

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area West Committee** held at **The Guildhall, Chard** on **Wednesday 20 February 2019**.

(5.30 - 10.06 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Jason Baker (Chairman)

Mike Best	Sue Osborne
Amanda Broom (until 9.40pm)	Ric Pallister
Dave Bulmer	Angie Singleton
Carol Goodall	Andrew Turpin
Val Keitch	Linda Vijeh
Jenny Kenton	Martin Wale
Paul Maxwell	



Officers:

Jo Morris	Case Services Officer (Support Services)
Andrew Gunn	Specialist (Planning)
Debbie Haines	Locality Team Leader
Mike Hicks	Specialist (Planning)
Adrian Moore	Locality Officer
Marc Dorfman	Senior Planning Adviser
Sarah Hickey	Senior Planning Lawyer
Mike Bellamy	Highway Consultant

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

113. To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 16th January 2019 (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th January 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

114. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Marcus Barrett and Garry Shortland.

115. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Cllr. Sue Osborne declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9 – Grant to Speke Hall, Dowlish Wake and Planning Application Nos. 18/00001/FUL and 18/00002/LBC, as the Ward Member.

Cllr. Linda Vjeh declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9 – Grant to Speke Hall, Dowlish Wake and Planning Application Nos. 18/00001/FUL and 18/00002/LBC, as the SCC Ward Member.

Cllr. Jenny Kenton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Planning Application No. 18/01902/REM**, as her sister's land abutted the application site. She left the room during consideration of the item.

Cllr. Dave Bulmer declared a personal interest in Planning Application No 18/01902/REM**, as a member of Chard Town Council.

116. Date and Venue for Next Meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted that the next meeting of the Area West Committee would be held on Wednesday 20th March 2019 at 5.30pm at The Guildhall, Chard.

117. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 5)

It was agreed that members of the public present would speak at the time the Agenda items would be discussed.

118. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman made no announcements.

119. Update on Police and Crime Commissioners Panel (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Martin Wale summarised his report as outlined in the agenda updating members on the Police and Crime Commissioners Panel. He made particular reference to the following:

- The annual police budget and the Panel reluctantly agreeing to an increase;
- 100 new police officers will join Avon and Somerset Constabulary paid for by the increase in the policing share of the council tax;
- The increase would also be spent on Operation Remedy - an exciting high profile policing operation to combat burglary, drugs and knife crime;
- The Annual Police and Crime Plan would be looked at by the Panel in the next month;
- Concerns have been made by the Panel in relation to dealing with rural crime.

Councillor Martin Wale responded to members questions on points of detail.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

120. Promoting Community Safety in Area West - Police Performance and Neighbourhood Policing Update (Agenda Item 8)

Sgt. Rob Jameson from Avon and Somerset Constabulary was welcomed to the meeting. He gave a short presentation on local issues and initiatives. Particular reference was made to the following:

- The new pattern of Neighbourhood Policing would give the Beat Managers and PCSOs time to deal with long term problem solving and issues. It would also benefit better team work and supervision;
- The role of the 24 hour response team;
- Mobile ways of working allowing officers to become more visible;
- Current funding issues;
- Staff changes in Chard, Ilminster and Crewkerne;
- Boundary changes on beats resulting in a slight alteration in Ilminster.

Sgt. Rob Jameson responded to members questions on points of detail.

The Chairman thanked Sgt. Rob Jameson for attending the meeting and providing an informative update.

121. Grant to Speke Hall, Dowlish Wake (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 9)

The Locality Officer introduced the report which asked members to consider the awarding of a grant towards the costs of refurbishing the new kitchen and car park improvements for The Speke Hall in Dowlish Wake.

The Committee was addressed by the Chairman of the Speke Hall Committee. He explained that the Speke Hall provided a social hub and entertainment facility for the local community and was also used by a number of clubs. He advised that the current kitchen was very old and a new kitchen would provide cooking facilities at the hall rather than bringing food to the hall. The car parking area was no longer fit for purpose particularly in unpleasant weather and was in need of improvement.

The Ward Member expressed her support for the proposal and advised that the Speke Hall also served Kingstone, Chillington and Cudworth Parish Meetings as well as supporting four communities.

Members expressed their support for the application and commented that the Speke Hall was a much needed and well used facility in the local community.

Members unanimously supported the recommendations of the report.

RESOLVED: That a grant of £10,000 be awarded to The Speke Hall, Dowlish Wake, to be allocated from the Area West capital programme and subject to SSDC standard conditions for community grants.

(Voting: unanimous)

Reason: to award a grant towards the cost of refurbishing the new kitchen and car park improvements at The Speke Hall, Dowlish Wake.

122. Reports from Members on Outside Bodies (Agenda Item 10)

The report submitted by Cllr. Carol Goodall updating members on the work of Ilminster Forum was noted by the Committee.

123. Area West Committee - Forward Plan (Agenda Item 11)

Members noted that the AONB Management Plan would now be considered in April. A request was made for an update report on S106 agreements relating to development within Area West.

Cllr. Martin Wale advised that it would no longer be necessary to report back on the Making It Local programme as the last meeting was being held the following week.

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

124. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 12)

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

Cllr. Paul Maxwell expressed his disappointment over the appeal decision at Land at Bullring Farm, Knowle Lane, Misterton.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

125. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 13)

The Chairman announced that he would be taking the planning applications in the following order: 18/00001/FUL, 18/00002/LBC, 18/01902/REM, 18/03425/FUL.

126. Planning Application 18/03425/FUL - Land At Carters Lane, East Chinnock (Agenda Item 14)

Application Proposal: Erection of two detached dwellinghouses, formation of access and associated works

The Specialist – Development Management presented the application as detailed in the agenda and explained that the application was a resubmission of a previous application that had been refused on the grounds of landscape character issues and harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed church. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation he outlined the application site and surrounding area and referred to the key considerations. Following refusal of the previous application, pre-application discussions were held with the applicant to negotiate a revised scheme to allow space to the eastern side of the development. The proposed dwellings were mostly single storey with some one and a half storey sections to the buildings. The aim of the design was to try and achieve a

more informal proposal. He recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

In response to questions, members were informed of the following:

- The East Chinnock Village Housing Survey was a material consideration and could be given some weight but was not sufficient to be a determining factor. Each proposal should be judged on its individual merits
- There were no development boundary limits within the Local Plan
- East Chinnock was considered to be an acceptable location and had a basic range of facilities
- A small amount of appropriate development was considered acceptable
- The benefits of providing dwellings in the location was based on housing need regardless of size
- Key changes to the application from the previous application included single and one and a half dwellings located more to the western side of the plot with an open space to the east. With the proposed changes the officer did not consider there to be sufficient landscape harm to recommend refusal

Ward Member, Councillor Ric Pallister read out the Landscape Officer's comments submitted in regard to the previous application and commented that policies had not changed since 2016. He felt that the proposed properties would be an extension into the open countryside and would impact upon the setting of the church and the village. He was unable to support the application on the same grounds that the original application was refused.

During the discussion, some members felt that the application was just as harmful to the landscape character of the area. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application on the same grounds as the previous refusal as outlined on page 34 of the agenda report. On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse the application was carried by 8 votes in favour and 3 against.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 18/03425/FUL be REFUSED contrary to the Specialist's recommendation for the following reason:

01. The proposal by reason of its siting beyond the established eastern boundary of the settlement would be contrary to the established pattern and layout of development in the area at a variance to local distinctiveness causing harm to the landscape character of the area. Additionally the proposed dwellings would encroach into undeveloped pasture that forms an integral part of the setting of the grade II listed church would interrupt views towards the church from the adjoining public right of way. Accordingly the setting of the Grade II Listed church would be harmed. As such the proposal would not accord with policies EQ2 and EQ3, of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the aims and the objectives of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

(Voting: 8 in favour and 3 against)

127. Planning Application 18/00001/FUL - The George, Back Street, Winsham (Agenda Item 15)

Application Proposal: Alterations to include the change of use of ground floor of dwelling (Use Class C3) to a shop/Post Office (Use Class A1) and café (Use Class A1) and café (Use Class A3). First floor to be ancillary to shop and café use

The Specialist - Development Management presented the application as set out in the agenda. He outlined the application site and the surrounding area and advised that there was an existing shop in the village located to the south of the proposed site on Church Street. He noted that the main consideration related to highway safety. He advised that the site consisted of a Grade II listed building and with the aid of photographs outlined the proposed alterations to the ground floor including the proposed location of the post office counter, shop, kitchen, café seating area and hard paved area to the rear of the shop. He noted that some concerns had been raised with regard to the seating area at the rear of the premises and the proximity to the adjoining property and the potential for noise and disturbance and advised that if members were minded to approve the application this element of the scheme could be conditioned. The Specialist – Development Management explained that there were significant concerns over the siting of the shop on a five-way junction, no off street parking provision being proposed, lack of visibility for vehicles and pedestrians, the possibility of children crossing the road to get to the shop from the Recreation Ground located opposite and an significant increase in use of the substandard Back Street/B3162 junction. Another concern related to proposed timber planters along the highway potentially exacerbating the restricted visibility. He recommended that the application be refused for the reasons outlined in the report.

In response to questions, Development Management Officers confirmed the following:

- SCC Highway Authority were content with the application although it could not be confirmed whether they had made a site visit.
- All the issues associated with the application should be considered not just those relating to highway safety.
- Clarified that EP15 required an 18 month marketing assessment to be carried out
- If permission were to be granted on The George and it started a use as a shop, Policy EP15 would still need to be satisfied but it could be considered that the 18 month marketing assessment wasn't needed if there was only one shop in the village.
- The fire exit would be through the main front door of the premises. The passageway to the side could only be used with permission from the adjoining neighbour.
- SSDC's Highway Consultant had the authority to take a different view from SCC Highway Authority to which SSDC would be responsible for defending that view at appeal and any associated costs.
- The applicant was made aware of the SSDC Highway Consultant's concerns at the pre-application stage.
- Use of the site 50 years ago was considered to be too long ago to be relevant to the current issues.
- The responsibility of the surface at the front overlapped with the owner of the premises and the Highway Authority.
- Any structure located on the highway would require a licence from SCC.

- It was the responsibility of the applicant to submit supporting evidence on potential pedestrian movements in light of the concerns raised by SSDC's Highway Consultant.
- The SSDC Highway Consultant reiterated his concerns over the junction being substandard and the potential for pedestrians to walk out of the shop and go straight across the road towards the recreation ground with substandard visibility and the potential for delivery vehicles to turn in and reverse back out. With the shop being located in this position he could not argue that there would not be a significant intensification of movement in the area.

The Committee was addressed by the Chair of Winsham Parish Council in support of the application. He commented that the shop provided a vital service to all ages and needs. Winsham would be a significantly lesser community without this vital asset which held the community together and was an important site for volunteers. The George was located within a prime location in the village and represented a strong link to the past and signpost to the future. He noted that SCC Highway Authority could not support refusal of the application which was in accordance with the Local Plan and Policy EP15.

The Committee was addressed by seven members of the public in objection to the application. Some of their comments included:

- The shop and post office was an asset to the village but The George was an inappropriate and unsafe location.
- Proposal not supported by a sound business plan.
- Increase in traffic along a narrow road.
- No pavements outside The George.
- No dedicated parking for cars, delivery vans and cyclists.
- Unsafe for pedestrians and vehicles.
- The site is not the only option for the relocation of the shop and there were other safer and sustainable locations within the village.
- Child safety concerns as the shop would be on the opposite side to the school and the recreation ground.
- Increased use of junction not safe.
- Limited visibility along the B3162.
- Concerns over the speed of vehicles passing the site.
- Proposed planters are unsuitable to prevent pedestrians crossing the road.
- The village already has a public house providing a community facility.

The Committee was then addressed by five members of the public in support of the application. Some of their comments included:

- No evidence to suggest that there would be a significant increase in traffic.
- Location of the shop will make no difference to the traffic.
- The delivery lorry manoeuvres would continue regardless of whether the shop is relocated.
- Early morning delivery vehicles would be able to stop outside The George and turn around in Back Street.
- No previous collisions or injuries at the junction.
- Most of the café users would be existing store and post office customers and the level of new traffic would be minimal.
- A 34 space public car park was being planned further down the road from the shop using S106 monies from a new housing development in the village.

- Increased use of The George would enhance the heart of the village.
- Planters would make the junction safer.
- Social benefits for the community.

The applicant then addressed members, some of her comments included:

- The post office was key to the rural community particular as more and more branches close.
- The shop and post office provided employment and volunteering opportunities.
- The proposal provided a secure solid building in the centre of the village which had been approved by Post Office Authorities.
- Current lease unlikely to be renewed.
- Business case produced and funding secured.
- The highway situation of the proposed location was no more of a risk than the existing.
- Deliveries would be safer in Back Street compared to the current location in Church Street.
- Back Street had fewer vehicle movements than Church Street which had been demonstrated by a traffic survey.
- County Highways supported the application.
- The George was centrally located, viable, accessible, funded and available.

Ward Member, Councillor Sue Osbourne commented that the shop and post office was key to the rural community and that it was sad that the application had spilt the village. She referred to the application being finely balanced between unsuitability of the junction and the needs of the community to keep its shop to provide community cohesion and economic services.

During a long discussion mixed views were expressed and some of the comments raised related to the following:

- The need to address speed limits and safety for children.
- No information from the existing owner to suggest that the existing lease would not be renewed.
- Cannot dismiss highway issues raised by SSDC's Highway Consultant.
- Unsuitable and dangerous location for pedestrians and vehicles.
- Finely balanced application.
- Duty of care to the safety of the community.
- Unable to support due to highway safety concerns particularly in relation to the blind corner.
- 2nd fire exit at the back of the property not suitable.
- Fire exits would be dealt with by Building Regulations.
- The village pub already provided a café facility.
- Village Survey figure valid.
- No evidence to support anything dangerous had occurred.
- Sad to see that the application had spilt the community.
- Parish Council support for the application.
- Planters not substantial enough to stop people stepping out into the road.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Ward Member reiterated her support for the concept of a village shop, post office and café. She referred to the number of people in support of the proposal and in indicating her support for the application made reference to the

community accepting the risks. She requested a condition to address the impact on Dragon House by imposing time restrictions for the outside seating area should the application be approved. She asked that SSDC provide help and support in the event of the application being refused.

It was initially proposed to approve the application but on being put to the vote this was lost. The votes in favour of approving the application were 5 in favour and 8 against and 0 abstentions.

It was subsequently proposed and seconded to refuse the application as per the Officer's recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried by 8 votes in favour, 5 votes against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 18/00001/FUL be REFUSED as per the Development Management Specialist's recommendation for the following reason:

01. The location of the development proposal and the traffic generated by the scheme (including pedestrians, cyclists, private vehicles, and delivery/service vehicles) would lead to an increase in use of the existing Back Street/B3162 Church Street/Western Way/Fore Street junction such that safe and suitable access to and from the site cannot be achieved for all users, and the impact on highway safety would be unacceptable. In addition, the development fails to provide any off-road parking leading to additional on-road parking in and around the aforementioned junction to the detriment of highway safety. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and would be contrary to paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

(Voting: 8 in favour, 5 against)

128. Planning Application 18/00002/LBC - The George, Back Street, Winsham (Agenda Item 16)

Application Proposal: Internal and external alterations associated to the change of use of ground floor of dwellings to a shop and café. First floor to be ancillary to shop and café use.

The Specialist – Development Management presented the application. He advised that the proposal would respect the historic character of the Listed building and the setting of the church and therefore recommended approval of the application.

There were no questions from members of the Committee.

The Ward Member, Cllr. Sue Osborne expressed her support for the application.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the Specialist's recommendation. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried by 12 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 18/00002/LBC be APPROVED as per the Planning Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

01. The proposed works, by reason of their materials, scale and design would respect the character of the area, would preserve the character of the Listed Building and the Conservation Area and would not harm residential amenity in accordance with Policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. The works hereby granted consent shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: As required by Section 16(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

02. There shall be no alterations to existing internal doors until details of any alteration have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to preserve the historic and architectural interest of the listed building to accord with Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (20056-2028).

03. Prior to works commencing on the formation of the new opening to the rear elevation, details of a method statement for the proposed works and details of making good of any structure abutting any of those to be demolished, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such approved details, once carried out shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to preserve the historic and architectural interest of the listed building to accord with Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (20056-2028).

04. Prior to its construction, details of the new extraction equipment, including drawings showing appearance, any boxing in of the flue, method statement and external flue shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such approved details, once carried out shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to preserve the historic and architectural interest of the listed building to accord with Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).

(Voting: 12 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)

129. Planning Application 18/01902/REM - Land North Of Tatworth Road And Adjacent To Forton Road, Chard (Agenda Item 17)

Application Proposal: Reserved matters application for the erection of up to 200 dwellings including access, layout, scale and appearance, landscaping and associated ancillary works

(Having earlier declared a personal and prejudicial interest, Cllr. Jenny Kenton left the room during consideration of the application).

The Specialist – Development Management advised that following the decision to defer the application last month, a meeting was held with the applicant to allow members to outline their concerns. He referred to the issues discussed at the meeting and outlined the agreed actions in relation to layout/density, bus stops/shelters and pedestrian/cycle provision, play area/education, garages and phasing of the development.

In response to questions, members were informed of the following:

- Confirmed the tarmac links between the site and the bus stop.
- The applicant had their own management Company who would maintain the green areas.
- Maintaining the green areas was enforceable.
- The money requested as part of the legal agreement in relation to education would go towards the provision of a new school.
- The drainage scheme had been assessed by the Local Lead Flood Authority and conditions imposed relating to long term maintenance and management.
- The pavements would be adopted by County Highways.

The Committee was addressed by one member in objection to the application. He raised concerns in relation to anti-social behaviour, boundary fencing, lack of highway infrastructure and increase in traffic.

The Applicant then addressed the Committee. Some of her comments included:

- Principle of development already approved.
- Traffic assessment considered acceptable at the outline application stage.
- Bus Stops approved with continuous footpath linking the two.
- Bus stops would be clear at both ends.
- Phasing dictated by installation of the infrastructure on the site
- Secondary access would be brought in from Tatworth Road as soon as possible.
- Sustainable drainage would be managed by the Management Company.
- The density in the area adjoining the Wessex Close boundary was consistent with the rest of the site. The fencing along the boundary has been increased to 1.8 metres.
- Some of the previously agreed financial contributions would be used to improve facilities at the current play area at Ashcroft.

Ward Member Councillor Jason Baker referred to the density and closeness of properties to Wessex Close and noted that there was a good distance between the property boundaries and an increase in the boundary fence and the retention of the hedgerow.

He highlighted that it had been agreed that the bus shelter at Holcombe would be replaced and there would be a new one on the opposite side with a footpath making it safer for people to access public transport. He was satisfied that the play area in the development was compliant and there was a good footpath between Ashcroft and the proposed new play area. With regard to the phasing of the development he noted that the Tatworth Road route would be opened up as soon as possible to alleviate the junction on Forton Road. He commented that there were still issues with regard to the infrastructure and road layout in Chard but was not part of this application. He highlighted the need to work with Planning Officers to try and bring the new road system on board as soon as possible with the future developments to get the link road across.

During the discussion, a member welcomed the opportunity to engage with the applicant over concerns and felt that everything had been done to achieve the best scheme possible for this site. He also welcomed the lower density adjacent to the Holbear end of the site and the tidying up of Forton Road but raised concerns about SCC's approach to calculating education provision and the capacity of schools in Chard.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the Officer's recommendation outlined in the agenda report. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried by 9 votes and favour and 2 against.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 18/01902/REM be APPROVED as per the Specialist's recommendation outlined in the agenda report for the following reason:

01. This proposed sustainable development is located within part of the Council's designated area for growth in the Chard Plan and will provide much needed market and affordable housing. The development will also make contributions towards education provision, sport, play and community facilities and travel planning and provide a section of the new road link between the A30 and the A358. The site is in a sustainable location within reasonable distance of the town centre accessible by foot, cycle or bus. It would provide sufficient parking and would not adversely harm any residential amenity, landscape or ecological interests. The proposal is therefore in accord with Policies SD1, SS1, SS4, SS5, SS6, PMT1, PMT2, HG3, TA4, TA5, TA6, HW1, EQ2, and EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted 2015) and policies within the NPPF.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

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

Site location plan (17144 L01.01 Rev P1)
Site layout plan (17144 L02.01 Rev P1)
Illustrative site layout plan (17144 L02.02 Rev P1)
Boundary treatment plan (17144 L92.01 Rev P1)
Boundary treatment plan (17144 L92.02 Rev P1)
Boundary treatment plan (17144 L92.03 Rev P1)
Boundary details (17144 L92.04 Rev P1)

Boundary details (17144 L92.05 Rev P1)
 Hardworks plan (17144 L93.01 Rev P1)
 Hardworks plan (17144 L93.02 Rev P1)
 Hardworks plan (17144 L93.03 Rev P1)
 Softworks plan (17144 L94.01 Rev P1)
 Softworks plan (17144 L94.02 Rev P1)
 Softworks plan (17144 L94.03 Rev P1)
 Leap play area plan (17144 L94.04 Rev P1)
 Youth provision plan (17144 L94.05 Rev P1)
 HT1 Provence (17144 HT1.L.02.01 & 17144 HT1.L.04.01 & 02)
 HT2 Rutherford V1 (17144 HT2.L.02.01 & 17144 HT2.L.04.01 & 02)
 HT3A Pinewood (17144 HT3A.L.02.01 & 17144 HT3A L.04.01 - 04)
 HT3B Pinewood (17144 HT3B.L.02.01 & 17144 HT3B.L04.01)
 HT4 Pentire (17144 HT4.L.02.01 & 17144 HT4.L.04.01 - 02)
 HT5 Oakford (17144 HT5.L.02.01 & 17144 HT5.L.04.01 - 02)
 HT6 1-Bed Flat (17144 HT6.L.02.01 & 17144 HT6.L.04.01 - 02)
 HT7 FOG (17144 HT7.L.02.01 & 17144 HT7.L.04.01)
 HT8 HA 2 Bed (17144 HT8.L.02.01 & 17144 HT8.L.04.01)
 HT9 HA 3 Bed (17144 HT9.L.02.01 & 17144 HT8.L04.01 & 02)
 HT10 HA 4 Bed (17144 HT10 L.02.01 & 17144 HT10.L04.01 & 02)
 HT11 HA 3 Bed Wide front (17144 HT11.L.02.01 & 17144 HT11.L.04.01 & 02)
 G01 Garage Pack (17144 G01.L.02.00 - 02)
 Proposed Site Access Arrangements (SK02.01)
 Proposed Site Access Arrangements (SK02.02)
 Proposed Site Access Arrangements - Tracking Plan (SK07.01)
 Proposed Site Access Arrangements - Tracking Plan (SK07.02)
 Location Plan (S98.0)

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

02. The external materials to be used for the dwellings hereby approved shall be in accord with the submitted Materials Schedule unless otherwise approved in writing by the by Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area to accord with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

03. No drainage shall be installed until details of the surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles together with a programme of implementation and maintenance for the lifetime of the development have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

These details shall include: -

- Details of phasing and information regarding the provision and maintenance of any drainage systems (including temporary) in place during construction of

this and any other subsequent phases. Drainage infrastructure should be constructed and implemented during the initial phase of development, to ensure no increase in flood risk through inadequate drainage provision. Where this is not possible, a clear phasing plan should be submitted to show how the drainage scheme will be implemented.

- Information about the design storm period and intensity, discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities, means of access for maintenance (6 metres minimum), the methods employed to delay and control surface water discharged from the site, and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters.
- Detailed Construction Drawings with manhole schedule, invert levels, landscaping details, finished floor levels, ground levels and flood storage details.
- Any works required off site to ensure adequate discharge of surface water without causing flooding or pollution (which should include refurbishment of existing culverts and headwalls or removal of unused culverts where relevant).
- Flood water exceedance routes both on and off site, note, no part of the site must be allowed to flood during any storm up to and including the 1 in 30 event, flooding during storm events in excess of this including the 1 in 100yr (plus 40% allowance for climate change) must be controlled within the designed exceedance routes demonstrated to prevent flooding or damage to properties. Holding areas for flood volumes generated through exceedance of the drainage system must be clearly shown on a flood exceedance plan and the developer must demonstrate the site remains safe.
- A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management company or maintenance by a Residents' Management Company and / or any other arrangements to secure the operation and maintenance to an approved standard and working condition throughout the lifetime of the development

Reason: To ensure that the development is served by a satisfactory system of surface water drainage and that the approved system is retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details throughout the lifetime of the development, to accord with the NPPF.

04. The garages hereby approved shall be used solely for vehicle parking purposes incidental to the occupation and enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which they serve. They shall not be used for, nor in connection with any commercial, trade or business purposes and shall not be converted into habitable accommodation, including domestic workshop, study, games room and similar uses, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of parking provision and highway safety, to accord with Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Somerset County Council's adopted parking standards.

05. None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed above damp proof course level until a scheme of landscaping to accord with the recommendations and advice of the Council's Arborist (contained within his memo dated 10th September 2018) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of all new tree/shrub/hedge planting and 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 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: To protect the amenity of the area to accord with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

(Voting: 9 in favour, 2 against)

.....
Chairman