

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at the **Churchfield Offices, Wincanton on Wednesday 15 January 2020.**

(9.00 am - 11.30 am)

Present:

Members: Councillor Henry Hobhouse (Chairman)

Robin Bastable
Hayward Burt
Tony Capozzoli
Nick Colbert
Sarah Dyke
Charlie Hull

Mike Lewis
Kevin Messenger
Paul Rowsell
Lucy Trimmell
William Wallace
Colin Winder



Officers:

Steve Barnes
David Kenyon
Angela Cox

Play and Youth Facilities Officer
Specialist (Development Management)
Specialist - Democratic Services

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

115. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 1)

There were no apologies for absence.

116. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest made by Members of the Committee.

117. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 3)

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Area East Committee would be at the Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton on Wednesday 12 February 2020 commencing at 9.00 am.

118. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 4)

There were no questions from members of the public present.

119. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 5)

The Chairman advised that it had been brought to his attention that the decision taken by the Committee the previous month relating to Agenda item 10: Churchfields Offices, Disposal - Inclusion of public car park, needed to be reviewed in light of new information which the Committee were not aware of at the time of the decision. He proposed that under Part 4 of the Council's Constitution - Rules of Procedure (Standing Orders) a Motion to rescind a Previous Decision be taken relating to this item. This proposal was seconded and when put to the vote, was confirmed by 10 votes in favour and 1 abstention. This was subsequently confirmed in writing by the Members.

The Chairman thanked Members and advised that the report would be re-presented at the next meeting in February 2020.

The Chairman also advised that he had requested temporary emergency accommodation for homeless people and families be found within Area East to assist local people in need.

120. Reports from Members (Agenda Item 6)

Councillor Mike Lewis advised that he had attended Cary Moor Parish Council meeting the previous evening where concerns of light pollution from an industrial site were discussed. He asked if there was anything the Council could do to overcome the problem, which was the angle at which the lights were positioned.

Councillor Colin Winder spoke of this concern relating to UPVC (plastic) windows being installed in Listed Buildings. He said that there appeared to be several instances of properties having their windows replaced in Wincanton at the moment and he was concerned that they may be happening without proper consent.

The following response was provided by the Lead Specialist for Development Management:-

"The installation of UPVC windows in Listed Buildings needs listed building consent 99% of the time. The only instances where such materials would be potentially allowed would be in more modern additions or replacing existing plastic or metal windows that may have been installed prior to listing.

I note Cllr Winder's concern regarding instances he may have observed where UPVC windows have been installed in Listed Buildings in Wincanton.

The first thing he could do is check online to see if the property benefits from listed building consent, the second thing he could do is submit an enforcement complaint using the online form which would trigger the Council investigating the matter.

We have found from experience that complaints regarding UPVC windows in listed buildings can trigger a chain reaction of complaints from unhappy homeowners who point to others they claim have done the same, so Members should be aware of this.

In my opinion it would not be cost effective to send a letter to each Listed Building owner reminding them of their responsibilities with regard replacement windows. We currently offer free-application advice and are working to provide online guidance on replacement

windows. In the future we are planning to introduce charges for Listed Building pre-application queries.

The Town Council or neighbourhood plan team may choose to undertake a local project of Listed Building owner education which we could support with the appropriate technical knowledge.”

During a short debate, Members felt that any instances of windows being replaced with plastic in listed buildings should be reported to the Lead Specialist for Development Management.

121. Planning Appeals (for information only) (Agenda Item 7)

Members noted the planning appeals which had been received, allowed or dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.

122. Area East - Draft Area Chapter 2020/21 (Agenda Item 8)

The Locality Team Leader introduced the report, noting that the Chapter listed a good list of projects to take forward in the then following 12 months, although some may take longer to complete.

During discussion, Members made the following comments:-

- The geographical location of each project should be included.
- Details of the volunteer health walks to be circulated to Members.
- The column relating to Healthy, Self-Reliant Communities should be listed first as communities were central to the Council's work.
- In the Environment column, include businesses in the last point: Support community **and business** led initiatives that combat climate change.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members were content to agree their Area Chapter for 2020/21 with the proposed amendments.

RESOLVED: That Area East Committee agreed the priorities for the Area to be presented to District Executive for consideration for inclusion in the Council Plan 2020/21, with the additional amendments as mentioned above.

123. Future Arrangements for Area East Committee (Agenda Item 9)

The Locality Team Leader advised that the preferred site for the new Customer Access Point (CAP) was the Balsam Centre in Wincanton. He confirmed that a pass was not required to enter the building and it had private interview rooms in case of any confidential issues.

During discussion, it was suggested that the Customer Access Point should be at the Town Hall along with the Town and County Council. It was noted that there were accessibility issues to overcome and if the Town Hall building became accessible in the future then the decision could be revisited.

Councillor Mike Lewis asked if the Haynes Motor Museum at Sparkford had been investigated as a future venue for the Area Committee as it was centrally located. The Democratic Services Specialist agreed to investigate this option and Members agreed to defer the decision on their future meeting venue to the next meeting of the committee.

RESOLVED: That Area East Committee agreed to defer the decision on their future meeting venue for further information on an alternative venue.

124. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 10)

The Locality Manager advised that a grant application for Community Accessible Transport would be presented in February 2020.

It was also noted that a presentation on Affordable Housing would be presented in February 2020.

Members noted the Area East Committee Forward Plan.

125. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 11)

Members noted the Schedule of Planning Applications to be determined by the Committee.

126. Planning Application 19/01786/FUL - Clapton Farm Solar Park, Land at Clapton Farm House, Tinkers Lane, Cucklington (Agenda Item 12)

Application Proposal: Installation of a CCTV camera system comprising of a network of wooden pole mounted cameras, related cabinets and ducting, plus ancillary and related equipment.

The Planning Consultant introduced the report and advised that the site was on the edge of the district and the solar array was already installed. The permission included the installation of 5 CCTV cameras on 6m high steel poles. The application now proposed 15 cameras on 3m poles with no wider range of vision other than the boundary fence. The security fencing was 2m high so the cameras would be 1m above. As the site was not on the skyline and, the principle of development was already established, he recommended approval of the application.

The Agent for the applicant advised that the cameras were required to deter intruders and prevent theft. He said it was necessary to have full CCTV coverage of the perimeter site for insurance purposes. There would be no pre-recorded message if a camera was activated but an officer in a control centre would challenge the person. The lighting would be infra-red and the cameras were directed away from nearby properties.

The Ward Member, Councillor Robin Bastable, said he had not received any representations regarding the application and he could not see a problem with the proposal.

During a brief discussion it was noted that the audio challenge should not be unduly intrusive. It was also noted that Cucklington village had received community benefit from the applicants which had been used in part to resurface the village hall car park.

The recommendation to grant permission was proposed and seconded and unanimously agreed by Members.

RESOLVED: That planning application 19/01786/FUL be GRANTED permission for the following reason:

01. The proposal to install a CCTV camera system, comprising of a network of 20 wooden pole mounted cameras, a control cabinet, ducting and other small ancillary and related equipment, all in association with the existing solar array development for the same temporary period as the solar park itself would respect the character of the area and would cause no demonstrable harm to landscape character and visual amenity, neighbour amenity, highway safety, flood risk or biodiversity. As such, the proposal is in accordance with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies SD1, EQ1, EQ2, EQ4, EQ5, EQ7, TA6 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

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 drawings:

Drawing no. 1088-0200-01: Site Boundary Plan
Drawing no. 26377-1-B: CCTV Layout - Site Layout - Planning Application (Proposed Additions)
Drawing no. 26377-1-C: CCTV Layout - Site Layout - Planning Application (Overall Security Design)
Drawing no. GBSG SD-1B: GBSG Standard Detail - Wooden Post Detail
Brochure: IP55 Outdoor Wall Mounting Cabinets, DS-CW55 Series

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

03. The development hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition within 25 years of 31 March 2017 or within 6 months of the cessation of the use of the solar farm for the generation of electricity, whichever is the sooner, in accordance with a restoration plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The restoration plan will need to include all the works necessary to revert the site to open agricultural land including the removal of all the structures, materials and any ancillary equipment which shall be removed from the site.

Reason: In the interests of character and appearance further to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006- 2028.

04. No CCTV equipment or other cameras shall be installed on the site other than those shown on the submitted drawings nos. 26377-1-B and 26377-1-C, in accordance with the CCTV design details submitted with the application.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to safeguard the character and appearance of the landscape in accordance with the aims of the NPPF and Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

05. Each camera hereby permitted shall have a fixed field of vision, being angled and of a visual range as indicated on the submitted drawings nos. 26377-1-B and 26377-1-C and there shall be no subsequent variation to allow a greater field and range of vision for any of the camera without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to safeguard the rural character of the setting in accordance with the aims of the NPPF and Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

06. Other than the on-site audio challenge facility (described in the agent's email dated 5th November 2019) forming part of the security system hereby permitted, no other form of audible alarm shall be installed on the site without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to safeguard the rural character of the setting in accordance with the aims of the NPPF and Policies EQ2 and EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

127. Planning Application 19/02235/OUT - Land at North Town Farm, Higher North Town Lane, North Cadbury (Agenda Item 13)

Application Proposal: Outline planning application with all matters reserved for the erection of 5 dwellings

The Chairman advised that although he lived in the village of North Cadbury, he could not see the application site from his property and so he had no interest to declare.

The Planning Consultant introduced the report and advised that that the site was formerly occupied by a large agricultural building. He noted that a class Q application to convert the barn had been refused for technical reasons. The site had permission for 3 dwellings and it was now proposed to build 5 dwellings on the site. There were third party objections to the proposal but the Highway Authority and the Council's own Highway Consultant had not raised any objections to the application. The site was accessed from an unlit lane with no pavements and the village school was some 900m distance. It was remote from the village and in an unsustainable location therefore his recommendation was to refuse the application.

The Committee were then addressed by the Chairman of North Cadbury PC and two local residents in opposition to the application. Their comments included:-

- The junction of the lane and the A359 was very dangerous with more traffic accidents than were stated in the report.
- Applications had been submitted for two then three and now five dwellings. Would it stop there? There was no attempt to address sustainability and the road junction had accidents on a regular basis.
- Pollution from silage effluent had killed nearby trees which the Environment Agency were aware of. The development was unsustainable.

The Agent for the applicant said that since gaining approval for 3 dwellings, the planning policies had changed to allow 5 to be built. The policies also supported development on brownfield sites and the proposal was only for 2 above what already had permission. Tree contamination surveys had been carried out and the footpath to the south of the site would not be affected. He concluded that housing was needed across the district and he asked Members to support the application.

One of the Ward Members, Councillor Henry Hobhouse, said the number of accidents at the junction with the A359 was very high, nevertheless, he supported the application.

The other Ward Member, Councillor Kevin Messenger, said he had visited the site and could not understand where the silage effluent spoken of came from. He said that although the access lane was narrow it was for road users to exercise caution and he would support the application.

During discussion, Members were generally supportive of the proposal. It was felt if more properties were built then the village could become more sustainable although concern was expressed that the Highway Authority had not objected to the poor access junction. It was proposed and seconded to approve the application as the proposal was considered to be acceptable in the location, because the distance to the village was the same as other neighbouring residential developments to the west of the site, the site was not in a remote location due to it being adjacent to other residential properties, and the means of pedestrian access to the village was not considered to be unduly dangerous in this rural location. On being put to the vote, the proposal was granted permission by 9 votes in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning application 19/02235/OUT be GRANTED permission, contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reason:

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location, because the distance to the village is the same as other neighbouring residential developments to the west of the site, the site is not in a remote location due to it being adjacent to other residential properties, and the means of pedestrian access to the village are not considered to be unduly dangerous in this rural location. Due regard has been had to the recent planning history of the site and for the extant permission for three dwellings at the site. In addition the proposal would cause no significant adverse impact on the character of the area, residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk or biodiversity. As such it accord with Policies SD1, SS1, SS2, EQ1, EQ2, EQ4, EQ5, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and relevant guidance in the NPPF.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

Conditions.

Outline / reserved matters – time limits
 Accord with plans

Protection of trees along southern boundary (pre-commencement)
Surface water drainage scheme (pre-commencement)
Condition survey of existing highway (pre-commencement)
Construction Environmental Management Plan (pre-commencement)
Contamination investigation (pre-commencement)
Hours of construction works
No burning on site
Access details
Landscaping details
Protection and retention of landscaping
Infrastructure details
Garaging/parking/turning details
Electric vehicle charging points
Refuse/recycling areas
Timing of roads provision
External lighting details

Informatives

CIL
Birds
Lighting
Highways
Contamination
Public Right of Way

(Voting: 9 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions)

128. Planning Application 19/01680/OUT - Coombe Hill Farm, Furlong Lane, Milborne Port (Agenda Item 14)

Application Proposal: Outline application with all matters reserved save for access for the erection of an agricultural workers dwelling

The Planning Consultant introduced the report and advised that there was a proven need for an agricultural workers dwelling at the farm although it would be clearly seen from the road to the north. The height of the dwelling would be approximately 7m and the access would be through the existing farm yard. Because of the visual impact, his recommendation was to refuse the application.

The Ward Member, Councillor Sarah Dyke, said the visual impact would be minimal as the farm buildings nearby were already substantial. She said there were no objections from the Parish Council or local residents and the applicant had already discussed mitigation by keeping to a single storey

The Agent for the applicant said the need for the dwelling was proven and the only issue was landscaping and visual impact. He said the floor level could be reduced by 1m and an earth bund could be positioned to the north. He said the site was not isolated and the bungalow would be fully linked to the farm.

During discussion, Members were in favour of the proposal as they felt it would break the mass of the agricultural buildings and there was a need for farm workers to be near their

cattle. They suggested that conditions of approval include the occupier being in agricultural employment and constructed of local stone.

It was proposed and seconded to grant permission as the proposal was considered to be acceptable in the location, being necessary for the purposes of providing accommodation for an agricultural worker, and would cause no demonstrable and unacceptable harm to the landscape character and appearance of the locality, being sited in close proximity to the existing agricultural buildings. In addition the proposal would cause no adverse impact on residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk or biodiversity. On being put to the vote, the proposal was unanimously granted permission.

RESOLVED: That planning permission for 19/01680/OUT be GRANTED contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reason:-

01. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location, being necessary for the purposes of providing accommodation for an agricultural worker, and would cause no demonstrable and unacceptable harm to the landscape character and appearance of the locality, being sited in close proximity to the existing agricultural buildings. In addition the proposal would cause no adverse impact on residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk or biodiversity. As such it accord with Policies SD1, SS1, SS2, HG9, EQ1, EQ2, EQ4, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and relevant guidance in the NPPF.

Conditions

Outline / reserved matters – time limits

Accord with plans

Single storey/details of floor levels, ridge and eaves heights

Access details

Boundary treatments

Landscaping details

Surface water disposal

Electric vehicle charging point

External lighting details

Agricultural occupancy

Removal of permitted development rights (extensions, outbuildings, means of enclosure)

Informatives

CIL

Lighting

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

129. Planning Application 19/00454/OUT - Land Adjacent The Florins, Bineham Lane, Yeovilton (Agenda Item 15)

Application Proposal: Erection of two single storey dwellings and formation of vehicular access

The Planning Consultant introduced the report and reminded Members that they had recently considered two applications for new dwellings nearby and there was a need for consistency as officers did not consider the site as a sustainable location. He noted the site was a former nursery and existing buildings to the north would be demolished. A

consideration was the distance to local services like shops, pub and church. Design guidance recommended a walk of no more than 800m. He advised that his recommendation to refuse the application was based on its remote location and not on residential; impact or visual amenity.

The Chairman of Yeovilton Parish Council said they supported the application as it was a redundant nursery and two single storey dwellings would improve the area. She said a fit person could walk to nearby amenities in 20 minutes.

The Agent for the applicant said there were no objections on visual or residential amenity and the Committee had approved an application for a dwelling nearby the previous month, citing that the location was sustainable.

All of the Ward Members spoke in support of the application and said it was a suitable infill plot for single storey dwellings.

In response to a question, the Planning Consultant confirmed that the site was within noise zone B and not C. During discussion, Members voiced their support for the application but asked that the noise contours from RNAS Yeovilton be retested as it was felt they were outdated. It was proposed to grant permission because the village of Yeovilton, along with Ilchester and Limington, acted as a cluster providing residents with the necessary local services. Also the proposal would cause no significant adverse impact and harm on the character of the area, on the nearby designated heritage asset, residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk or biodiversity. On being put to the vote the proposal was granted permission by 11 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning application 19/00454/OUT be GRANTED permission, contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reason:

01. The proposal lies in a settlement that the Committee considers, along with Ilchester and Limington, acts as a cluster providing residents with the necessary local services in accordance with Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028). In addition the proposal would cause no significant adverse impact and harm on the character of the area, on the nearby designated heritage asset, residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk or biodiversity. As such it accord with Policies SD1, SS1, SS2, EQ1, EQ2, EQ3, EQ4, EQ5, TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and relevant guidance in the NPPF.

Conditions

Outline / reserved matters – time limits

Accord with plans

Single storey/details of floor levels, ridge and eaves heights

Implementation of ecological measures

Details of protection of trees and hedges (prior to commencement)

Implementation of tree and hedge protection works (prior to commencement)

Noise impact assessment (prior to commencement)

Timing of works (nesting birds)

Badger protection works during construction

Hours of construction works

No burning of materials

Access details

Landscaping details

Protection and retention of landscaping

Garaging/parking/turning details
Electric vehicle charging points
External lighting details
Ecological enhancement measures

Informatives
CIL
Birds
Bats and roosts
Lighting

(Voting: 11 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)

.....

Chairman