

South Somerset District Council

Draft Minutes of a meeting of the **Regulation Committee** held on **Tuesday 17th September 2013** in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Brympton Way, Yeovil.

(10.00 a.m. – 10.40 a.m.)

Present:

Peter Gubbins (Chairman)

Tim Carroll	Ros Roderigo
Nick Colbert	Sylvia Seal
Tony Fife	Angie Singleton
Shane Pledger	

Officers:

Jo Boucher	Committee Administrator
Adrian Noon	Area Lead – East/North
Alex Skidmore	Planning Officer
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive

7. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting of the Regulation Committee held on Tuesday, 16th July 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, were approved as a correct record by the Chairman.

8. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Ian Martin, Terry Mounter, Gina Seaton, Paul Thompson and William Wallace

9. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

There were no Declarations of Interest

10. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 4)

There were no questions or comments from members of the public.

11. Erection of one dwelling, West View, Folly Road, Kingsbury Episcopi 13/01092/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report as set out in the agenda and explained to members that at the meeting of the Area North Committee on 24th July 2013 it was resolved that the application be referred to the Regulation Committee with the recommendation to approve contrary to the officer's recommendation. She reminded members that the application site was located outside the development limit area.

Ward Member, Derek Yeomans spoke in support of the application. He felt it was an adequate plot with a sufficient car parking and turning area. He said it was located on a straight road and an ideal infill site. The location was not in the open countryside by definition and the village needed housing. He felt the dwelling and its proposed design would be an asset to the village.

Ms Helen Lazenby, Agent commented that policy had changed significantly since the refusal of a similar application in 1990 and considered that under new policy the proposal was acceptable. She felt the site was not in the open countryside nor did it have an open view, was within walking distance of village facilities and was in a more sustainable location than others recently approved nearby. She felt the visibility access would be improved by the re siting of the hedgerow and explained how the applicants aspiration was to move into the proposed dwelling with the remaining family to stay in West View, thereby the dwelling would be used for a local family. She also noted that the Area North Committee had supported the application and no objections had been received from neighbours.

During the ensuing discussion, Members speaking in support of the Officer's recommendation referred to a number of issues, which included the following:

- Sporadic layout of houses within the area
- No pavements and therefore would not walk to nearby facilities
- Could set a precedent for similar infill developments within the area
- Outside the defined development limits and no proven justification to warrant an exception to policy

Members speaking in objection of the Officer's recommendation made a number of comments which included the following:

- Genuine infill plot with no detrimental effect on surrounding area or adjacent houses
- 30mph speed limit along highway, not an exceedingly busy road therefore no harm to highway safety
- Should look to encourage village development where appropriate
- Proposed dwelling is of good design and would improve vehicular access for both properties

It was then proposed and seconded to amend the application for approval contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation for the reasons as stated by the Area Leads at the meeting as follows:

Although this site is outside the development area the proposed dwelling would constitute an appropriate infill development of this garden site that would not result in any demonstrable harm to visual or residential amenity or highways safety. Given the

proximity to the services and facilities available in Kingsbury Episcopi and Stembridge it is not considered that this is an unsustainable location. As such the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of the National Planning policy Framework and policies ST3, ST5, St6 and Ec3 of the South Somerset local Plan.

On being put to the vote, members voted 5 in favour and 2 against the proposal.

A substantive motion was then proposed and seconded to approve the application for the reasons already stated by the Area Leads at the meeting and subject to the conditions as suggested by Area North Committee. On being put to the vote, members voted 5 in favour and 2 against.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 13/01092/FUL be approved for the following reasons:

Although this site is outside the development area the proposed dwelling would constitute and appropriate infill development of this garden site that would not result in any demonstrable harm to visual or residential amenity or highways safety. Given the proximity to the services and facilities available in Kingsbury Episcopi and Stembridge it is not considered that this is an unsustainable location. As such the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of the National Planning policy Framework and policies ST3, ST5, St6 and Ec3 of the South Somerset local Plan.

Subject to the conditions as suggested by Area North Committee:-

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to be agreed
4. Visibility in accordance with plans
5. Turning parking in accordance with plans
6. No additional opening to east elevation
7. Drainage

(Voting: 5 in favour, 2 against)

12. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 6)

Members noted that the next meeting of the Regulation Committee would take place on Tuesday 15th October 2013 at 10.00am in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Brympton Way, Yeovil.

.....
Chairman