

## Planning Committee – 1 November 2017

Present: - Councillor Bowrah (Chairman)  
Councillor Mrs Hill (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Brown, Cavill, Coles, Gage, Hall, C Hill, Nicholls, Sully,  
Townsend, Watson, Wedderkopp and Wren

Officers: - Matthew Bale (Area Planning Manager), Gareth Clifford (Principal  
Planning Officer), Martin Evans (Solicitor, Shape Partnership Services)  
and Tracey Meadows (Democratic Services Officer)

Also present: Mrs A Elder, Chairman of the Standards Advisory Committee.

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm)

### 71. Apologies/Substitutions

Apologies: Councillors Mrs J Adkins, M Adkins, Martin-Scott, Morrell and  
Mrs Reed

Substitutions: Councillor Wren for Councillor Mrs J Adkins  
Councillor Cavill for Councillor M Adkins  
Councillor Sully for Councillor Martin-Scott  
Councillor Hall for Councillor Mrs Reed

### 72. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Townsend declared that he was a Kingston St Mary Parish  
Councillor. With regard to application No. 30/17/0022, Councillor Brown  
declared that he had been approached by a member of the public opposing  
application. He declared that he had not 'fettered his discretion'; Councillor  
Coles declared that he had received a letter from Clark Wilmot and Clark and  
declared that he had not responded or 'fettered his discretion'; and the  
Chairman, Councillor Bowrah, declared that he had received two letters from  
Clark Wilmot and Clark, and declared that he had not 'fettered his discretion'.  
Councillor Wren declared a personal interest as he was the Clerk to Milverton  
Parish Council.

### 73. Applications for Planning Permission

The Committee received the report of the Area Planning Manager on  
applications for planning permission and it was **resolved** that they be dealt  
with as follows:-

(1) That **planning permission be granted** for the under-mentioned  
development:-

**19/17/0016**

**Replacement of Nissen shed with erection of a portal frame industrial unit at Station Works, Station Road, Hatch Beauchamp (retention of works already undertaken)**

(a) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-

- (A3) DrNo C001-LP-001 Rev P3 Location Plan;
- (A1) DrNo C001-MP-003 Rev P1 Proposed Site Master Plan;
- (A1) DrNo C001-FP-001 Rev P1 Ground Floor Plan;
- (A1) DrNo C001-FP-002 Rev P1 Roof Plan;
- (A1) DrNo C001-EL-001 Rev P1 Elevations 1-1 and 2-2;
- (A1) DrNo C001-EL-002 Rev P1 Elevation 3-3;
- (A1) DrNo C001-EL-003 Rev P1 Section A-A;
- (A1) DrNo C001-EL-004 Rev P1 Section B-B;
- (A1) DrNo 17108 L94.01 Rev C Landscape Screening Option;
- (A1) DrNo Figure 1 Swept Path Analysis of HGV;

(b) Only those materials specified in the application shall be used in carrying out the development hereby permitted unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;

(c) No machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site outside the following times 0730hrs – 1800hrs on Mondays to Fridays, 0730hrs - 1500hrs on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays;

(d) The building hereby permitted shall be demolished to ground level and all materials resulting from the demolition shall be removed within six months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:-

- (i). Within three months of the date of this decision a scheme for landscaping along the south-western boundary shall have been submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation; (ii). If within 11 months of the date of this decision the Local Planning Authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State; (iii). If an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State. (iv). The approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable;

(e) Parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved plan;

- (f) The area identified for the turning of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on Drawing No Figure 1 should be kept clear from obstruction;

(Notes to applicant:- (1) Applicant was informed that in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council had worked in a positive and pro-active way and had imposed planning conditions to enable the grant of planning permission; (2) Applicant was advised that attention is drawn to the publication 'Secure by Design' as a means of designing out crime. You are advised to contact the Police Liaison Officer; (3) Applicant was advised that a separate Listed Building Consent was required for this proposal; (4) Applicant was advised that all staff should be advised that they should park within the application site and not on the public highway; (5) Applicant was advised that drivers of HGVs visiting the site should be advised to manoeuvre within the site and leave in a forward gear and not reverse along Station Road; (6) Applicant was advised that deliveries to the site should be timed to avoid school drop-off and collection times; (7) Applicant was encouraged to investigate a travel plan for the site with a view to reducing staff travel to and from the site by means of the private car.)

- (2) That **Planning permission be refused** for the under-mentioned development:-

**30/17/0022**

**Change of use of agricultural land to part domestic curtilage and part for tourism use with siting of 2 No. shepherd huts and erection of a toilet block on land adjacent to Cherry Tree Barn, Sellicks Green, Pitminster**

**Reason**

The site is situated outside the settlement limit for Blagdon Hill and is, therefore, in the open countryside. The extension of residential curtilage into agricultural land is contrary to Policy DM2 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy, which causes harm to the visual amenities of the area.

The proposed tourism use is not a diversification of an existing farming business. The provision of huts in this location, not being a touring caravan or camping site, is not supported by Policy DM2 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy and the proposal would not be significantly beneficial to the local economy.

(The meeting ended at 8.46 pm)