

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee - South held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Brympton Way, Yeovil BA20 2HT, on Tuesday, 25 July 2023 at 5.00 pm

**Present:**

Cllr Peter Seib (Chair)  
Cllr Jason Baker (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Steve Ashton  
Cllr Jenny Kenton  
Cllr Sue Osborne

Cllr Mike Best  
Cllr Tim Kerley  
Cllr Martin Wale

**In attendance:**

Cllr Tony Lock

Cllr Jo Roundell Greene

**18 Apologies for Absence - Agenda Item 1**

Apologies were received from Councillors Andy Kendall, Oliver Patrick, Evie Potts-Jones and Jeny Snell.

**19 Minutes from the Previous Meeting - Agenda Item 2**

Resolved that the minutes of the Planning Committee - South held on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2023 be confirmed as a correct record.

**20 Declarations of Interest - Agenda Item 3**

There were no declarations of interest.

**21 Public Question Time - Agenda Item 4**

There were no questions from members of the public.

## **22 Planning Application 22/03397/FUL - Land at Owl Street, Stocklinch, Ilminster - Agenda Item 5**

The Planning officer introduced the application to the committee with the assistance of a powerpoint presentation. He referred to the previously approved Class Q approval of the site and the key considerations. The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out within the agenda report.

Five members of the public addressed the committee in objection to the application. Some of their comments included:

- Narrow single track to the site that is not maintained.
- Dangerous junction and no speed limit in Stocklinch therefore a safety concern regarding pedestrians and local school children.
- Situated in open countryside and in an unsustainable location.
- Questioned the long-term use and possible intent of holiday lets.
- Referred to the class Q approval and considered the conversion of the existing barns was a far better option than the demolition and rebuild of new dwellings.
- Raised concern regarding the surface water run off on the site.
- Significant visible impact on the local countryside and wholly out of character with the village and surrounding landscape.
- Adverse impact on the nearby listed buildings.
- Impact on the local amenities and village hall.
- Encroachment on agricultural land.
- Outside settlement limit.
- Development areas will significantly increase well beyond the Class Q approval limit.
- Would increase the population of the village by over 10%.

A representative from Whitelackington Parish Council and a representative from Stocklinch Parish Council addressed the committee in objection to the application. Some of their comments included:

- Lack of local facilities.
- Believe use will move to holiday let accommodation.
- Referred to recent nearby development schemes with intention to link both.
- Proposal would diminish rather than enhancement the settlement.
- Local community does not support the application and that this has not been taken into account.
- Proposal has no benefit or value to the village.
- Concern raised regarding the high-pressure water main running across the

site.

- Referred to recent government advice and that development should not take place in open countryside and in unsustainable communities.

Division member Councillor Jo Roundell-Greene addressed the committee. Some of her comments included:

- Felt this application should be looked at in its own right and not with the premise of the Class Q development rights of the barns.
- There was over provision of parking spaces.
- Development was in an unsustainable location with no local facilities such as school, shop or pub nearby.
- Proposed materials were not in keeping with the local area.
- Proposal did not fulfil the local housing need.
- Would set a precedent for future development in open countryside.

The Applicant then addressed the committee. Some of his comments included:

- Class Q permission had already been granted.
- Believe the proposal to be more environmentally sustainable.
- Proposed design preserves the agricultural nature of the buildings and rural surroundings.
- Noted that the highways authority had raised no objection.
- Confirmed the intention for the scheme was to let on a long term basis.
- Estate has no access to the land around the development and that the additional track was sought so to alleviate the large farm machinery traffic from travelling through the streets of the village.

The Planning Officers responded on the points raised by the public speakers and on points of detail and technical questions raised by members including:

- That an application for holiday let use can be submitted at any time.
- Considered the listed buildings to be a significant distance away from the development (over 100m) and therefore the historic setting is not affected.
- Relevance of neighbouring applications.
- Showed the location of the high-pressure water main.
- Explained the Class Q approval in comparison with this application.
- Obligation to secure phosphate mitigation not required regarding Class Q development fall back position.
- Condition would be included to control materials used.
- Given the location and Class Q development it was unlikely any further development would be allowed.

During debate comments were made including:

- The approved class Q application was appropriate and more suitable to the

character and curtilage of the surrounding countryside and the site.

- Felt there was too much of a suburban element to the design that would be harmful to the setting of Stocklinch.
- Contrary to the local plan and not in a sustainable location.

It was proposed by Councillor Jenny Kenton and seconded by Councillor Martin Wale to refuse the application on the grounds that the demolition of the barns and the urban style of design would have a detrimental impact on the landscape character.

In response to comments raised, the Lead Specialist provided advice and suggested the reason could refer to the arrangement, layout, design and scale, distribution of dwellings and the parking arrangements would create a residential character which wasn't achieved by the Class Q approval. This was agreed by the proposer and seconder.

Following a short discussion prior to the vote, members were happy to agree the exact wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to officers. On being put to the vote, the proposal to refuse the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation was carried 7 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstention.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning application 22/03397/FUL be REFUSED permission, contrary to the officer recommendation, for the following reason:

01. The proposed development by reason of its extended residential curtilage compared to the scheme approved under (22/00743/PAMB) together with the number and distribution of dwellings and associated residential buildings and paraphernalia in a form that reflects a designed residential layout detracts from the wider landscape character of the site, and negatively contrasts with the simpler form of development approved under (22/00743/PAMB) wherein the development was underpinned by the reuse of simple agricultural buildings reflective of a countryside location. As such, the application proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2008 - 2028 and Paragraph 174 of the NPPF.

(Voting: 7 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions)

**23 Planning Application 18/01311/OUT - Agenda Item 6**

The Lead Specialist introduced the application to the committee with the assistance

of a powerpoint presentation. He explained the background of the application and the reason why it had been brought back to committee as detailed in in the agenda report and confirmed that the applicant now had an agreed phosphate solution.

He referred to the key considerations from the original application and confirmed that the recommendation was the same as per the previous conditionally approved scheme. He explained there was the need to update the affordable housing resolution to include 'first homes' and that in essence this was a tidying up of the resolution to be able to issue a consent in a timely manner.

A representative from Broadway Parish Council addressed the committee. He requested that the application be deferred as felt further consideration was required regarding the phosphate's mitigation report. He suggested that further discussions be held with Wessex Water, Natural England and the Parish Council on the issues involved and concerns regarding the foul water flow and further pollution and contamination.

The Applicant then addressed the committee. Some of his comments included:

- This was a high-quality scheme that they had been working on since 2017 and were committed to delivering.
- Scheme was already approved and that this was solely for the addition to secure phosphates mitigation and update to the affordable housing.
- Scheme delivers many benefits including footpaths and traffic calming.
- Application was policy compliant.
- Proposed phosphates mitigation has been agreed and delivers nutrient neutrality.

The Lead Specialist responded on the points raised by the public speakers and on points of detail and technical questions raised by members around Wessex Water's legal obligations regarding foul water surface drainage and the development at this site.

He suggested that if the committee were minded to approve the application, that members agree the recommendation as detailed in the agenda report, subject to a meeting being arranged with Wessex Water prior to the planning decision notice being issued. The meeting with Wessex Water being to discuss and understand their action plan regarding Wessex Water's legal obligations regarding the development at this site.

There being no further debate it was then proposed by Councillor Sue Osborne and seconded by Councillor Tim Kerley to approve the application, as per the officer recommendation detailed in the agenda report, and subject to a meeting with

Wessex Water prior to the planning decision notice being issued. On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning application 18/01311/OUT be APPROVED, as per the officer recommendation detailed in the agenda report, and subject to a meeting with Wessex Water prior to the planning decision notice being issued. The meeting with Wessex Water being to discuss and understand their action plan regarding Wessex Water's legal obligations regarding the development at this site.

(Voting: Unanimous in favour)

**(The meeting ended at 7.05 pm)**

.....  
**CHAIR**