

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area South Committee** held at the **Council Chamber, Council Offices, Brympton Way, Yeovil. on Wednesday 7 November 2018.**

(2.00 - 4.00 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Peter Gubbins (Chairman)

Cathy Bakewell	Wes Read
John Clark	David Recardo
John Field	Gina Seaton
Nigel Gage	Peter Seib
Kaysar Hussain	Alan Smith
Mike Lock	Rob Stickland
Tony Lock	

Officers:

Jo Boucher	Case Services Officer (Support Services)
Jacqui Churchill	Planning Officer
Marc Dorfman	Senior Planning Adviser
Neale Hall	Senior Planning Officer
Helen Rutter	Communities Lead

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

27. Minutes of previous meeting (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the Area South Committee held on 3rd October 2018 copies of which had been circulated, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

28. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andy Kendall, Graham Oakes and Sarah Lindsay.

29. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

There were no Declarations of Interest.

30. Public question time (Agenda Item 4)

There were no questions from members of the public.

31. Chairman's announcements (Agenda Item 5)

There were no Chairman's Announcements.

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

Councillor John Clark informed members that £890k of the £996k had been secured to fund the Westfield Community Hall. A preferred contractor had been agreed and he was hopeful that they would start works in the New Year.

33. Area South Revenue Grant Request (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 7)

The Communities Lead presented the report and explained this was a one off grant to recruit a part time post that would subsequently be self-sustaining. She explained the role of the post was to help co-ordinate town centre activities and focus on events and promotions within Yeovil town centre.

David Woan, President of the Chamber of Trade addressed the committee and said that this role was needed to ensure the town centre did not suffer as a result of reduced support from SSDC Officers. He believed funding was critical to deliver events in Yeovil and was part of the Yeovil Refresh project.

During discussion members voiced their support of the grant application and agreed that events are essential to help bring people into the town centre to help the future of the town.

It was then proposed and subsequently seconded to agree a grant up to £7500 to the Town Centre Events on behalf of Love Marketing Group.

RESOLVED: That members agreed to grant up to £7,500 from the community grants budget to Town Centre Events on behalf of Love Marketing Group.

Reason: To consider the request for community grant funding towards Town Centre Events on behalf of Love Yeovil Marketing Group.

(voting: unanimous)

34. Area South Forward Plan (Agenda Item 8)

The Communities Lead presented the report and updated members that the Crematorium presentation would now take place at the February committee. She also said an approach had been made to the relevant officer at SSC Education on the future demand and requirements for education places in Yeovil and she would update the committee as soon as information is supplied by them.

Councillor Peter Gubbins asked that the Yeovil Refresh and Economic Development update report be brought to the March committee.

Councillor Tony Lock requested an update report on the ongoing work and current situation of Birchfield Park in Yeovil.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor John Clark as to when the Area South Council Plan element would be finalised and whether it would be brought back to committee, the Communities Lead advised that this would come to the December committee.

- 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)

35. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 9)

Members noted the Planning Appeals.

36. Schedule of Planning Applications to be Determined by Committee (Agenda Item 10)

Members noted the Schedule of Planning Applications.

37. Planning Application 18/02667/FUL - 10 Westbury Gardens Higher Odcombe Yeovil (Agenda Item 11)

The erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse 10 Westbury Gardens Higher Odcombe Yeovil

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. She confirmed the application was part retrospective and that should the application be refused consideration of enforcement action would be taken.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there were no further updates to the report and referred to the key considerations being the impact on visual and residential amenity and believed that on balance she does not consider the proposal causes demonstrable harm to the neighbouring properties and is located in a residential road of differing styles. Her recommendation therefore was to approve the application for reasons as set out in the agenda report.

In response to members' questions the Planning Officer explained that planning conditions are imposed on applications at the time of approval. Individuals have the right to re-submit an application in future which may or may not allow removal of conditions previously imposed, however each application would be assessed

appropriately at that time. She also confirmed the original single storey extension south elevation would be finished in render and remained the same for this proposal.

A representative of Odcombe Parish Council then addressed the committee who believed the additional height was overbearing to the neighbouring property with the extension built right up to the neighbouring boundary. She confirmed the Parish Council were happy with the original application but unanimously against approval of this proposal.

Two members of the public made comments in objection to the proposal. These included:

- Very overbearing and oppressive.
- Extension dominates the view.
- Second storey is a step too far.
- Building works and scaffolding have been ongoing for an extensive period of time causing undue stress to occupants of neighbouring property.
- Badly designed and not in keeping with surrounding properties.
- Insufficient gap between extension and neighbouring property.
- Causes loss of light and dominates neighbouring bungalow.
- Disproportionate size for the area.
- Original single storey extension was acceptable.

The agent then addressed the committee and told members that work had now stopped on site and believed the proposal was not unduly obtrusive. He apologised for any inconvenience caused but hoped that members would support the application.

Ward member, Councillor Gina Seaton said this proposal was overbearing and dominated the view to the neighbouring bungalow. She said it overlooked No.12 garden and dominates their private amenity space with the extension obscuring the view and therefore would not support the application.

Ward member, Councillor Cathy Bakewell believed the two storey extension finished in render to the side elevation was out of keeping with the streetscene and as the road sloped stood very imposing and overbearing to the neighbouring property also being in close proximity to the neighbouring boundary line.

During discussion, members raised comments including the following:

- Render to the south elevation of the extension was not a key material used in the street scene.
- Considered the single storey extension to be acceptable but two storey became massive and overbearing.
- In very close proximity to the neighbouring boundary.

Following a short discussion it was proposed and seconded to refuse the application based on the reasons raised during the debate. Members then agreed to adjourn the meeting to finalise and agree the full wording for the reason for refusal.

Following the adjournment the Senior Planning Advisor then suggested the proposed reasons for refusal as follows:

'The proposed development, and specifically the proposed and now part constructed two store side extension, by virtue of its inappropriate use of render to the southern elevation;

its height and its close proximity to the southern boundary, would lead to an overbearing and negative visual impact on the street scene. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and design policies in NPPF 2018’.

Members agreed with the reasons for refusal and agreed that enforcement action will not commence until consultation has taken place with the applicant and the final decision to be delegated to the Planning Officer and in consultation with the Ward Members.

On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application **18/02667/FUL** be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development, and specifically the proposed and now part constructed two store side extension, by virtue of its inappropriate use of render to the southern elevation; its height and its close proximity to the southern boundary, would lead to an overbearing and negative visual impact on the street scene. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and design policies in NPPF 2018.

(voting: unanimous)

38. Planning Application 18/01122/FUL - Great Western Hotel 47 Camborne Grove Yeovil (Agenda Item 12)

Change of use of former public house to 8no flats with associated internal, external works and parking, Great Western Hotel, 47 Camborne Grove, Yeovil BA21 5DG

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 told members the original application had been deferred at the September committee to allow negotiations to take place in respect of the parking provision associated with the proposal.

He referred members to the proposed amendments as set out in his report and although this had reduced the parking provision requirement by one space a 4th parking space had now been created.

He also updated members that two further letters had been received reiterating concerns regarding parking provision and sustainability, however all other consultee comment’s remained unchanged. His recommendation therefore was to approve the application and the conditions as set out in the agenda report.

A member of the public and representative for Camra then spoke in objection to the application. Comments raised included:

- Disappointed the Council had decided not to enter the property onto the list of Assets of the Community (AVC) as it was an excellent community pub that should remain.
- The scheme showed no consideration for local residents with the parking provision to be unacceptable.
- Roads within the area were already to full capacity and the addition of many more cars would have an impact on highway safety.

- Questioned the sustainability and the reliance for residents to depend solely on public transport with the area already badly served by the local bus service.

The agent then addressed the committee and believed the amendments made to the application with the additional parking space to be acceptable. He noted the Council had decided for a second time to decline adding the pub to the Community Asset Register and believed it to be in a highly sustainable location, within walking distance of the railway station and town centre facilities. He said it was an opportunity to provide housing of smaller units for low cost and was fully compliant to policy.

Ward member, Councillor Tony Lock acknowledged the former public house was no longer a viable business with lack of trade over recent years and therefore supported the change of use. Nonetheless he still raised concern regarding the lack of parking provision given the number of flats proposed within the development. He said the surrounding roads were already at full capacity and this proposal would result in more pressure for on street parking and be harmful to pedestrian safety.

Ward member, Councillor Rob Stickland also had concern regarding the lack of parking provision given the surrounding roads were already at capacity and could not support the application.

Ward member, Councillor David Recardo reiterated concerns regarding parking provision and that the pub had declined over the years and therefore was just not viable.

During discussion members made several comments including the following:

- Felt the proposal was within a sustainable location and that the applicant had made acceptable amendments to mitigate concerns regarding parking provision.
- No substantial reasons for refusal that could be defended at an appeal.
- Concern regarding the proposed provision of car parking and potential impact for on street parking in the area.
- Highlighted the County Highways comments stating their reservations regarding the proposed parking provision and potential impact for on street parking and local bus service manoeuvrability.
- Believed the pub was no longer a viable business opportunity.
- Should note the concerns of local residents who have to rely on road parking with numerous vehicles already parked on the street corners, therefore this proposal would have a severe impact on public safety.
- Noted the objections from Yeovil Town Council and that the proposal did not meet the County's parking strategy.

Following a short debate it was then proposed and subsequently seconded to approve the application as per the recommendation set out in the agenda report. On being put to the vote this was lost by 2 votes in favour, 10 against and 2 abstentions.

Following a further discussion the Senior Planning Advisor suggested to members the following reason for refusal based on the issues raised during debate.

'The proposal does not provide sufficient on-site parking provision and the expected nature and volume of traffic and parked vehicles generated by the development, in this particular location, would have a detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the area, particularly local bus service manoeuvrability, contrary to Policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.'

Members agreed with the suggested reason for refusal and it was therefore proposed and subsequently seconded to refuse the application for the reason as read out by the Senior Planning Advisor and on being put to the vote this was carried by 10 votes in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Application **18/01122/FUL** be refused for the following reason:

The proposal does not provide sufficient on-site parking provision and the expected nature and volume of traffic and parked vehicles generated by the development, in this particular location, would have a detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the area, particularly local bus service manoeuvrability, contrary to Policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

(voting: 10 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions)



.....
Chairman

.....
Date