

AW.07:13/14
DATE 20.11.13

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held on **Wednesday 20th November 2013** at The Shrubbery Hotel, Ilminster.

(5.30 p.m. – 8.50 p.m.)

Present:

Members:	Cllr. Angie Singleton	(in the Chair)
	Dave Bulmer (until 6.30 p.m.)	Sue Osborne
	John Dyke	Ric Pallister (from 5.45 p.m.)
	Carol Goodall	Ros Roderigo
	Brennie Halse	Kim Turner
	Jenny Kenton (until 6.30 p.m.)	Andrew Turpin
	Paul Maxwell	Linda Vijeh
	Nigel Mermagen	Martin Wale

Officers:

Andrew Gillespie	Area Development Manager (West)
Paul Philpott	Neighbourhood Development Officer
Diana Watts	Planning Officer
John Millar	Planning Officer
Andrew Gunn	Area Lead West
Amy Cater	Solicitor
Jo Morris	Democratic Services Officer

Also Present:

Mike Fear Assistant Highway Service Manager, Somerset County Council

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

71. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th October 2013, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and, having been approved as a correct record, were signed by the Chairman.

72. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)

An apology for absence was received from Cllr. Mike Best.

73. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Cllr. Carol Goodall declared a personal interest in planning application 13/02740/FUL, as one of the objectors addressing the Committee was a friend. She also declared a personal interest in the application, as a member of Ilminster Town Council.

Cllr. Angie Singleton declared a personal interest in planning application no. 13/03129/FUL, as a member of Crewkerne Town Council.

74. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 4)

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

75. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 5)**Free Car Parking over the Festive Period**

Members were informed of the 'Small Business Saturday' national campaign taking place on Saturday 7th December dedicated to supporting small businesses across the country. To support this event, the Area West team has organised free parking on 7th, 14th and 21st December in Crewkerne, Ilminster and Chard to encourage more shoppers to visit the towns.

Area West Member Information Workshop on the Local Plan

Members noted that an information session to feedback responses to the Local Plan consultation would be held on Wednesday 22nd January 2014 prior to the Area West Committee. It was agreed that the workshop would commence at 4.30pm.

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

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

The Area West Development Manager reported that there were no additional items or amendments and welcomed any ideas for future items to be added to the Forward Plan.

Members were content to note the Forward Plan as attached to the agenda.

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)*

77. County Highway Authority Report (Agenda Item 7)

The Assistant Highway Service Manager presented the report which informed members of the work carried out by the County Highway Authority and the proposed works programme for the 2013/14. He updated Members with three additional schemes due to be undertaken in Area West, under the Department of Transport funding, which were noted as follows:

Tatworth	Ashill	Drainage	Due to commence on 3 rd February 2014*
Combe St Nicholas	Bell Lane	Drainage	Due to commence on 6 th January 2014*
Tatworth	Post Office Lane	Drainage	Due to commence on 9 th December*

*Dates subject to change.

The Assistant Highway Service Manager noted members' comments and concerns about local issues within the area including:

- A member requested further information regarding issues at the cemetery and Post Office Lane, Tatworth;
- A request was made for the Assistant Highway Service Manager to circulate to members a list of failed sites from 2012;
- Members raised a number of concerns regarding blocked gullies and the lack of gully clearances throughout Area West;
- A Member congratulated the Assistant Highway Service Manager on the completion of the drainage scheme at Cuttifords Door;
- A member referred to the winter maintenance programme and made a request for the whole of the B3126 to be pre-salted;
- A member queried whether Ditton Street, Ilminster was on the priority list for gully clearance;
- A member expressed concerned regarding an overgrown hedge along the footpath at Canal Way, Ilminster;
- A member felt that it would be useful for Parish Councils to be given an update on failed surface dressing sites including financial liability and a statement around quality assurance;
- A member sought assurances that a collapsed drain at Unity Lane, Crewkerne would be addressed.

The Assistant Highway Service Manager urged members to continue to report blocked gullies so that problems areas could be targeted.

The Chairman thanked the Assistant Highway Service Manager for attending the meeting.

NOTED.

*(Mike Fear, Assistant Highway Service Manager, South Somerset Highways – 0845 3459155)
(countyroads-southsom@somerset.gov.uk)*

78. Chard Town Team (Agenda Item 8)

The Neighbourhood Development Officer presented the report, which updated members on the development of Chard Town Team and the contribution of the Team to the regeneration of Chard Town Centre. He commented that the Chard Town Team had taken forward a number of successful projects and with the aid of a powerpoint presentation highlighted some of the Town Team's achievements including:

- The Town Traders Board
- Town Centre Tree Project
- Bubble and Speak Community Kitchen
- Business Fair
- Pop Up Shop

Members thanked the Neighbourhood Development Officer for his presentation and for the work and support he had provided to the Chard Town Team. Members also congratulated the Chard Town Team on their achievements in the town.

RESOLVED: that the work of the Chard Town Team in 2012/13 be commended.

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

79. Area West – Reports from Members on Outside Bodies (Agenda Item 9)

Meeting House Arts Centre, Ilminster

Cllr. Sue Osborne updated Members on the achievements of the Meeting House Arts Centre, Ilminster. Members were informed that the past year had been very successful with very good attendance figures for performances. She informed members of various events planned including folk evenings and craft workshops. The gallery was fully booked for 2014 and the café was operating successfully with some refurbishment works due to commence shortly. A review of disabled access was also being implemented. Overall, the Meeting House Arts Centre was a very successful and vibrant organisation.

NOTED.

80. 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.

81. 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)

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

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday 11th December 2013 at 5.30 p.m. at Horton Village Hall.

NOTED.

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

83. Planning Applications (Agenda Item 12)

Prior to the commencement of planning applications, Cllr. Carol Goodall reiterated her personal interest in planning application no. 13/02740/FUL, as one of the objectors addressing the Committee was a friend.

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).

13/03129/FUL – The erection of 3 No. detached dwellings with attached garages, a replacement garage for Hilltop and formation of a new access (GR343811/109014), Land to rear of Hill Top Lyme Road, Crewkerne – Marst Developments Ltd

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report including the key considerations. There were no updates to the report. She confirmed that her recommendation was to approve the application.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer clarified points of detail raised by members, which included the following:

- All of the hedgerow along Lyme Road would be removed;
- The applicant wished to retain the additional access which would be wide enough for a vehicle;
- The hedgerow and fencing was in the applicant's ownership;
- The 3 car parking spaces, consisting of 1 garage and 2 spaces in front would all be in control of the property owner.

The Committee was addressed by Jo Dawson, representing Crewkerne Town Council. She reiterated the concerns of the Town Council in that the development would have a detrimental effect on the neighbours' privacy and amenity; there would be overcrowding on the site and there was insufficient space for large 2 storey buildings. The Town Council also had concerns about insufficient car parking provision, access and extra vehicles coming from the site onto a very busy road with the school not far away.

The Committee then noted the comments of Mr Antony Barratt, in objection to the application. He clarified that he owned the hedge along the southern boundary. Mr Barratt was of the view that the site was only suitable for single storey bungalows and referred to the privacy and amenity issues of the proposed development. He commented that if members were minded to approve the application he would be in favour of the dormer window being removed and replaced with a velux or redesigned and put at the rear of the dwelling.

The Applicant's Agent, Helen Lazenby referred to all the planning issues being comprehensively discussed and the applicant being a local company and a long standing member of the local community. The proposed development would contribute to the appearance of the town and the developer had worked hard to ensure that the houses were of an attractive design, with good layout, sufficient parking and not overcrowded. The density of the development was typical of what should be expected in a town. There was considered to be no harmful impact on highway safety and every aspect of the proposed development met the national planning standards.

Ward Member, Cllr. John Dyke referred to the issues of privacy which he felt could be addressed by obscure or fixed glazing. He was of the opinion that the site was only suitable for single story bungalows and referred to there being a shortage of bungalows in the town. Reference was also made to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) urging the need to plan positively for the ageing population and that the proposed development would target a completely different market. He also felt that the proposed development was not in keeping with the character of the area.

Ward Member, Cllr. Angie Singleton supported the views of Crewkerne Town Council and the objectors to the application. Bearing in mind the history of the site, she was supportive of the previous permission requiring dwellings to be single story only. She felt that the proposed development was not spacious and therefore not in keeping with the surrounding area.

During discussion, members expressed various views, which included the following:

- There were no issues with overlooking;
- It was felt that there was no unreasonable impact on residential amenity;
- Although the site was a little cramped, there was no planning reason to refuse the application;
- The design was considered to be acceptable and the difference in roof height between the proposed dwellings and a bungalow was only about 1 metre and therefore the impact was minimal;
- The applicant had produced 3 properties with a much more flexible design;
- The site was within development boundaries within walking distance to local amenities and access to public transport;
- The proposed development was a prudent use of land.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation as it was considered that the design and layout of the development was not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. On being put to the vote, the proposal was lost. Members voted 3 in favour and 10 against.

It was subsequently proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the Planning Officer's recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried 10 in favour and 3 against.

RESOLVED: That planning application no. 13/03129/FUL be **APPROVED** as per the Planning Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

01. It is considered that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, cause no demonstrable harm to residential amenity or highway safety in accordance with the aims and objectives of policies ST5 (General Principles for Development) and ST6 (Quality of Development) of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

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: drawing nos. 6326-01 received 2 August 2013, 6326-02 (planting only) received 28 August 2013, 6326-02B (surfacing only) accompanying agent's e-mail of 17 September 2013, 6326-02C received 2 October 2013, 6326-03 received 2 August 2013, 6326-04A received 14 August 2013, 6326-05A received 14 August 2013, and 6326-06 received 2 August 2013.

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

03. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out using the materials stipulated in the agent's e-mails of 2 and 17 September 2013, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

04. The area allocated for parking and turning on the submitted plan shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for the parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

05. 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 additional windows or other openings formed at first floor level in any of the dwellings hereby permitted without the prior express grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

06. The development hereby approved shall not be commenced unless details of the full boundary treatment of the site, including all fencing between the new dwellings, and the existing hedgerows around the site, including the height at which they are to be maintained, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such agreed boundary treatment shall be completed before the dwellings are first occupied and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity, in accordance with policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

07. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced unless there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include details of the boundary hedgerows to be retained, together with measures for their protection during the course of the development, additional planting to enhance the boundary planting and details of any changes proposed in existing ground levels. All planting, seeding, turving 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 building or the 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 policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

08. The proposed access road, including any turning space, shall be constructed in such a manner so as to ensure that each dwelling is served by a properly consolidated and surfaced road between the dwelling and the existing highway, before it is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2006).

09. The existing vehicular access shall be stopped up and its use permanently abandoned within one month of the new access hereby permitted being first brought into use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2006).

10. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900mm above adjoining road level forward of a line drawn 2.4m back and extending to a point on the nearside carriageway edge 43m to the north-east of the access, and there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 600mm above adjoining road level forward of a line drawn 2.4m back and extending to a point on the nearside carriageway edge 43m to the south-west of the access, as outlined in red on the approved

plan. Such visibility shall be fully provided before works commence on any of the dwellings hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2006).

11. The gradient of the proposed access shall not be steeper than 1 in 10.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2006).

12. Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such measures shall be fully implemented before the development hereby permitted is first occupied and shall thereafter be maintained at all times

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

13. The development hereby approved shall not be commenced unless details of the attenuation tank have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and such agreed details shall be fully implemented before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

14. 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) as defined in Classes A, B, and C of Part 1, Schedule 2 there shall be no extensions to the dwellings including alterations to the roof without the prior express grant of planning permission.

Reason In the interests of visual and residential amenity, in accordance with policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

15. Work shall not commence on the construction of any natural stone walls comprised in the development hereby approved unless a sample panel of stonework has been prepared for inspection on site to show the final appearance and finish of the stone external walls and has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

16. Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans, the new wall to the front of Hilltop, and either side of the access, shall be constructed in natural hamstone with cock and hen coping in

accordance with the agent's e-mails of 11 and 17 September 2013.

Reason In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

Informatives:

01. When finalising the landscaping plans pursuant to condition 7 above, the applicant's attention is drawn to the neighbour's comments regarding tree planting and the potential for loss of light.
02. This development is unsuitable for adoption as a public highway but it must be noted that the Advance Payments Code is applicable as it constitutes the laying out of a private street. Please contact the Estate Roads Team on 01823 356687 for further information about this.
03. The appropriate licences must be applied for from the Highway Authority namely a section 171 licence from the Traffic & Transport Development Group and a section 184 licence from the area office prior to any works being undertaken.

(Voting, 10 in favour, 3 against)

13/03145/FUL – The erection of an agricultural building (Revised Application of 12/01733/FUL) (GR327552/112007), Land at Beetham, High Beetham, Whitestaunton – Mr K Parris

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report including the key considerations. He informed members that since the last application was considered, the applicant had taken into account the concerns raised by neighbouring properties and had also looked at several other sites but was unable to find a more appropriate site. Through pre-application discussion, the applicant had provided more justification for the proposed location. He confirmed that his recommendation was for approval.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer and Solicitor clarified points of detail raised by members, which included the following:

- He presumed that the animals had been housed in the other holding during the winter months but this was now operating at full capacity;
- A sequential test had been undertaken on other sites which were all considered to be inappropriate. The proposed site offered an existing field access with good visibility splays and was set low in the landscape. Other sites were much more prominent;
- The roof water would be taken away to a separate soakaway. The other liquid would be contained within straw and would be removed and spread on the fields once or twice a year, which is a common agriculture practice;
- The other sites identified were further into the AONB. The applicant wanted a particular presence on the proposed site as he wished to avoid moving cattle back and forth to the other unit;
- The Environment Agency had the powers to act if there was any potential for contamination. The site did not fall within a Source Protection Zone;

- The applicant had undertaken a drainage analysis which concluded that water did come from boreholes, but this was incorrect;
- The other site was located 2 ½ miles away;
- There was no information available to suggest that the site was located within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone;
- If the application was approved and at a later stage there was contamination to the spring water, it was unlikely that a Court would consider the Council to have been negligent in approving the application as it had relied on the professional advice of the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency, are the authority responsible for regulating water pollution and as stated in the report they had no objections to the application.

The Committee noted the comments of Marion Edwards and Andrew Warren in objection to the application. Points raised included the following:

- The local residents were disappointed that they had not been consulted by the applicant;
- The farming activities undertaken by the neighbouring landowner were more akin to that of a small holding;
- The nearest properties to the site did not have mains water supply and all their water was provided from local springs; The proposed development had the potential to greatly affect the quality of the ground water;
- The catchment area supplying the springs was approximately 150 metres away;
- Concerns regarding the impact on the character of the AONB;
- The proposed location and access would mean an increase in traffic;
- There was no pressing business need for the site;
- There was no justification for the proposed site.

Ward Member, Cllr. Ros Roderigo commented that she failed to understand why the applicant had chosen the furthest point away from the farm for the proposed development which was also in a different county. She was not convinced that the proposed site was justified and there was no record of further evaluation of alternative sites. She commented that all the points raised to the previous application were still relevant and that the correct decision had been previously made. Reference was made to the lane accessing the site which was relatively narrow with no passing places and therefore traffic would be a danger to residents. She also referred to the Study that had been undertaken confirming that surface water may reach the source of the springs and that this advice should be taken into consideration.

During discussion, members raised various concerns, which included the following:

- The proposed building was detrimental to the landscape;
- It was felt that no straw bedding was 100% absorbent and that there was likely to be some seepage;
- Concerns over loss of residential amenity;
- There was no information available in the report on the consultation that had taken place concerning alternative sites;
- Concerns over no expert advice being sought regarding sub-surface flows as referred to by the Technical Officer;
- Strong concerns over the potential contamination of the water supply.

The Area Lead West advised that if members were minded to refuse the application there would be strong planning reasons to object on landscape grounds. The Solicitor explained that landscape considerations were subjective and Members were entitled to

disagree with officers if they considered the impact of the development would be too great on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that this could be an acceptable reason for refusal. The issue of contamination would be more difficult to defend should a planning appeal be submitted as it was controlled by the Environment Agency and there was environmental legislation to deal with these issues. The Solicitor suggested that a further reason for refusal could be on the grounds that Members felt that the application had not supplied sufficient information about the effect the proposal would have on the water supply for nearby properties.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation due to the proposed building having an adverse impact on the landscape and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and inadequate justification for the proposed location, as well as insufficient information about the impact of the proposed development on the water supply for the neighbouring properties, the exact wording to be agreed by the Chairman and Ward Member with the Planning Officer. On being put to the vote the proposal was unanimously supported.

RESOLVED: That planning application no. 13/03145/FUL be **REFUSED** contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

1. Inadequate justification has been submitted to demonstrate a need for the building in the proposed location. Therefore, the building by reason of its siting and scale is considered to have an adverse impact on local landscape character and on the natural beauty of the AONB. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies ST5, ST6 EC2 , EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and the provisions of chapter 11 and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed erection of an agricultural building for the accommodation of livestock, by reason of its siting and proximity to the spring source for a private water supply providing drinking water to nearby residential properties, is deemed to be unacceptable and is considered likely to have an adverse impact on ground water to the detriment of the local water environment and to the amenities of nearby residents deriving their drinking water from local sources. As such the proposal is contrary to saved policies ST5, ST6 and EP9 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and the provisions of chapter 11 and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: unanimous)

13/02740/FUL – The erection of 65 No. dwellings and associated works (GR3348451/114681), Land at Canal Way, Ilminster – Persimmon Homes (SW) Ltd.

The Planning Officer with the aid of slides and photographs summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report including the key considerations. He updated members that the Environment Agency had no objections to the amended drainage proposals. The Highway Authority was satisfied with amended plans subject to conditions. He confirmed that his recommendation was for approval.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer clarified points of detail raised by members, which included the following:

- Further explanation over the proposed development in relation to the existing cycleway and links to the next stage of Stop Line Way;
- There was no formal allocation for the site, which is within the defined development area of Ilminster. The previous consent for employment use of the land expired in 2012;
- The proposed floor area for the flats was 46.28 metres squared. The units just fall outside the Council's expected minimum space standards but were within the Housing Quality Indicators for space standards;
- The block of flats designated for affordable housing would be classed as landmark properties on the site;
- The proposed development would not affect demand figures within the emerging Local Plan. The site should be viewed as a windfall site. The area for growth in Ilminster would still come forward;
- There was no specific policy to require pepper-potting on site;
- The attenuation scheme was due to be adopted by Wessex Water and details would be included within the S106 agreement;
- The site would be served by separate systems of drainage;
- The final arrangement of the site would be inspected by Building Control;
- The proposed planted amenity space would be managed by a management company;
- SSDC Community, Health & Leisure had requested on site play provision to a minimum standard of a LEAP be provided. They were not satisfied with a small scale provision;
- Management of the footpaths would need to be part of the S106 agreement.

The Committee was addressed by Andrew Sharman, representing Ilminster Town Council. They were objecting to the scheme on the grounds of over development, concerns over room sizes and the impact on the existing infrastructure, particularly sewage and drainage. He commented that the Town Council would prefer the land to be used as commercial for light industry. With regard to the social housing element, the Town Council would wish to see it spilt up. Reference was also made to the need for a small play area for pre-school children on the site as it was not easy for parents to access the recreation ground. The issue of primary schools in the area being at full capacity was also mentioned and that a school was needed much more than houses.

Emma Jane Taylor, an objector to the application clarified that there was a bridleway behind the houses that was often used by horses. She referred to concerns over flooding which was becoming a major issue in the area. She also referred to the need for a play area for pre-school children on the site as it was too dangerous to walk to the play area at Winterhay Lane and the Recreation ground was over a mile away. She commented that she would prefer to see a less developed site than proposed and raised concerns over access to the development commenting that it would be difficult for emergency vehicles to pass.

The Applicant's Agent, Catherine Knee commented that the proposed scheme was located within development limits and was supported by the adopted and draft Local Plan. The land had been marketed unsuccessfully for a number of years and the previous commercial permission had since expired. The affordable housing element of the scheme was in accordance with policy. She commented that the proposal was also supported by the National Planning Policy Framework and represented sustainable development. In terms of density she referred to there being a similar adjoining development. She also referred to a significant contribution towards enhancing the existing equipped play area at Ilminster Recreation Ground as being the most viable

option. She commented that there were no objections from Statutory Organisations and asked Members to support the application.

Ward Member, Cllr. Carol Goodall referred to the increase in units on the site having a bid impact on the size of the proposed rooms and gardens. She raised concerns that lack of adequate space would have a significant impact on health and family relationships and referred to research undertaken by the Rural Institute of British Architects which concluded that lack of space had an impact upon basic lifestyle needs. She also referred to the proposed space standard being less than the recommended space standards for London.

Ward Member, Cllr. Kim Turner commented that she was disappointed to see a sign and site office being erected by the developers prior to the planning application being considered. She was unable to support the application and felt that the site should be for employment land as there was a desperate need for office space. Reference was made to there being no infrastructure in place to support additional houses and that the school was already overcrowded. She also raised concerns over emergency vehicles being able to access the site because of the width of the road. She was disappointed to see that the affordable housing element of the scheme was in a cluster. Concerns were also raised in relation to overdevelopment, flooding issues and poor design.

During discussion, members raised various concerns, which included the following:

- The design of the scheme was disappointing with no regard to the character of Ilminster;
- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Lack of sustainable travel to the site;
- Not supportive of a management company;
- The design and layout of the scheme was not considered to be of a good standard;
- Concerns over flooding;
- There was no on site play facilities for pre-school children;
- The size of the proposed properties were very small;

In response to member comments, the Area Lead West clarified that the Council did not currently have a 5 year land supply or specific policy requirements relating to minimum space.

The Area Lead West advised that the size of application would require on site play provision and that the proposed development not making any provision for on site play facilities could be an acceptable planning reason for refusal but suggested that poor design of the scheme would be more difficult to defend should a planning appeal be submitted.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation due to the proposed development not making any provision for on site play provision. On being put to the vote the proposal was unanimously supported.

RESOLVED: That planning application no. 13/02740/FUL be **REFUSED** contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

The proposed development does not make any provision for on site play facilities and thus does not provide the opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of communities. The development is therefore contrary to saved Policy CR2 of the South Somerset Local Plan, the sustainable

development principles and chapter 8 of the NPPF.

(Voting: unanimous)

.....
Chairman