

## South Somerset District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at the **Meeting Room, Churchfield Offices, Wincanton** on **Wednesday 12 August 2015**.

(9.00 - 11.45 am)

**Present:**

**Members:** Councillor Nick Weeks (Chairman)

Mike Beech	Tim Inglefield
Tony Capozzoli	Mike Lewis
Nick Colbert	David Norris
Sarah Dyke-Bracher	William Wallace
Anna Groskop	Colin Winder

**Officers:**

Anne Herridge	Democratic Services Officer
Helen Rutter	Area Development Manager (East)
Tim Cook	Neighbourhood Development Officer (East)
Adron Duckworth	Conservation Manager
Emma Meecham	Planning Assistant
David Norris	Development Manager

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

---

### 47. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> May and 8 July 2015, copies of which had been circulated, were agreed and signed by the chairman. A slight amendment was made to the wording of confidential minute agenda Item 17.

In response to a query from Cllr Colin Winder the chairman pointed out that the Planning Inspectors decision to allow an appeal on land at Dancing Lane Wincanton had been included in the minutes. Further discussion about that decision would be included in the briefing to be given by the Development Manager after the close of the Area East Committee meeting.

---

### 48. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

An apology for absence had been received from Cllr Henry Hobhouse.

---

### 49. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.

---

## 50. Public Participation at Committees (Agenda Item 4)

- a) Mr John Jeremiah a regular attendee at AEC meetings advised the meeting that he would soon be moving away from the area after 30 years; and would no longer be able to attend AEC meetings. He thanked committee members for protecting his village and the Blackmore Vale and also thanked them for the use of common sense during the many discussions and planning applications.

Cllr Mike Lewis wished Mr Jeremiah well in his move.

The Chairman read the comments included in a letter from Mrs Elson (who had been unable to attend the meeting) regarding the recent Planning Inspectors decisions printed in the agenda.

The Chairman agreed to allow members of the public who wished to comment on Agenda Item 9, the Review of the Charlton Mackrell and West Charlton Conservation Area, to address the committee at this point of the meeting.

Mrs J Greenway the Chairman of Charlton Mackrell PC addressed the committee with reference to agenda item 9, the review of the Charlton Mackrell and West Charlton Conservation Area, she explained that although the PC was broadly in support of the proposed amended boundary, some parish councillors were against it but overall they were concerned that the consultation period had been too short.

Mr P Trevethan spoke in objection to the proposed amended boundary of Charlton Mackrell and West Charlton Conservation Area, he also considered that the timescale for the consultation period had been too short and questioned why the Conservation Area Appraisal had not yet been prepared.

Mrs C Mycock and Ms M Hilborne both spoke in support of the amendments to the designated area which in their opinion would help enhance the village and its many historical properties and was key to the setting of Charlton House.

- b) Cllr Mike Beech spoke with reference to Planning Application 15/02628/OUT as he was concerned that the Scheme of Delegation had not been followed and a representation made by the Parish Council had not been taken into account.

The Chairman asked if others had experienced similar issues to Cllr Beech. A number confirmed that they had concerns about consultation on planning applications in their ward. Further discussion would take place with the Development Manager during his briefing following AEC and it was also felt that the issue should be referred to Scrutiny Committee to ensure that due process is being followed.

Concern was expressed about a wind turbine appeal that was being heard in Bristol rather than locally. The ADM agreed to follow up the matter with the Planning Service to see if it could be remedied and request that all planning appeal hearings should take place locally rather than out of the area.

---

## 51. Reports from Members Representing the District Council on Outside Organisations (Agenda Item 5)

Cllr Tim Inglefield had recently attended a meeting with South West Audit Partnership (SWAP) in order to review last year's accounts.

---

**52. Feedback on Reports referred to the Regulation Committee (Agenda Item 6)**

There had been no recent meetings of the Regulation Committee.

---

**53. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 7)**

The chairman reminded members of the briefing with the Development Manager after the AEC meeting.

---

**54. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 8)**

Members noted the date of the next AEC meeting would be Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2015 at 9.00am at Churchfield Wincanton.

---

**55. Charlton Mackrell and West Charlton Conservation Area Review (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 9)**

The Conservation Manager presented the report as detailed in full in the agenda; with the aid of a power point presentation photos of the area were shown. He also confirmed that members had received a copy of the revised map, as of 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015, of the proposed extension to the Charlton Mackrell Conservation Area that had been amended following consultation.

Charlton Mackrell parish council had indicated their general support for the proposals and it had been hoped that they would formally consider the proposal at their meeting on July 25<sup>th</sup>, however that had not happened and would now not be considered until the meeting due to take place in August. All the affected residents had been written to directly, and public notices had been displayed in the area, referring them to information on the council's website. Although the consultation period had been short due to concern over Ale House Lodge, there was no statutory requirement by SSSC to consult.

Ward Member Cllr Dave Norris was unhappy that a Conservation Area Appraisal had not yet been prepared but because the Conservation Officer considered the boundaries to now be correct, Cllr Norris was happy to support the amendments as they stood.

During discussion several members voiced their unease about the short time frame of the consultation and felt the application to be premature. There was also concern that if the decision was postponed Ale House Lodge could be demolished within the 28 day statutory notice before a decision was taken in September.

A proposal was then made and seconded to support the amendments to the designated area subject to confirmation of support from Charlton Mackrell PC at their next PC meeting. If no changes were requested, the decision would then be confirmed by the Conservation Manager in liaison with the Ward Member.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried by 6 votes in favour and 4 against.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That members were content to support the amendments to the designated area subject to confirmation of support from Charlton Mackrell PC at their next PC meeting. The decision then to be confirmed by the Conservation Manager with liaison with the Ward Member
2. Once approved the changes will be advertised in accordance with the requirements of the Planning (Listed building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Reason: To recommend amending the boundary of the Charlton Mackrell Conservation Area, consisting of a large extension to the north of the existing designation.

(Voting: 6 in favour 4 against)

---

**56. Endorsement of Henstridge, Yenston and Bowden Parish Plan (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 10)**

The Community Development Officer presented the report as detailed in the agenda and asked members to formally endorse the Henstridge, Yenston and Bowden Parish Plan.

Mr M Petherham addressed members and explained that the production of the plan had been an enjoyable and thorough process; it was an accurate reflection of local wishes and needs and was already being used as a framework to implement community priorities.

Ward Member Cllr Tim Inglefield confirmed that a lot of good work had been carried out during the process and the Community Development Officer had been of great help.

Members were content to endorse the Parish Plan but wanted to ensure that Development Control took into account the evidence of needs and priorities when considering local planning applications. The PC guaranteed that the Plan would be kept updated.

**RESOLVED:**

That Area East Committee formally endorses the Henstridge Parish Plan.

Reason: To present a summary and findings of the Henstridge Parish Plan and to ask Area East Committee members to formally endorse the Plan.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

---

**57. Endorsement of Pitcombe Parish Plan 2015 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 11)**

The Community Development Officer asked members to formally endorse the Pitcombe Parish Plan as detailed in the agenda report.

John Knight from Pitcombe PC addressed the committee and explained that as there were only 200 households within the parish, this parish plan was very different from the Henstridge Parish Plan previously discussed, it was very much a 'living' document and issues were reviewed monthly. He urged members to endorse the plan.

Ward Member Cllr Mike Beech congratulated the group on the production of the plan, he also pointed out a typo in the agenda report that referred to the A37 instead of the A371.

Members were unanimously content to formally endorse the Pitcombe Parish Plan. The Chairman advised that Ward Members should take responsibility to ensure that Planning Officers took relevant Parish Plans into account during consideration of planning applications within their wards. Parish plans could also be used as evidence when referring to Policy SS2 - Development in Rural Settlements (not Market Towns or Rural Centres). He also thanked the Community Development Officer for his hard work

### **RESOLVED:**

That Area East Committee formally endorses the Pitcombe Parish Plan.

Reason: To present a summary of the findings and actions from the Pitcombe Parish Plan and to ask members of Area East Committee to formally endorse the Plan.

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

---

## **58. Area East Development Service Plan (Agenda Item 12)**

The ADM presented the report as detailed in the agenda. She explained that the Area East Committee revised local priorities on an annual basis within the framework of the overall Council Plan. Through the Area East Development Service Plan and other means, it sought to make progress on these priorities by allocating resources and working with partners and other services within SSDC to achieve results. Progress against the Service Plan was monitored monthly by staff and reported to Committee at 6 months and then at year end.

Each Councillor had been issued with their Ward Profile setting out key facts and contact details for their ward. They had also identified particular problems and issues affecting their wards.

Reference was made to page 26 of the report regarding offering advice and support to any community groups, the wording would be amended to ensure only community groups within Area East were included.

Following member's discussion Cllr Sarah Dyke-Bracher, who is also Programme Manager of the Heart of Wessex LEADER funding programme, asked members to note that there would be a briefing for members at the Council Offices, Brympton Way, Yeovil on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2015. She explained that there was a need for a wide range of support for businesses.

In response to a query from the Chairman regarding the number of days allocated to the Limington to Yeovil multi-user path, the ADM explained that there would be discussions with the Area South team regarding the pooling of resources in order to bring the scheme forward.

This scheme. The ADM also explained that as the Balsam Centre was a key facility in the area; strong support from SSDC for the development of its services was offered in response to local needs to improve its sustainability.

The ADM also explained that the Balsam Centre was a key facility in the area. It had lost major funding with the restructuring of Children's Centres. Some intensive support from SSDC for the development of its services was being offered, especially to support skills and job opportunities, in response to local needs and to improve the Centre's sustainability

Overall, Members were content to approve the Area East Development Service plan 2015/16.

**RESOLVED:** To approve the Area East Development Service Plan 2015/16.

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

---

**59. Heart of Wessex Rail Partnership Update (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 13)**

The ADM presented the report as detailed in full in the agenda; she confirmed that the annual partnership had reported an increase in passenger journeys, and consideration was being considered to enhance the parking at Castle Cary station and changes to platform access at Bruton station. Although it was hard to get the train operator to make further investment due to the short franchise arrangement; improvements to the Sunday service was a short-term priority.

Catherine Phillips of the Rail Partnership was thanked for the excellent work she carries out.

Members were content to approve the recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

That Area East Committee Members:

- 1) Note the work undertaken by the Heart of Wessex Rail Partnership in 2014/15 and that a similar report will be taken to Area South Committee
- 2) Approve a funding contribution of £2,000 from the Members' discretionary budget for 2015/16

Reason: To receive a summary of the work undertaken by the Heart of Wessex Rail Partnership during 2014/15 and to consider making a partnership contribution for 2015/16.

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

---

**60. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 14)**

Cllr Colin Winder was disappointed that a report that had been requested to go on the agenda for today's meeting regarding an appeal that had been allowed for outline planning permission on land at Dancing Lane Wincanton was not on the public agenda.

The Development Manager had considered that it would not have been in the best interests of SSDC to highlight the issues within a public report; further discussion on the matter would take place during a briefing straight after the AEC meeting.

Due to further discussion regarding having a report on appeals on a future agenda a proposal was made for a special workshop to be held in order to ensure all members were fully aware of the procedure once a planning application had been referred to Development Control. If they were still concerned after that a report could be put on the forward plan for the October/ November meetings

The ADM agreed to arrange a workshop for one evening and let members know the date and time as soon as possible. It was essential that all members made the effort to attend the planned workshop.

---

**61. Items for information (Agenda Item 15)**

**NOTED**

---

**62. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 16)**

**NOTED**

---

**63. Planning Application 15/01314/FUL - Acorn House, 7 Lansdowne Place, Wincanton. (Agenda Item 17)**

The Planning Officer presented the report as detailed in full in the agenda. She provided members with 2 updates: a letter from a member of the public referring to the proposed garage. (Amended plans now indicated that the proposed garage had been removed from the application) and correspondence that stated that as the road was private the advice given by Highways was irrelevant.

Several photos of the locality were shown as part of the power point presentation, the officer confirmed that her recommendation was to approve the application as per the reasons as detailed in full in the agenda report.

Mr D Rogan spoke in objection to the application; he was concerned about the impact the proposal would have on the site within the listed walls, he also made reference to the private through road and the local covenants regarding parking.

Mr G Adlem the agent spoke on behalf of his clients, Mr & Mrs Smith, who in his opinion were putting more into the proposal than would be taken out. The Conservation Officer was now happy with the design of the wall and the proposed materials. Mr Adlem explained that the listed wall covered 44 square meters in total and less than 6 square meters would be removed as part of this proposal and would tidy up the whole area. He read from a letter written by the applicants Mr & Mrs Smith, regarding some of the negative comments made by neighbours.

Ward Member Cllr Colin Winder felt let down because there was not an SSDC Legal Officer in attendance at this meeting. He raised the civil matter of previously agreed parking issues and access road. If this application was approved he felt that it would be

unfair as those concerns would have to be dealt with via legal channels at a cost to residents themselves. Cllr Winder explained that there were two relevant listed buildings in the vicinity not just the one that had been purported to, he also queried the number of policies referred to in the recommendation.

In response, the Development Manager confirmed that it was general practice to list all planning policies that may be relevant to an application, he also explained that parking arrangements had not been part of any S106 obligation, and in his opinion there was adequate parking provided and planning permission was not required to park in part of a garden.

Ward Member Cllr Nick Colbert concurred with Cllr Winder's comments, although he was unhappy that the application had to be considered by AEC at all because Wincanton Town Councillors and Ward Members, who knew the town well,, had unanimously voted to refuse the application and Cllr Colbert felt that should mean that the application should have been refused at that stage.

In response to a misstatement Mr Adlem confirmed that the applicants have a legal right to park 2 cars outside their property.

Denise Ballance a Director of Lansdowne Property Management addressed members and gave an explanation of the current parking rights used by residents of the estate.

During discussion some members felt that by approving the application an important piece of historical asset would be lost, and did not support the proposed natural stone wall. The views of both Ward Members who knew the locality well should be taken into account, however if the application was refused reasonable reasons should to be used.

A proposal was then made and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the officer's recommendation as the proposed works would have an adverse impact upon both the fabric and setting of designated heritage assets.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried by 6 votes in favour: 1 against and 3 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Application 15/01314/FUL be **refused** contrary to the officers recommendation for the following reason:

The proposed works will have an adverse impact upon both the fabric and setting of designated heritage assets and as such will be contrary to Policies EQ2 and EQ3 of South Somerset Local Plan March 2015 and advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 6 in favour: 1 against; 3 abstentions)

---

**64. Planning Application 15/01315/LBC - 7 Lansdowne Place, Wincanton.  
(Agenda Item 18)**

The Planning Officer had presented the report in conjunction with the previous Planning Application 15/01314/FUL.

A proposal was made and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the officer's recommendation as the proposed works will have an adverse impact upon both the fabric and setting of designated heritage assets.

**RESOLVED:**

That Listed Building Consent be refused contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reason:

The proposed works will have an adverse impact upon both the fabric and setting of designated heritage assets and as such will be contrary to Policies EQ2 and EQ3 of South Somerset Local Plan March 2015 and advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 6 in favour: 4 against)

---

.....  
Chairman