

Meeting JAE **02M** 09/10
Date **08.07.09**

South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Joint Area East Committee** held at **the Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton** on **Wednesday, 8th July 2009**.

(9.30am - 1.50pm)

PRESENT:

Members:

Mike Lewis	In the Chair
Tony Capozzoli until 12.00 pm	Henry Hobhouse
Tim Carroll until 12.25pm	Bob Little until 12.40 pm
Sam Crabb	Lucy Wallace until 13.05pm
Janet Cronie	William Wallace
John Crossley	Colin Winder
Anna Groskop	Jimmy Zouche

Officers:

Helen Rutter	Head of Area Development – East
Anne Herridge	Committee Administrator
Jean Marshall	Development Control Team Leader
Simon Fox	Planning Officer
Tim Cook	Regeneration Officer
Tim Pollock	Somerset County Council Admissions Manager
Sgt Ed Hawkins	Avon & Somerset Police
Jeff Copp	SCC Highways
Angela Watson	Assistant Solicitor

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

13. Minutes (Agenda Item 1)

As the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd June 2009 were distributed late due to the planning reserved matters application, it was decided to give members more time to read them; therefore they will be signed at the next meeting on 12th August 2009.

14. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Tim Inglefield, Maili Felton and John Calvert.

15. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Colin Winder declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 9 as he is a governor of King Arthur's school, he exercised his right to join the discussion but left the room whilst Members voted.

Councillor Anna Groskop declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application 08/04605/FUL she left the room when that item was discussed.

Councillor John Crossley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application 08/05142/FUL; he did not exercise his right to speak as a member of the public but left the room during the discussion.

16. Public Participation (Agenda Item 4)

Questions/comments from members of the public

There were no questions or comments from members of the public.

Questions/Comments from representatives of parish/town councils

Cllr Tony Cappozoli raised concerns regarding cars speeding at the Mead Ilchester, but it was suggested that he discuss the matter during Item 18 when Sergeant Ed Hawkins would join the meeting.

17. Reports from Members Representing the District Council on Outside Organisations (Agenda Item 5)

There were no reports from Members.

18. Feedback on reports referred to the Regulation Committee (Agenda Item 6)

The Chairman reported that there had been no meeting of the Regulation Committee this month or the last few months.

19. Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 7)

The Chairman advised Members that the applicant and case officer had withdrawn Planning application 08/03334/FUL from the agenda for consideration, and if no agreement was reached it would be on the agenda for the JAC meeting in September. He also welcomed County Councillors Jimmy Zouche and Bob Little to their first JAC meeting.

He also:-

- asked Councillors and Members of the Public to ensure that their mobile phones were switched off in case they interfered with the public announcement system;
 - informed Councillors and Members of the Public that the building and its immediate confines were no-smoking areas. He indicated the outside area that had been allocated for smoking to the rear of the building.
 - asked members of the public who attended the meeting to complete the feedback forms placed on their chairs.
 - explained that Parish Councillor Janet Cronie and County Councillors Jimmy Zouche; Bob Little and Sam Crabb could not vote on SSDC 'Excepted business ' but could join in discussions.
-

20. Planning Applications (Agenda item 8)

08/03334/FUL (Pages 5 – 11) Change of use to form a car park, rebuilding of walls/fences, alterations to access and formation of footpath to dovecot (GR368382/134420 Land Adjacent to Dovecot Park Wall Bruton Mrs K McCarthy.

This application was withdrawn from the agenda for consideration by the applicant and case officer, and if no agreement was reached it would be on the agenda for the JAC meeting in September.

08/04305/FUL (Pages 12 – 29) Demolition of existing housing and the erection of 34 flats and houses (GR 368183/134424 Land at Cox's Close Bruton Mr M Dillon (Major Application - Excepted Business)

Councillor Anna Groskop left the room at this point.

The Development Control Officer reminded Members that a previous application had been considered at the JAC meeting in February 2009. Approval was given at that meeting for the development of 31 flats and houses. This application was a revised scheme as the layout had been modified because Yarlinton Homes had been able to purchase the flat excluded from the original scheme. The material choices had been amended following comments from Members on the original choice of brick, which was to be replaced by reconstructed stone to match the area. Another amendment was for the provision of extra parking. The Officer explained that the revised application was not actually shown in the shaded part of the map in the agenda. He then proceeded to show slides of:

- Sites A and B;
- Godminster Lane and Jubilee Park;
- Aerial photo of the railway line;
- Revised application taking in the newly purchased land;
- The proposed new footpath over the railway line;
- The proposed extra parking;
- Site B with the upgraded footpath;
- The elevations of the properties to the front of the development to show the symmetry of the frontage;
- The elevation from Godminster Lane;
- The different levels of sites A and B;
- The view from the Dovecot
- The proposed street scene;
- General photos of the area to show it does not retract from the roof scope;
- The overgrown lane as seen from site B;
- The narrow lane and vegetation that currently poses a hazard to pedestrians;
- The steps leading up to Cox's Close;
- Proposals of how the current unsafe foot path will be upgraded.

The Development Control Officer explained that due to the overgrown slope of Site B, engineering works would be required to make it feasible, the viability of the site was very finely balanced. The applicant wished to demolish the boarded up properties as a priority, and an amendment to the wording of conditions 04,05,07 and 08 was recommended to read 'Save as to demolition...' He advised that Bruton Town Council were in support of the scheme particularly in light of the use of the revised materials and increase in parking spaces, English Heritage had no problem with the application either

and the Tree Officer had suggested that the landscaping in front of the development be implemented before building started.

Justin Robinson a representative from Bruton Town Council reiterated that the Town Council supported the revised scheme, the improved pavements and the change of materials. He was particularly pleased with the way Yarlington Housing Group had taken on board the suggested amendments.

John Shaw representing Yarlington Housing Group was delighted with the excellent update and good understanding of the situation. Yarlington Housing Group had listened to the community regarding what was required as they are a community led organisation. The standard and number of car parking spaces for their developments in general was much higher than a private developer.

During the ensuing discussion Members were generally in favour of the application but questioned the final number of planned parking spaces, and a suggestion was made to amend condition 21 to include a time control of the street lighting to ensure the lights would not be on unnecessarily. The overall provision was good and there appeared to be a better quality of space on a development for a RSL than there would be for a private sector developer.

In response to comments made, it was clarified that the total amount of available parking spaces would now be 56, which was just over the standard provision. The Highways Officer present at the meeting could not confirm if it would be possible to put timers on the new street lighting that would have to be clarified later, therefore could be included as an informative at this stage.

In response to a request for clarification, the Head of Area Development advised that the proposed 5 units on Site B were approved not as a rural exception housing scheme ring fenced for local people, but would be available in the normal way through Choice Based Lettings.

The committee was of the view that the application was acceptable and that permission should be granted subject to conditions as recommended by the officers in the report with an amendment to conditions 04,05,07,08 and an extra informative.

RESOLVED: That application reference 08/04305/FUL Cox's Close Bruton be approved subject to:

- a) the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation and
 - b) the imposition of the planning conditions as set out in the Agenda report plus the revised wording of the conditions as set out below:
04. *Save as to demolition of existing buildings no development shall be carried out* on the approved development unless particulars of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- a. materials (including the provision of samples) to be used for external walls, roofs and chimneys;
 - b. material and external finish to be used for all windows and doors;
 - c. details of all internal and external boundary treatments; and
 - d. surface treatments for all parking spaces and garden paths.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area to accord with policies ST5, ST6, EH1 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

05. *Save as to demolition of existing buildings no development shall be carried out* on the approved development unless there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, managed and supplemented, together with measures for their protection in the course of the development, as well as details of any changes proposed in existing ground levels; all planting, seeding, turfing or earth moulding comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which subsequently die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To maintain the character and appearance of the area to accord with policies ST5, ST6, EH1 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

07. *Save as to demolition of existing buildings no development shall be carried out* on the approved development unless details of the internal ground floor levels of the buildings to be erected on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity to accord with policies ST5, ST6, EH1 and EC3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

08. *Save as to demolition of existing buildings no development shall be carried out* on the approved development unless foul and surface water drainage details to serve the development, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such approved drainage details shall be completed and become fully operational before the development hereby permitted is first brought into use. Following its installation such approved scheme shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the site is adequately drained to accord with policy EU4 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).

Extra informative:

06. With reference to Condition 17 the applicant is requested to consider timed street-lighting to avoid unnecessary light spill in the vicinity of the Dovecote.

(Vote: Unanimous)

*(Simon Gale, Head of Development and Building Control)
(simon.gale@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462723)*

08/05142/FUL (Pages 30 – 40) The erection of 2 dwelling houses plus associated garaging and landscaping (GR363470/127443) Little Orchard Castle Cary Road North Cadbury Mr & Mrs Close.

Councillor John Crossley left the room during discussion of this item.

The Development Control Officer corrected two misstatements in the report and advised that Cox's Close was not wholly built of reconstructed stone as was stated, and that in paragraph 3 the reference to Hylands and Quest Cottage state they were of reconstructed stone, but they are predominantly of render with some reconstructed stone.

The Officer then summarised, with the aid of slides and photos the details of the application as set out in the agenda report:-

- a plan of the site;
- a more detailed plan showing how the lower ground level would have to be excavated;
- a cross section of the site of Little Orchard;
- side elevations of the proposed dwellings;
- proposed floor plans;
- the front elevation and how they would fit in with the current street scene;
- how in time the planting would cloak the new buildings;
- an overview of an ordnance survey map to show that this application was not out of character and how there was already backland development in place around the proposed site, how the existing older type cottages were all close to the road but the more modern properties built in the 80's were set further back to enable cars to park in the front, but this plan would enable cars to park along side the properties rather than in front, in order to restore the original style of the village;
- another view from the ordnance survey map that indicated that Little Orchard was not in the conservation area;
- a view of the through road through North Cadbury;
- the school traffic parked alongside the road;
- the properties leading straight on to the road;
- the property known as Ambleside that was on similarly elevated land;
- view from Cox's Close and the dominant trees;
- Little Orchard and the land which would have to be excavated;
- the listed building opposite Little Orchard;
- a view of the current streetscene;
- the modern houses built of constructed stone;
- the gable end window of 1 Cox's Close;
- the properties 30 and 31 Cox's Close that are built of stone;
- the view from Quest Cottage;
- the impact of the current greenery on the streetscene;
- aerial view of the site.

Slides that neighbours had produced were then shown of: -

- cars parked in the nearby roads;
- the stone roadside wall and the dense vegetation;
- view from the reception room of Dairy House to Little Orchard.

The Development Control Officer then indicated that the application was considered acceptable and the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions. He mentioned that there would be two additional conditions; regarding the bats in the

vicinity; and the preservation of the stone roadside wall. An amendment would be made to Condition 07 to the word 'vial' which should be replaced by 'visual'.

Members noted the comments of Mr Richard Crewdson from North Cadbury Parish Council in objection to the application. He referred to his concern at what he thought was a bad application and informed Members that there was a solid wall of opposition from the parishioners. They had been disappointed as a site meeting had been arranged but neither the applicant nor architect had attended, although a summary of the meeting had been sent to them. Mr Crewdson was pleased with the added condition regarding the stone wall, but he was concerned that if tree roots were removed from near the wall, parts of it would collapse. He acknowledged that it would be a shame if the trees were cut down as they formed a canopy over the road in the summer. He was disappointed by the Tree Officer's reference that the majority of trees lacked sufficient quality to be the subject of a TPO. He also felt that the proposed excavation of the site was understated in the report and that the quantity of soil to be removed would in itself cause a problem to the village and would have an enormous impact on the locality, just for the sake of building 2 very small houses. This would cause avoidable harm and have an adverse effect on the stability of the land. The application did not address these issues in enough depth and he could not understand why the Conservation Officer had not raised any issues, he would like to see the evidence of a geological survey regarding the stability of the land before the application was approved.

The Committee then heard comments from Mr T J Hosker in objection to the application. He was the owner of the Dairy House which was the listed building opposite the site, he wanted to point out that he was not adverse to change but wanted to protect the conservation area and the building line of the street. He felt that this application would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area and was concerned with the proposed depth of the excavation, particularly as it was not known what was under the site and the possible impact on his listed building and others in the area. Although he was pleased that condition 10 requested a geological survey, he wanted to ensure that he and his neighbours would be protected from any damage that could potentially occur and suggested that the application be adjourned until a survey had been carried out.

The Agent Mr J A Paterson then spoke in support of the application, he was aware that neighbours were not happy with the plans but he advised that some of the trees in question were diseased and could be removed anyway, at any time, as they were not covered by any TPO's. The proposal did allow for new additional tree planting and although the Parish Council were not happy with the highways proposals Somerset County Council had raised no objections to permission being granted. The plan to build close to the street replicated the original design of the village rather than the modern properties of the 60's to 80's. He did not think it would be fair to insist that the applicant had a geology report before the permission was granted, as that would be very expensive. The applicant had been very flexible already and had made amendments to the original scheme and had removed one dwelling from the original application. He wanted it noted that he had not refused to attend the meeting but had been away. The applicant would not be liable for any damage that could occur, that would have to be met by the developers 3rd party insurance.

The Development Control Team Leader made a small amendment to Condition 10 to include the words 'and approved' to the first sentence 'No works shall be carried out unless a geology report has been submitted *and approved* to the Local Planning Authority.'

The Assistant Solicitor advised members that if any works damaged the property at all, it would be a private, civil matter and as such was not a relevant consideration. She also

indicated that the absence of a geological survey would not be a justifiable reason to refuse the application, especially as it was proposed to cover this issue through Condition 10.

The County Council Division Member Councillor Bob Little could not support the application and was not comfortable with what he had heard at the meeting and was not happy with some of the wording in the report. He felt a geology survey should be carried out prior to the start of the development. He pointed out that the applicants and agent had not actually attended the site meeting and it was not the attendance at the Parish Council meeting that had been questioned, he felt that it did not look good from the residents' point of view that they had not attended the site meeting. He was also concerned at the amount of soil that may be excavated and carried through the village.

The Assistant Solicitor advised that when it came to what additional information was required to be submitted with a planning application, consideration had to be given as to what was proportionate and reasonable, and in this case there didn't appear to be sufficient justification to require a geological survey prior to approval.

She also reminded members that, were they minded to refuse the application, their reasons for refusal needed to be capable of being substantiated at appeal, otherwise the Council may be at risk of an award of costs against it.

Ward Member Councillor Henry Hobhouse is a resident of North Cadbury but he was unable to see the site from his property. He spoke in objection to the application and referred to a previous development at Woolston Road where damage had occurred to the highway due to the use of HGV's at considerable cost to SCC. Movement of this kind was bad for any village. The stability of the land in the area meant that there were more 1-storey properties in the village than 2 storey properties and this application was out of keeping with that. He made reference to the existence of a covenant limiting the construction of the Cox's Close estate to 1-story, but the Assistant Solicitor advised that this was not a relevant consideration.

During the ensuing discussion members were concerned at the amount of excavation that would need to be carried out for this application to commence, and the possible damage to the stone wall along the front of the site. Concern was raised that the application did not appear to respect the character of the village and the possible loss of trees in the area. However another Member and the Development Control Team Leader both pointed out that the trees could be removed at any time as none of them were covered by a TPO. It was also acknowledged that other backland applications in the area had been approved and this was not an over development of the site, although it was in close proximity to the conservation area. The Officer was asked to show the photo again of the slope of the ground to enable Members to be able comprehend the amount of excavation that would be needed.

As Members had raised these concerns it was suggested that a site visit take place before making a decision on this application.

The majority of Members voted for a site visit to take place on Friday 17 July 2009.

RESOLVED: That consideration of the application be deferred for a site visit to take place on 17 July 2009 at 2.30 pm

(Vote: 7 for and 1 against)

*(Simon Gale, Head of Development and Building Control)
(simon.gale@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462723)*

21. School Admissions Arrangements for Sexey's School, Bruton (Agenda Item 9)

Tim Pollock SCC Admissions Manager referred to the agenda report which gave information of Somerset Schools Admissions arrangements for 2010, he gave a brief summary of the recent changes to this. He explained how SCC would be objecting to the proposed increase in day places at Sexey's School Bruton from 20 to 31. SCC had no objection to the increase in boarding places as this would not have any real impact on neighbouring schools. It was necessary to determine if the increase was appropriate or not, and what impact it would have on the area for the September 2010 intake. The yearly amount of 20 day places had slowly increased due to the success of appeals, 13 were successful last year increasing the day places to 33. This meant that potentially there could be more than the proposed 31 places each year. It was essential to consider the impact on the other schools in the area particularly as there was no dedicated catchment area.

Bruton Town Council member Justin Robinson spoke on this item and made comment that the people of Bruton do actually associate with Sexey's School and do see it as their catchment school. In the past the distance from the school was used at appeals by some parents, but distance would not be an issue this year. He said there was no easy solution to the problem but a strong Area view was a necessity in order to lessen the impact on King Arthurs and Ansford Schools. He had no problem with the increase in boarding pupils as that did help the local economy.

John Smith objector to the proposal is a governor of King Arthur's School and the Chairman of Business Together, he felt that all the local schools needed local support but there was a distinct lack of cohesive policy regarding education, and that a proper policy was required to promote the legislation but the end result wanted by everyone was the best education for the children.

Ms Tamara Bradbury, the Head of King Arthurs School commented that her staff cared passionately about the school. It had improved greatly over the last 2 years but the reduction in the population of South Somerset in general, was a cause of concern, as was the reduced budget that they now had to work with. She was concerned at the lack of strategy in the provision for education. A solution for one school was often a problem for another, there was a need to collaborate, and to all work in partnership and not to be in competition with one another. A review of the wider issues of all the schools in the area was needed.

Mr Chris Culpin the Chairman of Ansford School was concerned with the proposed increase in day places at Sexey's School as it could have an impact on school admissions in the area, Sexey's admissions policy had changed 4 times over the last 10 years, and would probably always be changing. Co-operation between the schools was needed rather than competition. A great deal of the local children often go on to Sexey's 6th form after completing their education at the other schools in the area.

Ward Member Councillor Anna Groskop would welcome a review that would be of benefit to all 3 schools, but did not want any engineering of funds in order to carry this out. It caused a problem to families when children were unable to go to their local school and she pointed out that a lot of the people of Bruton do think of Sexey's as their local school and do expect their children to gain a place there. There were also a large number of local children who attend schools in Dorset, that also reduced the uptake of places at Ansford and King Arthurs.

Other Members made a number of comments:-

- boarding places do not have an impact on schools in the area, but an increase in day places would have a significant impact, although the appeal process meant that year on year more day places were given than the allocated amount, although some appeals were refused;
- perhaps appeals should not be allowed;
- a review would be welcomed and needed to be carried out as soon as possible;
- there were currently too few pupils in the area and the fall in numbers was a problem but the proposed large housing developments in the area would change the pattern again;
- a report of the review should be brought back to committee as soon as possible and if practical by the September meeting of Area East;
- Tim Pollock was complimented on his report;
- a review should have been carried out earlier before planning decisions were made;
- the number of extra day pupils being discussed was 11 and would that really make a great deal of difference? The popularity of the other schools also had an impact.

The Admissions Manager advised that he would discuss with his colleagues the feasibility of having the results of the review ready by September 2009, he was unsure that they would be. The new admissions code was full of points but no flexibility, the consultation period was statutory and the appeal procedure was very prescriptive, every parent had the right of appeal but County Council had no input into that at all. The catchment mileage limit of approximately 1 mile was to be reintroduced again from 2010; its removal had caused more problems with appeals etc.

Members concurred that they were not opposed to the increase in the number of boarding places, but were opposed to the proposed increase in the number of day places, particularly ahead of the planned review; which was required as soon as possible. A full picture was also needed regarding details of pupils who travel elsewhere/ outside the county for their education.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that JAC East members support the increase in the number of boarding places but to oppose an increase in the number of day places at Sexey's School Bruton as outlined in paragraph 11 of the report until a full review had taken place;
- (2) to request that a further report with the main findings of the overall review of school places be brought back to committee in September 2009 by the SCC Admissions Manager.

(Vote: 8 in favour, 3 against; 1 abstention)

*(Lead Officer Tim Pollock)
(tpollock@somerset.gov.uk or 01823 355615)*

22. Promoting Quality of Life in Area East – Priorities for 2009/10 (Agenda Item 10) (Excepted Business)

The Head of Area Development presented her report as detailed in the agenda, she advised that the Local Development Framework (LDF) consultations were starting over the next few weeks, a Parish workshop was planned and this would set out the overall framework and seek parish views on the further consultation required.

The resources directed through the Area Development Plan were under the control of District Councillors only, but it was intended that once Phase One of the Joint Area Committees (JAC)'s had been evaluated the potential for pooling budgets could progress in Phase Two of the arrangements for JAC's.

The 7 priority themes had been established by looking at local needs and the preferences of local people within the area, and they were presented as detailed in the report.

In response to the report Members commented that: -

- the JAC should be fully in place by next year and would hopefully include more County input;
- the lack of a household waste disposal area in Wincanton had not been identified as a specific priority.
- could the £25,000 ring fenced for affordable housing schemes for the last 3 years be used for other projects?

The Head of Area Development explained that members were not in a position to recommend the setting up of a household waste area in Wincanton, as Somerset County Council had acquired the land but withdrawn the budget for this development some time ago. Further lobbying could be undertaken of Somerset Waste Partnership. The ring fenced sum of £25,000 was to be used for the initial acquisition of new sites but had not been drawn on recently. She felt it was a valid point as it was not currently being deployed, but suggested this be reviewed by the end of the year.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that Members recommended priority themes be endorsed for Area East as set out in the report, and that these priorities be used to help determine the allocation of resources over the year;
- (2) that Members recommended a revised Area East Development Plan 2009/10 be circulated to Councillors by the end of September 2009 by the Head of Area Development (East);
- (3) that Members recommended a review, by the end of the year, of the sum of £25,000 capital, ring fenced for affordable housing scheme(s).

Reason: To seek the Committee's agreement on an updated set of local priorities for 2009/10. To enable better direction of resources under the control of the Joint Area Committee.

(Vote: Unanimous)

*(Helen Rutter, Head of Service Area East)
(helen.rutter@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01963 435012)*

23. Grants Budgets Financial Summary and SSSC Grants Policy (Agenda Item 11) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

The Head of Area Development presented the report as shown in the agenda and summarised the impact of the budget in Appendix A, she asked for Members approval of

a transfer of £25,000 from the Capital Reserve to the Community and Leisure Capital Grants Budget.

- RESOLVED:** (1) that Member's approved a transfer of £25,000 from the Capital Reserve to the Community and Leisure Capital Grants Budget;
- (2) that Member's read the financial summary of bids and grants policy framework in conjunction with Items 12 to 14 in the agenda.

Reason: To top up the Community and Leisure Capital Grants Budget to enable these and future bids to be supported and to inform members of the current budgetary position and remind Members of South Somerset District Council's Grants Policy as reviewed in February 2009.

(Vote: unanimous)

(Helen Rutter, Head of Area Development)
(helen.rutter@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01963 435012)

24. Revenue Grant Request – Bruton Museum (Agenda Item 12) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

The Community Development Officer presented the report and explained that Bruton Museum had been encouraged and supported to reduce their reliance on SSDC grant aid, although running costs continue to rise and there was very little financial support available to Community museums. The nearby Wincanton Museum was due to shut down due to problems with existing accommodation in September.

Bruton Town Council representative Justin Robinson spoke in support of the museum, and advised that the Town Council continued to support the museum as much as they could and had increased their financial contribution again this year.

One Member questioned why the museum had to pay the full market rent, which they could not afford, although they occupied space in the District Council owned Dovecot building. What would happen if the museum could not afford to pay the rent in the future?

The Head of Area Development explained that the District Council is required by audit requirements to charge all tenants of its properties the appropriate rent as set by the District Valuer. The grants budgets were managed under specified criteria quite separately and grant awards are based on the value placed on that activity and evidence of financial need. If this was not the case then, by virtue of renting from the Council, voluntary sector tenants would be in an advantageous position over other groups. The decision to rent Council property was a business decision for the organisation concerned and the grants policy was very clear on this matter

Members requested that a full review of the future of museums in South Somerset be carried out as soon as possible.

RESOLVED: that £3000 (45 % of eligible running costs) be awarded to Bruton Museum from the Community Grants Revenue Budget towards its running costs for 2009/10, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) that the progress of the Museum continues to be measured through the service level agreement;
- (2) that the committee continues to work with SSDC officers to produce a business plan to demonstrate gradual reduction in SSDC grant reliance;
- (3) that SSDC support is acknowledged on publicity;
- (4) that a full review of the future of museums in South Somerset be requested as a matter of urgency.

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: To agree revenue funding for Bruton Museum towards their 2009/10 running costs.

*(Tim Cook, Community Development Officer)
(tim.cook@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01963 435088)*

25. District Wide Village Hall Grant budget - Capital Grant Request – Barton St David Village Hall and Templecombe Village Hall (Agenda Item 13) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

The Community Development Officer presented the report as shown in the agenda and explained that Templecombe Village Hall had recently suffered from a loss of income because the pre-school no longer used the hall.

During the ensuing discussion Members were generally supportive of both proposals and commented that Barton St David Village Hall was an exemplary village hall and had a good track record of raising funds locally.

RESOLVED: that Members agreed to a contribution of £1630 (47% of total project costs) from the District Wide Village Halls budget, towards the cost of installing a suspended ceiling at **Barton St David Village Hall** subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The funding has been awarded based on the information provided on the application form for application number AE/09/02;
- (2) The SSDC Evaluation Form will need to be completed in full and returned to the Area Council Offices when the applicant returns the signed acceptance of the funding offer;
- (3) all other funding sources are secured;
- (4) SSDC is given prior notice of the date when work is to commence;
- (5) SSDC is acknowledged on any publicity and on any permanent acknowledgement of assistance towards the project;
- (6) the applicant will work, in conjunction with SSDC Officers, to monitor the success of the scheme and the benefits to the community, resulting from SSDC's contribution to the project;
- (7) should the scheme be delayed or unable to commence within six months from the date of this Committee, SSDC must be notified in writing; and
- (8) should the final cost be less than the estimate considered by the Committee, the funding will be proportionately reduced. However,

if the cost exceeds that estimate, no further funding will normally be available.

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: to agree capital funding for improvements to Barton St David Village Hall

RESOLVED: that Members agreed to a contribution of £1,650 (36% of total project costs) from the District Wide Village Halls budget, towards the cost of installing a suspended ceiling and additional insulation at **Templecombe Village Hall** subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The funding has been awarded based on the information provided on the application form for application number AE/09/03;
- (2) The SSDC Evaluation Form will need to be completed in full and returned to the Area Council Offices when the applicant returns the signed acceptance of the funding offer;
- (3) all other funding sources are secured;
- (4) SSDC is given prior notice of the date when work is to commence;
- (5) SSDC is acknowledged on any publicity and on any permanent acknowledgement of assistance towards the project;
- (6) the applicant will work, in conjunction with SSDC Officers, to monitor the success of the scheme and the benefits to the community, resulting from SSDC's contribution to the project;
- (7) should the scheme be delayed or unable to commence within six months from the date of this Committee, SSDC must be notified in writing;
- (8) should the final cost be less than the estimate considered by the Committee, the funding will be proportionately reduced. However, if the cost exceeds that estimate, no further funding will normally be available; and
- (9) the applicant should work towards Hallmark 1 scheme run by Community Council for Somerset.

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: to agree capital funding for improvements to Templecombe Village Hall.

*(Tim Cook, Community Development Officer)
(tim.cook@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01963 435088)*

26. Community & Leisure Capital Grant Request – Milborne Port Church House and The National Trust (Lytes Cary) (Agenda Item 14) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

The Community Development Officer reported that Milborne Port Church House was located centrally it had recently been refurbished and was now used even more but needed funds in order to provide accessible toilets. It was not eligible for support through the District-wide village halls budget, as it did not operate under a standard Village Hall constitution.

Although members were supportive of the recommendation, one member commented that the Hall should be encouraged to look at the criteria for joining the Hallmark Scheme.

The Officer then reported on the provision of allotments at the National Trust Lytes Cary, the Trust had made the land available for the provision of allotments. The Head Gardener attended the meeting and was extremely enthusiastic about the project, he explained that several local communities had shown an interest in having the use of an allotment and they would be run on a very similar basis to 'Growing Space'. Help would be provided to establish the plots and to teach the groups how to work the land and learn to grow food. 35 of the 40 proposed allotments were to be used for local people and the demand had been so high that some allotments may have to be shared.

RESOLVED: that Members agreed to a contribution of £9,500 (11% of total project costs) from the Community and Leisure Capital budget, towards the cost of providing fully accessible toilets at **Milborne Port Church House** subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The funding has been awarded based on the information provided on the application form for application number AE/09/05;
- (2) The SSDC Evaluation Form will need to be completed in full and returned to the Area Council Offices when the applicant returns the signed acceptance of the funding offer;
- (3) all other funding sources are secured;
- (4) SSDC is given prior notice of the date when work is to commence;
- (5) SSDC is acknowledged on any publicity and on any permanent acknowledgement of assistance towards the project;
- (6) the applicant will work, in conjunction with SSDC Officers, to monitor the success of the scheme and the benefits to the community, resulting from SSDC's contribution to the project;
- (7) should the scheme be delayed or unable to commence within six months from the date of this Committee, SSDC must be notified in writing;
- (8) should the final cost be less than the estimate considered by the Committee, the funding will be proportionately reduced. However, if the cost exceeds that estimate, no further funding will normally be available; and
- (9) the applicant be encouraged to work towards the Hall Mark Scheme.

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: to agree capital funding for improvements to Milborne Port Church House.

RESOLVED: that Members agreed to a contribution of £3000 (28% of total project costs) from the Community and Leisure Capital budget, towards the costs of establishing a community allotment project at **Lytes Cary** subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) the funding has been awarded based on the information provided on the application form for application number AE/09/03;
- (2) the SSDC Evaluation Form will need to be completed in full and returned to the Area Council Offices when the applicant returns the signed acceptance of the funding offer;
- (3) all other funding sources are secured;
- (4) SSDC is given prior notice of the date when work is to commence;

- (5) SSDC is acknowledged on any publicity and on any permanent acknowledgement of assistance towards the project;
- (6) the applicant will work, in conjunction with SSDC Officers, to monitor the success of the scheme and the benefits to the community, resulting from SSDC's contribution to the project;
- (7) should the scheme be delayed or unable to commence within six months from the date of this Committee, SSDC must be notified in writing;
- (8) should the final cost be less than the estimate considered by the Committee, the funding will be proportionately reduced. However, if the cost exceeds that estimate, no further funding will normally be available; and
- (9) lease agreement must be on the basis of a term of at least 10 years in line with our current grant policy.

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: to agree capital funding to The National Trust towards allotments at (Lytes Cary).

*(Tim Cook, Community Development Officer)
(tim.cook@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01963 435088)*

27. Outside Organisations – Appointment of Members 2009/10 (Agenda Item 15) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

RESOLVED: that the following Members be appointed to the outside bodies for 2009/10 as listed below:

Organisation	2009/10 representative(s)
Caryford Fitness & Leisure User Group	John Crossley;
Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Partnership Panel	Maili Felton
Viridor – Dimmer Liaison Group	Henry Hobhouse Colin Winder
Henstridge Airfield Consultative Committee	Tim Inglefield, William Wallace Lucy Wallace
South Somerset Disability Forum	John Calvert;
Yarlington Homes Residents Forum (East)	John Crossley
Wincanton Community Sports Centre Board	Tim Inglefield Board Member Tim Carroll as Observer

Councillor John Crossley pointed out that he is a representative for Area East on the Crown Pet Food Liaison Committee but wished to be removed as an official representative; this had been omitted from the above chart.

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: To appoint District Council representatives to outside organisations.

*(Angie Cox, Democratic Services Manager)
(angela.cox@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462148)*

28. Appointment of Area East Panels/Working Groups/Sub-Committees – Municipal Year 2009/2010 (Agenda Item 16) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

RESOLVED: that the following Panel, sub Committee and Steering group be reappointed for 2009/10 with the following membership

Title	2009/2010 representative
Area East Community Safety Action Panel	John Crossley
Community Planning Sub-Committee	Mike Lewis, Anna Groskop Tim Carroll Colin Winder John Crossley Maili Felton
Castle Cary Market House Steering Group	Mike Lewis Henry Hobhouse John Crossley

Reason: To reappoint area east panel, sub-committee, and steering group for 2009/10.

*(Anne Herridge Committee Administrator, Legal and Democratic Services SSDC)
(anne.herridge@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462570)*

29. Development Control Scheme of Delegation – Nomination of Substitutes for Area East Chairman and Vice Chairman (Agenda Item 17) (Executive Decision) (Excepted Business)

RESOLVED: that, in line with the Development Control Scheme of Delegation, Councillors Colin Winder and John Crossley be nominated to act as substitutes during 2009/10 for the Chairman and Vice Chairman to make decisions in the Chairman's and Vice Chairman's absence on whether an application should be considered by the Joint Area Committee as requested by the Ward Member(s).

(Vote: unanimous)

Reason: To nominate two substitute members for the Chair and Vice Chair to make decisions in their absence during 2009/10 in line with the Development Control Scheme of Delegation.

*(Simon Gale – Development and Building Control)
(simon.gale@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462071)*

30. Safer & Stronger Neighbourhoods - Community Safety (Agenda Item 18)

Sgt Ed Hawkins of Avon and Somerset Police gave an update of their achievements in Area East over the past year. He said that there had been a restructure of the police teams and Area East now had more staff with PCSO's each covering 9 beats. Sgt Hawkins himself was now full time at Wincanton with the admin support of the PCSO Support Officer Anne Porter who deals with neighbourhood schemes. PCSO officers

within neighbourhood teams deal with prevention but were not response officers, they were approachable and accessible and working to a good set of rules.

The 3 towns within Area East were showing a declining crime rate, during the period from 1 January 2008 until 1 July 2008, 939 crimes had been recorded but for the same period in 2009 this figure was down to 748.

The neighbourhood teams work in partnership with Yarlinton Housing Group; Parishes and Youth Groups. A very successful Multi Agency day had been held which was an initiative between the Police, SSDC and the Environment Agency; it covered activities in and around the Area East Neighbourhood Police area. The aim of the day was to forge partnership working between the Police and other organisations, with a view to making the multi-agency approach sustainable. Ilchester had held a litter pick involving up to 100 children and proved good for the community spirit; the river at Bruton had been cleared of weed and debris by the local community.

The open day at Area East had formalised the working of the partnership and included the opening of the new police cell at Wincanton. Partnership working was proving to be very successful and more efficient by understanding who dealt with what and where.

The team had recently distributed post cards throughout the area asking residents what concerns they have within their area. The team were very pleased with the response that they had received so far, the main concerns appeared to be speeding and illegal parking. An explanation was given regarding the 'message in a bottle' that the Ambulance service had set up, this encouraged members of the public to put personal details such as next of kin and any medication that they were taking etc on paper into a small bottle and store it in the fridge, this meant that in an emergency the Ambulance crew knew where to look for details.

Local action groups were encouraged to take up the Community Speed watch initiative, as it offered a good productive service and SSDC officers validated results of the campaign, all parishes were welcome to take this up, but it was up to them to take the initiative.

The Community Justice Panel within Area East was being promoted at every opportunity and worked in partnership particularly with Yarlinton Homes, this was proving to be very effective by encouraging victims and offenders to work through issues together with a trained mediator, and this proved a very low chance of re-offending.

The Neighbourhood Watch scheme needed to be reinvigorated and the register up dated.

Farm Watch had started in Area East and was in the process of being set up in the other areas. The idea again was prevention, and information was given to help protect against thieves and criminal damage in general, extra funding was needed in order to be able to set up a plant equipment register. Warning messages are to be sent by text to warn of any strange unsuitable behaviour in the area. Horse Watch has been set up, and includes tack marking. If the tack is marked there is a much larger chance of it being returned to the rightful owner if recovered following a theft. The Horse Watch team will visit stable yards or houses to carry out the marking process and registration and hope to include every eligible person in the area. Membership of both is free of charge.

The Sergeant was thanked for the report and several Members made the following points:-

- One Member was concerned over the amount of cars driven at high speed through the Mead at Ilchester. – Sgt Hawkins advised that work was going on around The Mead and anti social car drivers were given a warning and the cars could be removed if necessary but he would ask Dave Pepper to contact the member direct;
- Another Member was concerned about the anti social behaviour that went on around Jubilee Pavilion, Bruton during the early evening and thought that the PCSO's should be more visible during the evening as opposed to the day – the Sgt replied that there was a further PCSO covering the Bruton and surrounding area and if a problem was identified then they could change their shift pattern to suit;
- Another Member mentioned that after the London bombings people had been encouraged to store their emergency details on their mobile phones under the heading ICE, but was not such a good idea when phones were lost or stolen;
- One Member brought up the matter of the broken street light on the bridge in Bruton, which was no longer safe after being hit during an accident and the delay in getting this repaired, this was a safety issue and improved lighting sensitive to the conservation area was a necessity in the area; there was still a delay in getting a camera as BT have confirmed it could not be attached to their pole.

Members thanked Sgt Hawkins for his presentation.

RESOLVED: that members noted and commented on the presentation.

(Helen Rutter, Head of Area Development)
(helen.rutter@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01963 435012)

31. Area East Community Safety Action Panel – Update (Agenda Item 19)

Members were asked if they had any questions or comments regarding the report as shown in the agenda. The Panel is chaired by Cllr Crossley.

The Youth Opportunities Group had proved to be very successful; work had been carried out to investigate the extension of the DPPO in Wincanton and good cross agency progress on a new DPPO in Bruton; other key work areas were the commissioning of the Parenting Support Programme and the introduction of the Community Justice Programme in Area East.

Councillor William Wallace had been appointed Cabinet Member for Community Safety for Somerset County Council, he explained that the Trading Standards had recently organised test purchasing services in the area and the purpose of the exercise was to help prevent the illegal sale of age restricted products, and where necessary, to obtain evidence to commence a prosecution. It was confirmed that the Panel supported trading standards on this initiative.

The Farm and Horse Watch scheme was welcomed but concern was raised regarding the possible need for more funding.

Mr Jeremiah a member of the public gave thanks for the Speed Watch in his local village.

Councillor Anna Groskop advised that a deployable CCTV unit was shortly due to be placed in Bruton for a 1 month period, but another Member commented that it was a necessity to get the protocol working properly to facilitate placements.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

32. Joint Area East Forward Plan (Agenda Item 20)

Members noted the report but a comment was made regarding the layout of the tables for the meeting and lack of space. This will be taken up with the Admin Team.

RESOLVED: that Members noted the proposed Joint Area East Forward Plan as attached at Appendix A.

33. Items for Information (Agenda item 21)

A report was requested regarding the protocol of 106 planning obligations and the amount of planning appeals that take place.

34. Next Meeting (Agenda Item 22)

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of Joint Area Committee - East would take place on Wednesday, 12th August 2009 at 9.30am at the Council Offices, Churchfield, Wincanton.

*(Anne Herridge Committee Administrator, Legal and Democratic Services SSDC)
(anne.herridge@southsomerset.gov.uk or 01935 462570)*

.....
Chairman