

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SHEPTON MONTAGUE PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL, SHEPTON MONTAGUE ON MONDAY 4<sup>th</sup> MARCH  
2019 AT 7.30pm**

**Present:** Richard Ellis (chair), Richard Reed, Andrew Wiley, Janet Robinson, Margaret Hill (Clerk), Anna Groskop (County Councillor).

1. **Apologies for absence:** were received from Paul Williams and Tim Russell, P.C.S.O.
2. **Declarations of Interest:** Andrew Wiley declared an interest in item 5. A query was raised as to whether Richard Reed should declare an interest in this item. Richard stated that he had received apple waste in the past which was fed to his cattle but that he had no pecuniary interest.
3. **Minutes of last meeting:** were signed as a correct record.
4. **Matters Arising:**
  - **Drains from Welham along Cattle Hill:** Work on the drains has been completed.
  - **Planning application 18/03550/FUL Land opposite Southdown Farm:** Approved.
  - **Salt/grit:** This will be supplied for this winter (only) free of charge.

Andrew Wiley stepped down.

5. **Planning Application no. 19/00311//FUL Erection of agricultural building for the storage of agricultural machinery and equipment in connection with the agricultural unit, together with the storage and processing of apples into apple juice and cider. Land by Higher Shepton Road, Higher Shepton, Shepton Montague**

Janet Montgomery (JM), agent for the applicant, addressed the meeting by summarizing the main aspects of the proposal. She confirmed that this was for a building for agricultural use – storage of equipment and the processing of apples into apple juice and cider. She explained that the applicant processes other peoples' apples and it is this that takes the planning application outside Permitted Development Rights. She stated that this was the only reason the previous application was rejected and therefore the applicant had decided to apply for full planning permission. JM had been in discussion with planners and there was no issue with the siting of the building or its use.

The proposal is for a small business, limited to a maximum of 7,000 litres. She said that Mr. Dowding has no intention of producing more product than this. She then went on to clarify a couple of points that had been raised previously: The original plan submitted did not show the proposed access way in full. A new plan submitted and available at the meeting now shows the precise route of the trackway.

Lighting: she confirmed there will be no external lighting and that internal lighting does not require planning permission.

Containers and outside storage: JM said that Mr. Dowding appreciates neighbours' concerns and wants to find a solution. The solution is therefore the new building. When this is built the containers will be removed. She stated that

no enforcement action has been taken by SSDC and the containers can remain there.

She additionally stated that there was a tree belt and copse between the rear boundary of the site and the residential gardens. This, coupled with the low profile of the site means that the building will not be visible to residents.

The chair then invited comments from the floor and 5 local residents spoke against the application, listing their objections to the proposal and their concerns regarding the inaccuracies in the application and the lack of information supplied on various aspects of the proposal.

Members then considered their response and it was resolved to send the comments to Planning.

Of the three members present, one is in favour of this agricultural development within the village, one has strong objections to this proposal (included below) and the Chair is broadly in favour of the proposal but feels that the processing, bottling and storage activities would be better sited elsewhere and that the inaccuracy of the submission document left many concerns (see below).

None of the local residents present at the meeting spoke in favour of the proposal.

Objections and concerns included:

#### Containers

The Applicant agreed at a previous meeting that the containers he has positioned in breach of planning regulations were a separate issue from this application and their removal was not dependent on permission being granted for this building. He has now changed his position and it would appear the removal of the containers is entirely dependent on gaining planning permission for this building. In fact the information included with the application states that '*The need for the building has been manifested by the bringing onto the land of two shipping containers ..*'

This sets a very dangerous precedent for future planning applications and has led to the conclusion that assurances from the applicant cannot be relied upon.

Mr. Dowding's agent stated that in fact no formal enforcement action had been taken by Planning despite the Parish Council and local residents calling for removal of these eyesores and the attendant clutter on the site.

As stated in response to each of the earlier applications, the Parish Council would appreciate speedy enforcement action to facilitate their removal.

#### Other matters:

The very large size of the building is still of some concern. Mr Dowding previously offered to plant more trees to screen the building but Council requests that this is made a formal condition of any permission.

The single access track to the field and the proposed building goes behind four houses. The residents are concerned about traffic movements along this track behind their houses with attendant noise and disturbance. There is also considerable concern about noise from bottling and other activities within the building itself.

Mr Dowding previously confirmed that he will honour the agreement he entered into in 1994 when planning permission was granted (for the houses which back on to the proposed development), NOT to develop the surrounding fields for residential use. It would be helpful if this agreement was reiterated/confirmed in any future permissions.

There are no facilities for anyone working in the building (e.g. toilet/hand washing)

As the applicant will be bringing in the majority of the apples to be processed and stored, this building does not have to be on this land and could just as easily be sited other than in this green field.

Inaccuracies/lack of clarity in the information submitted to Planning:

There are no 'portacabins' on the site, only metal shipping containers. These are clearly visible at the end of the residents' gardens.

The application refers to 'an existing layer of hardcore' on which the building will sit. This is only 'existing' because the applicant has put it there in anticipation of the building on what was formerly a green field.

The application refers to a 'substantial and mature landscaping belt' but this is in fact a row of small deciduous trees which, unfortunately, will provide little screening in winter.

There is no information provided as to the amount of future traffic anticipated on the access track and there are concerns as to its suitability and safety, exiting as it does at the crossroads by the pub.

There is a lack of detail concerning arrangements for water or waste run off and the removal of waste from the site.

There is very little information about the processing and bottling processes to be carried out in the building and their scope, or the machinery being used, and the proposed times of operation, yet this will have impact in terms of noise, effluent and waste and on the amenity of the houses that border the field.

Andrew Wiley re-joined the meeting.

**6. Planning Application no. 19/00294/HOU Erection of two storey side extension to dwelling and single store extension and new roof to rear of dwelling. 1 Quarry Close, Red Roses, Stoney Stoke, BA9 8HR.**

It was resolved to send the following comment to Planning:  
Council has no objections to this proposal.

**7. Planning Application no. 19/00423/FUL Rear extension (Revised application 18/01425/FUL. Trendle, Stoke Hill, Stoney Stoke, BA9 8HY**

It was resolved to send the following comment to Planning:  
Council has no objections to this proposal.

**8. Finance: Clerk's pay for 2018-19.** A cheque was signed for the Parish Clerk in the sum of £495.

**9. Correspondence:**

- The clerk had received a planning application from Emily Estates relating to Welham Farm so another meeting would be needed soon to consider this. She advised that this proposal does not form part of the visitor attraction and will not be open to the public, but is for an archive.

- The clerk advised that there would be local council elections on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Anyone wishing to stand for the Parish Council would need to complete nomination forms – available from the clerk – which need to be returned by hand to SSDC by 4pm on 3<sup>rd</sup> April.
- Tim Russell, P.C.S.O. had supplied a crime report for Jan/Feb which shows that no crimes were recorded. Only 2 crimes were recorded in the Parish in the last 12 months.

#### **10. A.O.B.**

- The clerk was requested to chase up Tim Russell regarding using the speed gun to catch motorists speeding through the village.
- Anna Groskop reported that more money had been made available from Central Government so that the County Council could balance its books.
- John Sykes offered to spruce up the main village noticeboard which is looking somewhat worn. This offer was gratefully accepted.

#### **11. Open discussion**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.30 pm.

Chairman \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_