

**WINCANTON TOWN COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF THE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON  
MONDAY 14<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2017 IN THE TOWN HALL**

---

**PRESENT:** Councillors Ellard (Chairman), Tudgay (Vic-Chairman), Walters, Fry, Hibberd, Galitzine, H Smith, Rodgers, D Smith, Cook, Hinks, McLarnon and Hearne

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

A non resident who has business interests in the Town asked to speak about the Brains Farm application. The Chairman invited him to speak. Mr Smith asked Council to defer making a decision on the Brains Farm application until after the presentation in Cucklington on Wednesday and to support our County Councillor in refusing the application.

0108

**APOLOGIES**

Councillors H Smith, D Smith, McLarnon, Hibberd and Old.

0109

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Cllr Cook declared an interest in the Christmas Decoration request.

0110

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Monday 24<sup>th</sup> July 2017 (0094-0107). On a proposal from Councillor Ellard, seconded by Councillor Rodgers, the minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman.

0111

**PLANNING**

**Applications recommended for approval**

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 17/02819/FUL | Erection of a single storey rear extension, Bramble Cottage, Common Road.<br>Proposed by Councillor Rodgers and seconded by Councillor Ellard. Vote: Unanimous                               |
| 17/02858/ADV | The display of 1 externally illuminated fascia sign and 1 non illuminated sign, Plot E4, Land of Dykes Way.<br>Proposed by Councillor Tudgay and seconded by Councillor Fry. Vote: Unanimous |

**Applications recommended for refusal**

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| 17/03063/FUL | Erection of a single storey and 2 storey extension, 38 Penn View. As per previous comments, the lack of privacy, loss of light and overbearing to the neighbouring property.<br>Proposed by Councillor Rodgers and seconded by Councillor Ellard. Vote: Unanimous   |
| 17/03257/CPO | Demolition of existing agricultural buildings and erection of a farm anaerobic digester plant for the processing of Agricultural manures, crops, crop residues and pasteurised food waste together with the change of use of agricultural dwelling (Use class C3) to plant office (Use Class B1), earthworks and bunding, technical plant, flood compensation, a new site access off Moor Lane, landscaping and ancillary infrastructure, Brains Farm, Moor Lane.<br>Proposed by Councillor Fry, seconded by Councillor Hearne. Vote: 9 for. Councillor Cook abstained from voting.<br>The reasons are attached to these minutes. |

**Applications approved by South Somerset District Council**

17/02804/FUL  
17/02775/TPO

The erection of a conservatory, 7 Blackmore Chase.  
Application to carry out tree surgery works to a sycamore tree, 1 Maple Lodge.

**0112 CHEQUE LIST**

On a proposal from Councillor Ellard and seconded by Councillor Hinks, the cheque list was approved. Councillors Hinks and Vagg will sign the cheques on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

**0113 CHRISTMAS DECORATION**

Council discussed the suggestion from Zac Greening regarding a Christmas installation at the roundabout entering the Town. Council agreed that as the roundabout is the responsibility of Somerset County Council and is sponsored by Crestmoor and Otter Nursery, Zac should contact them direct. On a proposal from Councillor Ellard, seconded by Councillor Rodgers, Council confirmed the precept for Christmas decorations in the Town has been allocated and no further funds are available. Vote: Unanimous.

**0114 TOWN CLERK REVIEW**

As per Standing Order 1C, Council voted to exclude the press and public whilst discussing this item. Councillor Fry abstained from voting.  
The Clerk informed Council she would leave the room whilst discussions took place.  
Council resolved unanimously to adopt the recommendation given by The Chairman and Deputy Chairman at the Town Clerks review. The Clerk will now be graded at spinal point 42.

The meeting ended at 7.50pm

Signed .....

Dated: 29<sup>th</sup> August 2017

1. The site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the applicant has attempted to justify the acceptability of the site in his submitted Sequential Test. However, his justification is predicated upon two factors that should not be relevant: firstly, that he controls no other suitable land within a 2.5 km radius of the gas grid connection point, and secondly, that land any further away from that connection point would make the project financially unviable. The Town Council contends that such evaluation criteria are irrelevant within the context of the Sequential Test. Consequently, **it is recommended that the application is refused on the grounds of inappropriate development within the flood plain.**
2. The Town Council note that the applicant has not held any public consultation events to describe the application to the population, despite being specifically requested so to do by the Chairman of the Town Council at the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at which the applicant's representative made a very brief presentation to the Town Council of the proposals. The applicant refers to this presentation within the Design and Access Statement and infers that public consultation has taken place. However, since the applicant's representative could not answer any questions put to him at the meeting, to suggest that this presentation constitutes a consultation event is disingenuous.
3. The Town Council notes that the applicant has reduced the proposed throughput of the facility from 69,000 tonnes per annum to 50,000 tonnes per annum, specifically and explicitly for the sole reason of trying to avoid the need to submit an Environmental Impact Statement with the application. This is regrettable and suggests that the applicant does not wish to provide appropriate information with which to evaluate the proposal.
4. The applicant refers to the need for this type of facility within Somerset but has not shown any assessment to back up this statement beyond stating that there are several pre-existing facilities in Somerset. Part of establishing the need for the development would be an assessment of waste arisings and their current means of treatment. This has not been addressed in the application. The Town Council considers that this is a significant omission and is extremely relevant to an assessment of whether or not it is reasonable to develop within Flood Zone 2 and 3.
5. The number of vehicle movements has been described in terms of the daily average as being acceptable, however, the applicants own traffic assessment shows significantly greater numbers of movements in some months. It is contended that the test of acceptability should be based upon the peak months when movements are double the average. The Town Council seeks assurance that the County Council's highways officers will undertake an appropriate assessment of the peak vehicular flows and that **should the Council be minded to grant planning permission, that any permission has a condition to limit daily vehicle movements to a level below that at which unacceptable impact might occur.**