

## YEOVIL TOWN COUNCIL

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE** held in the Town House, 19 Union Street, Yeovil on **Monday 13 October 2008**

(7.00pm to 8.40pm)

### **Present:**

Philip Chandler - Chairman  
Julian Freke  
Pete Goodman  
John Grana  
Tom Parsley  
David Recardo

### **Also Present:**

Jean Marshall - Development Control Team Leader, SSDC  
Jane Green - Planning Assistant, SSDC  
Sally Bing - Assistant Town Clerk

### 7/293 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 September 2008, copies of which had been circulated, were amended by removing David Recardo's name from the paragraph under Declarations of Interest with reference to membership of South Somerset District Council (Minute reference 7/287) as he had given his apologies for absence. Following this amendment the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 7/294 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from J Vincent Chainey, Clive Davis, Simon Hester and Wes Read.

### 7/295 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Julian Freke, Tom Parsley and David Recardo referred to their membership of South Somerset District Council and indicated that whilst they might speak and possibly vote on applications which might be referred to that Council for determination, they would reconsider such applications at District level taking into account all relevant evidence and representations made at that tier.

David Recardo declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application number 08/03529/FUL. Demolition of existing industrial unit and the erection of a new Lidl foodstore, address Ashleys of Yeovil, West Hendford, Yeovil due to his son's employment with Lidl.

Julian Freke declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application number 08/01969/FUL. Alterations extension and the conversion of existing offices into 6 flats, 25/27 Hendford, Yeovil, due to his friendship with the applicant.

John Grana declared a personal interest in application number 08/03384/FUL. The erection of a sun room to south elevation of dwelling. Cherry Trees, 4a East Coker Road, Yeovil, due to association with the applicant as he had historically carried out work at that address.

7/296 **PLANS LIST**

It was **RESOLVED** that application number 07/05341/OUT. Formation of road access and the development of land for B1 office and industrial use buildings. Land South of the A3088 Western Relief Road, Yeovil would be considered at the end of the Plans List as the location was in Coker Parish.

**2. Planning Application: 08/03529/FUL**

Site Address:	Ashleys Of Yeovil West Hendford Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (South)
Proposal :	Demolition of existing industrial unit and the erection of a new Lidl foodstore with associated parking, servicing and infrastructure improvements (GR: 354914/115458)
Recommending Case Officer:	Andrew Collins
Target date :	3rd December 2008
Applicant :	Lidl UK
Type :	Major Retail f/space 1,000 sq.m or 1ha+

David Recardo requested confirmation regarding the red outline perimeter of the land on the plan as it included public highway and access to Westland.

Jean Marshall (Development Control Team Leader) explained that as works to the highway would be required to facilitate the development they needed to be included within the delineation of the red line site

*(David Recardo having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application left the room during its consideration and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon)*

Jean Marshall drew the Committee's attention to the comments of the Economic Development Team Leader, particularly with regard to the sequential test and the identification of a site in Yeovil Town centre known as Stars Lane North which the applicants had considered unsuitable. She also pointed out that there was historically an application for Change of Use to retailing in the area in 2004 and 2007 which was refused, however this was non food retailing. She stated that the reasons for refusal were no less significant today and that the proposal would result in a loss of 8 jobs to the site. She further explained that the proposed Lidl store would be of modest scale and complement neighbourhood shopping, as other small retailers, for example tobacco, lottery etc., would be required to support the 12,000 products provided by Lidl.

She stated that there was a clear quantitative need for a discount store on the west side of Yeovil and that a retail capacity study stated that convenience and comparative goods were needed. She concluded by saying that this would provide an addition to the Lidl on Lyde Road and not replacement.

James Mitchell from Lidl Stores stated that the turnover of the proposed store could be accommodated within the shopping needs for Yeovil. He explained that the new store would reduce the need to travel across the town centre and that there would be no sense in locating a new Lidl store at the site known as Stars Lane North due to its proximity to the existing store. He felt that there would be no detrimental impact on other stores and stated that the retail case for the application was proven. He added that the scheme designed was suitable for the area and approaches had been made to County Council regarding roads and highways to improve access.

Nigel Ashley, land owner, explained that Ashleys was a family run precision engineering firm with 35 full time employees. He explained that the existing buildings would require investment over the forthcoming years and that choice in plant and machinery was becoming limited due to the lack of height of the building. He said that the old building was inefficient and provided little natural light to work by but that a new site had been purchased for relocation where a safe environmentally friendly and appropriate building would be located to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of the company. Many aspects had been taken into consideration before purchasing the site including a suitable location for employees and Mr Ashley explained that the new building would be a modern purpose built premise.

The Committee discussed the application and recognised that that other potential sites indicated in the sequential test were unsuitable.

With regard to employment, it was felt that whilst Ashleys provided employment Lidl were also employers. It was recognised and supported that the landscape officer had requested a condition of a landscape scheme and it was felt that advertising around the site should be limited.

## **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

### **3. Planning Application: 08/01969/FUL**

Site Address:	25/27 Hendford Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	Alterations, extension and the conversion of existing offices into 6 No. flats (GR 355478/115805)
Recommending Case Officer:	Andrew Collins
Target date :	24th October 2008
Applicant :	Mostly Property Ltd
Type :	Minor Dwellings 1-9 site less than 1ha

*(Julian Freke having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application left the room during its consideration and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon).*

Jean Marshall informed the Committee that comments had been received from the agents stating that the building was not suitable for office use. It was explained that there was an existing planning consent and acknowledged that no parking would be provided on the site.

#### **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

##### **4. Planning Application: 08/03384/FUL**

Site Address:	Cherry Trees 4A East Coker Road Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (South)
Proposal :	The erection of a sun-room to south elevation of dwelling (GR 354945/114676)
Recommending Case Officer:	Marianne Bareham
Target date :	13th October 2008
Applicant :	Mr I Montague
Type :	Other Householder - not a Change of Use

It was explained that this was an application for a small extension in an area of archaeological interest however no objections had been received.

#### **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

##### **5. Planning Application: 08/03468/FUL**

Site Address:	26 St Johns Road Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (East)
Proposal :	The erection of a single storey extension( GR 356429/117391)
Recommending Case Officer:	Alex Skidmore
Target date :	30th October 2008
Applicant :	Mukhtar Ali
Type :	Other Householder - not a Change of Use

Jean Marshall explained that one further neighbour objection had been received with concerns over increase of noise and intrusion of privacy.

The Committee considered the application and felt that there was ample curtilage to the property for this extension.

#### **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

## **6. Planning Application: 08/03540/FUL**

Site Address:	164 Preston Road Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (South)
Proposal :	The erection of a boundary fence and a 2m high fence to enclose grassed area to front of property (GR 353839/116238)
Recommending Case Officer:	Mr Dominic Heath-Coleman
Target date :	6th November 2008
Applicant :	Quantock Education Trust
Type :	Minor Other less than 1,000 sq.m or 1ha

Jean Marshall explained that comments had been received from Technical Service with no objections and highways with no observations. She stated that one neighbour objection had been received that the proposal was not in keeping with the surroundings and concern was raised over balls being kicked or thrown inadvertently into the road by children playing in the front garden. Concern was also raised that more signs would be put up on the fence.

Mr J Sheddon, on behalf of the applicant, explained the details of the type of fence and informed the Committee that the small grassed play area at the front of the building would meet with Ofsted requirements for the school. He explained that the timber fence would be to the sides of the property and metal fence to the front. In answer to a query from the Chairman, he confirmed that he would be happy to include climbing plants on the metal fence to soften the impact.

**RECOMEMMENDED APPROVAL** on condition that planting was provided to soften the impact of the front metal fence.

*(John Grana wished his vote against the passing of the above resolution be noted.)*

## **7. Planning Application: 08/03886/FUL**

Site Address:	16 Watercombe Lane Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (South)
Proposal :	The erection of a single storey rear extension to dwelling ( GR 353890/116101)
Recommending Case Officer:	Marianne Bareham
Target date :	24th October 2008
Applicant :	Mr P Latham
Type :	Other Householder - not a Change of Use

**RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

## **1. Planning Application: 07/05341/OUT - FOR INFORMATION**

Site Address:	Land South Of The A3088 Western Relief Road Yeovil
Ward :	COKER
Proposal :	Formation of road access and the development of land for B1 office and industrial use buildings. GR (353075/115103)
Recommending Case Officer:	Andrew Collins
Target date :	26th February 2008
Applicant :	Abbey Manor And Brympton Estate
Type :	Major Manfr f/space 1,000 sq.m or 1ha+

Jean Marshall explained to the Committee that a correction to the report was needed as it stated that County Highways had raised no objections, however they had just received significant information and had not sent any comments as yet. She explained that the application was for outline planning permission and location of buildings only. She summarised the application explaining that it was 20 hectare employment site with strategic landscaping, particularly in the area of land known as the "banana field" and along a straight line at the south side of the site to soften the impact on neighbouring sites. Due to the considerable sloping of the site a height plan had been submitted to ensure the buildings at the top of the site were suitable. This was particularly important as the development would be seen from Coker Ridge and the western side of Yeovil. It was explained that the proposal would be for a high quality B1 business park with a design code and philosophy of design throughout. It was added that there may be an ability to provide a Christmas or weekend park and ride facility and included within the design was a square for the Nippy bus to enter, turn around and egress.

The footpath and cycle ways would remain as existing and due to a number of badgers on the site, green corridors throughout the site had been maintained.

It was explained that a large area for drainage was located just off the site and that there was potentially an area of archaeological interest. English Heritage had previously raised an objection due to the proximity of the development to Brympton D'Evercy however, this had been removed following the proposals to provide planting on the "banana field". Significant amendments for vehicle movement to provide access to the site would be required with traffic modelling to Cartgate roundabout.

The Committee discussed the proposals and were generally supportive of the application. Some concern was raised regarding the impact on the road network as well as concern that the development would not be a habitable space for evenings as well as daytime.

Jean Marshall explained that whilst it was not designed to preclude other uses it was not anticipated that bars and restaurants would be included within the business use of the properties. Support was given to the areas of planting which had been designed to provide screening from neighbouring sites.

It was generally recognised that the development would potentially provide high quality employment opportunities and

**RESOLVED** that the proposals be supported.

7/297 **REPORT TABLE**

**RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** to the applications set out in the Report Table

7/298 **PLANNING DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED** that the matters be noted.

7/299 **CORRESPONDENCE**

The Assistant Town Clerk reported receipt of the following item of correspondence:-

- Notification of appeal decision in respect of application decision reference 08/00243/FUL. Location: 21 The Park, Yeovil, Somerset, BA20 1DG. Proposal: Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and the erection of 10 flats with associated parking. The appeal was **DISMISSED**.

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

7/300 **REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH WEST CONSULTATION**

The Committee considered the report by the Assistant Town Clerk. The supplementary agenda refers.

The Committee discussed the responses summarised by the District Council and felt that some relevant issues had not been included. Those issues are indicated in italics in the following resolution:-

**RESOLVED**

- (1) that the matter be noted;
- (2) that the response summarised by the District Council be supported with the addition of the following statements in italics; and

**Transport**

- The second strategic route was vital to South Somerset and the South West.
- Objections should be made to downgrading the A303/A358 in the strongest possible words.
- Years of study of the A303 had come to nothing.
- Proposed improvements to the A303 would be swept away leaving reliability of journey time only.
- Grading of Podimore and Cartgate roundabouts was essential
- East to west connectivity should be retained as well as north to south.

- A decision was needed on the whole A303 route, parts of the route could not be promoted without Stonehenge.
- None of the airfields in the district had been mentioned.
- It was important to reinstate rail improvements if roads were to be downgraded.
- *It is imperative that rail links are improved – including reinstating link from Sherborne and extending services to evenings*
- Accommodating housing would be difficult if transport links were poor.
- Businesses would not relocate to the region if there was a poor infrastructure.
- *Public transport is far from satisfactory and improvement needs to be made to bus services as well as rail links*
- *Improvements to roads required (quality and access across region)*

### **Housing**

- 8,300 houses to be built outside of Yeovil were acceptable.
- 11,400 dwellings for Yeovil was an unrealistic level of provision.
- *Current density levels set out in PPG3 too high for town centre of rural town*
- *Whilst it is understood that it is not part of spatial strategy consultation, parking is problematic with high level density and no off street parking provision – this impacts spatial strategy as it enforces the need for increase in dwellings to be supported by effective and realistic infrastructure*
- A figure of 16,600 new dwellings for the district was more realistic in reflecting growth rates.

There was a view that the reference to role and function under Policies B and C should be reinstated. The Portfolio Holder expressed his opinion that whilst desirable this was not necessary as it was an inevitable requirement of implementing these policies.

### **Employment**

- An allocation of employment land outside Yeovil was essential to balance the district.
- Balance was a key component of growth and would drive sustainability.

### **Infrastructure**

- The provision of waste disposal, water, and work were important to all housing developments.
- Deliverability of infrastructure in Yeovil was difficult especially in relation to house prices.
- *Concern was raised regarding displacement of water and decrease in green spaces which act as natural sponge to rainwater runoff. Within infrastructure – important to incorporate/retain green open spaces and have respect for areas which are prone to flooding*

## **Affordable Housing**

- The provision of 35% affordable housing was impossible in the current economic climate.
- The backlog had not yet been dealt with and work on the key sites not started.
- The target of 35% should be endorsed but concerns should be raised regarding deliverability.

## **Policy RE5**

- Flexibility and local discretion for local planning authorities should be included within Policy RE5.
- If a 20% reduction in emissions was to be the policy in the South West, there should be regional building regulations to reflect this.
- There was a strong case for large developments to consider renewables.
- Government should be lobbied to change building regulations to make a level playing field across the country.
- The confusion between renewables and energy efficiency should be clarified.
- The whole life of building a new house should be considered – from transport of materials to completion.

Members felt that local authorities should be able to apply renewable energy requirements to developments below the current identified threshold without having to await LDF justification and Government should be asked to recognise this in their revisions to policy RE5.

- (3) that the endorsement of the District Council comments with the addition of the comments in italics by the Planning and Licensing Committee be ratified using the Town Council's Emergency Procedure (Standing Order 51).

## **7/301 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr Mackay voiced his concern regarding the display of a notice for the meeting. He explained that the notice posted on the Town Council noticeboard stated that the Committee would be discussing all the items listed overleaf, however those items were not available on the noticeboard. He explained that whilst he was sure we had met our statutory duty to display the notice, he was unable to attend the Town House during opening hours and was therefore not aware of the contents of the meeting.

The Assistant Town Clerk was therefore asked to refer the matter to the Town Clerk requesting that a concise listing of the items to be discussed to be included with the notice on the agenda. The Assistant Town Clerk explained that it would be difficult to provide this for the agendas for all 5 committees but that the wording on the notice could be amended.

**RESOLVED**

that the matter be noted and amendment to the wording or provision of a concise list of items to be discussed be posted along with the notice for the meeting as appropriate.

Chairman

SB/JW  
24/10/08