

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area South Committee** held at the **Council Chamber Council Offices Brympton Way on Wednesday 14 June 2017.**

(2.00 - 4.45 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Peter Gubbins (Chairman)

Cathy Bakewell	Graham Oakes
Gye Dibben	Wes Read
John Field	David Recardo
Nigel Gage	Gina Seaton
Andy Kendall	Peter Seib
Sarah Lindsay	Alan Smith
Mike Lock	Rob Stickland
Tony Lock	

Officers:

Jo Boucher	Democratic Services Officer
Simon Fox	Area Lead (South)
Paula Goddard	Senior Legal Executive
Helen Rutter	Assistant Director (Communities)
Andrew Collins	Planning Officer
Lisa Davis	Community Office Support Manager
Natalie Fortt	Area Development Lead South

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

4. Minutes of previous meeting (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the Area South Committee held on 3rd May 2017 and 18th May 2017 copies of which had been circulated, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors John Clark and Kaysar Hussain.

6. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Rob Stickland declared a Personal interest in Agenda Item 14 Planning Application 17/01316/FUL as he lives near the application site.

Councillor Gina Seaton declared a Personal interest in Agenda Item 13 Planning Application 17/01396/FUL as she is a member of West Coker Parish Council.

7. Public question time (Agenda Item 4)

There were no questions from members of the public.

8. Chairman's announcements (Agenda Item 5)

The Chairman informed members that:

- Transformation Workshop 6-8pm Thursday 15th June 2017 before Full Council. Please could all Councillors try to attend to start to get involved in the practicalities of Transformation and help to identify ways that could be improved as a result of the new way of working.
 - Yeovil Refresh briefing session to take place immediately after the close of next month's Area South Committee on 5th July 2017. Please let Jo know whether you will be attending if you haven't already done so.
-

9. Reports from representatives on outside organisations (Agenda Item 6)

There were no reports made from representatives on outside organisations.

10. Community Safety - Yeovil One Team (Agenda Item 7)

The Assistant Director, Communities introduced Tim Coombe and Claire Leonard from the Avon and Somerset Police Authority who were also in attendance. She proceeded to present the report as detailed in the agenda including:

- Informing members that Steve Brewer, the Community Safety Coordinator had now left the Authority and clarified the situation regarding current staffing arrangements and responsibilities at the present time. She also introduced Charley Dawes the Administrator for the Yeovil One Team.
- The work of the Yeovil One Team identifying deprivation and community safety issues by working in a multi-agency way, including the work of the weekly Operational Group and the monthly Tactical Group.
- Recent liaison with the Accident & Emergency department at Yeovil District Hospital to identify the individuals with frequent repeat attendance at the A & E department and looking with partners at the root causes as a way of reducing demand.

Tim Coombe, Avon and Somerset Police Authority reiterated the continued focus was on demand reduction, working with the most deprived in the community and the need to keep re-evaluating and the use of partnership working when dealing with these issues.

In response to members' questions, he also confirmed that Yeovil Central area was the main focus although there is always a need to review to ensure the right areas are being looked at. He also explained the new body-worn cameras that front line officers were now equipped with and the many benefits since the introduction of these within the force.

Members thanked Tim Coombe and Claire Leonard from the Avon and Somerset Police Authority for attending committee and also wished to note their thanks to Steve Brewer, Community Safety Co-ordinator for all the excellent work he had done for the Authority.

NOTED

11. Community Offices Update Report (Agenda Item 8)

The Community Office Support Manager presented the report as detailed in the agenda and with the aid of a powerpoint presentation gave details of the total community office footfall over the last three years highlighting the footfall of the core services including Benefits, Council Tax, Refuse and Recycling, Housing and Homelessness. In response to members she also informed them that:

- Universal credit (UC) was fully rolled across South Somerset in April 2017 and that although this should eventually reduce the demand for the service this is not the case at present particularly at Petters House.
- The majority of UC gets paid directly to the claimant; however there is still the opportunity to get this paid directly to the landlord.

The Community Support Office Manager also noted a query regarding Personal Independent payments and would contact the member direct with this information.

There being no further discussion the members thanked the Community Office Support Manager for her comprehensive report.

NOTED

12. Area South Committee Working Groups and Outside Organisations- Appointment of Members 2017/18 (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 9)

(This item was taken before Item 8 on the agenda)

The Committee agreed the appointment of members to serve on the various working groups, panels and outside bodies for 2017/18.

- RESOLVED:**
1. that members be appointed to serve on those groups and panels for the municipal year 2017/18 as follows:
 2. that appointments be made to outside bodies as follows:

Reason: To appoint members to working groups and outside bodies.

Area South Panels and Working Groups

Area South Community Forum

Representation 2017/2018

Tony Lock
Peter Gubbins

Yeovil Town Centre Enhancement Group	Mike Lock John Clark Tony Lock David Recardo Wes Read Gina Seaton Sarah Lindsay Andy Kendall Peter Gubbins
Yeovil Youth Service Review Group	Cathy Bakewell Rob Stickland
Yeovil Market Improvement Group	David Recardo Cathy Bakewell Gina Seaton Mike Lock Nigel Gage Sarah Lindsay
Birchfield Group	Yeovil East and Yeovil Without Ward Members
Outside Bodies	Representation 2017/2018
Abbey Community Association	Alan Smith
John Nowes Exhibition Foundation	Peter Seib
South Somerset MIND	Andy Kendall
Wyndham Trust (Yeovil)	Peter Seib
Yeovil Crematorium and Cemetery Joint Committee	Nigel Gage Graham Oakes Gye Dibben
Yeovil in Bloom Gardeners Market Steering Group	Wes Read
Yeovil One	Tony Lock
Yeovil Sports Club Board of Management	Andy Kendall
Preston School Strategic Management Group	David Recardo Wes Read
Yeovil Vision Board	Peter Gubbins David Recardo One further Councillor, to be invited at the Chairman's discretion when required

(Resolution passed without dissent)

13. Scheme of Delegation - Development Control - Nomination of Substitutes for Chairman and Vice Chairman (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 10)

RESOLVED: that, in line with the Development Control Revised Scheme of Delegation, Councillors Peter Seib as first substitute and Tony Lock as second substitute be nominated to act as substitutes for the Chairman and Vice Chairman to make decisions in the Chairman's and Vice Chairman's absence on whether an application should be considered by the Area Committee as requested by the Ward Member(s).

Reason: To appoint members to act as substitutes for the Chairman and Vice Chairman for the planning scheme of delegation

(Resolution passed without dissent)

14. Area South Forward Plan (Agenda Item 11)

The Assistant Director, Communities updated members on the progress of the item requested by them on the Western Corridor Improvements. She explained that SCC have agreed to attend Area South committee along with a contractor representative, however there has been a short delay in the tendering process and the most probable date for attendance is now October or November committee. This will be updated on the forward plan as soon as possible.

She gave no further updates to the report and clarified that the August Area South Committee would only take place if there were any planning applications to be determined.

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

(Voting: Without dissent)

15. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 12)

Members noted the Schedule of Planning Applications.

16. Planning Application 17/01396/FUL - Coker Firs 141 West Coker Road Yeovil (Agenda Item 13)

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda and with the aid of a powerpoint presentation showed the site and proposed plans, including photos of the site and from neighbouring properties.

He also showed plans from the previously approved application which had since lapsed, as he believed it would help members in showing the differences in this application and the previous application approved in 2011.

The Planning officer confirmed that there were no further updates to the report and referred to the key considerations for members including:

- Whether anything had materially changed since application 10/04538/FUL and does this result in the same decision?
- Impact upon residential amenity.
- Impact upon visual amenity.
- Impact upon highway safety.

He considered the current policies and guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to be fundamentally the same and that the proposed dwelling was to be sited further away from the neighbouring property than that of the current garage. He referred to the comments made by the County Highways Authority and that the existing access is sufficient for this application and therefore his recommendation was to approve the application for reasons as set out in the agenda report.

In response to members' questions the Area Lead South and Planning Officer confirmed that:

- There is additional land within the applicant's ownership as indicated by a blue line within the application plans; however this land is not part of this application.
- With the aid of slides showed the differing levels between the application site and the existing bungalows and their gardens in Nash Lane to the west of the site.
- Obscure glazing would be fitted to the 2 first floor windows in the rear south elevation.
- The proposed dwelling was to be the same height as the previously approved dwelling with the footprint marginally larger to include a garage at ground floor level with a larger bedroom above.
- Proposed dwelling to be approximately 6 metres from the neighbouring property 2a Nash Lane.
- Appreciated the concerns regarding the drainage issues especially due to the levels and alleged sandy soil, however the application is accompanied with a drainage proposal, previously a detailed scheme was agreed and on the basis of expert advice a suitable form of drainage can be achieved on this site.
- Had consulted with Western Power regarding electricity wires across the site however no comments had been received at this time.
- This application is for a single dwelling located within the site as indicated within the red line of the submitted plans. The land situated outside of this area, although within the applicants ownership, is not part of this application and should not be considered with this application.

Councillor Gina Seaton ward member, proposed that in order to appreciate the full degree and levels of the site in relation to the existing properties, 2 and 2a Nash Lane, and the concerns regarding run off and flooding that a site visit be made before the application was determined. This was subsequently seconded and on being put to the vote was lost by 7 votes in favour and 7 votes against. The Chairman provided his casting vote against the proposal of a site visit.

Mrs Bridget Sugg, Chairman of East Coker Parish Council then addressed the committee and spoke in opposition to the application. She wished to reinforce the comments already made by East Coker Parish Council and believed that due to the topography of the site it was a totally unsuitable location for any new dwelling. She reiterated the concern regarding the sandy soil within the area and the overbearing impact this proposal would have on the neighbouring properties within Nash Lane. In conclusion she believed this proposal would be seriously detrimental to the streetscene and have a significant impact on the surrounding local area.

Mr David Stephens, representative of some of the residents of Nash Lane spoke in opposition to the application. He appreciated this was a controversial application and believed the report placed great reliance on the previously approved planning permission which had now since lapsed. He believed the framework of planning had changed radically since 2010 and that this application does not comply with the sustainable aspects as set out within the NPPF, principally due to the impact this proposal would have on the neighbouring properties. He was not confident in the proposed surface water drainage system, believed a site visit was necessary to fully appreciate the levels of this site and that the knowledge of local residents should be taken into account.

Mr Shaun Travers and Mr Ryan Huntley also addressed the committee and spoke in opposition to the application. Comments made included:

- This proposal would have a significant visual impact on what is a historical and characterful part of the town.
- Would harm what was a distinctive site with a large number of protected trees.
- Insufficient survey undertaken of neighbouring properties especially the properties to the west of the site within Nash Lane.
- Noted the strong objection from both East Coker and West Coker Parish Councils.
- Significant change in planning policy since the approval of the last planning permission and therefore do not need to make the same mistake twice.
- Concern regarding water services running through the proposed site that currently served neighbouring properties.
- Reiterated concerns regarding the sandy soil and surface water drainage of the site.
- Overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties.
- Localism and lack of consultation from the applicant.

Mr Rob Smith the agent then addressed the committee. He referred to the previous planning permission already granted where all conditions had been discharged and building control regulations met. He believed there was no significant change from the previous scheme other than this proposal was to be sited further away from the neighbouring boundary which also provided a good three bed house for the local area.

Councillor Gina Seaton, Ward member raised concerns regarding the overbearing impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties, the loss of light and overall loss of

privacy to the adjacent properties particularly 2 and 2a Nash Lane. She considered that due to the topography and sandy soil of the site that this is a totally unsuitable location for a dwelling. She referred to a recent refused application of the site which had included three bungalows and stated the reasons for refusal of that application. She believed the proposal would be detrimental to the area and contrary to Policy EQ2 of the local plan and aims and objectives of the NPPF and would not support the application.

Councillor Cathy Bakewell, Ward member also raised concern regarding the proposal. She reiterated concerns regarding the significant impact the proposal would have on the streetscene and surrounding local area and the flooding and drainage issues of the site. She questioned the concerns over the future of the remaining land at the rear of the site that is still within the ownership of the applicant.

During discussion, members expressed varying comments including

- Appreciated the varying levels of the site and sought clarification over the differing ground levels of the site in relation to the neighbouring properties in Nash Lane.
- Raised concerns regarding the overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties of Nash Lane but questioned whether this had significantly changed from that of the previous approved application.
- Believed the proposed dwelling located further away from the neighbouring property 2a Nash Lane was an improvement from that of the previous approved scheme.
- Cannot clearly find any significant reasons to go against the policies set out in the local plan or NPPF.
- Questioned the outcome and costs of an appeal and the weight given to any historical planning consent of the site.
- Raised concern regarding the land at the rear of the site and its future use.

In response to members' comments the Area South Lead acknowledged the previous application had since lapsed but clarified that the reasons and considerations for this application were fundamentally the same. He appreciated the concerns raised regarding the varying levels and drainage issues of the site due to the alleged sandy soil, however stated that no evidence had been proven and as such the recommendation was still to approve this application.

The Chairman then proposed and subsequently seconded that planning permission be granted as per the officers recommendation as set out in the agenda report. On being put to the vote this was lost by 5 votes in favour and 3 against.

Following a short discussion it was then proposed and subsequently seconded that the application be refused contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reasons as read out by the Planning Officer:

'The proposal by reason of its location and siting fails to conserve or enhance the landscape character of the area, fails to reinforce local distinctiveness and respect local context whilst causing an overbearing relationship to 2 and 2a Nash Lane. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy EQ2 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the aims and objectives of the NPPF'.

On being put to the vote this was carried by 9 votes in favour, 5 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That application **17/01396/FUL** be refused for the following reason:

The proposal by reason of its location and siting fails to conserve or enhance the landscape character of the area, fails to reinforce local distinctiveness and respect local context whilst causing an overbearing relationship to 2 and 2a Nash Lane. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy EQ2 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the aims and objectives of the NPPF'

(voting: 9 in favour, 5 against, 1 abstention)

17. Planning Application 17/01316/FUL - 88 Southville Yeovil (Agenda Item 14)

The Planning Officer presented the application as detailed in the agenda and with the aid of a powerpoint presentation showed the site and proposed plans.

He explained the application had been referred to committee as the visibility splays that can be achieved do not meet the standing advice guidance. However following the advice from the SSDC Highway consultant and consideration given to the width of the road, traffic calming measures and vehicle speeds in the area on balance he felt the proposal to be acceptable.

The Planning Officer also clarified to members that Gordon Road was an unclassified road and that anyone could create a vehicular access without planning permission. He therefore concluded that for reasons set out in the agenda report his recommendation was to approve the application

In response to members' questions the Area Lead South and Planning Officer confirmed that:

- Clarified the tandem parking bays to serve both the existing property and the additional dwelling attached to the end of terrace.
- Condition to be imposed to ensure the street light column currently located along the frontage would be relocated.
- Advice given to applicant for the need to extend the drop kerbing at the point of access onto the pavement.

Mr Hayz Herman the applicant then addressed the committee and clarified the parking arrangements of the site. He explained the scheme would include the addition of three further car parking spaces and that he was happy to comply with the planning conditions imposed.

Councillor Tony Lock, Ward member although supported the proposed design and layout of the scheme voiced concern regarding the proposed visibility splay. He appreciated the proposal would tidy up the site but the area became very congested with parked cars and believed the introduction of Traffic Regulation Orders would help aid visibility and improve traffic safety in the area.

Councillor Rob Stickland, Ward member reiterated the concern raised regarding the visibility splay and acknowledged the congestion from the on road parking within the

area. However he did consider the proposed dwelling to be acceptable and an improvement of the site.

Councillor David Recardo, Ward member believed the proposal would improve and tidy up the site and believed the width of the road and nearby junction was satisfactory to safeguard traffic speeds in the area.

Following a short discussion it was then proposed and subsequently seconded to approve the application as per the officer's recommendation as set out in the agenda report. On being put to the vote this was carried by 13 votes in favour, 0 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That application **17/01316/FUL** be approved subject to:

01. The proposed scheme provides development that makes efficient use of land, respects the character and form of development in the area, causes no demonstrable harm to residential amenity and provides a great improvement to the existing sub-standard access and as such accords with Policies YV1, EQ2 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3.1, 4.1 received 13 March 2017.

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

03. No works shall be undertaken on the finished walls unless details of the proposed bricks have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028).

04. The garage / workshop building shall not be demolished until details of the boundary treatment between numbers 86 and 88 Southville have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The new boundary treatment shall be erected within 1 month once the garage / workshop building has been demolished and thereafter retained at the agreed height.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028).

05. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 600 millimetres above adjoining road level forward of a line drawn 2.0 metres back and parallel to the nearside carriageway edge over the site frontage, save for the proposed dwelling. Such visibility shall be fully provided before works commence on the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy TA6 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028).

06. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless the area allocated for parking on the submitted plan (3.1) shall be properly consolidated and surfaced in accordance with details which shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Such parking shall be kept clear of obstruction at all times and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy TA6 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028).

07. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied unless details of the provision of surface water drainage from the driveway has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy TA5 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028).

08. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless the existing street light located on Gordon Road has been relocated in accordance with a scheme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy TA6 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028).

Informatives:

01. Please be advised that approval of this application by South Somerset District Council will attract a liability payment under the Community Infrastructure Levy. CIL is a mandatory financial charge on development and you will be notified of the amount of CIL being charged on this development in a CIL Liability Notice.

You are required to complete and return Form 1 Assumption of Liability as soon as possible and to avoid additional financial penalties it is important that you notify us of the date you plan to commence development before any work takes place. Please complete and return Form 6 Commencement Notice.

You are advised to visit our website for further details <https://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/cil> or email cil@southsomerset.gov.uk

02. Having regard to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that the creation of the new access and the relocation of the street light will require a Section 184 Permit. This must be obtained from the Highway Service Manager for the Yeovil Area at The Highways Depot, Mead Avenue, Houndstone Industrial Estate, Yeovil, Somerset, BA22 8RT, Tel No 0300 1232224. Application for

such a permit should be made at least four weeks before access works are intended to commence.

(voting: 13 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstention)

.....

Chairman

.....

Date