote and carried (voting: 9 in favour, 4 against, 0 abstentions).

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Application 13/00828/FUL be **REFUSED** contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reasons:

1. The erection of a dwelling on this site of restricted dimensions would result in a contrived and cramped development which would be out of character with surrounding development and would therefore not be in accordance with saved policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and the provisions of chapter 7 and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed dwelling by reason of its siting and proximity to neighbouring properties is considered to cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers and future occupiers of the proposed dwelling by way of overlooking and limited provision of private amenity space. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and the provisions of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

*(Voting: 9 in favour, 4 against, 0 abstentions)*

---

**12/04518/OUT - Mixed development comprising 350 homes, floodlit full size football pitch, unlit full size training and mini pitches, multiuse club house, spectator facilities and parking. Hub for neighbourhood/community facilities, public open space, landscaping, drainage, associated vehicular & pedestrian access. Land regrading, associated infrastructure and engineering works on land East of Mount Hindrance Farm, Mount Hindrance Lane, Chard - Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd, S.E Blackburn Discretion Trust**

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda with the aid of a power point presentation of the site and proposed plans. He noted that since writing his report, a further 5 letters of objection had been received emphasising points previously raised. He also noted that although the following planning application for 110 dwellings on land East of Crimchard, Chard was adjacent to this site, the applications must be considered separately.

He confirmed that the recommendation was to refuse permission as the site was not sustainable, no employment land was proposed, there were ecological and landscaping issues and it was contrary to the Chard Regeneration Plan.

In response to questions from Members, the Planning Officer and the Somerset County Highway Authority Officer advised that:

- Full traffic modelling assessments had not been carried out on all traffic junctions in Chard.
- There was concern at potential future noise nuisance as some of the proposed houses would be located close to existing industrial units.
- The South East of the site was already allocated in the Chard Regeneration Plan for the relocation of the football club and for business use.
- There were 2,716 new houses proposed in Option 3 of the Chard Regeneration Plan which forecasted a population increase of approximately 7,000 people.
- The wildlife mitigation measures put forward by the applicants were currently not to the satisfaction of the Ecologist Officer, particularly relating to the proposed fragmentation of the existing hedgerows which would severely impact upon the existing dormice population.

The committee were then addressed by Mr G Sayers of Combe St Nicholas Parish Council, Mr M Gilling of the Cuttifords Door Residents Association, Ms H Lock, Ms S Pargeter, Mr J Robinson, Ms T Letten, Mr J Gallagher, Mrs E Quantrell of the Mount Hindrance Action Group, Mr A Quantrell and Mr G Davis who all spoke in objection to the application. Their comments included:-

- Combe St Nicholas Parish Council was unanimous in its opposition to the application.
- There were not sufficient jobs in the town for the number of people which the houses would attract.
- Cuttiford Door would cease to have a separate identity.
- North Chard was on a gradient which would need to be cut and filled to achieve a level football club pitch.
- Roadside ditches were unable to cope with the present water run-off.
- Destruction of the hedgerows would have a negative impact on bats, badgers and dormice.
- The application proposed nothing in terms of infrastructure, schools or facilities.
- Lighting of the football pitch would interfere with wildlife.
- The proposed three way traffic lights at the entrance to the site would encourage traffic to use the lanes around Combe St Nicholas.
- Four options for areas of development were considered in the Chard Regeneration Plan and Option 3 was agreed. Option 4 had proposed land at Crimchard but it was dismissed as it would put pressure on road junctions.
- The site was not serviced by an existing road network or a proposed distributor road and so the additional traffic on the existing roads would be unbearable.
- The proposed prohibited turn at the Convent junction would force more traffic through the town.

The committee were then addressed by Mr M Hone of Chard Town Football Club and Mr J Edwards, the Agent for the application. Their comments included:-

- Chard Town Football Club was at risk of being ejected from the FA Cup and their league position was also in danger due to their current lack of facilities.
- Strategic planning of sports facilities in the town was urgently needed.
- The development would not compromise the Cedar development but would encourage investment in the town.
- SSDC has no 5 year land supply and the National Planning Policy Framework says that planning permission should be granted where there is no 5 year land supply or Local Plan in place.

- The site would deliver much needed homes and a new site for Chard Town Football Club.

The Ward Member, Councillor Ros Roderigo, said the application would have a detrimental effect on the village of Combe St Nicholas and the hamlet of Cuttifords Door. She said the application was opportunistic, proposed no employment land and was not in the economic interest of the town and she asked that the officer's recommendation to refuse the application be supported.

During discussion, Members were unanimous in their opposition to the application. It was felt that the developer had not taken account of the Chard Regeneration Plan, which the recent Planning Inspector had found no fault with and it failed to demonstrate the traffic impact of the development upon the wider Chard network. Further, the Travel Plan was not satisfactory and was contrary to the County Travel Plan.

The Somerset County Highway Authority Officer confirmed that whilst the Highway Authority neither supported nor objected to the application, they would provide support to the Local Planning Authority in respect of a refusal with regard to the inadequate Travel Plan and impact of the transport proposals on the wider highway network.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application as per the Officer's recommendation and on being put to the vote was carried unanimously in favour.

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Application 12/04518/OUT be **REFUSED** permission.

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:**

01. The proposed scheme does not provide any employment land and therefore will not provide a mixed and balanced development. Moreover, housing is proposed on land identified for employment use within the Chard Regeneration Plan (CRP), thus the proposal is in conflict with the CRP and would delay the early delivery of employment land in Chard. Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to be a sustainable form of development as defined by the government and therefore would be contrary to the NPPF and Policy PMT1 and PMT2 of the emerging Local Plan.
02. The proposal will result in removal and fragmentation of habitat, and consequent reduction in population of Hazel Dormouse, a European Protected Species subject to protection under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The proposal fails to adequately satisfy or demonstrate that favourable conservation status of Hazel Dormouse will be maintained. Furthermore, Hazel Dormouse is a 'priority species' and this proposal fails to protect a priority species population on this site. The development is therefore contrary to Chapter 11 of the NPPF, Policy ST5 (point 3), ST6 (point 4) and EC8 of the South Somerset Local Plan.
03. The proposed development would by reason of encroachment of built form into an identified area of high landscape sensitivity, in the northern part of the site, result in an adverse landscape impact. Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to saved policies ST5 (point 4) and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

04. The proposed development is contrary to the Council's strategic approach to the delivery of future development in Chard, contrary to Policy PMT1 and PMT2 of the emerging South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).
05. The proposal fails to demonstrate the traffic impact of the development upon the wider Chard road network, contrary to the NPPF.
06. The Travel Plan submitted with the application was inadequate and contrary to the NPPF and County Travel Plan.

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

---

**13/01535/OUT - Residential development of up to 110 dwellings together with formation of new access and related works (outline) on land East of Crimchard, Chard - David Wilson Homes South West Limited**

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda with the aid of a power point presentation of the site and proposed plans. He advised that the site was originally the proposed Option 4 which was rejected in the Chard Regeneration Plan. He also noted that the applicant relied on the Redrow Homes appeal at Mitchell Gardens, Chard for evidence of need but he said there were significant differences between the two applications. His recommendation remained to refuse the application.

In response to questions from Members, the Planning Officer advised that:-

- There was only one entrance to the proposed development site.
- No traffic light control was proposed at the entrance to the site.
- The land was currently in separate ownership.
- If the application was refused permission then any future appeal made by the applicants would have to also consider the adjacent site (12/04518/OUT).

The Somerset County Highway Authority Officer advised that they were not in a position to object to the application as the Chard Regeneration Plan was not yet an adopted document and so could not be used as supporting evidence.

The committee were then addressed by Mr G Sayers of Combe St Nicholas Parish Council, Mr M Froom of the Cuttifords Door Residents Association, Mr J Gallagher, Mr A Quantrell, Mrs E Quantrell of the Mount Hindrance Action Group, and Mr G Frecknall who all spoke in objection to the application. Their comments included:-

- Combe St Nicholas Parish Council objected to the application as it was not part of the Chard Regeneration Plan.
- The Highway Authority have underestimated the additional traffic which the application will generate at the Crimchard junction and the road bends by the Bell Public House.
- The application relies heavily on the successful Redrow Homes appeal at Mitchell Gardens, Chard but there are few similarities.
- The development is in the wrong place and will overload the existing road structures.
- This site was the rejected Option 4 in the Chard Regeneration Plan which presents a strategic and planned future for the town.
- The application makes no provision for employment.
- Any future appeal by the applicants must be robustly defended.

The Ward Member, Councillor Jenny Kenton, thanked the public for attending the meeting. She said there was no footpath outside the development leading into the town so no-one would be able to walk to the town from the site. Similarly, the roads outside the site were not conducive to cyclists. She proposed the officers recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Dave Bulmer.

During discussion, Members were unanimous in their opposition to the application. It was felt that the developer had not taken account of the Chard Regeneration Plan and the traffic generated by the development would impact on the wider Chard road network. Also the traffic at the single access to the site during peak periods would build up and the lack of pavements to the town centre would be dangerous for pedestrians. Further, the Travel Plan was not satisfactory and was contrary to the NPPF and County Travel Plan.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application as per the Officer's recommendation with additional reasons relating to the Travel Plan and general accessibility of the site. Reference also to be made that the development made no clear contribution to Chard Regeneration Plan (wording to be agreed with Ward Member and Chairman). On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse was carried unanimously in favour.

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Application 13/01535/OUT be **REFUSED** permission.

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:**

- 01. The proposed development is not located within the Council's preferred Area for Growth for Chard (Growth Option 3). It will also absorb some of the additional highway capacity created at the Convent Junction for the benefit of early phase development within the Chard Regeneration Plan. This development is contrary to the Council's strategic and planned approach to the delivery of future development in the town. The proposal is therefore contrary to the sustainable development objectives outlined in the NPPF and Policy PMT1 and PMT2 of the emerging South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.
- 02. The proposal fails to demonstrate the traffic impact of the development upon the wider Chard road network contrary to the NPPF.
- 03. The Travel Plan submitted with the application was inadequate and contrary to the NPPF and County Travel Plan.

*(Voting: unanimous in favour)*

**45. Date and Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda Item 13)**

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> September 2013. Venue to be confirmed.

**NOTED.**

*(Jo Morris, Democratic Services Officer – 01935 462055)  
(jo.morris@southsomerset.gov.uk)*

.....  
Chairman