

South Somerset District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Area East Committee** held at **Churchfield Offices, Wincanton on Wednesday 12 February 2020.**

(9.00 am - 1.06 pm)

Present:

Members: Councillor Henry Hobhouse (Chairman)

Robin Bastable	Kevin Messenger
Hayward Burt	Paul Rowsell
Tony Capozzoli	Lucy Trimmell (until 1.00pm)
Nick Colbert	William Wallace
Charlie Hull	Colin Winder
Mike Lewis	



Officers:

Tim Cook	Locality Team Manager
Dan Bennett	Property and Development Project Manager
Charles Cooksley	Case Officer (Service Delivery)
Leisa Kelly	Case Officer (Service Delivery)
David Kenyon	Planning Consultant
Rob Parr	Locality Officer
Pam Williams	Specialist (Economy)
Jo Morris	Case Officer (Strategy & Commissioning)
Robert Orrett	Commercial Property. Land & Development Manager
Stephen Baimbridge	Specialist (Development Management)

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

130. Minutes of Previous Meetings (Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meetings of the Area East Committee held on 29th October 2019, 13th November 2019, 11th December 2019 and 15th January 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

131. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 2)

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Sarah Dyke.

132. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.

133. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 4)

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday 11th March 2020 at 9.00am. Venue to be confirmed.

134. Public Question Time (Agenda Item 5)

Questions and comments from members of the public were taken at the time the agenda item was discussed.

135. Chairman Announcements (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman announced that Somerset County Council's Regulation Committee had approved the use of land for composting of green waste to remain at Dimmer Landfill Site until 2030.

136. Reports from Members (Agenda Item 7)

There were no reports from members.

137. Presentation on Affordable Housing in South Somerset (Agenda Item 8)

The Case Officer (Service Delivery) and a representative from Magna Housing gave a short presentation on affordable housing in South Somerset. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, members were informed about the following:

- Housing Need and how it's established within the District.
- The role of Homefinder Somerset.
- Housing Needs Surveys were also used to establish the hidden need in a parish which could be used to support a planning application on a rural exception site.
- 725 homes were needed in South Somerset of which 206 would be for affordable housing as outlined in the Local Plan.
- There were currently 2016 people registered on Homefinder Somerset looking for affordable accommodation in South Somerset. 290 of those people were looking for affordable accommodation in Area East.
- The Countywide Somerset Housing Strategy was adopted in March 2019 and was the overarching strategy that looked at affordable housing. The Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Strategy sat underneath the Housing Strategy. The Initial plan that was submitted with the Housing Strategy when it was adopted at District Executive linked in with the priorities of the SSDC Council Plan.
- The Rural Lettings Framework applied to rural dwellings to ensure that parishes with very few affordable homes were prioritised to those people living within the parish or within an adjoining parish.
- There were six Community Land Trusts (CLTs) within South Somerset which included Charlton Horethorne and Queen Camel in Area East. The service supported CLTs and also worked closely with Wessex Community Assets.
- There was grant funding still available for housing needs surveys, planning feasibility studies, a revolving land fund and small grants for Community Land Trusts.

- Magna Housing provided approximately 300 homes in South Somerset. A target of 200 new homes were provided on a yearly basis providing a mixture of shared ownership and social rented and affordable rented.
- Collaborative approach to affordable housing provision through partnership working with other organisations.
- Modern methods of construction were being looked at, Magna had a partnership with Rollalong, who were based in Dorset.
- The current development programme for 2020/21 included provision for 275 affordable dwellings comprising:
Social Rent - 59
Affordable Rent – 115
Affordable Rent to Buy - 7
Shared Ownership/ Intermediate – 74
- Myths regarding the need and allocation of affordable housing was also discussed.

Following the presentation, the Case Officer responded to members' questions on points of details.

At the conclusion of the item, the Chairman thanked the officers for attending the meeting.

138. Churchfields Offices, Disposal - Inclusion of public car park, additional information following decision of 11/12/19 (Agenda Item 9)

Members agreed to reconsider the report under Part 4 of the Council's Constitution – Rules of Procedure (Standing Orders) following a motion to rescind a previous decision.

The Committee was addressed by the Vice-Chairman of Wincanton Town Council. He advised that Wincanton Town Council had entered into a compensation scheme with SSDC in 2012 and that in 2016 notice was given to cancel the agreement. He informed members that a survey was undertaken with local residents and the majority of people who responded were supportive of an increase in council tax to keep car parking free. Wincanton Town Council had informed SSDC that they were willing to enter into a new compensation agreement. He said that Wincanton Town Council had already budgeted and set its precept and would have no means of repaying residents if the car park was sold. Members were informed that the car park was well used by parents of children attending the school, various businesses including the dances studio, dental surgery who all rely on the car park. With reference to the regeneration programme, it was hoped that there would be a greater footfall within the town and a greater need for car parking spaces.

The Committee was addressed by sixteen members of the public in objection to the disposal of the public car park at Churchfields. Comments made included the following:

- The loss of the car park would have a huge impact on the businesses and residents in Wincanton.
- Wincanton had a lot of flats with no parking spaces.
- There was limited public transport therefore parking needed to be provided.
- The car park was well used on a daily basis and important for bringing new vitality to the town and keeping Wincanton sustainable.
- The church was well supported, had a large regular congregation and was popular for weddings and funerals and people would require parking for more than an hour.

- There was already a vast amount of new housing and services were stretched to the limit.
- Closure of the car park would threaten the vitality of the town centre and the quality of life of the people that live in Wincanton.
- Closure of the car park would lead to chaotic parking in other areas of the town.
- People would decide to shop out of town because of lack of parking.
- Wincanton was embarking on a regeneration programme to encourage visitors who would need all the parking available and probably more not less.
- There was no practical alternative parking available.
- Residential areas in parts of Wincanton had restricted parking or double yellow lines so visitors often had to use Churchfields car park as overspill.
- The streets were already full with parked vehicles and there was no room for anymore.
- Wincanton voted for free parking and this should remain.
- Support for less regeneration and the car park to be kept.
- Installing electric charging points in car parks would encourage people with electric cars to visit and help support Wincanton.
- Concerns over an increase in illegal parking making the streets more dangerous and the potential for accidents.
- Where were the residents of Churchfields and visitors to the lower part of the town expected to park?
- Residents have been misled by the vote that was held and at no time was only two car parks mentioned.
- Consideration should be given to introducing parking permits for residents.
- Parking spaces on the grasscrete should be retained in the district council ownership which would require minimal maintenance. The land could not be built upon because of its proximity to the trees.

The Property Development Project Manager introduced the report and confirmed that at the December Area East Committee a decision was taken not to dispose of the grass-crete strip of land.

Cllr. Nick Colbert advised that he had received further comments from eleven people who were unable to attend the meeting. Comments made included the following:

- The car park was needed.
- All the car parks were well used.
- Sale of the car park would cause a problem for Wincanton.
- This would be a retrograde step and should not be allowed to happen.
- Residents want Wincanton to prosper.
- As a user of the dance studio the car park was used as somewhere safe to get to after classes especially in winter and inclement weather.
- Where would the cars park instead?
- No consultation with local people.
- Effect on local businesses.
- The car park was vital for people without driveways.
- There would be no safe place to drop off and pick up children from school.

During the debate, members made the following comments:

- There was no support for the disposal of the car park within the town.
- Car parking space was valuable.

- Properties within Church Street had been given planning approval for multi-use occupancy on the basis that the car park would be available.
- Surveys undertaken had included requests for more and better car parking.
- No consultation on the proposal had been undertaken.
- Support for investigating a community transfer of assets from SSDC to Wincanton Town Council.

In response to a member comment, the Property Development Project Manager confirmed that the open piece of land with the trees located upon it was not subject to any proposal to dispose.

At the conclusion of the debate, it was proposed and seconded that the car park and the grass-crete parking area stay in the ownership of SSDC and the remainder of the land is disposed of. A vote was taken and the proposal was unanimously supported.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That members noted the situation regarding the public car park and the representation of views from Wincanton Town Council.
 - (2) That the car park and grass-crete parking area stay in the ownership of SSDC and the remainder of the land is disposed of.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

139. Community Capital Grant Request (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 10)

The Locality Officer introduced the report and explained that South Somerset Community Transport were seeking funding towards the purchase of a new nine seater fully accessible minibus. Members were also asked to support officers exploring capacity building/feasibility work that would aim to make SSCAT a sustainable community transport service in the future.

The Committee was addressed by the Chairman of South Somerset Community Transport (SSCAT) who advised that SSCAT were requesting funding towards 30% of the cost of a new minibus and that SSCAT were providing 20% of their own funds.

During the discussion, members commented that SSCAT provided a valuable service and expressed their support for the project.

In response to questions, members were informed that the minibus was designed for two wheelchair spaces and that advertising of the service would be one aspect to be covered as part of the capacity building work.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members unanimously approved the recommendations of the report.

- RESOLVED:**
- (a) That a contribution of up to £12,000 (31% of total project cost) be approved from the Community Grants existing capital budget towards the provision of a new nine seat, fully accessible mini bus for community transport, subject to the standard conditions set out in Appendix A.
 - (b) That officers explore capacity building options for SSCAT to increase

their financial sustainability and fund this from the Area East community revenue budget, with the exact amount to be agreed with the Chair of Area East Committee and Ward Members for Bruton, Castle Cary and Wincanton.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

Reason: To agree a contribution towards the provision of a new nine seat, fully accessible mini bus for community transport and to support capacity building/feasibility work that would aim to make SSCAT a sustainable community transport service.

140. Retail Support Initiative Grant Application - (Executive Decision) (Agenda Item 11)

The Specialist (Economy) introduced the report. She explained that members were being asked to consider a request for funding in relation to a property in Wincanton that had been empty for some time and qualified for the higher level funding. The application was being considered as an exception to policy under the Retail Support Initiative's operating criteria due to the assessment score because of the future use of the premises by the Police.

In response to questions, members were informed of the following:

- The project costs related to the front façade of the premises.
- The Police would contribute towards the interior refurbishment of the building.
- The Retail Support Initiative was unique to Area East and promoted across the area and a number of applications had been supported.
- The application met the existing criteria.
- The annual review of the operation of the scheme would be brought to members at the April Area East Committee meeting.

At the conclusion of the debate, members unanimously supported the recommendations of the report.

RESOLVED: That £2,500 be awarded from the Area East revenue reserve budget, RSI element, ring-fenced for the Wincanton Top-up scheme, as a 40% contribution to the exterior improvements at 14 Market Place, Wincanton subject to the standard condition contained at the end of Appendix A.

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

Reason: To agree a grant towards exterior improvements at 14 Market Place, Wincanton.

141. Future arrangements for Area East Committee (Agenda Item 12)

The Committee was addressed by a member of the public who expressed the view that he would prefer to see meetings of the Area East Committee held in village halls throughout Area East.

The Locality Team Manager advised that the other Area Committees were held in one main venue which was mainly due to resources and consistency of quality of halls.

During the discussion, members made the following comments:

- Expressed support for moving to the Memorial Hall
- Favourable to hold meetings in a fixed place rather than go to different locations
- The venue should be consistent for members of the public
- Disappointed that Wincanton Town Hall was not an option
- Adequate car parking was essential

In response to a member comment, the Locality Team Manager advised that it was not possible to use Wincanton Town Hall for meetings as it currently operated a stair lift but if in future a lift was installed the premises could be considered as a suitable option. He explained that following the closure of Churchfields, there would be a Customer Access point located at the Balsam Centre which also provided remote access to an officer if required. Officers would still have a presence with touch down spaces located in Wincanton and throughout the area and would be able to offer a home visiting service to customers who were unable to access the Customer Access point.

At the conclusion of the debate, the majority of members supported the recommendation of the report to hold future meetings of the Area East Committee at the Memorial Hall, Wincanton.

RESOLVED: That future meetings of the Area East Committee be held at the Memorial Hall, Wincanton.

(Voting: 10 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)

142. Area East Committee Forward Plan (Agenda Item 13)

Members noted the Area East Committee Forward Plan as outlined in the agenda.

143. Planning Appeals (Agenda Item 14)

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

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

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

145. Planning Application 19/02363HOU - The Ridings, Middle Ridge Lane, Corton Denham (Agenda Item 16)

Application Proposal: Demolition of existing part side and part rear extension, demolition of existing garage, erection of new two storey side extension and single storey rear and side extensions

The Case Officer (Service Delivery) presented the application as detailed in the agenda. He explained that the site was located within a rural setting with open fields surrounding the area and that the dwellings on Middle Ridge Lane were predominately built of reconstituted stone. The site was not within an area of special designation or within the immediate setting of any listed buildings. Members were shown the existing layout of the property including areas where the development would take place and advised that timber cladding would be used on the exterior of the development which would be left untreated to weather naturally. The design of the two-storey extension would incorporate a hip roof to mitigate any loss of sunlight to the neighbours to the north.

The Case Officer (Service Delivery) outlined the key considerations which were residential amenity and visual amenity. He advised that concerns had been raised by neighbouring properties to the north and south regarding the use of timber cladding and loss of light. The use of timber cladding was supported by the Parish Council and was quite typical in modern development as it showed a clear divide between the existing property and new development and left to weather naturally was considered to be acceptable. A study had been conducted to show that the hours where the sunlight would be blocked was late in the day and very limited to the winter months.

The Committee was addressed by an objector who raised concerns in the relation to the following:

- The north wall of the proposed development would be 4 metres from the neighbouring property which would worsen the existing tunnel affect between the two properties.
- Concerns over loss of light and shadowing and possible damage to floating slab foundations.
- Building of the extension and future maintenance may have to occur from the neighbouring property.
- The front west facing lounge window of the adjoining property would also be affected in addition to the window located on the south.
- Hedgerow reduction at The Ridings had not made any difference to the overshadowing on Broadfields side wall.
- Concerns over the close proximity of the extension to the boundary fence due to the steep gradient height increase there would be clear views from the rear extension into the neighbouring garden.
- Proposed extension overly wide and 60% of original house width residential amenity would be significantly affected by overshadowing, loss of light, significant dominance and loss of privacy.

Ward Member, Councillor William Wallace questioned whether there were any legal measurements in terms of overlooking that should be complied with when considering a planning application.

In response, the Specialist – Development Management confirmed that there were no planning laws in relation to loss of light or overbearing. He encouraged members to look

at the relationship between the proposed development and the neighbouring property and consider what they feel would be overlooked and whether it would be demonstrably harmful to living standards.

Ward Member, Councillor Hayward Burt commented that he had concerns with overlooking, overshadowing, which had been proved in the officer's report and loss of privacy. For these reasons he was unable to support the application.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reasons:

- Overshadowing
- Overlooking and loss of privacy

A vote was taken on the proposal and there were 10 votes in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

It was agreed that the final wording to refuse the application would be agreed by the planning officer in conjunction with the ward member.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 19/02363HOU be **REFUSED** contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following reason:

The proposal, by reason of its size and design will result in loss of light, overlooking and a loss of privacy for the neighbouring property known as 'Broadfields', to the detriment of living standards. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy EQ2 of the SSDC Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 10 in favour, 1 against)

146. Planning Application 19/01604/OUT - Land At Coombe Farm Os Plots 4300 Part And 4613 Pa West Street Templecombe (Agenda Item 17)**

Application Proposal: Outline application with all matters reserved save for access for residential development for up to 49 dwellings including landscaping, drainage and new vehicle access from West Street

Members noted that the application had been 2-starred under the Scheme of Delegation and that if the Committee were minded to refuse the application, whilst it would be able to debate the issues and indicate grounds for refusal, the final determination would be made by the Regulation Committee.

The Planning Consultant gave a detailed presentation on the application which covered the following:

- The access was for detailed consideration. All details in relation to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale were reserved for consideration at the reserved matters application stage.
- The application site was located on the south-western edge of Templecombe and be would accessed from West Street.

- The site was undeveloped and was located to the south-west of an existing residential area.
- The site was not located within any landscape designation.
- Traffic calming measures incorporated along the main A Road to control speeds.
- Access to the application site and exit route.
- On-street parking located in the surrounding area and lack of parking restrictions.
- Illustrative layout of the proposed development.
- Pedestrian routes located within the site and links to existing pavements.
- Intention to provide woodland buffers to the south-west and north-west boundaries and an attenuation pond to the northern part of the site.
- Part of the hedgerow would be removed to create the necessary width of access.
- Location of existing pavements and where there were no pavements in the surrounding area.
- Distances from the site centre to various services i.e. bus stop.
- Updated that the public house was now closed and being redeveloped.
- Photographs were shown outlining Vine Street, Westcombe, West Street and egress routes along Bowden Road.
- The Council did not have a 5 year housing land supply.
- Policies SS1, SS2 and SS5 were considered to be out of date and permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- The proposal would be of benefit in helping to address the shortfall of housing land supply.
- There was a particular acute need for affordable housing and the proposal would make a contribution.
- The site was reasonably accessible to local services and facilities and well located in terms of accessibility by sustainable means.
- The application would be of economic and social benefit.
- The key considerations were Highway Safety, Visual amenity, Flooding and drainage, Ecology, Residential amenity and Loss of agricultural land.
- Summary of the Henstridge appeal decision for 130 dwellings. The application had similarities to this application.
- The application was recommended for approval subject to a S106 agreement and conditions.

The Committee was addressed by seven people in objection to the application. Points raised related to the following:

- Lack of public transport at appropriate times.
- Access road narrow and dangerous.
- No pedestrian footpath at the top of Bowden Road.
- Significant impact on existing residents and infrastructure.
- Parked cars along West Street reducing the road to a single lane with two way traffic.
- Roads not capable of taking additional traffic unless substantially improved.
- Drainage and sewerage system would not be able to cope.
- Planning permission had already been granted for a large number of dwellings in the village.
- No demand for additional housing and existing houses not selling.
- No reference to Vine Street in highway correspondence.
- Vine Street narrow stretch of road and not suitable for additional traffic.
- No pavements on Vine Street.

- Increase in traffic and concerns over the potential for accidents.
- Templecombe not able to cope with the level of development proposed.
- Inadequate approach roads to the development.
- Lack of facilities and infrastructure.
- Wrong location for development.
- Top of West Street was a narrow single track with no pavement with 3 concealed driveways and a blind corner.
- Poor visual splay at Westcombe/Bowden junction.
- Westcombe narrow and congested with parked cars.

The Applicant's Agent commented that he had worked closely with officers in preparing and submitting the application. The site had been identified as being suitable for development by the Council and in principle support for up to 68 dwellings was indicated at the pre-application stage. A scheme for up to 49 dwellings was considered a suitable compromise with the development providing enhanced public open space and landscape parking. He highlighted that Templecombe benefited from broad service provision including a large employer with excellent transport connections and the settlement was capable of accommodating additional housing growth. The development was considered accessible, sustainable and acceptable in principle by planning officers. He noted that the Highway Authority had assessed the scheme thoroughly and were satisfied with the transport impact. The affordable housing provision met Local Plan requirements and contributions would be secured towards education, open space, sports and recreation. There were no objections raised by technical consultees, the development would help address the national housing crisis and the benefits of the scheme demonstrably outweighed any limited harm that had been identified.

The Highway Authority representative responded to members questions on points of detail. He confirmed the following:

- Vine Street had been looked at as part of the Highway Authority assessment.
- When an application was submitted for consideration, the Highway Authority looked at the access as well as the existing situation. This included information on the traffic generated by existing estates contained within the national transportation database, existing junctions, existing road geometry, visibility splays and potential increase in traffic associated with the site.
- There were no reported collisions on the adjacent estate.
- 49 units would generate 20-25 private vehicular trips in the peak hour which equated to 1 every 3 minutes.
- Under the NPPF, the Highway Authority could only object if development would create a severe impact for the highway users.
- There was no evidence to prove that the traffic impact from this development would be severe.
- The junction into the site could be constructed to current standards. The internal layout was a matter for consideration at the reserved matters stage.

Ward Member, Councillor Hayward Burt made reference to the following points:

- The developments would create a 20% uplift in the population in Templecombe which was a huge increase.
- Templecombe was not a sustainable area. There was only 1 bus every 2 hours.
- The doctors surgery was under pressure and operated limited opening hours.
- Templecombe was a rural settlement and considered part of the countryside to which National Countryside Protection Policies applied.

- Development not in accordance with Policy SS1, SS2, SS5 and TA5.
- Breaching settlement hierarchy by turning Templecombe into a rural centre.
- In danger of destroying the unique quality of our districts, communities, villages and hamlets by building because of the lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
- The development was not sustainable as people would have to use their cars as there was no other way to access services.
- No housing survey had been undertaken in Templecombe to prove that there was a housing need.
- The local community did not support the development.
- Concerns over safety of accessing the site, parked cars and poor visibility.

Ward Member, Councillor William Wallace concurred with the comments of his fellow ward member. He commented that the cumulative effect of the previously approved developments and the proposed development would cause harm over the benefits of the scheme. He referred to Vine Street being very narrow with no room for pavements and felt that members should listen to local knowledge. The need for housing was a district-wide requirement and further housing was not needed in Templecombe.

During the discussion on the application, members made a number of comments in relation to the following:

- Disappointed that the Environment Strategy had not been considered.
- Concerns over lack of footpaths.
- Trains and buses run infrequently.
- Increase in cars on an already dangerous road network.
- Green infrastructure should be looked at before developments are considered.
- Conditions attached to the application did not look at meeting the challenge of climate change.
- The rural housing allocation target had been met.
- Highway infrastructure not adequate for a new development in the proposed location.
- There were no objections from statutory consultees.

A proposal was made to approve the application as per the officer's recommendation outlined in the report but was not supported by members.

The Planning Consultant and Specialist – Development Management advised that if the application was recommended for refusal and went to appeal, the Appeal Inspectors had made clear that SS1, SS2 and SS5 were considered to be out of date in terms of housing and therefore carry limited weight as the NPPF stated that the Council did not have a 5 year housing land supply. Members were asked to consider the harm of approving the application and whether it significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits.

It was proposed and seconded to recommend refusal of the application on the following grounds:

- Taken cumulatively with other dwellings in Templecombe completed or with permissions within the Local Plan period, the proposal would result in a level of growth commensurate with the higher tier of Rural centres, and would be inconsistent with and contrary to Policies SS1, SS2 and SS5 of the Local Plan.
- Concerns over highway safety and infrastructure.

It was agreed that the final wording on the recommendation for refusal be agreed by the Planning Consultant, Specialist – Development Management in conjunction with the Ward Members.

The proposal to recommend refusal of the application was supported by 10 members in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 19/01604/OUT** be **REFERRED** to the Regulation Committee with a recommendation from Area East Committee that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. Templecombe is defined as a rural settlement and, as such, Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) is a material consideration in the determination of this proposed development. It is considered that the numbers of dwellings proposed, taken cumulatively with other dwellings in Templecombe completed or with permissions within the Plan period (2006-2028), would result in a level of growth commensurate with the higher tier of Rural Centres. This would be inconsistent with the distribution of development as set out within the Rural Settlements tier in Policy SS5 of the Local Plan. Overall, the proposal would not accord with Policy SS2 and, on this basis, would not accord with Policies SS1 and SS5 of the Local Plan. Whilst the Council acknowledges that it cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and thus paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF is a material consideration, nevertheless the Council is of the opinion that the adverse impacts that would result from the granting of permission for this proposed development would, for the reasons set out above, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.
2. The development would result in an increase in traffic along narrow approach roads, including certain sections with no pavements and poor visibility. This would prejudice the safety of highway users both on foot and cycle. As such the proposed development would be contrary to the aims set out in Policy TA5ii of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Voting: 10 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions)

147. Planning Application 19/02846/S73A - Chilton Cantelo Solar Park Chilton Cantelo Yeovil (Agenda Item 18)

Application Proposal: S73A Application for the installation of a secure storage container (without complying with condition 3 of planning permissions 19/01020/FUL, to extend operational life span of secure storage container to 40 years).

The Planning Consultant presented the application as outlined in the agenda and referred to the key considerations.

Ward member, Councillor Charlie Hull expressed his support for the application.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application as per the officer's recommendation as set out in the agenda report. A vote was taken and Members unanimously approved the application.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 19/02856/S73A be **APPROVED** as per the Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

01. The proposal, by reason of the changes to scale and design, is not considered to present a material increase in the visual impact of the approved scheme or to harm highway safety and is in accordance with Policies SD1, EQ1, EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028), and the provisions of the NPPF (2019).

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans: 1:10,000 Location Plan, 1:5000 Location Plan, 1:1250 Location Plan, 1:200 Container Location Plan and NMA Container Specification.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the development authorised, in the interests of proper planning and in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

02. The development hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition within 40 years of 13th July 2012, (being the decision date of original solar farm planning permission 12/01055/FUL), or within six months of the cessation of the use of the solar farm for the generation of electricity whichever is the sooner.

Reason: In the interests of landscape character and visual amenity in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

(Voting: unanimous in favour)

148. Planning Application 19/02847/S73A - Chilton Cantelo Solar Park, Chilton Cantelo, Yeovil (Agenda Item 19)

Application proposal: S73A Application for the erection of a solar farm comprising the erection of solar arrays, inverters, transformers, equipment housing, security fencing, internal tracks and ancillary equipment (without complying with Condition

7 of planning permission 12/01055/FUL, to extend operational lifespan of Solar Farm to 40 years)

The Planning Consultant presented the application as outlined in the agenda and referred to the key considerations.

Ward member, Councillor Charlie Hull expressed his support for the application.

It was proposed and 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 9 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That Planning Application No. 19/02847/S73A be **APPROVED** as per the Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

01. The proposal to vary the operational lifespan of the solar farm for a period of 40 years is considered acceptable, having no material impact on the temporary nature of the permission, and causing no demonstrable harm to landscape character, neighbour amenity, highway safety or the environment. The proposal is in accordance with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies SD1, TA5, EQ1, EQ2, EQ4, EQ5 and EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the application is recommended for approval.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Location plan and planning application boundary plan received 20/03/2012
Drawings numbered 11853-SD07 and 3001_Rev B received 20/03/2012
Drawings numbered 2334_100_Rev E, 2334_300_Rev B, 2334_301_Rev A received 02/05/2012

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

02. The perimeter fencing and CCTV equipment hereby approved shall accord with the height, colours, appearance and other specifications set out in the letter and attachments from Landmark Practice dated 02/05/2012.

Reason: In the interests of landscape character and visual amenity in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

03. The supporting posts to the solar array shall be anchored into the ground as shown in drawing no. 2334_300 Rev B received 02/05/2012 and shall not be concreted into the ground.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable construction and to accord

with Policies SD1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

04. The development hereby permitted shall be based on the indicative planting scheme detailed on plan 2334_100_Rev E received 02/05/2012 and shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of the approved development and a management plan for the maintenance of the hedgerows around the perimeter of the site for the operational lifetime of the development. The approved details shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the commencement of the development. Any trees or plants which, within the operational lifetime of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and landscape character in accordance with Policy EQ5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

05. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details regarding surfacing materials for all hardstanding and tracks to serve the development and shall not be altered unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policies SD1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

06. The development hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition within 40 years of the date of permission 12/01020/FUL or within six 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 structures, materials and any associated goods and chattels from the site.

Reason: In the interests of landscape character and visual amenity in accordance with Policies SD1, EQ1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

07. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out

in accordance with the mitigation measures set out within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by H2OK dated March 2012 and associated drawing number 3001 Rev B received 20/03/2012 to limit the surface water run-off generated by the 1:100 year storm so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of / disposal of surface water from the site in accord with Policies SD1 and EQ1 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

08. No means of external illumination/lighting shall be installed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to safeguard the rural character of the area to accord with Policies SD1, EQ1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

09. No works shall be carried out, no machinery operated and no deliveries taken or despatched from the site at any time on Sundays, bank or public holidays or outside the hours 07.00 to 18.30 Mondays to Fridays and 07.00 to 12.30 on Saturdays for the duration of the construction phase of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of the area to accord with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

10. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the approved 'Ecological Working Method Statement', unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: For the conservation and protection of legally protected species of recognised nature conservation importance in accordance with Policies EQ1 and EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028), and to ensure compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the relevant aims and priorities of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Informatives:

01. There must be no interruption to the surface water drainage system of the surrounding land as a result of the operations on the site. Provisions must be made to ensure that all existing drainage systems continue to operate effectively and that riparian owners upstream and downstream of the site are not adversely affected.

(Voting: 9 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention)

.....

Chairman