

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area North Committee** held at the **Long Sutton Village Hall** on **Wednesday 22 February 2017**.

(2.00 pm - 4.10 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Clare Aparicio Paul (Chairman)

Neil Bloomfield	Crispin Raikes
Adam Dance	Dean Ruddle
Graham Middleton	Sylvia Seal
Tiffany Osborne	Sue Steele
Stephen Page	Derek Yeomans

Officers:

Helen Rutter	Assistant Director (Communities)
John Millar	Planning Officer
Andrew Gunn	Area Lead (West)
Adrian Noon	Area Lead (North/East)
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Becky Sanders	Democratic Services Officer

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

143. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

144. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jo Roundell Greene and Gerard Tucker.

145. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Neil Bloomfield declared a personal interest for planning applications 16/04453/FUL and 13/01500/OUT as he is also a member of Martock Parish Council. He also declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest for 17/00104/FUL as the application was for his home address.

Councillor Graham Middleton declared a personal interest for planning applications 16/04453/FUL, 13/01500/OUT and 17/00104/FUL as he is also a member of Martock Parish Council.

Councillors Adam Dance and Crispin Raikes both declared a personal interest for planning application 15/03646/FUL as they are also members of South Petherton Parish Council.

146. Date of next meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted the next meeting of Area North Committee is scheduled for 2.00pm on Wednesday 22 March 2017, at the Edgar Hall in Somerton.

147. Public question time (Agenda Item 5)

There were no questions from members of the public.

148. Chairman's announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman thanked members who had attended the Area North Parish meeting and also the staff for arranging the event which had been well received.

149. Reports from members (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Sylvia Seal was pleased to announce that Darcy Bussell would be officially opening the Westlands Entertainment Venue in June, and advised members that tickets were selling quickly.

150. Area North Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 8)

There were no updates to the Forward Plan. The Assistant Director (Communities) noted that a report from Highways would try to be arranged for the May meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Area North Committee Forward Plan be noted.

151. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 9)

Members noted the report that detailed recent planning appeals which had been lodged, dismissed or allowed.

152. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined By Committee (Agenda Item 10)

Members noted the schedule of planning applications to be determined at the meeting.

153. Planning Application 15/03646/FUL - Frogmary Green Farm, West Street, South Petherton. (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Construction of on-farm Anaerobic Digester (AD) plant (revised application, part retrospective).

The Area Lead (West) introduced the application and reminded members why the application had been deferred at the December meeting of Area North Committee. He noted that a response had since been received from the Secretary of State which had confirmed that the proposal was not considered to be EIA development.

The Planning Officer then presented the application as detailed in the agenda report, highlighting that Highways had raised no objections and traffic movements were predicted to be similar to the previous approved application. He acknowledged concerns had been raised about traffic movements, and the issues had been checked with the applicant and Highways. Highways had confirmed that they considered the road network to be adequate. Concerns had also been noted about odour and flooding but statutory consultees had not raised any objections, nor had there been any objections on ecological grounds.

Mrs T Sienkiewicz spoke in objection to the proposal and hoped members had noted the submissions from Lopen Parish Council. She raised a number of points including:

- the scheme was now much bigger than originally led to believe
- concerned there is no updated traffic plan as the existing plan refers to historical data.
- asked for the committee to insist on a new transport plan using current data
- one CHP and underground tank should be removed

Mr D Manley, applicant, commented the transport arrangements had not changed with this application and the footprint was largely unchanged. The change with this application regarding injecting gas into the grid was supported by the Climate Change Officer, and the scheme met national and SSSC policies regarding renewable energy. There were no objections from statutory consultees and no increase in public objections.

Ward member, Councillor Crispin Raikes, noted he had visited the site with his colleague ward member and was supportive of anaerobic digestion in principle. He noted that concerns were mainly around capacity and traffic. He acknowledged the digester tank had yet to be built and that it had probably led to some storage issues and more traffic movements than there may be in the future. He felt there should be a condition to require traffic figures to be submitted to the LPA for monitoring. Although it was unfortunate how the current situation had happened he felt the application should be supported.

Ward member, Councillor Adam Dance, concurred with his fellow ward member, and noted that although he had never been happy with how Greener For Life had operated, he could see no reason to refuse the application.

During discussion mixed views were expressed including:

- excellent use of farm waste for energy.
- transport plan is fine, as a working farm could have any level of traffic.
- there is an impact on landscape as it's visible from the A303.
- Consideration should be given to the provision of passing spaces, to Highways standards, and maintained for the life of the plant by the farm.
- The report indicates the applicant has responded to questions raised.

- Support agricultural, but this is more like industrial.
- Have doubts that this type of energy production is an asset for renewable energy.
- The site will be heavily controlled by permitting regulations.
- Report indicates that feedstock for the plant already comes from up to 23 miles away including Taunton.

In response to comments made during discussion, the Area Lead (West) clarified that:

- Condition 9 could be amended to require quarterly submission of feedstock data and also the wording strengthened to include adherence to agreed transport routes.
- Passing spaces – he believed the passing spaces created were on third party land and it may be possible to get a Grampian. He noted Highways had not requested a need for passing spaces.
- He would be happy to liaise with the applicant and Highways to bring the passing spaces provided up to the necessary specification.

During discussion it was proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the officer recommendation subject to the amended wording of condition 9. At the end of debate a vote was taken on the proposal which was carried 5 votes in favour, 4 against, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning application 15/03646/FUL be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The proposal would respect the character and appearance of the area, would provide an efficient means of dealing with farm waste and provide a sustainable form of renewable energy, it would not adversely affect highway safety or residential amenity or harm any ecological interest. The proposal would accord with policies SD1, TA5, TA6, EQ1, EQ2, EQ3, and EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan, the Waste Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Subject to the following:

01. Notwithstanding the time limits given to implement planning permission as prescribed by Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), this permission shall have effect from the 19th August 2015.

Reason: To comply with The Town and Country Planning Act.

02. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan - drawing no. SA15799/01 rev B, received 11 September 2015
- Site Plan - drawing no. SA19247/02 rev B received 11 September 2015
- Sectional elevations - drawing no. SA19247/03 received 19 August 2015
- Elevations omitting foliage - drawing no. SA19247/04 Rev A received 19 August 2015

- Digester, Digestate Tank and Gas Holder section - drawing no. SA19247/06 received 19 August 2015
- Proposed Digestate Spreading Area - drawing no. SA15799/07 received 19th August 2015
- Proposed Digestate Spreading Area with proposed routes for imported poultry manure- drawing no. SA15799/07 received 19 August 2015
- Proposed Feedstock Source Area - drawing no. SA15799-08 received 19 2015
- Proposed Feedstock Source Area with transport routes- drawing no. SA19247/08 received 19th August 2015
- Tractor Movement Plan - drawing no. SA15799/09 received 19th August 2015
- JCB Loader Movement Plan - drawing no. SA15799/10 received 19th August 2015
- HGV Movement Plan - drawing no. SA15799/11 received 19th August 2015
- Supporting Statement received 19th August 2015
- Planting zones drawing number SA19247/13 Rev A received 7th October 2015
- Drainage layout Drawing number 00020-00-H received 8th August 2015.
- Site surfacing PPlan - drawing number SA19247/13 received 19th August 2015.
- Revised Flood Risk Assessment received 21st January 2016
- proposed routes for imported poultry manure via A303 received 7th August 2015.
- Transport route from Ilminster field blocks /Dillington Estate received 7th August 2015
- Frogmary digestate pipeline routes received 7th August 2015.
- Route from Ilminster fields blocks received 7th August 2015.
- Frogmary land banks below Harp Road received 7th August 2015.
- Archaeological Watching Brief received April 2016
- Ecology Appraisal received April 2016.

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

03. No further buildings or structures as approved by this permission shall be constructed until particulars of the materials (including the provision of samples where appropriate) to be used for external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and character of the area in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

04. No external lighting shall be erected on the application site unless details including size, design, location and degree of luminance have been previously submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and character of the area in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan

05. Within 2 months of the date of this decision, a surface water drainage scheme for the site (to accord with SuDS requirements where necessary), based on the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system in accordance with the NPPF.

06. Within 6 months of the cessation of the use of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the removal of all buildings, structures, hard-standings, plant and machinery, roadways, fencing or other structures and equipment brought onto or erected on the land for the purposes of the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of restoration and a timescale for completion. The scheme shall be fully implemented within 3 months of the date of approval.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and character of the area and in accordance with policies EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

07. The landscaping scheme hereby approved shall be fully implemented in the first planting season following completion of the construction of the development. 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: To safeguard the amenities and character of the area in accordance with policies EQ2 the South Somerset Local Plan.

08. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard highway safety and rural amenity in accordance with policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

09. The feedstock to serve the anaerobic digester hereby approved

shall be limited to farm waste and agricultural crops only. The total tonnage shall not exceed 19,300 tonnes without the express grant of planning permission. This feedstock shall only be grown or harvested from the land identified on the feedstock source maps drawing no. SA19247/08, Map E (submitted 7th August 2015) and Dillington Estate map received 20 August 2014), as referred to in the agent's emails of 18 and 21 August 2014, (as per application no: 14/01923/FUL) without the express grant of planning permission. In addition, digestate pipeline routes shall only be located as shown on the submitted plan titled 'Frogmary digestate pipeline routes' received 7th August 2015. The transport routes of vehicles shall follow only the vehicular routes as outlined on submitted Maps A,B, E, and as shown on submitted map titled 'Proposed routes for imported poultry manure via A303' all received 7th August 2015. A record shall be kept of all feedstock to serve the digester, including its origin, amount and type. This recorded information shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority every 3 months, commencing at the end of March 2017.

Reason: To allow any other feedstock source and additional feedstock over and above the weight limit approved to be properly considered in order to safeguard highway safety and rural amenity in accordance with policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

10. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900mm above adjoining road level in advance of lines drawn 2.4m back from the carriageway edge on the centre line of the access point and extending to points on the nearside carriageway edge 70.0m either side of the access. Such visibility shall be fully provided before the development hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety to accord with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

11. The proposed southernmost access onto West Street over at least the first 10.0m of its length, as measured from the edge of the adjoining carriageway, shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

12. Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards and shall be set back a minimum distance of 10.0m from the carriageway edge.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

13. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced unless the surfacing materials for all hardstanding and tracks to serve the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and the interests of amenity in accordance with policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the NPPF.

(Voting: 5 for, 4 against, 1 abstention)

154. Planning Application 16/04453/FUL - Land Adjoining Fosse Way Farm, Stoke Road, Martock (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: The erection of 1 no. dwellinghouse.

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda report, noting that the proposal was not considered to be something particularly in keeping with the local area. The principle of a modest replacement dwelling was not disputed, but the bulk, design and impact of the proposed dwelling was the main reason for an officer recommendation of refusal.

Mr S Travers, agent, noted there was only one issue which was the subjective matter of taste. He noted the applicants liked the design and the footprint was similar to that of the extant permission for a four bedroom house. There were no objections from neighbours or statutory consultees, and the site was well contained. He noted the NPPF stated you should not try to imply architectural styles.

Ward member, Councillor Neil Bloomfield, acknowledged as an LPA we had a responsibility for design, but this was a well hidden site along a national speed limit road with no pavement. He commented that the design may not be to everyone's taste but had had no issue with the building proposed.

Ward member, Councillor Graham Middleton, noted it was difficult to see into the site even during the winter when there is little foliage. He supported the application and proposed approval.

During a short discussion several members voiced support for the application commenting that it was a good design, nicely proportioned and it was good to see a change of design.

As members appeared minded to approve the application, the Area Lead advised that conditions would be required for time limit, approved plans, landscape scheme, and removal of the existing barn which has extant permission. Based on comments made during discussion he suggested the wording for the justification would be the opposite of the reason shown in the report.

During a brief further discussion some members commented they would be nice to see the existing hedge protected if possible. It was also queried if there was any benefit to removing Permitted Development Rights (PDR). In response the Area Lead noted there was no reason to removed PDR given that it was a large site.

At the conclusion of debate, it was proposed to approve the application, contrary to the officer recommendation, subject to the conditions and wording of the justification as suggested by the Area Lead. On being put to the vote, the proposal was carried 9 in favour with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/04453/FUL be APPROVED, contrary to the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

The proposal, by reason of its siting, design, scale, proportions, bulk and massing, represents a form of development that respects the established character and appearance of the locality, in accordance policies SD1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-28) and aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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: '3671/001', '3671/002 Rev A', '3671/003', '3671/004' and '3671/006', received 12th October 2016.

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

03. The existing barn, as indicated on the submitted topographical survey) (drawing no. '3671/1005'), and for which prior approval has been granted for conversion to a residential dwelling under decision ref. 15/01837/PAMB, shall be completely removed from the site in its entirety (notwithstanding any element indicated for retention on approved plan '3671/003'), prior to any works commencing on the construction of the dwellinghouse hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure that two dwellings are not provided, as the site is inappropriate for unjustified residential development due to its location beyond any established settlement boundaries and at distance from essential local services, and as the proposal does not occupy the same part of the site as the building to be removed that has received prior approval for conversion to a dwellinghouse, in accordance with policies SD1, SS1 and SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

05. A scheme of landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the

land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of the development, as well as details of any changes proposed in existing ground levels. All planting, seeding, turfing or earth moulding comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season after the development hereby permitted is first brought into use; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 and the provisions of chapters 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 9 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)

155. Planning Application 13/01500/OUT - Land off Lyndhurst Grove, Martock. (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Outline application for residential development for 35 dwellings.

The Area Lead introduced the application, noting that it had been brought back to committee as there was a resolution several years previously to approve the application subject to Section 106 obligations. There had been slow progress regarding the legal agreement and the applicant had now come back saying the obligations along with increased build costs made the development unviable. The District Valuer had not initially agreed with the applicant and negotiations were commenced. The leisure obligations had been re-assessed due to a change in policy and the figure had subsequently reduced from that originally requested. The application was now returned for consideration with less financial obligations and less affordable housing which the Valuer considered to be viable.

He provided members with an update from the applicant, who highlighted that one of the increased costs was due to the requirement for an acoustic screen. He acknowledged that parish council had noted they had not been consulted regarding the changes, but this was normal in the circumstances where a Section 106 had not been signed and was then referred back to committee. He informed members that the application was back with members to be considered due to the revised obligations. It was noted that Martock Parish Council had submitted a letter referring to the reduction in affordable housing and it not being the council's responsibility to provide for developer profits – and the comments were read to members. In response the Area Lead explained that an applicant was entitled to ask for reconsideration of obligations and the LPA could not ignore the viability of schemes.

The Area Lead then presented an overview of the application, and highlighted the key considerations. He noted the Committee had previously approved the application subject to the signing of a S.106 so now, in the absence of other changes in circumstance the committee were effectively only considering the viability.

Ms F Hook, spokesperson for Martock Parish Council, noted they were disappointed with the reduced level of affordable housing as it was needed locally. They felt the reduction was unacceptable and were worried it would set a precedent. She raised their concerns about the commercial viability of these developments, and noted as a parish council they firmly believed that their priority was to protect and provide for residents and not to increase the profits of other individuals.

Ms S Gardner, spoke on behalf of Unwin Safety Systems in objection to the application. She noted their location was the only place they could grow their business, and the current access to their site had already been the source of complaints with neighbouring residents. Security was paramount to the business and their cameras could have an impact on the privacy of new houses. The business was introducing new machinery on site, and at certain times of the year they were working more shifts. She commented the acoustics report would have been done without some of the existing machinery in use, and she queried if it had been undertaken in a summer environment.

Ward member, Councillor Neil Bloomfield, commented that new housing next to an established use wouldn't stop complaints by new residents. Referring to the viability of the application, he noted he had studied the figures in a confidential document and felt the predicted house sale prices indicated appeared to be very low. He noted when the application was first considered there were a number of objections. He felt if it was a new application we would not accept the provision of 4 affordable houses. He did not accept the viability case and did not support the application.

Ward member, Councillor Graham Middleton, noted building housing on the site ceased any opportunity to extend the business estate in the future, and Martock needed employment land. He objected to the proposal and felt the housing level was too dense for the site.

During a lengthy discussion varying comments were raised including:

- How many members had seen the confidential calculations document referred to by the ward member?
- A quite large buffer zone will be required next to industrial land, and don't want to jeopardise an existing business.
- Need more affordable homes for local people.
- Approved back in 2013, it's only the obligations that have changed.
- As a point of principle - the make-up of the committee has changed since 2013, Parliament cannot bind its successors.
- Need local employment and feel this development will be a barrier.
- Unwins said last time that they wanted to expand.
- Another major change since last considered is that Tesco has pulled out of coming to Martock.
- If the site had permission, has it now lapsed?
- There are too many anomalies with the application and it should be deferred.
- Proposal should be refused due to changes in circumstances since last considered and the drop in contributions.
- If Unwins are claiming they are making more noise now than previously, evidence of noise levels needs to be seen.
- Need a confidential session with District Valuer.
- Recent appeals have been dismissed, with one reason being cited as Martock is over the settlement figure in the Local Plan.
- If new application we would accept 4 affordable homes and feel there are grounds to refuse the application.

The Area Lead and Senior Legal Executive responded to points raised during discussion and their advice included:

- As members were considering the application for a second time, the first resolution was a material consideration of great weight.
- Only the ward members had requested and been sent the confidential viability information.
- The members on the committee may have changed but it is the same committee, Area North Committee, making the decision.
- The fact obligations had reduced was not in itself a reason for refusal. However if it was felt that the applicant had unreasonable depressed obligations it could be looked at differently.
- Leisure obligations have reduced as a result of a change in policy and not due to the applicant seeking a reduction in costs.
- There is currently no planning permission on the site. Permission had not been issued as it was subject to the completion of a Section 106 which had not been completed.
- Previous decision for approval in 2013 carried great weight.
- If members were minded to refuse on the grounds of the reduction in obligations, there should be a reason why the reduction was considered to be unacceptable.
- Grounds for refusal must be justified to avoid costs against the Council.
- Improvements and pavements at the Coat Road junction had been a requirement of the Tesco application due to the potential number of users. The highway improvements had not been considered necessary for this application.
- In terms of viability, if a new scheme had come forward with justification for only four affordable homes, it would probably still be recommended for approval.
- The proposed development has been referred to as an acceptable scheme with a resolution to grant permission in a number of appeals.

During discussion two proposals were put forward, firstly for refusal and secondly for deferral of the application. The first proposal to refuse the application was seconded on the grounds that there had been changes in circumstances, number of dwellings being over the settlement figure in the Local Plan and the drop in obligations for affordable housing being unacceptable. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried 5 votes in favour of refusal, 4 against with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning application 13/01500/OUT be REFUSED, contrary to the officer recommendation, for the following reason:

Reasons:

1. The proposal for up to 35 dwellings would exceed the level of growth for Martock as set out in policy SS5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.
2. The proposal fails to provide for 35% affordable housing as required by policies HG3 and SS6 and fails to provide for the appropriate contributions to mitigate the impact of the development on leisure and recreation facilities as required by policies HW1 and SS6.

(Voting: 5 in favour of refusal, 4 against, 1 abstention)

156. Planning Application 17/00112/FUL - Thistledown, Gore Lane, Pitney. (Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and sheds and the erection of a new garage.

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the report, and noted the only reason the application was before members was due to the applicant being a member of staff who also had an input into the development control process.

There was no discussion and it was proposed to approve the application as per the officer recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00112/FUL be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The proposed garage is of a scale and relationship to the main dwelling without detriment in terms of visual amenity, character and appearance, highway safety and without neighbour concerns so accords with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

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: Location Plan, Garage plan and elevation plan received 4 January 2017.

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

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

157. Planning Application 17/00104/FUL - 52 Lavers Oak, Martock. (Agenda Item 15)

Proposal: Erection of single storey pitched roof side extension.

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the report, noting the only reason it was before councillors was due to the relationship of an elected member to the applicant.

At the end of a very brief discussion it was proposed to approve the application as per the officer recommendation, and on being put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00104/FUL be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the following:

Justification:

01. The proposal by reason of its nature and location will have no substantial adverse impact on visual or residential amenity in accordance with the aims and objectives of policy EQ2. Subject to appropriate conditions the policies TA5, TA6 and SD1 of the South Somerset Local and the relevant sections of the National Policy Planning Framework 2012.

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 works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans numbers PL/001, PL/002, PL/003, PL/004, PL/005, PL/006, PL/007 and PL/008 and the external surfaces of the development shall be of materials as indicated in the application form and no other materials shall be used without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the local character and distinctiveness of the area is not adversely affected in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

(Voting: Unanimous)

.....
Chairman