



---

## **Regulation Committee**

**Tuesday 20th August 2019**

**10.00 am**

**Council Chamber  
Council Offices  
Brympton Way  
Yeovil, BA20 2HT**

(disabled access and a hearing loop are available at this meeting venue)



---

Members listed on the following page are requested to attend the meeting.

The public and press are welcome to attend.

For further information on the items to be discussed, please contact the Case Services Officer (Support Services) on 01935 462011 or [democracy@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@southsomerset.gov.uk)

This Agenda was issued on Monday 12 August 2019.

**Alex Parmley**, *Chief Executive Officer*



This information is also available on our website  
[www.southsomerset.gov.uk](http://www.southsomerset.gov.uk) or via the mod.gov app

# Regulation Committee Membership

The following members are requested to attend the meeting:

**Chairman:** Peter Gubbins  
**Vice-chairman:** Tony Capozzoli

Jason Baker  
Neil Bloomfield  
Adam Dance  
Henry Hobhouse

Tony Lock  
Sue Osborne  
Crispin Raikes  
David Recardo

Paul Rowsell  
Andy Soughton  
William Wallace  
Colin Winder

---

Any maps contained within this document are reproduced from/based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office ©, Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Ordnance Survey mapping/map data included within this publication is provided by South Somerset District Council under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to undertake its statutory functions on behalf of the district. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/map data for their own use. South Somerset District Council - LA100019471 - 2018.

---

# **Information for the Public**

## **Public Participation at Committees**

This is a summary of the Protocol adopted by the Council and set out in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution.

## **Public Question Time**

The period allowed for participation in this session shall not exceed 15 minutes except with the consent of the chairman of the committee. Each individual speaker shall be restricted to a total of three minutes.

## **Planning Applications**

Comments about planning applications will be dealt with at the time those applications are considered, rather than during the Public Question Time session.

Comments should be confined to additional information or issues, which have not been fully covered in the officer's report. Members of the public are asked to submit any additional documents to the planning officer at least 72 hours in advance and not to present them to the Committee on the day of the meeting. This will give the planning officer the opportunity to respond appropriately. Information from the public should not be tabled at the meeting. It should also be noted that, in the interests of fairness, the use of presentational aids (e.g. PowerPoint) by the applicant/agent or those making representations will not be permitted. However, the applicant/agent or those making representations are able to ask the Planning Officer to include photographs/images within the officer's presentation subject to them being received by the officer at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. No more than 5 photographs/images either supporting or against the application to be submitted. The Planning Officer will also need to be satisfied that the photographs are appropriate in terms of planning grounds.

At the committee chairman's discretion, members of the public are permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes each and where there are a number of persons wishing to speak they should be encouraged to choose one spokesperson to speak either for the applicant or on behalf of any supporters or objectors to the application. The total period allowed for such participation on each application shall not normally exceed 15 minutes.

The order of speaking on planning items will be:

- County Council, Town or Parish Council Representative
- Objectors
- Supporters
- Applicant and/or Agent

Ward members, if not members of the Regulation Committee, will speak after the town/parish representative.

If a member of the public wishes to speak they must inform the committee administrator before the meeting begins of their name and whether they have supporting comments or objections and who they are representing. This must be done by completing one of the public participation slips available at the meeting.

In exceptional circumstances, the Chairman of the Committee shall have discretion to vary the procedure set out to ensure fairness to all sides.

## **If a Councillor has declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or a personal and prejudicial interest**

In relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, a Councillor is prohibited by law from participating in the discussion about the business on the agenda that relates to this interest and is also required to leave the room whilst the relevant agenda item is being discussed.

Under the new Code of Conduct adopted by this Council in July 2012, a Councillor with a personal and prejudicial interest (which is not also a DPI) will be afforded the same right as a member of the public to speak in relation to the relevant business and may also answer any questions, except that once the Councillor has addressed the Committee the Councillor will leave the room and not return until after the decision has been made.

## **Recording and photography at council meetings**

Recording of council meetings is permitted, however anyone wishing to do so should let the Chairperson of the meeting know prior to the start of the meeting. The recording should be overt and clearly visible to anyone at the meeting, but non-disruptive. If someone is recording the meeting, the Chairman will make an announcement at the beginning of the meeting.

Any member of the public has the right not to be recorded. If anyone making public representation does not wish to be recorded they must let the Chairperson know.

The full 'Policy on Audio/Visual Recording and Photography at Council Meetings' can be viewed online at:

<http://modgov.southsomerset.gov.uk/documents/s3327/Policy%20on%20the%20recording%20of%20council%20meetings.pdf>

# Regulation Committee

**Tuesday 20 August 2019**

## Agenda

### *Preliminary Items*

**1. Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 July 2019.

**2. Apologies for Absence**

**3. Declarations of Interest**

**4. Public Question Time**

**5. Planning Application 18/01602/FUL - Former BMI Site, Cumnock Road, Ansford (Pages 6 - 28)**

**6. Planning Application 18/01603/LBC - Former BMI Site, Cumnock Road, Ansford (Pages 29 - 35)**

**7. Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Regulation Committee will be held on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2019 at 10.00am. However this meeting will only take place if there is business to conduct.

# Agenda Item 5

## Officer Report on Planning Application: 18/01602/FUL

<b>Proposal :</b>	Demolition of existing buildings, conversion of and alterations to listed buildings to form 11 No. dwellings, the erection of 70 No. dwellings (total 81 No. dwellings) and associated works, including access and off-site highway works, parking, landscaping, open space, footpath links and drainage infrastructure
<b>Site Address:</b>	Former BMI Site, Cumnock Road, Ansford
<b>Parish:</b>	Castle Cary
<b>CARY Ward (SSDC Member)</b>	Cllr Kevin Messenger Cllr Henry Hobhouse
<b>Recommending Case Officer:</b>	Stephen Baimbridge
<b>Target date :</b>	5th September 2018
<b>Applicant :</b>	Castle Cary (BMI) Ltd
<b>Agent: (no agent if blank)</b>	Mr Matt Frost, Motivo, Alvington Yeovil, BA20 2FG
<b>Application Type :</b>	Major DwlgS 10 or more or site 0.5ha+

The application was referred to the Ward Members as neighbour and Town Council comments had been received that were contrary to the officer's recommendation. The Ward Members referred to the Vice Area Chair, and the application was referred on to the Area East Committee.

The Area East Committee of 12/06/19 resolved that planning application be deferred for officers to negotiate an amended scheme to address issues concerning:

1. Highway adoption
2. To increase levels of car parking (incl. visitor)
3. To reduce the density of the development
4. To establish the specific boundary treatments with Beechfield House
5. To seek to retain more protected trees currently proposed to be felled
6. Clarity regarding the new highway infrastructure on Cumnock Road



The application returned to the Area East Committee on 10/07/2019.

It was resolved to reject the officer's recommendation to approve the application and instead refer the application to Regulation Committee with a recommendation of refusal for the following reasons:

1. The density of the development is considered too great
2. The lack of on-site parking failing to meet the SCC Parking Strategy
3. The fact the highway as designed within the development cannot be adopted
4. An insufficient number of protected trees are to be retained

If the Regulation Committee is mindful to approve the application then the Committee asks that consideration be given to:

- a) Condition the specific boundary treatments with Beechfield House.
- b) Secure a stone wall in the north eastern corner of the development to prevent pedestrian access to Upper High Street.
- c) Adding an informative note stating the Council will instigate a Tree Preservation Order to protect all new trees planted; to replace those protected trees on the site which will be felled.



## **SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL**

The application site is the Former BMI Site in Castle Cary, a redundant employment site comprised of a number of listed and unlisted buildings all of which are in various stages of dilapidation. The site is accessed off Cumnock Road and is surrounded by residential properties on all boundaries but for the eastern boundary which is also shared by the nursery site.

The application seeks permission for the demolition of existing buildings, conversion of and alterations to listed buildings to form 11 No. dwellings, the erection of 70 No. dwellings (total 81 No. dwellings) and associated works, including access and off-site highway works, parking, landscaping, open space, footpath links and drainage infrastructure.

The application is supported by:

- Planning Statement
- Design & Access Statement
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Transport Assessment
- Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy
- Heritage Statement
- Heritage Statement of Significance
- Ph 1 Ecology Survey
- Ecological Impact Assessment
- Tree Report
- Ground Investigation Report
- Structural Surveys of listed buildings (X3)
- Asbestos Report
- Viability Report
- CIL Information Form

## **HISTORY**

Various historic permissions pertaining to the employment site. The decisions of most relevance to this application are:

01/02024/FUL: The carrying out of residential development, including the conversion of existing buildings. Application refused by Committee (14/03/2003). Allowed at appeal (20/05/2004).

01/02025/LBC: The conversion of former mill and two associated buildings to residential use. Application permitted with conditions (09/01/2002).

## **POLICY**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), and Paragraphs 2, 11, and 12 of the NPPF indicate it is a matter of law that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

For the purposes of determining current applications the local planning authority considers that the adopted development plan comprises the policies of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006 2028 (adopted March 2015).

Policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028)

SD1 - Sustainable Development

SS1 - Settlement Strategy

SS4 - District Wide Housing Provision



SS5 - Delivering New Housing Growth  
SS6 - Infrastructure Delivery  
SS7 - Phasing of Previously Developed Land  
EP3 - Safeguarding Employment Land  
HG2 - The Use of Previously Developed Land (PDL) for New Housing Development  
HG3 - Provision of Affordable Housing  
HG5 - Achieving a Mix of Market Housing  
TA1 - Low Carbon Travel  
TA4 - Travel Plans  
TA5 - Transport Impact of New Development  
TA6 - Parking Standards  
HW1 - Provision of open space, outdoor playing space, sports, cultural and community facilities in new development  
EQ1 - Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset  
EQ2 - General Development  
EQ3 - Historic Environment  
EQ4 - Biodiversity  
EQ5 - Green Infrastructure  
EQ7 - Pollution Control

#### National Planning Policy Framework - March 2019

2. Achieving sustainable development  
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes  
8. Promoting healthy and safe communities  
9. Promoting sustainable transport  
11. Making effective use of land  
12. Achieving well-designed places  
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

#### Castle Cary & Ansford Neighbourhood Plan (2016-2028)

Subject to modification as recommended by the Examiner's Report, and to a successful referendum before being 'made'.

Given the stage of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Council's under-supply of housing land, the policies within carry limited weight.

The Plan supports the re-development of the BMI site. Policy HOU 1 (Housing development within the settlement area) states:

*The NP councils will encourage and support early development or redevelopment for housing purposes of brownfield sites within the settlement area, in particular:*

- *Nursery site*
- *Hillcrest School*
- *Constitutional Club*
- *BMI site*
- *Red House.*

#### Other

Somerset County Council Parking Strategy (September 2013)

Somerset County Council Highways Development Control - Standing Advice (June 2017)

## CONSULTATIONS

**CASTLE CARY TOWN COUNCIL:** We welcome the input from Highways and the tree officer and absolutely support their comments.

Below are the issues that still need to be addressed and until they have been we are unable to support this application

**DECISION** The Planning Committee voted unanimously against this planning application: Although the Council is very much in favour of brownfield development in the town in principle, it was felt that there are a number of key issues that this new brown field development has failed to address satisfactorily:

- The proposals rely on census information from 2011 which suggests that each dwelling will only require 1.6 car spaces.
- Highways advised in the application that the new roads on the development will be unadoptable, which means residents will have to maintain them in the future. This is unacceptable; other sites in Area East have had problems with similar proposals.
- Despite concerns raised by CCTC in 2018 about the numbers of visitor parking spaces, only 6 visitor parking places are proposed on a site with 81 dwellings, so it is likely that new residents' cars will spill out on to surrounding streets causing congestion.
- No regard has been given to our concerns about the demolition of the Listed former engine house
- Lack of renewable energy solutions including photovoltaics in the new house designs.
- The revised plans, with new three storey houses, compromise the curtilage of nearby Listed buildings, the amenity and privacy of neighbours and views from the Conservation Area of North Street.
- The site owner must rectify any outstanding breaches of law relating to the listed buildings and structures within their curtilage before any new building commences.
- Adequate provision for footpath access between the Red House development and the BMI site needs to be considered, to avoid future residents having to use the busy and dangerous A371 to visit each other.

## CONSERVATION OFFICER:

### Historic Building Conversion

The historic buildings have been on our Heritage at Risk Register for a long time. Despite lots of effort from Council Officers no meaningful repairs have been carried out, although some work has been carried out to improve the security of the site as unauthorised entry and vandalism has been a recurring problem. There is an historic consent to convert the building into dwellings. The introduction of a new use is welcome, as it will secure the full repair of the building and give it a good future.

We have had some discussion about how the building is best divided up. It is characterised by large open floor areas, where the length of the building can be easily appreciated, giving a sense of past industrial activity that has taken place within the building. The reasons for not dividing in this manner are set out clearly in the submitted heritage statement. In summary the current floor levels are low. Horizontal subdivision will create the need to provide fire and acoustic separation between separate flats, which will reduce the ceiling levels further. Currently the underside of the floor boards and floor joists are revealed to the room below. It should be possible to retain this arrangement if the room above is within the same unit, however this detail will be hidden if divided into flats. I am satisfied that the proposed vertical division is the best solution for the building.

The application includes the replacement of the stair and associated boarding in the Mill. The heritage statement suggests this is original, yet no justification has been submitted for its removal. It should be feasible to retain the stair in Unit 20. If this isn't possible then further justification is needed regarding

this. You should also consult Historic England and the amenity societies as the removal of the stair constitutes substantial internal demolition.

There is mention of a cellar under the offices. Information is needed regarding this - will it be associated with one of the flats, perhaps used for storage? Is work required?

The brick setts to the front of the main Mill building should be retained, and should be referenced on the proposed plans.

Plot 26 is badly lit with only two north facing windows. This should be re-considered. It is likely that this unit will be difficult to sell, or subject to high occupancy turn over, which won't be good for the building. The central windows on the east elevation of this building are shown in timber. A steel system should be used for these new openings, to match the adjacent windows. The little garden areas to the front aren't appropriate here. The industrial character of the building would be better retained by removing these and pushing the parking towards the building, or creating an area of 'shared' hardstanding.

Justification has been put forward in the submitted heritage statement relating to the demolition of the engine house. I am satisfied with the case that has been made.

### **New buildings**

The rest of the site generally has quite a cramped appearance. I like the design of units 1-16. The strong linear form relates well to the industrial use of the site and the character of the listed factory building, as does the smaller range adjacent. It is a shame that this aesthetic cannot be adopted across the whole site. As well as giving the whole scheme some integrity the use of terrace forms will make better use of the space. With regard to units 1-16 specifically the south end of the building faces towards the listed building and will be readily viewed. It's fairly disappointing architecturally. This needs to be considered further. In addition the units seem to have one small rooflight over the top bathroom (which seems to straddle the ridge). Given that they are based on the design of a north light building why not introduce a big block of glazing over the central stairwell to flood the core of each unit with natural light?

I am not keen on arrangement resulting from Unit 75. It would be better to remove this one, improving gardens to 74 and 62. The Unit in front could be raised in height to offset this loss - it doesn't look great currently anyway next to a large three storey building.

The arrangement of plots 30 to 33 is awkward. Plot 31 belongs with plots 34 - 39. It will look a bit odd on its own. Plot 30 has a nice wide frontage, which would suit the position of 33 and 32 better. Sitting a unit back in the corner is awkward and wastes some space because of the extent of hardstanding required. In addition the gable end of 31 has the potential to harm the setting of the adjacent listed building. The view south alongside 70-73 should have a decent terminus building at this point. Currently it finishes with a parking area and garage.

The two pairs of hipped roofed dwellings are likely to look fairly odd. I appreciate that one of the retained historic buildings is hipped, but this is unusual for the area, and not something that will make much sense replicated in these two isolated locations.

There are some cases where large buildings are right next to shorter buildings - such as units 40/41 and 42/43. We should have more consistency in such areas.

Unit 28/29 seems over-scaled for its location. It is much bigger than the adjacent retained building and has the potential to be prominent from the environs of Cary Place to the rear.

*Officer comments: Seeks retention the staircase in plot 20 (or justification for its loss), retention of the brick setts in front of the main listed building and raises a number of comments on the new build houses in terms of their impact upon heritage assets and setting thereof. All comments addressed by amended*

*plans submitted 03/01/19).*

**HISTORIC ENGLAND:** We have now received the revised floor plans for the grade II listed Mill and we are pleased to see the retention of the historic staircase as part of the redevelopment of the site.

**SOUTH WEST HERITAGE TRUST:** I recommend that the developer be required to record elements of the heritage asset and provide a report on any discoveries made as indicated in the National Planning Policy Framework. This should be secured by the use of the following conditions attached to any permission granted.

- HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY (SOMERSET CC): No objection to the principle of the development as the impact on the highway network is not considered to be severe. They explained that:
- A Travel Plan would be required as part of a Section 106 agreement;
- That the application would need to enter a suitable legal agreement with the Highway authority regarding the implementation of new traffic signals. Several design issues were identified which must be addressed as detailed design progresses;
- The footway onto Barnes Close requires a safe design;
- The estate roads are not suitable for adoption and would therefore remain private, as such the applicant should ensure long-term maintenance arrangements are in place in accordance with the Advance Payment Code regime.
- A number of issues were identified with regard to the estate road layout. On the basis that the roads are to remain private, no objection is raised by the Highway Authority but nonetheless it is recommended that the road layout be reviewed to ensure appropriate standards are met.

The Highway Authority recommended numerous conditions be imposed if planning permission were to granted

**SSDC HIGHWAYS CONSULTANT:** Refer to SCC comments.

**NATURAL ENGLAND:** No objection.

**SSDC ECOLOGIST:** The Ecological Impact Assessment (ECOSA, March 2018) assessed the site and included surveys for some protected species. Roosts for four different species of bats were recorded in the old mill building. Although the bats were present in only low numbers, the inclusion of rarer species make the site of 'moderate' biodiversity value. The development proposals will result in the loss of these roosts (except the cellar).

In order to satisfy legislation and planning policies, mitigation (including compensation bat roosts) will be required.

Outline mitigation measures are indicated in section 5.5.2 of the report. This includes repair and creation of a dedicated loft space roost above plots 25-27 (the other historic building being retained and converted), and retention of the cellar below building 1 (plots 23-24). I'm satisfied the outline measures are appropriate and feasible.

I recommend a condition requiring full mitigation details to be submitted for approval:

The development shall not commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, full details of a Bat Mitigation Plan detailing timing restrictions and protective measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for harm to bats and their roosts. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the mitigation plan, as modified to meet the requirements of any 'European Protected Species Mitigation Licence' issued by Natural England, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: For the conservation and protection of species of biodiversity importance in accordance with NPPF and Policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan, and to ensure compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and The Habitats Regulations 2017.

Please note that as the development will result in the destruction of a bat roost, the officer or committee report will need to include an assessment against the three Habitats Regulations tests:

#### Habitats Regulations reporting

An assessment against the three derogation tests of the Habitats Regulations 2010 is a legal requirement in the determination of this application. Permission can only be granted if all three derogation tests are satisfied. Such assessment should be included in the relevant committee or officer report. The tests are:

1. the development must meet a purpose of 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'
2. 'there is no satisfactory alternative'
3. the development 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range'.

In respect of test 3, I conclude that favourable conservation status is likely to be maintained due to the presence of only low numbers of bats, and the securing of appropriate mitigation and compensation by condition.

#### Other issues

The site has high potential to be used by nesting birds. I therefore recommend a condition: No removal of vegetation that may be used by nesting birds (trees, shrubs, hedges, bramble, ivy or other climbing plants) nor works to or demolition of buildings or structures that may be used by nesting birds, shall be carried out between 1st March and 31st August inclusive in any year, unless previously checked by a competent person for the presence of nesting birds. If nests are encountered, the nests and eggs or birds, must not be disturbed until all young have left the nest.

Reason: To avoid disturbance to nesting birds thereby ensuring compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the CROW Act 2000, and in accordance with Policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

**LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY (LLFA):** surface water, as discussed and agreed with the EA last year, will go to deep bore soakaways located beneath permeable paved shared spaces. These are indicated on the plans within the FRA, so the detail would need securing via a Grampian condition.

**ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:** I have had confirmation from our Groundwater Officer that they are now satisfied with the information that has been submitted to date, and therefore a condition controlling the detailed surface water drainage design as requested by the LLFA would be sufficient.

We will let you decide if an informative note to support the condition would be useful on the decision notice, to confirm the groundwater position statement that there must be no direct discharge to groundwater from the surface water soakaway.

**SSDC ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION:** Should the application be approved, a condition should be imposed to secure remedial measures for contaminated land.

**AVON AND SOMERSET POLICE SERVICE:** No objection subject to comments:

Please reconsider the access out of Barnes Close. The access point should be widened to the full width of the path to remove any corners to allow crim to prevail.

Provide bollards a minimum of 1.2 metres apart to prevent vehicular access.

Officer comment: Both matters addressed through amended plans.

**SSDC HOUSING DEVELOPMENT OFFICER:** Further to the DV report may I initially propose the following property mix for the 11 affordable units: 4 x 1 bed; 3 x 2 bed; 3 x 3 bed; and 1 x 4 bed. These will be split 80/20 - social rent/other intermediate tenures - however I would request the 4 bed be made available at a social rent. I am basing this on the current need on Homefinder Somerset and Help to Buy South West data.

These figures can be confirmed at a later date and subsequently included in the S106.

I would expect our space standards to be adhered to.

**SPORTS, ARTS, & LEISURE:** Financial contributions of £180,928 required as set out in their full response, towards:

- Offsite - contribution towards enhancing the existing play area at Donald Pither Memorial Ground, Ansford Road, or other youth facilities servicing Castle Cary and Ansford;
- Offsite - contribution towards enhancing the youth facilities at Fairfield; and
- Offsite contribution towards improved or new changing facilities at the Donald Pither Memorial Ground.

**SOMERSET SCHOOL & EDUCATION AUTHORITY:** Based on 25 primary places and 4 early years places, and a cost per place of £14,175, the financial contribution sought is £411,075.

**SOMERSET WASTE PARTNERSHIP:** Whilst I can see that there has been provision made for the bin collection points for the majority of properties on the development's private roads and courtyards, I do still have concerns about them being a fair distance from some of the properties they serve. In my experience people tend to leave their bins/recycling (has enough room been left for both?) in those collection point areas, and then they become a general dumping ground for others which can result in complaints, especially from those who have to look out onto it, or have to clear up any wind-blown litter as a result of it.

I did also want to query the collection point for plots 17-24; I think I'd assumed they were commercial premises on the original application but they do appear to be domestic after all, in which case the bin store at the far end of the private road would not be accessed by our vehicle. Could the bin store be moved nearer the entrance to the private road (but still so that residents wouldn't have to transport their waste more than 30m and the collection team wouldn't have to transport it more than 15m).

Plots 75-79 inc - I see there is a small amount of frontage in front of the building for plots 77-79; presumably where they'll store their waste containers. If the provision made outside the back garden for plot 74 was intended for their use I'm not sure this would work in practice due to the distance from the plots. Plots 75&76 appear to have an alleyway to the side of the property so hopefully they will be able to store their containers off of the pavement.

**SSDC TREE OFFICER:** My previous comments (dated 11/3/19 & 17/7/18) have encouraged a revised layout-design to include a high quality scheme of tree planting in an endeavour to mitigate for the loss of those trees which could not reasonably be retained.

Notwithstanding the refusal to alter the layout-design, I can confirm that the Architects have taken on-board my suggestions regarding compensatory plantings. They have diligently prepared a strong landscaping scheme which can objectively be described as being of the highest quality.

From a numbers perspective, the scheme proposes an impressive x62 large-sized container-grown trees (the majority of which would be between 2.5 - 4 metres tall) along with x 729 container-grown shrubs, X 1365 container-grown hedging shrubs, x 110 cell-grown native ecology shrubs, x 544

herbaceous plants (including Ferns and other shade-tolerant evergreen under-plantings), x 130 native Daffodils and x 130 native Bluebells.

However, the merits of the scheme are not all about numbers - the planting proposals have been carefully designed to provide strong visual-amenity benefits to compliment and soften the built-environment for existing and future residents. The longevity of many of those benefits can be reasonably predicted to continually increase in value for at least a couple of centuries.

The landscape scheme includes the use of specially engineered tree-pits that also act as Sustainable Urban Drainage measures for effective storm-water attenuation on a scale never seen before in South Somerset.

If Area East Committee does decide they are able to approve the proposed development, I would be grateful if the landscape and urban drainage measures could be imposed by condition in their entirety.

Furthermore, I would be grateful if Members could provide their support for confirming a subsequent Tree Preservation Order in order to secure the long-term futures of those newly planted trees.

**SOMERSET WILDLIFE TRUST:** Agree with the findings of the Appraisal and the SSDC Ecologist. Support the Mitigation and Enhancement (section 6). In addition, it is requested that all site boundaries include a small gap to allow free passage of small mammals, to be secured by condition.

**OPEN SPACE:** Insufficient Public Open Space to meet the required amount for a development of this size.

**DISTRICT VALUER:** The scheme is not viable at 35% affordable housing. The scheme becomes viable at 13.5% (11 units) affordable housing, and full financial contributions and CIL

## REPRESENTATIONS

### Contributions, 38 in total

The contributions are available in full on the Council's website so will be summarised, briefly and in no particular order, below:

#### 2 - Support

Support development of long derelict site

Development would stop rodent invasion and vandalism of adjacent properties

Development should be completed as soon as possible to protect and enhance the historic town

#### 10 - Representations/ General Observations

##### Residential Amenity

Proposed three storey could potentially introduce overlooking

Increase height of wall to 2.5m to prevent negative impact from site

##### Highways

Supports development on the site but a development of fewer units

#### 26 - Objections

##### Highways

Increase in number of vehicles - worsen congestion

Increase road traffic around entrance to site - not suitable for amount of traffic

Introduction of new traffic lights will cause more congestion  
Moving of the bus stop between sets of traffic lights will cause congestion  
Inadequate parking for new development  
Need more provided for non-vehicular traffic i.e. pedestrians and bicycles

#### Residential Amenity

Introduce overlooking into numerous existing dwellings  
Creation of noise and light pollution from site

#### Visual/Setting

Yellow road covering is harmful to setting  
Removal of protected trees will ruin the view  
Concerns over the listed building on the site (Powdered Workshop & Engine Room)  
Increased development will deteriorate character of Castle Cary  
Impact on sight-line from Upper High Street

#### Ecology

Unused site now occupied by wildlife  
Removal of trees means the removal of wildlife habitat

#### Other

Full consideration should be given by Members to the proposal, not just listed building issues.

#### Hanover Court Concerns

- Reopening of walkway between Barnes Close - causes distress to residents if reopened
- Concerns over car park being used
- Concerns over parting wall being effected by development - wish to be involved with site meetings when its being discussed if planning permission is granted

Lawson Cypress Hedge trees were planted as part of restrictive covenant - will not agree to remove if not replaced with higher wall.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

#### Principle of Development

The principle of re-developing the vacant and redundant employment site (as previously developed land (PDL)) is encouraged under policy SS7 and the NPPF. The site is contaminated, it has not been in active use for employment purposes for a long time, and listed buildings are falling into worse states of dilapidation. Providing a viable re-use of the land, whilst also providing dwellings towards the Council's under supply of housing, is positive.

The loss of the employment land is not considered to demonstrably harm the settlement's supply of employment land/premises and/or job opportunities given its current state and long history as a redundant site. The proposal is considered compliant with Policy EP3.

Castle Cary is a sustainable location for housing growth and is defined as a Local Market Town in policy SS1 of the Local Plan. The site is on the Council's Brownfield Register and is wholly within the development limits of the town.

The principle of development accords with the Local Plan but the Council's under supply and under delivery of housing must also be kept in mind in decision-making. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF explains that decision should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that for decision-taking that means:

- *approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without*



*delay; or*

- *where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*

*i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*

*ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.*

As the Council is currently only able to demonstrate a 4 year supply of deliverable housing land, the application must be approved unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

#### Design, Visual Amenity, and Historic Environment

The proposal involves the conversion of the Grade II listed 'Offices to Ansford Factory', and 'Mill Building to Ansford Factory', which are attached, and also the detached warehouse building to the west, not listed in its own right, to 11 dwellings. It also seeks to demolish the former engine house - which is not listed in its own right and is particularly ruinous. The Conservation Officer and Historic England are satisfied with the proposed method of conversion and with the demolition of the engine house. The benefit of providing the listed buildings with a viable use secures their restoration and ongoing maintenance as heritage assets, in accordance with Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Through the imposition of a condition, the developer will be required to record elements of the heritage assets and provide a report on any discoveries made as indicated in the National Planning Policy Framework prior to their conversion or demolition.

The remaining 70 dwellings would be provided through new-build dwellings. The residential properties are set out in a mixture of forms, in accordance with policy HG5; terrace, semi-detached, and detached dwellings, comprising a mixture of dwelling types and materials. Photovoltaic panels are also proposed on some properties and are to be located to as to minimise their appearance whilst benefiting from direct sunlight, thereby generating green energy in accordance with the aims of EQ1.

Notwithstanding concerns about the colour of the shared surface proposed, which is commonplace in many residential developments, the scheme is considered to be of an acceptable density, layout, and design, and the dwellings are of an appropriate scale, design and materials.

Given that the site is carefully designed to ensure the relatively dense development appears and functions appropriately, it is necessary to withdraw permitted development rights to all units for any extensions or outbuildings. It is also necessary to withdraw permitted development rights for any external alterations for plots 1-19 given their industrial design which would be significantly harmed with alterations of a domestic appearance.

The Open Spaces consultation raised highlighted that the level of informal open spaces was below their standards. However, this must be weighed up against the need to secure a viable re-use of this site. Given that even with 81 dwellings, the District Valuer has found the site can only afford 13.5% affordable housing, increasing open space would either require a reduction in units, making the scheme unviable, or places greater pressure on the remaining space to provide units in a more dense form which would have impacts on local character, the historic environment, and may also impinge on value of the properties, and thus viability. Alongside this argument, it should also be recognised that Policy HW1 allows for such requirements to be commuted off-site in appropriate circumstances. The development is making a significant contribution of in excess of £180,000 towards improvements at the Donald Pither Memorial Ground, accessible from the site and with enhanced public footpath links thereto.

The Town Council has asked that further consideration be given to providing access between the Red

House development and the BMI site. The agent sought to provide such an access but as there is no way of creating a right of way over private land, this is not a possibility. The site is considered to have sufficient permeability by reason of access into the nursery site and Barnes Close.

The proposed development is not considered to harm the setting of the listed buildings or the Conservation Area, and the demolition of the engine house has been satisfactorily justified. Accordingly, and notwithstanding objection received from the Town Council and local people, the development would not result in demonstrable harm to local character or the historic environment, and would provide opportunities for micro-generation, in accordance with policies EQ1, EQ2 and EQ3.

#### Residential Amenity

By virtue of their siting, scale, orientation, and boundary treatments (the exact detail to be agreed and controlled by condition), it is not considered that any of the proposed dwellings would unduly overlook, have an overbearing relationship, or result in loss of light to any neighbouring properties.

Comments have been made proposing alterations to means of enclosures around the site, including raising the height of a wall to 2.5 metres, and providing fixed-shut gates. There are opportunities to enhance existing enclosures through improvements to their structural integrities, materials, and designs-including their heights - and this will be secured through the imposition of a condition as agreed with the agent.

The proposed dwellings are considered to provide acceptable levels of amenity for future occupants.

On the basis of the above, and notwithstanding the objections received, it is not considered that the window layout would result in demonstrable overlooking or loss of privacy.

#### Highway Safety

Subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement, the County Highway Authority raise no objections to the scheme on the basis of parking standards, highway safety, or impact on the highway network.

For smaller developments, not requiring a travel plan, a condition would be imposed to ensure that an e-charging point is provided for each dwelling adjacent to the relevant parking area. However, these points will be secured as part of the travel plan, amongst other measures to secure low carbon travel.

Notwithstanding the objections received, it is not considered that the proposal would prejudice highways safety, and it is considered to accord with policies TA1, TA4, TA5 and TA6 of the Local Plan.

#### Ecology

The Somerset Wildlife Trust did not object to the scheme on the basis of the mitigation and enhancements put forward by the Ecological Report submitted and a condition that all site boundaries include a small gap to allow free passage of small mammals.

The Ecological Impact Assessment found bat roosts in the Old Mill building to be converted. Though they would be destroyed, he was satisfied that this would be acceptable provided mitigation and compensation measures are implemented as per his suggested condition.

As bat roosts would be destroyed, permission can only be granted if all three derogation tests are satisfied:

1. the development must meet a purpose of 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'
2. 'there is no satisfactory alternative'
3. the development 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range'.

With regard to the derogation tests no.'s 1-3 (Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010):  
Test 1 - It is considered that the proposal is required for social and economic reasons (to provide housing, re-use of the vacant and contaminated brownfield site, and to secure the repair and long-term maintenance of the listed buildings) and accords with both local and national planning advice/policies.  
Test 2 - It is considered that the need for housing, re-use and decontamination of the vacant brownfield site, and repair and long-term maintenance of the listed buildings is in the public interest, with no satisfactory alternative; this outweighs the harm that would be caused.  
Test 3 - The Ecologist concluded that favourable conservation status is likely to be maintained due to the presence of only low numbers of bats, and the securing of appropriate mitigation and compensation by condition.

In summary, the Ecologist has thoroughly considered the potential ecological impacts of the development and has no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

### Trees

The Tree Officer has raised concerns over the loss of protected trees, suggesting instead that the density be re-visited. As aforementioned, there is a balance to be played between securing a viable re-use of the land and retaining trees. Though the majority of protected trees would be lost, it is unlikely that the density of the scheme could be reduced without sacrificing the viability of the scheme, thereby losing the benefit of the site's re-use.

Additionally, the landscaping scheme has been amended to reflect the suggestions of the Tree Officer and as a result would provide an acceptable level of compensation through the provision of an appropriate planting scheme; replacement is taking place at a rate of almost 2 to 1 (58 trees proposed whilst 30 would be lost).

On that basis, given the constraints of the site and benefits of the scheme, the proposal is not considered to result in an undue level of harm to bio-diversity or green infrastructure. The proposal is considered to accord with policies EQ4 and EQ5.

### Drainage

The site is in Flood Zone 1 but involves the re-development of a large brownfield site. The application was submitted with a Flood Risk Assessment which the LLFA and Environment Agency found to be acceptable.

In accordance with the LLFA and Environment Agency, and subject to the Grampian condition suggested by the LLFA, the proposed development will be able to appropriately manage surface water within the site. The proposal therefore accords with EQ1.

### Land Contamination

As part of the re-development of the site, the contamination of the land will be addressed. This will be ensured through the imposition of a condition suggested by the Council's Environmental Protection Officer. The proposal is therefore compliant with policy EQ7.

### Waste Collection

The Manual for Streets states that residents should have a bin storage/collection point within 30 metres and the waste collection vehicle should be able to get within 25 metres of the bin storage/ collection point. It is considered that tolerances should apply to these distances where justified and within reason.

The vast majority of houses around the main roads on the layout can take bins to the kerbside for collection in the normal manner, and well within the distances prescribed by MFS.

There is no access for refuse vehicles into any of the private courtyards. The bin storage/collection

arrangements for these areas are outlined below:

**Central Courtyard -**

Note that all flats/FOGs (Plots 68, 70, 73, 75, & 79) have internal bin storage (either dedicated or within under-croft garage areas). These are all generally within 30 m from a collection point.

Plot 62 has more than 30 m to the highway (36 m).

There are a total of 18 houses within the courtyard and space shown within three collection areas (on the highway) for 21 wheelie bins. In reality, the collection areas are only necessary to serve ten plots (i.e. where placing bins on the kerbside would block access to garages etc). Therefore ample collection space is shown.

**North West Courtyard -**

Note that the FOG at Plots 46 & 47 have bin storage at the back of the undercroft parking.

The bin collection area is within 25 metres of the main road where the refuse vehicle can access. This only needs to serve six plots (42 - 47) and has space for 9/10 wheelie bins, which is ample.

Only the bin storage area for plot 47 is more than 30 m from the collection point.

**North East Courtyard -**

Plot 55 is the furthest point from the highway (35m). All bins can be collected from the roadside in the normal manner.

**Listed Courtyard -**

A bin store is proposed at the southern end of the courtyard, tucked away and designed to safeguard the setting of the listed building. This is about 65 metres from the main road. However, the agent has agreed to a condition to provide additional bin storage, within 30 m of the dwellings they serve and the collection area for all within circa 30 metres from the main road where the refuse lorry can access. The stores will need to be carefully designed to ensure impact on the setting of the listed building is limited.

Affordable Housing and Contributions

Policy HG3 requires 35% affordable housing. However, the District Valuer has stated that the scheme is only viable for 13.5% affordable housing, which equates to 11 of the 81 units. Those units are not highlighted on any plan but the agent has agreed that the units to be affordable rented and intermediate can be agreed through the S106 Agreement to accord with the units sought by the Housing Officer, and ultimately to the satisfaction of the Council's Lead Specialist - Development Management.

With 13.5% affordable housing, the District Valuer was satisfied that the scheme would be viable with full contributions being paid. The contributions to be paid, to be secured through the S106 are:

- Sports, Arts, & Leisure: £180,928
- Education: £411,075

Accordingly, the proposal would be compliant with policy SS7.

The development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Other

Any covenants, which may or may not be on the land, are not material planning considerations. If matters arise which affect the developer's right to build, this must be addressed through the appropriate legal process.

Conclusion

The Council's lack of a five year housing land supply lends significant weight when considering the

planning balance. In this case, the site is located in a sustainable location with access to a high range of services and facilities. The proposal is not considered to result in a significant and adverse impact upon the historic environment, visual amenity, residential amenity, highway safety, or ecology/biodiversity. Therefore, in terms of the 'planning balance', it is considered that there are no adverse impacts that would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits of providing 81 dwellings in this sustainable location, in addition to securing the ongoing maintenance of the listed buildings and the decontamination and an effective re-use of the land vacant land. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies SD1, SS1, SS4, SS5, SS7, EP3, HG2, HG3, HG5, TA1, TA4, TA5, TA6, HW1, EQ1, EQ2, EQ3, EQ4, EQ5, and EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Permission be granted subject to -

- a) The prior completion of a section 106 agreement (in a form acceptable to the Council's solicitor(s)) before the decision notice granting planning permission is issued to secure:
  - i. a Travel Plan to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority;
  - ii. financial contributions of £411,075 to be paid to the Somerset County Council as Education Authority;
  - iii. financial contributions of £180,928 to be paid to South Somerset District Council Sports, Arts, and Leisure;
  - iv. 11 units of affordable housing, the exact details (bedrooms, tenure, and locations) shall be to the satisfaction of the Lead Specialist Planning in consultation with the Council's Housing Development Officer; and
  - v. details of the management company to maintain the informal open space and, should the road not be adopted by the highway Authority prior to first occupation of any unit hereby permitted, maintenance also of the unadopted road.

b) planning conditions

01. The Council's lack of a five year housing land supply lends significant weight when considering the planning balance. In this case, the site is located in a sustainable location with access to a high range of services and facilities. The proposal is not considered to result in a significant and adverse impact upon the historic environment, visual amenity, residential amenity, highway safety, or ecology/biodiversity. Therefore, in terms of the 'planning balance', it is considered that there are no adverse impacts that would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits of providing 81 dwellings in this sustainable location, in addition to securing the ongoing maintenance of the listed buildings and the decontamination and an effective re-use of the land vacant land. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies SD1, SS1, SS4, SS5, SS7, EP3, HG2, HG3, HG5, TA1, TA4, TA5, TA6, HW1, EQ1, EQ2, EQ3, EQ4, EQ5, and EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 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 strictly in accordance with the approved plans as listed on the separate planning drawing issue sheet and landscape drawing issue sheet both dated 28.03.19.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt.

03. Excluding demolition, no development hereby permitted shall take place above ground level until details of all external materials (to be accompanied with samples and/or sample panels where deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority) for all buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To safeguard local character and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

04. No windows, doors, or other openings shall be installed in any of the buildings hereby permitted prior to details of their designs, materials, finishes, recessing, and levels of obscenity where relevant have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF

05. Before any of the buildings hereby permitted are constructed above ground level, details of all eaves/fascia board detailing, guttering, downpipes and other rainwater goods shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details once carried out shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

06. Before development commences for any of the buildings hereby permitted, details of the internal ground floor levels of those building(s), relative to the datum point, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

07. All dwellings shown on the approved plans as hosting PV panels shall not be first occupied prior to the proper installation of the PV panels for micro-generation in accordance with the approved plans as shown on the Plans Drawing Issue Sheet (indexed 02/04/2019).

Reason: To secure renewable energies/sustainable construction, in accordance with policy EQ1 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

08. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) there shall be no extensions to any of the buildings hereby permitted without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

09. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) there shall be no outbuildings erected or sited for any of the dwellings hereby without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) there shall be no external alterations made to the buildings in plots 1-19 (drawing no. 3728/001 rev Q) erected or sited for any of the dwellings hereby without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

11. No development hereby permitted shall be carried out prior to the submission to and agreement by the Local Planning Authority of a scheme of phasing for the works (full repair, conversion, and, for the engine house, demolition) of the listed buildings. The development shall then be carried out strict accordance with that phasing scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the listed buildings are appropriately repaired and converted as a benefit of this development, in accordance with policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

12. Prior to any works being undertaken on the listed buildings, a detailed method statement and specification of all works to the listed buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the listed buildings are appropriately repaired and converted as a benefit of this development, in accordance with policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

13. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, details of all boundary treatment and means of enclosures shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include small gaps to allow free passage of small mammals on each site boundary. The boundary treatments and means of enclosures shall be fully erected strictly in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To safeguard local character, amenity, the historic environment, and biodiversity, in accordance with policies EQ2, EQ3, and EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

14. No work shall commence on the development site (other than site clearance) until a signalised junction generally in accordance with that shown in Appendix 5 of the Peter Evans Partnership Transport Assessment (March 2018) has been provided in accordance with a design and

specification to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and to be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The provision of these works will require a legal agreement and contact should be made with the Highway Authority well in advance of commencing the works so that the agreement is complete prior to starting the highway works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

15. None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until the pedestrian links to Barnes Close and to the site boundary with the Nurseries have been constructed in accordance with details shown on Dwg nos. 3728/001 Rev Q, 3728 BBA SP 00 DR L 001 D and 3728 BBA SP 00 DR L 002 E.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

16. Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall be installed before the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved and thereafter maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

17. The proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, tactile paving, cycleways, bus stops/bus lay-bys, verges, junctions, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, carriageway gradients, drive gradients, car, motorcycle and cycle parking, and street furniture shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before their construction begins. For this purpose, plans and sections, indicating as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

18. The proposed roads, including footpaths and turning spaces where applicable, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling before it is occupied shall be served by a properly consolidated and surfaced footpath and carriageway to at least base course level between the dwelling and existing highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

19. The gradients of the proposed drives to the dwellings hereby permitted shall not be steeper than 1 in 10 and shall be permanently retained at that gradient thereafter at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

20. The areas allocated for parking and turning on the submitted plans shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.



Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

21. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling secure cycle parking at the rate of one space per bedroom shall be provided for that dwelling in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

22. No development shall commence unless a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plan. The plan shall include:
- Construction vehicle movements;
  - Construction operation hours;
  - Construction vehicular routes to and from site;
  - Construction delivery hours;
  - Expected number of construction vehicles per day;
  - Car parking for contractors;
  - Specific measures to be adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of the Environmental Code of Construction Practice;
  - A scheme to encourage the use of Public Transport amongst contractors; and
  - Measures to avoid traffic congestion impacting upon the Strategic Road Network
  - Measures to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site are in such condition as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway

Reason: In the interests of highways safety and residential amenity, in accordance with policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2008-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

23. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (excluding demolition), the development hereby permitted, surface water drainage details shall be submitted for the approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

As the development proposes to discharge surface water via permeable paving to deep bore soakaways, these shall include the following:

- details of falling head or infiltration tests (if not already undertaken) in accordance with BRE guidance
- final drainage design and layout, including any revised calculations
- methods employed to prevent direct discharge to groundwater
- ongoing management and maintenance arrangements specific to the scheme

The approved drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development is served by a satisfactory system of surface water drainage and that the approved system is retained, managed and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) and the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework.

24. Prior to commencement of the development, site vegetative clearance, demolition of existing structures, ground-works, heavy machinery entering site or the on-site storage of materials, a scheme of tree and hedgerow protection measures shall be prepared by a suitably experienced

and qualified arboricultural consultant in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction and submitted to the Council for their approval. Upon approval in writing by the Council, the scheme of tree and hedgerow protection measures (specifically any required ground-protection, fencing and signage) shall be installed and made ready for inspection. Prior to commencement of the development, the suitability of the tree and hedgerow protection measures shall be confirmed in-writing by a representative of the Council (to arrange, please contact us at [planning@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southsomerset.gov.uk) or call 01935 462670). The approved tree and hedgerow protection requirements shall remain implemented in their entirety for the duration of the construction of the development and may only be moved, removed or dismantled with the prior consent of the Council in-writing.

Reason: To preserve existing landscape features (trees and hedgerows) in accordance with the Council's policies as stated within The South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028); EQ2: General Development, EQ4: Bio-Diversity & EQ5: Green Infrastructure.

25. All planting and associated ground-preparation, weed-suppression, staking/supporting, tying, guarding, strimmer-guarding and mulching comprised in the approved scheme (As shown on the Landscape Drawing Issue Sheet, indexed 02/04/2019) shall be carried out in accordance with those details and within the dormant planting season (November to February inclusively) following the commencement of any aspect of the development hereby approved; and if any trees or shrubs which within a period of ten years from the completion of the development die, are removed or in the opinion of the Council, become seriously damaged or diseased, they shall be replaced by the landowner in the next planting season with trees/shrubs of the same approved specification, in the same location; unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the planting of new trees and shrubs in accordance with the Council's statutory duties relating to The Town & Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended)[1] and the following policies of The South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028); EQ2: General Development, EQ4: Bio-Diversity & EQ5: Green Infrastructure.

26. The development shall not commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, full details of a Bat Mitigation Plan detailing timing restrictions and protective measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for harm to bats and their roosts. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the mitigation plan, as modified to meet the requirements of any 'European Protected Species Mitigation Licence' issued by Natural England, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: For the conservation and protection of species of biodiversity importance in accordance with NPPF and Policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan, and to ensure compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and The Habitats Regulations 2017.

27. No removal of vegetation that may be used by nesting birds (trees, shrubs, hedges, bramble, ivy or other climbing plants) nor works to or demolition of buildings or structures that may be used by nesting birds, shall be carried out between 1st March and 31st August inclusive in any year, unless previously checked by a competent person for the presence of nesting birds. If nests are encountered, the nests and eggs or birds, must not be disturbed until all young have left the nest.

Reason: To avoid disturbance to nesting birds thereby ensuring compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the CROW Act 2000, and in accordance with Policy EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

28. Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, shall have secured the implementation of a programme of building recording work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted and

approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The WSI shall include details of the recording of the heritage asset, the analysis of evidence recovered from the site and publication of the results. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure a record is made of the heritage asset in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

29. The development hereby permitted shall not begin until a scheme to deal with contamination of land, controlled waters and/or ground gas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include all of the following measures, unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing:
1. A Phase I site investigation report carried out by a competent person to include a desk study, site walkover, the production of a site conceptual model and a human health and environmental risk assessment, undertaken in accordance with BS 10175 : 2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice.
  2. A Phase II intrusive investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, undertaken in accordance with BS 10175:2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice. The report should include a detailed quantitative human health and environmental risk assessment.
  3. A remediation scheme detailing how the remediation will be undertaken, what methods will be used and what is to be achieved. A clear end point of the remediation should be stated, such as site contaminant levels or a risk management action, and how this will be validated. Any ongoing monitoring should also be outlined.
  4. If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  5. A validation report detailing the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show that the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included, together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.

Reason: To protect the health of future occupiers of the site from any possible effects of contaminated land, in accordance with policy EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

30. Prior to commencement of any development above DPC level, a comprehensive scheme of refuse storage and collection areas shall be submitted to and agreed in writing. Unless a different phasing agreement is reached by the Local Planning Authority, the refuse infrastructure approved shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests to providing appropriate refuse infrastructure to the development, in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

31. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied prior to the full implementation of the boundary treatments around Beechfield House, the details of which shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior. The details shall show a suitable boundary treatment / means of enclosure to the northern boundary and the building up of the wall on the eastern boundary of Beechfield House.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity and the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

32. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied prior to the full implementation of the boundary treatments between the application site and both Ochil Tree House and Nursery House, the details of which shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior. Details shall include the blocking up with a wall of the current gate on that boundary.

Reason: To prevent pedestrian access to Upper High Street, in the interests of residential amenity, and to safeguard the historic environment, in accordance with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

**Informatives:**

01. The applicant will be required to secure an appropriate legal agreement/ licence for any works within or adjacent to the public highway required as part of this development, and they are advised to contact Somerset County Council to make the necessary arrangements well in advance of such works starting.
02. 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](mailto:cil@southsomerset.gov.uk)

03. The applicant should be aware that the Council will be seeking to serve tree protection orders (TPOs) on the trees within the landscaping scheme approved.

# Agenda Item 6

## Officer Report on Planning Application: 18/01603/LBC

<b>Proposal :</b>	Demolition of existing buildings, conversion of and alterations to listed buildings to form 11 No. dwellings, the erection of 70 No. dwellings (total 81 No. dwellings) and associated works, including access and off-site highway works, parking, landscaping, open space, footpath links and drainage infrastructure
<b>Site Address:</b>	Former BMI Site, Cumnock Road, Ansford
<b>Parish:</b>	Castle Cary
<b>CARY Ward (SSDC Member)</b>	Cllr Kevin Messenger Cllr Henry Hobhouse
<b>Recommending Case Officer:</b>	Stephen Baimbridge
<b>Target date :</b>	1st August 2018
<b>Applicant :</b>	Castle Cary (BMI) Ltd
<b>Agent: (no agent if blank)</b>	Mr Matt Frost Motivo Alvington Yeovil, BA20 2FG
<b>Application Type :</b>	Other LBC Alteration

The application was referred to the Ward Members as neighbour and Town Council comments had been received that were contrary to the officer's recommendation. The Ward Members referred to the Vice Area Chair, and the application was referred on to the Area East Committee.

The Area East Committee of 12/06/19 resolved that planning application be deferred for officers to negotiate an amended scheme to address issues concerning:

1. Highway adoption
2. To increase levels of car parking (incl. visitor)
3. To reduce the density of the development
4. To establish the specific boundary treatments with Beechfield House
5. To seek to retain more protected trees currently proposed to be felled
6. Clarity regarding the new highway infrastructure on Cumnock Road



The application returned to the Area East Committee on 10/07/2019.

It was resolved to reject the officer's recommendation to approve the application and instead refer the application to Regulation Committee with a recommendation of refusal for the following reasons:

1. The density of the development is considered too great
2. The lack of on-site parking failing to meet the SCC Parking Strategy
3. The fact the highway as designed within the development cannot be adopted
4. An insufficient number of protected trees are to be retained

If the Regulation Committee is mindful to approve the application then the Committee asks that consideration be given to:

- a) Condition the specific boundary treatments with Beechfield House.
- b) Secure a stone wall in the north eastern corner of the development to prevent pedestrian access to Upper High Street.
- c) Adding an informative note stating the Council will instigate a Tree Preservation Order to protect all new trees planted; to replace those protected trees on the site which will be felled.





## **SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL**

The application site is the Former BMI Site in Castle Cary, a redundant employment site comprised of a number of listed and unlisted buildings all of which are in various stages of dilapidation. The site is accessed off Cumnock Road and is surrounded by residential properties on all boundaries but for the eastern boundary which is also shared by the nursery site.

The application seeks listed building consent for the demolition of existing buildings, conversion of and alterations to listed buildings to form 11 No. dwellings, the erection of 70 No. dwellings (total 81 No. dwellings) and associated works, including access and off-site highway works, parking, landscaping, open space, footpath links and drainage infrastructure. The only matters to be considered as part of this application will be the physical works to the listed buildings. All other matters are considered within the full planning application.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

Various historic permissions pertaining to the employment site. The decisions of most relevance to this application are:

01/02024/FUL: The carrying out of residential development, including the conversion of existing buildings. Application refused by Committee (14/03/2003). Allowed at appeal (20/05/2004).

01/02025/LBC: The conversion of former mill and two associated buildings to residential use. Application permitted with conditions (09/01/2002).

## **POLICY**

Section 16 of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act is the starting point for the exercise of listed building control. This places a statutory requirement on local planning authorities to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'

Paragraphs 193 and 194 of the NPPF: Chapter 16 - 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' is applicable. It advises that:

"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional."

Whilst Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning Act is not relevant to this listed building application, the following policies should be considered in the context of the application.

The policies of most relevance to the proposal are:

Policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028): Policy EQ3- Historic Environments  
National Guidance: Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Planning Practice Guidance: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment; and Design

## CONSULTATIONS

**CASTLE CARY TOWN COUNCIL:** We welcome the input from Highways and the tree officer and absolutely support their comments.

Below are the issues that still need to be addressed and until they have been we are unable to support this application

**DECISION** The Planning Committee voted unanimously against this planning application: Although the Council is very much in favour of brownfield development in the town in principle, it was felt that there are a number of key issues that this new brown field development has failed to address satisfactorily:

- The proposals rely on census information from 2011 which suggests that each dwelling will only require 1.6 car spaces.
- Highways advised in the application that the new roads on the development will be unadoptable, which means residents will have to maintain them in the future. This is unacceptable; other sites in Area East have had problems with similar proposals.
- Despite concerns raised by CCTC in 2018 about the numbers of visitor parking spaces, only 6 visitor parking places are proposed on a site with 81 dwellings, so it is likely that new residents' cars will spill out on to surrounding streets causing congestion.
- No regard has been given to our concerns about the demolition of the Listed former engine house
- Lack of renewable energy solutions including photovoltaics in the new house designs.
- The revised plans, with new three storey houses, compromise the curtilage of nearby Listed buildings, the amenity and privacy of neighbours and views from the Conservation Area of North Street.
- The site owner must rectify any outstanding breaches of law relating to the listed buildings and structures within their curtilage before any new building commences.
- Adequate provision for footpath access between the Red House development and the BMI site needs to be considered, to avoid future residents having to use the busy and dangerous A371 to visit each other.

### **CONSERVATION OFFICER:**

#### Historic Building Conversion

The historic buildings have been on our Heritage at Risk Register for a long time. Despite lots of effort from Council Officers no meaningful repairs have been carried out, although some work has been carried out to improve the security of the site as unauthorised entry and vandalism has been a recurring problem. There is an historic consent to convert the building into dwellings. The introduction of a new use is welcome, as it will secure the full repair of the building and give it a good future.

We have had some discussion about how the building is best divided up. It is characterised by large open floor areas, where the length of the building can be easily appreciated, giving a sense of past industrial activity that has taken place within the building. The reasons for not dividing in this manner are set out clearly in the submitted heritage statement. In summary the current floor levels are low. Horizontal subdivision will create the need to provide fire and acoustic separation between separate flats, which will reduce the ceiling levels further. Currently the underside of the floor boards and floor joists are revealed to the room below. It should be possible to retain this arrangement if the room above is within the same unit, however this detail will be hidden if divided into flats. I am satisfied that the proposed vertical division is the best solution for the building.

The application includes the replacement of the stair and associated boarding in the Mill. The heritage statement suggests this is original, yet no justification has been submitted for its removal. It should be feasible to retain the stair in Unit 20. If this isn't possible then further justification is needed regarding this. You should also consult Historic England and the amenity societies as the removal of the stair constitutes substantial internal demolition.



There is mention of a cellar under the offices. Information is needed regarding this - will it be associated with one of the flats, perhaps used for storage? Is work required?

The brick setts to the front of the main Mill building should be retained, and should be referenced on the proposed plans.

Plot 26 is badly lit with only two north facing windows. This should be re-considered. It is likely that this unit will be difficult to sell, or subject to high occupancy turn over, which won't be good for the building. The central windows on the east elevation of this building are shown in timber. A steel system should be used for these new openings, to match the adjacent windows. The little garden areas to the front aren't appropriate here. The industrial character of the building would be better retained by removing these and pushing the parking towards the building, or creating an area of 'shared' hardstanding.

Justification has been put forward in the submitted heritage statement relating to the demolition of the engine house. I am satisfied with the case that has been made.

#### New buildings

The rest of the site generally has quite a cramped appearance. I like the design of units 1-16. The strong linear form relates well to the industrial use of the site and the character of the listed factory building, as does the smaller range adjacent. It is a shame that this aesthetic cannot be adopted across the whole site. As well as giving the whole scheme some integrity the use of terrace forms will make better use of the space. With regard to units 1-16 specifically the south end of the building faces towards the listed building and will be readily viewed. It's fairly disappointing architecturally. This needs to be considered further. In addition the units seem to have one small rooflight over the top bathroom (which seems to straddle the ridge). Given that they are based on the design of a north light building why not introduce a big block of glazing over the central stairwell to flood the core of each unit with natural light?

I am not keen on arrangement resulting from Unit 75. It would be better to remove this one, improving gardens to 74 and 62. The Unit in front could be raised in height to offset this loss - it doesn't look great currently anyway next to a large three storey building.

The arrangement of plots 30 to 33 is awkward. Plot 31 belongs with plots 34 - 39. It will look a bit odd on its own. Plot 30 has a nice wide frontage, which would suit the position of 33 and 32 better. Sitting a unit back in the corner is awkward and wastes some space because of the extent of hardstanding required. In addition the gable end of 31 has the potential to harm the setting of the adjacent listed building. The view south alongside 70-73 should have a decent terminus building at this point. Currently it finishes with a parking area and garage.

The two pairs of hipped roofed dwellings are likely to look fairly odd. I appreciate that one of the retained historic buildings is hipped, but this is unusual for the area, and not something that will make much sense replicated in these two isolated locations.

There are some cases where large buildings are right next to shorter buildings - such as units 40/41 and 42/43. We should have more consistency in such areas.

Unit 28/29 seems over-scaled for its location. It is much bigger than the adjacent retained building and has the potential to be prominent from the environs of Cary Place to the rear.

**HISTORIC ENGLAND:** Were not originally satisfied with the proposal in relation to the loss of a historic set of stairs but, on the basis of amended plans, they stated the following:

We have now received the revised floor plans for the grade II listed Mill and we are pleased to see the retention of the historic staircase as part of the redevelopment of the site.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Six representations submitted; three objections, two general observations, and one letter of support. The representations are available in full on the Council's website so that matters relevant to the listed buildings only will be summarised briefly below:

- Support for the conversion of the hand loom mill and warehouse to residential and the demolition of the engine house. The conversions are essential to preserve this industrial heritage which is so limited. The demolition is necessary given the building's state of repair.
- Recording of the buildings to be demolished is pleasing.
- It would be appropriate to provide an information board on the site's history and original use.
- Opposition to the loss of the powered workshop and engine room. The buildings have been allowed to deteriorate so should not form part of the argument for demolition.
- The 2005 approval retained the buildings and did not include horizontal division of the Mill building.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

The primary consideration for an application for listed building consent is assessing what impact the proposals will have on the character of the listed buildings.

The proposal involves the conversion of the Grade II listed 'Offices to Ansford Factory', and 'Mill Building to Ansford Factory', which are attached, and also the detached warehouse building to the west, not listed in its own right, to 11 dwellings. It also seeks to demolish the former engine house - which is not listed in its own right and is particularly ruinous.

Significant weight is put on the expert advice of Historic England and the Conservation Officer. Both are satisfied with the proposed conversions and with the demolition of the engine house. Accordingly, it is considered that the harm to the listed buildings is outweighed by the benefits of securing an optimal viable re-use of the 'Offices to Ansford Factory', 'Mill Building to Ansford Factory', and warehouse. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Consent be granted subject to conditions:-

01. The works, by reason of securing an optimal viable re-use for the Grade II listed 'Offices to Ansford Factory', 'Mill Building to Ansford Factory', and warehouse building, and their appropriate scale, design, materials, finishes, and intervention into the listed fabric, are considered to respect the historic and architectural significance of the heritage assets in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028).

## **SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:**

01. The works hereby granted consent shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: As required by Section 16(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

02. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans as listed on the separate planning drawing issue sheet dated 28.03.19.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt.

03. No works hereby permitted shall be carried out prior to the submission to and agreement by the Local Planning Authority of a scheme of phasing for the works (full repair, conversion, and, for the engine house, demolition) of the listed buildings. The works shall then be carried out strict accordance with that phasing scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the listed buildings are appropriately repaired and converted as a benefit of this development, in accordance with policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.

04. Prior to any works being undertaken on the listed buildings, a detailed method statement and specification of all works to the listed buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the listed buildings are appropriately repaired and converted as a benefit of this development, in accordance with policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and the provisions of the NPPF.