

MEETING JAS03m 09:10  
DATE 02.09.09

## **South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council**

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Joint Area Committee - South** held in The Council Chamber, Brympton Way, Yeovil on **Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2009**

(2.00pm – 6.15pm)

**Present:**

**Members:** Tony Fife (In the Chair)

Cathy Bakewell	Pat Martin
Lesley Boucher	Tom Parsley
Tim Carroll	David Recardo
Sam Crabb (left at 4.40pm)	John Richardson
Dave Greene	Peter Roake
Peter Gubbins	Peter Seib (left at 5.00pm)
John Hann	Alan Smith
Andy Kendall	Barbara Strong
Tony Lock	

**Also Present:**

**Officers:**

Martin Woods	Head of Area Development
Jo Boucher	Committee Administrator
Simon Gale	Head of Development and Building Control
Nick Whitsun-Jones	Principal Legal Executive Advocate
Andy Cato	Deputy Development Control Team Leader
Adrian Noon	Major Applications Co-ordinator
Andrew Collins	Planning Officer
Jane Green	Planning Assistant
Ioan Rees	Head of Highways and Passenger Transport – Environment Directorate
Mike Fear	Assistant Highway Service Manager, South Somerset Highways
Carl Brinkman	Principal Planning Liaison Officer

### **33. Minutes of meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2009 (Agenda Item 1)**

An amendment was made to include officers 'Amy Cater Solicitor' and 'Angela Cox Democratic Services Manager' who were present at the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2009, copies of which had been circulated, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

---

### **34. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors John Vincent Chainey, Ian Martin, Julian Freke, and Ruth Kendall.

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

Councillor Lesley Boucher declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application 09/01738/FUL – land adjacent Old Cinema Bed Centre, Court Ash, Yeovil. She confirmed that she would leave the room during consideration of this item.

Councillors John Hann, Peter Seib and Dave Greene declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application 09/02711/FUL – Oaklands Surgery, Birchfield Road, Yeovil, as they or family members are patients of the surgery.

---

### 36. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 4)

There were no questions from members of the public.

### 37. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 5)

The Chairman:

1. As clarification for the members of the public - a reminder that those Somerset County Council members who are not also SSDC members are not able to vote on major planning applications and financial matters which are designated as Excepted Business on the agenda. For your information the members on this committee are Councillor Sam Crabb and Councillor Tim Carroll – although Councillor Tim Carroll is also an SSDC member and Leader of the Council he sits on this committee as a County Council member only.

Also please note that the Parish Representative appointed to represent the parishes from within Area South will hold Observer status in relation to **all** matters and therefore will not be able to vote. For your information the member on this committee is Barbara Strong.

Further information can be found on the first few pages of the agenda under 'Information for the Public'.

2. Please note that although the forward plan shows that a 6 monthly update report for Streetscene Services is scheduled for this months meeting due to staff absences this report has been deferred until the October meeting.
  3. To inform members that the Area South Community Forum will take place on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> October ,6pm at the Innovation centre.
- 

### 38. Reports from Representatives on Outside Organisations (Agenda item 6)

Councillor Lesley Boucher advised that the West Coker Open Village weekend was a great success and thanked the committee for help in funding this event.

Councillor Peter Gubbins wished to thank the committee on the now fully funded Milford Hall project. The Head of Area Development, South updated members that a full planning application and re-location of the playgroup had now been approved and

tenders for the work were due to go out shortly and construction on site should start after Christmas.

### 39. Planning Applications (Agenda Item 7)

**09/01671/FUL – Mixed use redevelopment to provide 2 shops, 28 dwellings, one live/work unit, 8 flats and conversion of glove factory to form café/restaurant and offices and associated works, Foundry House and former Mill Lane Trading Estate Summer House Terrace – Mr Craig Bates**

The Chairman reminded members that as the District Council was the owner of the site the application was before the committee for comments only. The recommendation is to refer such comments to the Regulation Committee for determination of the application.

The Principal Legal Executive Advocate advised that the reason for referral of the application to Regulation Committee was not because the Council was the owner of the application land but for reasons of good governance and transparency, having regard to the Council's interest in the development scheme (e.g. part of the Yeovil Vision programme). He further advised that, under the Council's Constitution, both this application and the associated (next) application for listed building consent should be treated as 'excepted business', with County Council members not voting on either application. This application was a 'major' planning application and therefore 'excepted', and listed building applications were not planning applications and therefore not something upon which County Council members could vote.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator presented the application and advised members that the description of the application should read '10 flats' and not '8 flats'. He updated members that since the report was published comments had now been received from the County Highways Authority (CHA) and the Environment Agency (EA) and copies of these letters were provided at the meeting.

He informed members that both the CHA and EA had agreed in principle with the officers' recommendation subject to the additional conditions and informatives included in these letters. He advised members that no further correspondence had been received from the District Council's Environmental Protection Unit or the County Archaeologist.

With the aid of slides the Major Applications Co-ordinator outlined the current site showing the:

- Conversion of the Foundry House – a grade II listed building
- Creation of the 'promenade' on the southern boundary of the site
- Location of the site in relation to surrounding sites including Old Station Way and the car dealership site.
- The re-routing and culverting of the existing Dodham Brook and the creation of the new flood channel.
- The design layout and elevations of the proposed buildings
- The incorporation and location the electricity sub-station
- Car parking and cycle spaces - highlighting that the movement and safety of pedestrians would be enhanced by the link provided by the promenade to the town centre.

He informed members that the proposal does not provide for any affordable housing on site as required by policy HG7, however a contribution of £50,000 is offered towards off-

site provision. This offer has been made in light of the commercial viability of the proposal. This viability has been the subject of detailed examination through the process of agreeing the terms of the sale of this site, which is currently owned by the District Council.

The figures put forward by the applicant have been subject to expert scrutiny by an independent party and are not disputed. In light of this third party advice the Council's housing manager accepts the commuted offer on the grounds that it may not be sufficient to deliver a unit on this site and if it did a single unit would present unacceptable 'management' issues for an RSL.

It is therefore considered that, in this instance, a case has been made for a lower than normal affordable housing contribution and that a commuted sum would be the best way forward. On this basis the proposal would reasonably contribute to the provision of affordable housing in compliance with policies HG6, HG7 and HG8.

Members were also informed that a Section 106 planning obligation by 'unilateral undertaking' would be necessary in this case as an alternative to a Section 106 planning obligation by agreement, as the Council cannot enter into an agreement with itself.

The Major Applications Co-ordinator concluded that the design and layout of the site delivered an 'urban' style village which responded well to the design brief set out for this site. He added that the balance of mixed use units with the public space provided by the riverside promenade was a sympathetic transformation of this part of the town and created a quality development.

Craig Bates, the applicant, then addressed members informing them that this would be an environmentally friendly sustainable development including solar panels for hot water, high insulation within the buildings and low energy lighting. He reported that they had included a cafe to encourage the public into the park area and felt the design retained the character of the main building and hoped members would support the proposed development. He stressed this was a marginal scheme in terms of viability and had worked hard to maintain the scheme's viability through the economic downturn.

Councillor Peter Gubbins, Ward Member commented that he was slightly disappointed in the design of the site, and felt it looked a bit like a house estate rather than the quality mixed use site that was first envisaged. He was uncertain that the planned café would convey and promote the quality development that was originally proposed.

Councillor Andy Kendall, Ward Member, reiterated the comments regarding the residential units and felt there were more houses than originally planned.

A member of the committee said that the scheme remained a high quality scheme which would uplift this area of Yeovil, and felt that it delivered what the planning brief required.

During discussions members raised concerns:

- over the lighting and street furniture and who would provide and ensure enough lighting was provided on site
- the materials to be used regarding the brick and render for the buildings
- the number of residential units proposed as the original plans seemed to provide more commercial units than first envisaged.

Members felt that due to the nature of the site, facing the country park, fixings such as satellite dishes and meter boxes could be detrimental to the overall appearance and expressed a need for the removal of permitted development rights regarding this issue.

In response to members questions the Major Applications Co-ordinator commented that:

- Conditions 10 and 13 set out in the report should allow for provision of any additional street lighting required
- Condition 6 set out in the report should safeguard the materials used prior to the commencement of the works on site, in liaison with the planners and conservation team.

He stated that it could be appropriate to impose a condition to remove permitted development rights regarding the satellite dishes and meter boxes; however this could only cover the internal courtyard walls and would exclude any outside walls of the development.

The Head of Area Development, South and Head of Development and Building Control informed members that, as there were already many empty commercial units within the town centre, and although efforts had been made to keep the corners and frontage of the site commercial, the reality was the need for greater residential units due to the current change in the economic climate.

Members expressed sympathy regarding the current climate and agreed that the plan reflected the current economic change and that it still showed an excellent development providing for quality town centre living.

The officers recommendation to refer the application to the Regulation Committee with a recommendation to approve was proposed and seconded and carried.

**RESOLVED:** That application reference 09/01671/FUL be referred to the Regulation Committee with a recommendation to approve subject to:

- a) No irreconcilable adverse comments being received from the outstanding consultees (Environmental Protection Unit and County Archaeologist);
- b) the prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation (in a form acceptable to the Council's solicitor(s)) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued, the said planning obligation to secure the necessary contribution towards the provision of affordable housing
- c) the imposition of the planning conditions set out in the Agenda report, together with the additional conditions as recommended by the Environment Agency and the County Highways Authority and the additional conditions on meter boxes and satellite dishes as verbally reported at the meeting.

*(Voting: 11 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions)*

**09/01696/LBC – Repairs to existing glove factory and conversion to mixed use, Foundry House Mill Lane Trading Estate Summer House Terrace – Mr Craig Bates**

The same report was presented as for the above planning application 09/01671/FUL.

**RESOLVED:** That application reference 09/01696/LBC be referred to the Regulation Committee with a recommendation to approve subject to the following conditions:

1. The works for which consent is hereby granted shall be begun within three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Prior to the commencement of the conversion of Foundry House a full schedule of works, including specifications of materials, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include:-

1. Details of external materials and finishes
2. Details of new doors and windows including drawings at 1:5 scale.
3. The reinstatement of the original entrance doors.
3. Details of eaves and verges of reconstructed roofs.
4. Design details of new cupola, chimneys and fire escape
5. Sample panels of pointing for approval
6. Details of externally positioned meter boxes, ventilation extracts, flues etc
7. Details of all internal materials and finishes to floors, walls and ceilings
8. Details of internal joinery and secondary glazing

Once approved such details shall be fully implemented unless agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of this listed building in accordance with policy EH3 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the advice of PPG15.

*(Voting: 11 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions)*

---

**09/01738/FUL – The erection of 6 no. three storey townhouses, Land Adjacent Old Cinema Bed Centre Court Ash Yeovil – Abbey Manor Partners (Jason Mills)**

*(Councillor Lesley Boucher, having earlier declared a personal and prejudicial interest, left the room during consideration of this item).*

The Deputy Development Control Team Leader with the aid of slides presented the report. He highlighted to members that it was an elevated and narrow site running alongside the flank wall of the Old Cinema building and facing onto Court Ash.

He informed members that due to constrictions of the site the main windows and solar panels were situated on the front of the buildings to make best use of the natural light. He indicated these buildings sit under the shadow of the high mature trees located on the adjacent car park site and reported that the applicant has agreed with the imposition of a 'Grampian' style planning condition for the removal of the existing trees and replanting of suitable alternatives.

He drew attention to the Market Street Area Development Brief and whilst the area is identified for redevelopment of retail or residential usage this site is only detailed for a residential development.

Jason Mills the applicant addressed the committee and highlighted that they were working with the owners of the cattle market site to promote the redevelopment of the area for mixed residential and commercial use. They envisage that it will help reserve a footpath link from the town centre as part of a larger comprehensive scheme for the Market Street Development.

Councillor Andy Kendall, Ward Member expressed his concern in relation to the design brief for the Yeovil Vision Project. He would have preferred to have seen this site form part of the larger more comprehensive re-development of the overall Market Street area and felt the site was too narrow for the recommended development.

Councillor Peter Gubbins, Ward Member felt this was an acceptable development to best suit what was currently a small restrictive site.

During discussions members expressed concerns that:

- the alleyway situated at the rear of the properties could be a safety issue for the public
- the design of the development was not in keeping with the existing surrounding buildings
- the overall size of the residential units and living accommodation as the site was very small and narrow
- the overall natural light available into the rear of the properties as the main windows are situated to the front of the buildings
- this application if approved could compromise the future development of the overall market street development and highlighted the Conservation Officers comments as set out in the report

Some members felt this development was making good use of a small parcel of land which had been earmarked for residential development only and helped tidy up these areas which also met the housing needs of the town.

In response to members the Deputy Development Control Team Leader stated that:

- this application covered all aspects of what is currently an untidy infill site and dealt with the strict constraints of a very narrow site
- lockable gates would be installed at the rear of the property at either ends of the alleyway
- highlighted the comments made by the conservation officer in removing Unit 1 or replacing with a lower two storey building, however he felt this would not alter the overall design aspect regarding the corner of these two streets.
- the living accommodation would be located on the first and second floors and the bedrooms on the lower floor. This is known as 'upside down' living which is very common with this style of town house development.

The officers' recommendation to grant permission was proposed and seconded.

**RESOLVED:** That application reference:09/01738/FUL be GRANTED in accordance with officers recommendation subject to the conditions set out in the Agenda report

*(Voting: 11 in favour, 5 against, 0 abstentions)*

---

**09/02315/FUL – Alteration and the erection of a two storey extension and conversion of dwellinghouse to form two flats (Re-Submission), 3 Hillside Terrace Yeovil– Mr T Foote**

The Deputy Development Control Team Leader presented the report and with the aid of slides highlighted the proposed and existing plans pointing out the changes to the dormer window. He reported that no further updates to the report had been made.

Jenny Byrd, objector informed the committee that development work had already started on site. She stressed that there was already a significant parking problem within the area and this development would result in an increase in parking demand and result in further access issues for the emergency services.

She highlighted a big conflict of noise and disturbance at different times of the day and night with the proposed living room next to the bedroom and vice versa. She also had concerns regarding the amount of natural light into the upstairs kitchen, the invasion of privacy regarding the velux window situated on the ground floor and the access to the garden from the top flat.

The Deputy Development Control Team Leader confirmed that they did not realise work had already started on site and agreed that a condition could be included requiring the ground floor velux window to be fixed shut and obscure glass added.

Councillor Tony Lock, Ward Member raised his concerns over the impact this development would have on the overall residential amenity and access to the site. He was concerned the increase in use of the junction of Hillside Terrace and Sherborne Road as such would cause road safety issues.

He also felt that the proposed development would result in the increase in parking and did not agree with the policies which considered the parking demand be no different to that of



the existing dwelling. He therefore did not support the officers' recommendation to grant permission.

Councillor David Recardo, Ward Member reiterated the comments made regarding the parking issues and access onto Sherborne Road. He felt that although this development, on its own did not have a overall huge impact, if permission was granted it could set a precedent for future similar developments increasing the traffic for this area and therefore did not support the officers recommendation to grant permission.

During discussions members commented that:

- the application should be treated as a single application and bear no relevance to future application.
- concerns were raised over the increase in use of the junction of Hillside Terrace and Sherborne Road and as such would cause road safety issues
- the development would result in the increase in parking demands
- as the development had already started how do we enforce any conditions once work had commenced on site
- surrounding properties had already been redeveloped and therefore valid reasons would be required as to why they would go against the officers recommendation to refuse permission
- as located close to the town centre there were adequate services, facilities, public car parks and good transport links that could give rise to a very sustainable development in terms of transport and parking issues
- their concerns regarding internal noise disturbance and limiting the noise between properties is paramount

In response to members questions the Deputy Development Team Leader said he was aware there had been several house to flat conversions in the area and therefore this development was considered to be, in principle, a sustainable location indicating that if permission was refused a report would need to come back to committee for enforcement action as work has already started on site.

He appreciated the neighbours concerns regarding the internal noise issue and that limiting the noise was paramount. He reported that although this was covered under building control regulations he would add an informative reminding the applicant of the need to limit noise between properties and enlist an acoustic engineer if required.

Carl Brinkman, Principal Planning Liaison Officer, SCC informed members that as this was a private road network and on the basis considered the parking demand would be no different from that of the existing dwelling and therefore unreasonable to raise a highway objection to this proposal.

The Chairman reiterated his concerns over the increase in use of the junction to Hillside Terrace and Sherborne Road, the impact this would have on highway safety and the car parking issues and therefore did not support the officers recommendation to grant permission.

It was then proposed that planning permission be granted in accordance with the planning officers' recommendation and the amended conditions proposed and this was seconded.

On being put to the vote, this was carried (voting: 9 in favour, 7 against, 0 abstentions)

**RESOLVED:** That application reference:09/02315/FUL be GRANTED in accordance with officers recommendation subject to:

- a) the impositions of the planning conditions set out in the agenda report together with the following amendments verbally reported at the meeting:
- an additional condition requiring the ground floor velux window to be fixed shut and obscure glazed
  - the amendment of condition 4 to require details of materials to be submitted within one month of date of decision.

An informative be added reminding the applicant of the need to limit noise between the properties.

*(Voting: 9 in favour, 7 against, 0 abstentions)*

---

**09/02343/FUL – The erection of a single storey extension to front of dwelling (Retrospective), 255 St Michaels Avenue Yeovil – Mr Peter Talbot**

Jane Green, Planning Assistant presented the report and with the aid of slides highlighted the elevated position and open fronted area of the site. She informed members that advice was given to the applicant over the phone regarding planning permission but they did not take this up.

Jane Talbot, applicant addressed the committee and apologised for the retrospective planning permission stating they had been confused over the information given. She ensured members that the tiles could be replaced with old ones from the rear of the property and had been told that the materials used would weather down in time. She also agreed to make changes regarding the planting of greenery to obscure the development.

Tony Lock, Ward Member commented that there were no other developments similar within the street and that if this was not retrospective permission his opinion would have been to refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation.

David Recardo, Ward Member expressed his dislike to the materials used and that the design sits awkwardly within the street. He felt that if retrospective planning permission was granted this would set a precedent for future similar developments in this area.

During further discussions members reiterated there concerns regarding the brickwork and tiles used, however in time with age and weathering this should tone down and highlighted that the applicant was willing to change the tiles on the roof and other materials to help obscure the development.

Members again raised their concerns that if retrospective planning permission was granted in accordance with the officers' recommendation this would set a precedent for similar future developments within the area.

The Deputy Development Control Team Leader clarified to members that the advice given to the applicant was that they did in fact require planning permission for this development. He informed members that as this application seeks a retrospective permission a refusal would result in the need for enforcement action to be considered.

It was agreed that if enforcement action were required it would be deferred for three months and that as delegated by the planning officer a report would be brought back to committee at that time.

The Chairman then moved the officers' recommendation for approval, which was proposed and seconded, but the motion was lost 7 in favour, 9 against and 1 abstention.

It was then proposed and seconded to refuse this application, contrary to the officers' recommendation, because the proposal by reason of its location, scale and design does not respect the character of the area and if allowed would set an undesirable precedent. As such the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of policy ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan. On being put to the vote the proposal was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That permission be refused against application reference:09/02343/FUL contrary to officers recommendation.

Reason: The proposal by reason of its location, scale and design does not respect the character of the area and if allowed would set an undesirable precedent. As such the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of policy ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

*(Voting: 10 in favour, 4 against)*

---

#### **09/02711/FUL – Alterations and the erection of two single storey extensions to surgery, Oaklands Surgery Birchfield Road Yeovil – Dr's Hogben & Bonnington**

The Planning Officer presented the report with the aid of slides informing members that planning permission was granted in 2006 and has since lapsed. He reported this was a resubmission of the same application and that there were no further updates.

Councillors David Recardo and Tony Lock, Ward members both expressed their concerns regarding the increase in parking demands. They highlighted that the development was situated within an area, which already includes a school and community hall, and the extra traffic could cause a safety issue for the children and public using this area.

During further discussions members commented that:

- the proposed Lyde Road Key Site development would have an impact on the existing surgery which is currently incapable of taking on a larger patient list
- the car parking issues did not only relate to the surgery, but other facilities already situated within the area and therefore should not refuse permission for this reason.

Carl Brinkman, Principal Planning Liaison Officer, SCC highlighted to members that according to current policy the site already had an over provision of car parking and therefore could not recommended this application for refusal on these grounds. Members appreciated the issues regarding the car parking but felt that the priority was the need for an increase in patient demand and indicated their support for the application.

It was then proposed to grant permission and on being put to the vote, the proposal was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That application reference:09/02711/FUL be GRANTED in accordance with officers recommendation subject to the conditions set out in the Agenda report

*(Voting:15 in favour, 0 against)*

---

**09/03011/FUL – Alterations to extend existing driveway and widen vehicular access, 5 Thorne Lane Yeovil – Mr Adrian Partridge**

The Planning Officer presented the report and with the aid of slides showed details of the application together with plan of the site.

Barbara Strong, Parish Representative highlighted her concern regarding the proximity of the entrance and dropped kerb in relation to the traffic island.

The Ward Members made no comments and it was proposed and seconded to approve the application as set out in the agenda report.

**RESOLVED:** That application reference:09/03011/FUL be GRANTED in accordance with officers recommendation subject to the conditions set out in the Agenda report

*(Voting:14 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)*

*Simon Gale, Head of Development and Building Control (01935) 462071  
simon.gale@southsomerset.gov.uk*

---

#### **40. Somerset Highways Maintenance Programme Report (Agenda Item 8)**

Ioan Rees, Head of Highways and Passenger Transport, Environment Directorate gave a presentation with the aid of slides briefing members on the wider services provided by the Somerset Highways. (A copy of this powerpoint presentation is attached to the minutes).

Mike Fear, Assistant Highway Service Manager, South Somerset Highways then presented the agenda report updating members on the current maintenance programme. He added that Lower Wraxhill Road had now been added to the outstanding schemes to be completed in 2009-10.

During discussions members raised comments on the following:

- the suspending of flags and banners from existing lampposts
- the issues regarding the re-surfacing of pot holes - length of time it takes to repair which sometimes produces substandard results
- the programme for road markings within the area
- overhanging of private hedges onto the public highway – who's responsible if this becomes a safety issue
- the clearing of culverts and grass verges

In response to members questions the Head of Highways and Passenger Transport, Environment Directorate and Assistant Highway Service Manager, South Somerset Highways informed members that:

- there were safety aspects regarding the hanging banners or flags from existing lampposts
- Pot holes once reported for repair were dealt with as soon as possible. The practice of repairing these pot holes and any concerns were dealt with via the Somerset direct line.
- a programme of works was available for road markings and that the whole of Yeovil would be completed at one time.
- if overhanging of private hedges became a safety issue then they have the authority to cut back otherwise this is the responsibility of the private land owner.

The Chairman thanked both officers for their reports.

**NOTED**

*Mike Fear, Assistant Highway Service Manager, South Somerset Highways  
MGFear@somerset.gov.uk or 0845 3459155*

---

**41. Area South Community Safety Action Panel Update (Agenda Item 9)**

This report was deferred until the next meeting.

**NOTED**

*Martin Woods, Head of Area Development - South  
Martin.woods@southsomerset.gov.uk or (01935) 462708*

---

**42. Joint Area South Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 10)**

The Head of Area Development, South presented the forward plan and advised members of the future reports to the committee.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) that the Joint Area South Forward Plan and the comments of Members be noted.
  - (2) that the reports identified by Members be added to the Joint Area South Forward Plan.

*(Voting: Without dissent)*

*Jo Boucher, Committee Administrator, Legal and Democratic Services (01935) 462011  
jo.boucher@southsomerset.gov.uk*

---

.....  
Chairman