

## Planning Committee

You are requested to attend a meeting of the Planning Committee to be held in The John Meikle Room, The Deane House, Belvedere Road, Taunton on 19 July 2017 at 17:00.

---

### Agenda

- 1 Apologies.
- 2 Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 21 June 2017 (attached).
- 3 Public Question Time.
- 4 Declaration of Interests  
To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, in accordance with the Code of Conduct.
- 5 48/14/0001 Application for the amendment of schedule 1 and clause 1.1 of the section 106 agreement for Planning Application 48/05/0072 requiring 25% of the housing shall be affordable and not 35% concerning land at Monkton Heathfield.
- 6 38/16/0227 Change of use of land from siting of agricultural workers accommodation to siting of holiday accommodation on land to the north of Cutcliffe Farm, Sherford.
- 7 24/17/0007 Conversion of barn to dwelling at Garnseys Farm, Knapp, North Curry
- 8 Latest appeals and decisions received

Bruce Lang  
Assistant Chief Executive

14 October 2017

Members of the public are welcome to attend the meeting and listen to the discussions.

There is time set aside at the beginning of most meetings to allow the public to ask questions.

Speaking under "Public Question Time" is limited to 4 minutes per person in an overall period of 15 minutes. The Committee Administrator will keep a close watch on the time and the Chairman will be responsible for ensuring the time permitted does not overrun. The speaker will be allowed to address the Committee once only and will not be allowed to participate further in any debate.

Except at meetings of Full Council, where public participation will be restricted to Public Question Time only, if a member of the public wishes to address the Committee on any matter appearing on the agenda, the Chairman will normally permit this to occur when that item is reached and before the Councillors begin to debate the item.

This is more usual at meetings of the Council's Planning Committee and details of the "rules" which apply at these meetings can be found in the leaflet "Having Your Say on Planning Applications". A copy can be obtained free of charge from the Planning Reception Desk at The Deane House or by contacting the telephone number or e-mail address below.

If an item on the agenda is contentious, with a large number of people attending the meeting, a representative should be nominated to present the views of a group.

These arrangements do not apply to exempt (confidential) items on the agenda where any members of the press or public present will be asked to leave the Committee Room.

Full Council, Executive, Committees and Task and Finish Review agendas, reports and minutes are available on our website: [www.tauntondeane.gov.uk](http://www.tauntondeane.gov.uk)



Lift access to the John Meikle Room and the other Committee Rooms on the first floor of The Deane House, is available from the main ground floor entrance. Toilet facilities, with wheelchair access, are also available off the landing directly outside the Committee Rooms.



An induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter.

**For further information about the meeting, please contact the Corporate Support Unit on 01823 356414 or email [r.bryant@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:r.bryant@tauntondeane.gov.uk)**

If you would like an agenda, a report or the minutes of a meeting translated into another language or into Braille, large print, audio tape or CD, please telephone us on 01823 356356 or email: [enquiries@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

**Planning Committee Members:-**

Councillor R Bowrah, BEM (Chairman)  
Councillor M Hill (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillor J Adkins  
Councillor M Adkins  
Councillor C Booth  
Councillor W Brown  
Councillor J Gage  
Councillor C Hill  
Councillor S Martin-Scott  
Councillor I Morrell, BA LLB  
Councillor S Nicholls  
Councillor J Reed  
Councillor N Townsend  
Councillor P Watson  
Councillor D Wedderkopp

## **Planning Committee – 21 June 2017**

Present: - Councillor Bowrah (Chairman)  
Councillor Mrs Hill (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Booth, Brown, Hall, C Hill, Morrell, Nicholls, Mrs Reed,  
Sully, Watson, Wedderkopp and Wren

Officers: - Matthew Bale (Area Planning Manager), Gareth Clifford (Principal Planning Officer), Ian Timms (Assistant Director - Business and Development), Brendan Cleere (Director - Growth and Development), Martin Evans (Solicitor, Shape Partnership Services) and Tracey Meadows (Democratic Services Officer)

Also present: Councillors Berry, Habgood. Councillor Horsley for application 38/16/0357 and Mrs A Elder, Chairman of the Standards Advisory Committee.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm)

### **33. Apologies/Substitutions**

Apologies: Councillors Mrs Adkins, M Adkins, Gage, Martin-Scott and Townsend

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

### **34. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 24 May 2017 were taken read and were signed.

### **35. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Mrs Hill declared personal interests as a trustee to Hestercombe House and Gardens, a trustee to the Somerset Building Preservation Trust and as a Director of Apple FM. Councillor Nicholls declared a personal interest as a member of the Fire Brigade Union. Councillor Wren declared a personal interest as he was Clerk to Milverton Parish Council. All Councillors stated that they had received correspondences regarding application Nos. 25/17/0002 and 38/16/0357. They declared that they had not 'fettered their discretion'.

### **36. 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:-

**48/17/0025**

**Erection of stage 2 of a steel framed agricultural building for the housing of livestock at Quantock Farm, West Monkton (retention of part works already undertaken)**

- (a) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission;
- (b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-
- Proposed New Steel framed Cubical Building for Dairy Cows (Stage 2) and Site Location Plan, dated 20 April 2017;

An earth mound shall be constructed and maintained in the location shown on the submitted plan to a height of not less than 2 m in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and shall be provided within three months of the commencement of any part of the development.

(Note to applicant:- Applicant was advised 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) That the following application **be deferred** for the reasons stated:-

**25/17/0002**

**Demolition of buildings and redevelopment of petrol filling station to include the erection of a sales building, replacement of underground tanks, installation of 4 No. pump islands, erection of canopy with 2 No. jet wash bays, alterations to the forecourt, car parking, soft landscaping and boundary treatments at Cross Keys Car Sales, Norton Fitzwarren**

**Reasons**

- Highway issues;
- Environment Agency objection;
- Opening hours; and
- External lighting;

- 37. Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved for the demolition of the swimming pool and erection of a mixed use development comprising of retail, commercial, restaurant, residential, car parking and**

**associated public realm on land at Coal Orchard, Taunton (38/16/0357)**

Reported this application.

**Resolved** that subject to a legal agreement to secure a turning head, an improved footway and the Travel Plan being concluded, the Assistant Director – Planning and Environment be authorised to determine the application in consultation with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and, if outline planning permission was granted, the following conditions be imposed:-

- (a) Approval of the details of the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping of the site (hereinafter called “the reserved matters”) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun, not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved;

- (b) None of the dwellings shall be occupied until the drainage works for the site have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and completed in accordance with the details approved;
- (c) No wall construction shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out and thereafter retained as such, in accordance with the approved details as above;
- (d) No demolition of the Bicycle Chain building shall commence until a bat emergence and dawn survey report has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The survey(s) shall ascertain the usage of the site by bats. They shall be undertaken by an appropriately qualified person at an appropriate time of year (May to September) and use techniques and equipment appropriate to the circumstances;
- (e) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of a strategy to protect wildlife has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be based on the advice of Grass Roots submitted report, dated April 2016 and up to date bat surveys and include:-

- (1) Details of protective measures to include method statements to avoid impacts on protected species during all stages of development;
- (2) Details of the timing of works to avoid periods of work when the species could be harmed by disturbance;

- (3) Measures for the retention and replacement and enhancement of places of rest for the species; and
- (4) Details of any lighting.

Once approved the works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the works unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the resting places and agreed accesses for wildlife shall be permanently maintained. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme for the maintenance and provision of new bat and bird boxes and related accesses have been fully implemented;

- (f) The uses, floor areas and storey heights shall not exceed those illustrated on drawings LL-255-201, 202 and 203;
- (g) No new construction shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of the agreed programme of archaeological work in accordance with the written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out at all times in accordance with the agreed scheme or some other scheme that may otherwise be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and any finds shall be recorded and reported;
- (h) Details of the new footway shall be provided and there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 300 mm above adjoining road level in advance of lines drawn 2.4 m back from the carriageway edge on the centre line of the access and extending to points on the nearside carriageway edge 33 m either side of the access or as agreed if less. Such visibility shall be fully provided before the development hereby permitted is brought into use and shall thereafter be maintained at all times;
- (i) No new construction work shall commence on the development hereby permitted until details of the access junction with an appropriate turning head linking to the adopted highway has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The access shall then be fully constructed in accordance with the approved plan, to an agreed specification before the new car park and residential development is first brought into use;
- (j) Replacement space for the use of the Doctor's Surgery shall be provided prior to the demolition of the Bicycle Chain building;
- (k) An electrical vehicle charging point shall be provided within the public car park prior to the occupation of the 20th residential unit;
- (l) The development shall provide for covered and secure cycle storage facilities, details of which shall be submitted as part of the reserved matters condition above. Such facilities shall be provided prior to the

occupation of any dwelling to which it relates and shall thereafter be retained for those purposes;

(m) The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated July 2016 Hydrock ref: R/C161148/001.02, and the overland plans dated 13 March 2017, and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:-

- (1) No residential dwelling below 15.62 m AOD;
- (2) Provide flood resilience to the ground floor of the building;
- (3) Provide floodplain compensation storage for the building located in Flood Zone 3; and
- (4) No interruption to the overland flood route;

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority;

(n) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an amendment to the remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with;

(o) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the prevention of pollution during the construction phase has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should include details of the following:-

- (i) Site security;
- (ii) Fuel oil storage, bunding, delivery and use;
- (iii) How both minor and major spillage will be dealt with;
- (iv) Containment of silt/soil contaminated run-off;
- (v) Disposal of contaminated drainage, including water pumped from excavations; and
- (vi) Site induction for workforce highlighting pollution prevention and awareness.

Invitation for tenders for sub-contracted works must include a requirement for details of how the above will be implemented;

(p) Details of surfacing materials of the public realm, car park and delineation of parking spaces shall be submitted to, and approved in writing and thereafter carried out as agreed prior to occupation of any commercial units.



(Notes to Applicant:- (1) Applicant was advised 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 with the applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission; (2) Applicant was advised that the condition relating to wildlife requires the submission of information to protect the species. The Local Planning Authority will expect to see a detailed method statement clearly stating how the wildlife will be protected through the development process and to be provided with a mitigation proposal that will maintain a favourable status for the wildlife that are affected by this development proposal; It should be noted that the protection afforded to species under UK and EU legislation is irrespective of the planning system and the developer should ensure that any activity they undertake on the application site (regardless of the need for planning consent) must comply with the appropriate wildlife legislation. Most resident nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).)

### **38. Appeals**

Reported that three new appeals had been received details of which were submitted.

**Resolved** that the report be noted.

(The meeting ended at 8.04 pm)

## **Declaration of Interests**

### **Planning Committee**

- Vice-Chairman to Kingston St Mary Parish Council and Chairman to Kingston St Mary Village Hall Association – Councillor Townsend
- Trustee to Bishop Fox's Educational Foundation, Trustee to Trull Memorial Hall – Councillor Stephen Martin-Scott
- Councillor to Comeytrove Parish Council, Member of the Fire Brigade Union – Councillor Simon Nicholls
- Trustee of Hestercombe House and Gardens, Trustee of the Somerset Building Preservation Trust, Director of Apple FM – Councillor Marcia Hill

## Miscellaneous report

### Part 1

#### **48/14/0001 APPLICATION FOR THE AMENDMENT OF SCHEDULE 1 AND CLAUSE 1.1 OF THE SECTION 106 AGREEMENT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION 48/05/0072 REQUIRING 25% OF THE HOUSING SHALL BE AFFORDABLE AND NOT 35% CONCERNING LAND AT MONKTON HEATHFIELD**

Persimmon/Redrow Consortium Variation of S106BA

In January 2015 Members resolved to agree to grant permission for the S106 (BA) Variation at Monkton Heathfield (phase 1) in affordable housing levels from 35% to 25% subject to a suitable mechanism being established to ensure the funding for provision of the Western Relief Road in a timely manner.

Taunton Deane Borough Council commissioned an independent viability report (2014) which concluded that the scheme granted planning permission under 48/05/0072 was unviable, taking into account the need for the provision of the Western Relief Road.

The Housing Enabling Officer was involved in the process and accepted the principle of the reduction in this case given the long term benefits to the continued delivery of affordable housing for this site and the future core strategy site.

In reality the money released from the reduction in affordable housing will cover the purchase of the outstanding section of land from third party landowners and does not provide for the estimated construction costs for the road itself.

The mechanism, to ensure the delivery of the WRR (as referred to in the cttee recommendation), was agreed in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by all parties whereby the approval for the reduction in affordable housing would be issued when contracts were let thus providing TDBC with some confidence that the road construction would indeed proceed.

Following the signing of the MOU there has been significant progress in the project. The Consortium have been collaborating with SCC and have funded all the detailed design work that SCC have undertaken to enable the construction of the road to commence and this detailed work is now awaiting its final audit by SCC before implementation.

In order to purchase the remaining WRR land the consortium have entered into an agreement with the landowner at a beneficial rate and this will expire during August. In order to proceed with the land purchase the Consortium urgently need to release the funds resulting from the reduction of affordable housing prior to purchase i.e. upon purchase of the land rather than contracts let.

Given the degree of collaboration between the consortium and the SCC there is now a greater degree of confidence that, once the land is bought, the consortium will in fact commence the construction of the road and I therefore seek authorisation from

this committee for the approval of the reduction in the affordable housing to be granted on land purchase.

This said, there is still clearly a risk that the Consortium could use the funds released from the reduction of affordable housing to purchase the land, but then not deliver the road. Members may therefore wish to consider whether a further clause be applied requiring the land to be transferred to the Highways Authority after a reasonable period should the road not be delivered in line with the funding cascade in the MOU.

### **Recommendation**

**To delegate the decision to adjust the level of affordable housing from 35% - 25% to the Assistant Director Planning and Environment upon the receipt of evidence confirming the transfer of the remaining WRR land to the applicant.**

### **Part 2**

**48/15/0053**

### **ERECTION OF LOCAL CENTRE INCLUDING 5 No RETAIL UNITS WITH 18 No APARTMENTS ABOVE PLUS 69 No DWELLINGS, WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS AND ACCESS INCLUDING HIGHWAY WORKS TO THE ADJACENT A38 ON LAND OFF BRIDGWATER ROAD, MONKTON HEATHFIELD**

The Memorandum of Understanding which sets out the mechanism for the delivery of the road included a cascade for the release of additional funds in the event that the total road costs exceeded the total funds available. Now that the detailed design of the road has been progressed, as stated above, it is clear that significant additional funds will be required to cover the cost of the construction of the road. Given viability issues associated with the development and the need to secure the monies as soon as possible it is considered advisable that those additional funds are best generated from the development itself. Whilst the agreed cascade allows for this in principle, the detailed planning permission, 48/15/0053 does not.

In August 2016 Planning Committee granted full permission for the local centre parcel of land at Monkton Heathfield. The proposal took the total number of dwellings within the Consortium land above the 900 covered by the original outline and so required a full permission. The application provided for 25% affordable dwellings (8 shared ownership and 12 social rent) as required by the Core Strategy, and also the payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy. Whilst works have started on site there is still an option to vary or remove all or part of the agreed affordable housing in order to release additional funds as required for the road construction works.

The western relief road is essential for the delivery of the infrastructure necessary to cater for the traffic generated by the current permitted development and will enable the future delivery of the 2 – 3000 additional dwellings (plus employment, district centre new schools etc.), 25% of which (500 – 750) will be additional affordable housing. With this aim in mind it is considered vital that the funds are made available

and in a time scale to enable the construction works to start on the WRR, later this year.

**Recommendation: To delegate the decision to vary the s106 obligation relating to the quantum of affordable housing associated with planning permission no: 48/15/0053 to the Assistant Director Planning and Environment based upon the need to release money from the scheme to contribute towards the construction of the Western Relief Road.**

Reporting Officers:

Tim Burton Assistant Director Planning and Environment

Julie Moore Monkton Heathfield Project Team Leader

38/16/0227

## KIBBEAR FARM HOLIDAYS

**Change of use of land from siting of agricultural workers accommodation to siting of holiday accommodation on land to the north of Cutliffe Farm, Sherford.**

Location: CUTLIFFE FARM, SHERFORD ROAD, TAUNTON, TA1 3RQ

Grid Reference: 322948.123002

Full Planning Permission

---

## Recommendation

**Recommended decision: Conditional Approval**

### Recommended Conditions (if applicable)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

(A3) DrNo 41209/24 Site - Location Plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The proposed use hereby approved shall not commence until the new access to Cutliffe Farm (as required by Condition 18 attached to planning permission 38/12/0203) has been provided in accordance with that planning permission. Should the access cease to be available, the use of the site hereby permitted shall cease and shall only resume once the access has been made available once more.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

4. The mobile homes/caravans shall be occupied for holiday purposes only and shall be limited to 13 in number, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The mobile homes/caravans shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main residence.

The site operator or owner shall maintain an up to date register of the names

of all owners/occupiers of individual mobile homes/caravans on the site and of their main home addresses, and the duration of their stay and shall make this information available at all reasonable time to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent permanent occupation that would be contrary to countryside policies as set out in with paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Notes to Applicant

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way with the applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission.
2. You are advised of the need to access the site from the new access off Killams Drive.

## Summary

This application was deferred by the Planning Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> April for the following reasons:

- To clarify the status/lawfulness of the existing caravans;
- Whether access from the site to Sherford Road/Mountfields Road could be prevented;
- To seek comments from Economic Development;
- Confirmation of the size of the site and whether 13 vans could legally be stationed on the site for holiday purposes;
- Provision of photographs/visual assessment from the surrounding area (mid-distance views);
- Clarification of facilities for ablutions/the need for further drainage/infrastructure; and
- Licensing to be informed of the concerns of Members over the proximity of caravans/lack of facilities.

## Proposal

Cutcliffe Farm is situated in the open countryside, just outside of Taunton and accessed from Sherford Road and Mountfields Road. The site is a well-established farm consisting of a large number of buildings, mainly modern with some of traditional style. Part of the farm business operates as a fruit farm reliant on seasonal workers.

Planning permission is sought for a change of use of land from agricultural workers

accommodation to holiday accommodation. It is proposed that the holiday accommodation would amount to the same floorspace as the existing units, with the existing units either refurbished or replaced. It will provide employment for 3 part-time staff.

A Highways Technical Note has subsequently been submitted by the applicant in response to the initial objection from the County Council Transport team.

The agent has also provided a further letter in response to the Committee's reasons for deferral, which is summarised as follows:

- The units are currently partly occupied and are available for seasonal workers if and when required;
- The new access through Killam's is long desired by the applicant, who will direct traffic to/from the site to the new access through advertising and booking material;
- The applicant is prepared not to bring the site into use until the Killam's link is available;
- It is not practical to close Mountfield Road as it is used by others including the Wyvern Club;
- The site is just over 1 acre in area and can readily accommodate 13 vans;
- There is mains water and electricity on site. There is drainage to an existing septic tank and soakaway system. The number of units and occupancy levels are not set to increase so there should be no need for further drainage infrastructure.

## **Site Description**

The application site is a roughly rectangular field located to the north east of the main farm buildings. There are 13 mobile homes and a cabin on site and a car parking area in the north west corner. Access to the farm is gained via a private drive which is served off Sherford Road. The site is well screened to the west and north by trees and hedgerows.

A network of public footpaths pass in close proximity to the farm, but do not pass through the farmyard itself. The farm lies to the north of Cotlake Hill, a designated Special Landscape Feature. The site lies within the Vivary Green Wedge.

## **Relevant Planning History**

38/11/0687 – Erection of annexe to the accommodation block to accommodate seasonal farmworkers. Permission granted July 2012. This extension has been built and provides living accommodation for 8 seasonal workers on the fruit farm.

Various permissions have been granted in recent years for new farm buildings.

## **Consultation Responses**

*ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT* - Enterprise in rural areas, particularly in the tourism



(holiday accommodation) sector, is vital to the growth of Taunton Deane's economy, supporting a high proportion of local jobs both directly and indirectly. I am therefore happy to support this application.

*ENVIRONMENT AGENCY* - No comments received.

*SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP* - (Original Comments) The applicant has not provided a clear indication on which route they plan for the proposed traffic to utilise to and from the application. However, it is apparent that both Sherford Road and Mountfield Road are narrow in their nature. It is the opinion of the Highway Authority that the proposal would likely result in an increase of traffic movements along both roads which would have a detrimental impact on the existing highway network. Taking this into account, I would recommend that this application be refused on highway grounds for the following reason:

1. The approach roads by reason of their restricted width and poor alignment are considered unsuitable to serve as a means of access for the type of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane District Core Strategy (adopted 2011).

*SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP* (Further Comments) - Having received and reviewed the Technical Note from Bellamy Transport Consultancy, I would refer you to my letter dated 26 September 2016 in connection with this planning application (a copy of which is attached for your information). I consider that these comments apply equally to the present application.

The main concern that the Highway Authority had with the application for Cutliffe Farm was the approach roads being narrow in their nature, the increase of vehicle movements and the potential conflicting vehicle movements along the narrow approach roads with the existing vehicle movements would represent a highway safety concern.

*SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP* (Final Comments) - The Highway Authority would not raise an objection to the suggested Grampian condition being attached to the planning consent for Cutliffe Farm. However, the access would have to be constructed to an appropriate standard and there should not be any conflicting traffic movements between the vehicles that are going to use Cutliffe Farm and the construction traffic that the 38/12/0203 application generates before the Cutliffe Farm site is first brought into use.

## **Representations Received**

Councillor Herbert has written in to reiterate and support the concerns of the local residents.

Nine objections from local residents have been received and a letter from the Wilton & Sherford Community Association. The main issues raised are summarised below:

- The proposal will result in a significant number of car additional journeys on a narrow and bendy road;
- The lack of footways for pedestrians and blind bends will increase traffic hazards;
- The road is already plagued by heavy farm traffic;
- The area is prone to flooding;
- The proposed holiday lets will be in addition to the seasonal workers so there will be an increase in traffic;
- There is no information on how many months of the year that the holiday lets will be occupied;
- Visual impact on the Vivary green wedge;
- The economic benefit of 1.5 FTE jobs is insignificant compared to the impact on the environment;
- What happens to the existing seasonal workers?
- Could a new access via Mountfields/South Road be utilised?

Six further objections were submitted in response to the Highways Technical Note as summarised below;

- It is not agreed that the existing traffic is light as heavy farm machinery use Sherford Road.
- There are few opportunities to pass on the road;
- The access routes described in the note are footpaths and not primary dry walking routes;
- It would be better to build a new road to serve the farm;
- The new accommodation block approved in 2012 is not being occupied by seasonal workers;
- Whilst the new accommodation is now occupied, the caravans have not been removed from the land even though this was implied in the officer's report.
- There is no guarantee that traffic to and from the caravan park will use the new access through the Killams development. This new access is on the opposite side of the farm complex and will entail traffic driving across a working farm;
- A robust and enforceable condition is required that ensures that no additional traffic from the farm and its subsidiary developments uses Sherford Road;
- A traffic census would identify the frequency of non-agricultural use of Sherford Road.

## **Planning Policy Context**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan for Taunton Deane comprises the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012), the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016), the Taunton Town Centre Area Action Plan (2008), Somerset Minerals Local Plan (2015), and Somerset Waste Core Strategy (2013).

Relevant policies of the development plan are listed below.

SD1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development,  
CP6 - Transport and accessibility,

CP8 - Environment,  
SP4 - Realising the vision for rural areas,  
CP1 - Climate change,  
DM2 - Development in the countryside,  
SB1 - Settlement boundaries,  
ENV3 - Special Landscape Features,

This takes into account the recent adoption of the SADMP.

## **Determining issues and considerations**

### **The Principle of the Proposed Use**

The application site has been used for the siting of caravans for seasonal agricultural workers for a number of years. The use of land for the stationing of caravans for seasonal agricultural workers benefits from permitted development rights. However, this is on the proviso that the caravans are removed from the land when the seasonal workers are no longer required. Historically, the seasonal workers on the farm have been used for picking soft fruit during the summer period. The caravans have remained in situ for a number of years and have not been removed after the end of the fruit picking season. It is now apparent that some of the units are occupied, but not by seasonal workers. This means that the existing use of the land for the stationing of caravans/mobile homes for general residential occupancy (non-seasonal workers) is not lawful.

Accordingly, the application has to be considered as a fresh application for the use of the land for holiday accommodation. The site is located within the open countryside and should be assessed against Core Strategy Policies CP8 and DM2. Policy DM2 supports accommodation within existing buildings where it supports farm diversification and also supports caravan and camping sites provided that there is good access to the main road network. This proposal does not strictly comply with either of these parts of the policy as it is not a conversion of existing buildings and the caravans are static, permanent structures. That said, the proposal would support the diversification of the existing farming enterprise and, on balance, it is considered to be acceptable in principle.

### **Visual Impact**

The proposed site for holiday use is located to the north east of the existing farm complex. A visual assessment of the site from mid-distance views has been carried out by officers. Photographs have been taken from the public footpath to the north of the site (linking Sherford Road with Mountfield Road) and from the footpath to the west which ascends to Cotlake Hill. The site is well screened from near and mid-distant views by extensive hedging. The site is not visible from Cotlake Hill to the south as it is hidden behind the existing farm buildings. The existing mobile homes cannot be seen from the footpath to the west due to screening. Glimpses of the site through small gaps in the field hedge can be seen from the public footpath to the north of the site. However, the visual impact is insignificant.

In visual impact terms, there is little difference between caravans occupied by seasonal workers and caravans for holiday accommodation. The application is

seeking merely to establish the use of the land for holiday accommodation, with no increase in the number of caravans that have been positioned on the site for a number of years, albeit recently without planning permission. Consequently there would be little difference in landscape impact of the proposal. Any operational development on the site, such as the replacing the caravans with more permanent structures, will require planning permission. It is considered appropriate to impose a condition that limits the number of caravans, in order to safeguard the visual amenity of the area.

## **Highway Safety**

Access to the site is gained by a long private drive which connects to Sherford Road to the north west and Mountfield Road to the south west. Both of these roads are narrow with few passing places. These roads are heavily trafficked by both local traffic and heavy farm vehicles. A number of local residents have raised concerns about the suitability of the access and the likely intensification of use. County Highways also initially raised an objection to the proposal on the basis that the increase traffic and potential conflicting vehicle movements would represent a highway safety concern.

Members will be aware that a new housing development is being constructed on land at Killams Drive and Avenue. Planning permission was granted in December 2013 subject to a number of conditions including a requirement for a new access to Cutliffe Farm to be provided. Condition 18 states:

*“The new access to Cutliffe Farm shall be provided and capable of use prior to the occupation of the 50th dwelling within the first phase of development and shall thereafter be maintained as such.*

*Reason: The benefits to existing residents of Mountfields Road in terms of highway safety from the provision of the new agricultural access weigh in favour of the development and it should be provided at an early stage in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.”*

In discussions with County Highways, it is considered that the highway objection could be overcome by imposing a Grampian condition on any planning permission. This would prevent the use of the application site as holiday accommodation until the new access to Cutliffe Farm has been carried out satisfactorily. The applicant has indicated that they will use best endeavours to encourage visitors to the site to use the new main access road. It would not be reasonable in planning terms to insist on the closure of Sherford and Mountfields, particularly as the proposed use would not commence until the new access road is provided.

## **Conclusions**

The principle of the proposed holiday use is considered acceptable subject to conditions limiting the number of units and the satisfactory provision of a new access to the main farm complex.

In preparing this report the planning officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.

**Contact Officer: Ms A Penn**

24/17/0007

MR & MRS M DYKE

## **Conversion of barn to dwelling at Garnseys Farm, Knapp, North Curry**

Location: GARNSEY FARM, LOWER KNAPP LANE, KNAPP NORTH CURRY,  
TAUNTON, TA3 6BQ

Grid Reference: 330569.125533

Full Planning Permission

---

## **Recommendation**

### **Recommended decision: Refusal**

- 1 The proposed dwelling would be sited in an area of open countryside, distant from any well serviced settlement. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate whether there is a demand for the building to be used for other uses set out in the sequential approach of Policy DM2 (7.b). Furthermore, the building is not of any architectural merit worthy of retention that may have been an exceptional reason to convert if the sequential test was passed. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Taunton Deane Core Strategy Policies DM2 (7.b) and would result in a residential unit of accommodation in an unsustainable area of open countryside contrary to the aims of Core Strategy Policy SP1.

### **Recommended Conditions (if applicable)**

#### Notes to Applicant

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way with the applicant and has looked for solutions to enable the grant of planning permission. However in this case the applicant was unable to satisfy the key policy test and as such the application has been refused.

## **Proposal**

Conversion of barn to dwelling, use of land as domestic curtilage with two parking spaces.

Minimal alterations are proposed to the single storey building as previous works have changed the exterior of the building, infilling openings and inserting windows.

The proposed dwelling will accommodate two bedrooms.

## **Site Description**

The site lies within the hamlet of Knapp, outside of defined settlement limits. The building is sited next to agricultural buildings but within close proximity of residential dwellings.

## Relevant Planning History

24/15/0033/CQ - Prior approval for proposed change of use from agricultural building to dwelling house. Application was refused for the following reason: -

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development is not permitted development as it does not comply with the limitations or restrictions set out in Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q, paragraph Q.1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 in that;  
(a) the site was not used solely for an agricultural use, as part of an established agricultural unit on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013.

The above refusal reason was upheld by an appeal decision.

## Consultation Responses

### *NORTH CURRY PARISH COUNCIL -*

The Parish Council is aware that the Government has changed legislation in recent years to enable barn conversions and considers this to be a perfect example of a suitable barn for residential use.

*SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP -* See Standing Advice.

### *BIODIVERSITY -*

Bat Survey carried out in 2015- No evidence of bats using the barn, some low potential for crevice dwelling bats. Limited nesting habitat for birds. No birds recorded during survey, although evidence of nesting birds.  
Recommendations and mitigation to be a condition.

*LANDSCAPE -* Minimum landscape impact.

### *SOMERSET WILDLIFE TRUST -*

Fully support recommendations for enhancements for birds and support the proposals in respect of landscape and planting scheme.

## Representations Received

Ten letters of support: -

- No adverse effect on any neighbouring properties.
- No adverse effect on local landscape.
- Minimal construction work required.
- Existing road access will be used.
- Will allow family to continue farming.

One letter of support from Ward Councillor: -

- Type of redundant farm building that should be converted to a home.
- Construction typical and in keeping with Knapp; renovation will enhance character.
- No highway problems.
- No good reason why previous appeal (24/15/0033/CQ) and appeal were refused.
- Support from local residents and Parish Council.
- Conversion will allow other members of family to move to Knapp and ensure existing farm is able to continue to operate.

## Planning Policy Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan for Taunton Deane comprises the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012), the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016), the Taunton Town Centre Area Action Plan (2008), Somerset Minerals Local Plan (2015), and Somerset Waste Core Strategy (2013).

Relevant policies of the development plan are listed below.

DM1 - General requirements,  
 DM2 - Development in the countryside,  
 CP8 - Environment,  
 SP1 - Sustainable development locations,

This takes into account the recent adoption of the SADMP.

## Local finance considerations

### Community Infrastructure Levy

The application is for residential development outside the settlement limits of Taunton and Wellington where the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is £125 per square metre. Based on current rates, the CIL receipt for this development is approximately £10,500.00. With index linking this increases to approximately £13,000.00.

### New Homes Bonus

The development of this site would result in payment to the Council of the New Homes Bonus.

#### *1 Year Payment*

Taunton Deane Borough	£1,079
Somerset County Council	£270

## *6 Year Payment*

Taunton Deane Borough  
Somerset County Council

£6,474  
£1,619

## **Determining issues and considerations**

The proposed building to be converted is sited outside of any defined settlement within the countryside, as such, Policy DM2 (Development in the Countryside) of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy is relevant. Part 7(b) of Policy DM2 allows the conversion of existing buildings and follows a sequential approach; i. Community Uses; ii. Class B business uses; iii. Other employment generating uses; iv. Holiday and tourism; v. Affordable, farm or forestry dwellings; Vi. Community housing; Vii In exceptional circumstances, conversion to other residential use.

There has been no supporting information submitted to show that the other uses laid out within the sequential approach have been investigated and as to why they are not acceptable in each case before looking at a residential use. Furthermore, even if a supporting document had been submitted there does not seem to be an exceptional circumstance that would warrant the granting of residential use.

The building has been altered and has the appearance of a modern bungalow, this itself would not give justification for allowing the conversion to residential use; para 6.16 of the Core Strategy sets out that ' Residential uses will only be acceptable if the building is of particular architectural merit, worthy of retention and demonstrably unsuitable for all other listed uses'. This building did not comply with Class Q and was dismissed on appeal as not being permitted development. Non compliance with Class Q does not make a building suitable for residential conversion under planning policy.

The letters of support have made reference to the farm, its continued operation and other family members living on the farm. Whilst this is the case, no evidence has been submitted that the application is for a rural worker; no functional need has been established; whether the occupiers are primarily employed in agriculture; nor whether the need could be fulfilled by another existing dwelling on the unit or in the local area. As such, the proposal would not comply with Policy H1a: Permanent housing for rural workers, of the Taunton Deane Adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

In preparing this report the planning officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.

**Contact Officer: Mr D Addicott**



## **Appeal Decisions – 19 July 2017**

**Site: APPLEBROOK HOUSE, LYDEARD DOWN HILL, LYDEARD ST LAWRENCE, TAUNTON, TA4 3SB**

**Proposal: Change of use from orchard in agricultural use to domestic use on land to the east of Applebrook House, Lydeard Down Hill, Lydeard St Lawrence**

**Application number: 22/16/0017**

**Reasons for refusal: The site is an established orchard area surrounded on 2 sides by open countryside and paddock area.**

**The proposed change of use will result in the domestication of a large area of land which in its current condition contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would likely result in the introduction of domestic paraphernalia into the orchard which contributes to the setting of the village, resulting in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal is not in accordance with local policies DM1, DM2 and CP/8 of the adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy 2011-2028 and policies ENV1 (Protection of trees and woodland, orchards and hedgerows) of the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (SADMP).**

**Appeal decision: DISMISSED**

---

**Site: BURTS FARM, FORD STREET, WELLINGTON**

**Proposal: Alleged non-compliance with planning approval at Burts Farm, Wellington**

**Application number: E/0141/44/16**

**Reasons for refusal: It appears to the Council that the breach of planning control described at Paragraph 3(a) above has occurred within the last four years.**

**It appears to the Council that the breach of planning control described at Paragraph 3(b) above has occurred within the last ten years.**

**The new building is outside the settlement boundary for Wellington and its use for residential purposes is contrary to planning policy.**

**The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) contains guidance on the promotion of sustainable development in rural areas, and that Local Planning Authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances, such as the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside (Paragraph 55). In terms of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy, Policies SP1, CPS and DM2 restrict new developments in open countryside.**

**The residential use and new building works are detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and increase the need to travel to access services. The residential use on the Site results in sporadic development in the open countryside that collectively would be detrimental to the amenities of the area and contrary to Taunton Deane Core Strategy Policies CP8, DM1 and DM2.**

**The residential use of the Site results in an unsustainable form of development that would mean that occupiers of the Site are heavily reliant on the private car for most of their day to day needs. As such the proposal is contrary to Taunton Deane Core Strategy Policy SP1.**

The Council do not consider that planning permission should be given, because planning conditions could not overcome these objections.

It is therefore considered expedient to prevent the residential use of the Site. The alternative would be sporadic residential development in open countryside contrary to planning policy.

---

**Site: 126 GALMINGTON ROAD, TAUNTON, TA1 5DW**

**Proposal: Formation of vehicle access to hardstanding at 126 and 128 Galmington Road, Taunton**

**Application number: 52/16/0029**

**Reasons for refusal: Adequate provision cannot be made on the site for the parking and turning of vehicles in a satisfactory manner. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane District Local Plan/Core Strategy adopted 2011-2028).**

On the information currently available, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that a safe access to the site from Galmington Road can be achieved. The proposal therefore does not meet the requirements of Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane District Local Plan/Core Strategy (adopted 2011- 2028).

The proposed parking arrangement is considered substandard and consequently would result in vehicles parking on the verge, causing concern to highway and public safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane District Local Plan/Core Strategy adopted 2011-2028).

**Appeal decision: DISMISSED**



**The Planning Inspectorate**

---

## **Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

**by Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

**Decision date: 15 June 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/W/17/3168514**

**Applebrook House, Lydeard Down Hill, Lydeard St Lawrence, Taunton  
TA4 3SB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Maurice Hartnell against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref 22/16/0017, dated 17 July 2016, was refused by notice dated

26 September 2016.

- The development proposed is change of use from orchard in agricultural use to domestic use for adjoining property.
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Procedural Matter**

2. The Taunton Deane Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (DMP) was adopted in December 2016.

## **Application for Costs**

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Maurice Hartnell against Taunton Deane Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Lydeard St Lawrence Conservation Area.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance of the Conservation Area*

5. The appeal site has been used as an orchard and it is partly occupied by a number of fruit trees. The orchard adjoins the rear garden of Applebrook House and the gardens of neighbouring residential properties. To the north and east, the orchard boundaries are largely formed of mature hedges and planting, beyond which is land forming part of the wider open countryside interspersed by farm buildings.

A stream flanked by mature trees on the opposite bank forms the southern boundary with a residential property (Court Farm Barn). To my mind, taking account of all of these factors, the orchard clearly lies beyond the more built-up part of the village and it is closely related in its appearance to the adjoining land in countryside uses.

---

6. The Conservation Area (CA) is mainly made up of buildings of traditional appearance and materials, arranged in rows adjacent to the principal road through the village. Along with the relatively modern Applebrook House, the orchard is situated in the CA. The paddock immediately to the north of the orchard is identified in the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as green space. The green space contributes to a softer, less built-up setting to this part of the village.
7. The proposed domestic use of the orchard would be likely to result in it having a more manicured appearance in the short term, notably as a result of the regular maintenance normally associated with the use of land as a garden. Moreover, the orchard would be likely to obtain a more domesticated appearance over the medium term. This would principally occur as the occupiers add ornamental features such as planting beds and ponds, pathways and patios are constructed and items of garden furniture such as chairs and tables are placed on the land. Domestic use may also lead to pressure to remove the trees and/or boundary hedges, as the occupiers sought to minimise shaded areas and maximise the enjoyment of their garden. Over time this would be likely to erode the orchard's tree cover, which is identified in the CAA.
8. As a result, the more domesticated appearance of the orchard would appear as an alien feature, entirely at odds with the more rural appearance of the land to the north and east and it would appear as a residential intrusion into the countryside. Whilst it has been suggested that the orchard has not been used for agriculture for some years and that it might become neglected in future, those matters do not justify the harm described above.
9. I accept that due to the local topography and the boundary hedges, the orchard is open to limited public views. However, the orchard tree cover is recognised as an attribute of the CA in the CAA and it can be experienced as part of the village setting in views from the adjacent green space. Therefore, in my view the orchard makes a significant contribution to the setting of this part of the village. Whilst the orchard is not identified as green space in the CAA, this cannot be taken to mean that it does not make a meaningful contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The orchard is not entirely secluded, as there are at least some views over it from the rear elevations and gardens of adjacent housing. Moreover, the availability of limited views would by itself not be a good reason for allowing the proposal to go ahead as it could be repeated too often, thus undermining the character and appearance of the CA.
10. Removing permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 would enable a measure of planning control to be exercised in respect of proposals for future outbuildings in the orchard. Even so, it would not prevent the harm identified above. Consequently, imposing the suggested condition would not make the proposal acceptable.
11. A condition which imposed an obligation on the occupiers to maintain the existing trees and replant them where necessary in perpetuity would be an unduly onerous requirement and may exceed the protection already afforded to trees in the CA. Consequently, I am not persuaded that such a condition would pass the test of reasonableness in paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

12. I fully appreciate that the appellant wishes to continue to manage the trees and that he does not intend to make any physical changes to the orchard. I have been given no reason to doubt the appellant's intentions. Even so, planning permission runs with the land. Future occupiers may not wish to manage the orchard in the same sympathetic manner as the appellant. Consequently, I have to afford the appellant's intentions limited weight in determining this appeal.
13. Accordingly, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy CP8 of the adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy (CS), as it would not conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment. The proposal would also not accord with criterion in CS Policy DM1, as it would unacceptably harm the appearance and character of the village.
14. The orchard is outside of the settlement boundary in the DMP. CS Policy DM2 is permissive of various uses in the countryside outside of settlements. In my view, the way in which the policy is worded means that it is not necessarily restrictive of other uses in the countryside outside of those specified. Even so, the policy requires all development to meet a number of tests, including not creating a residential curtilage which would harm the rural character of the area. This test is analogous to the proposal and it would result in the harm that Policy DM2 seeks to avoid. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy DM2. Moreover, the proposal would not accord with DMP Policy ENV1, as it would not minimise the impact on the orchard.

*Planning balance*

15. The harm caused to the CA would be 'less than substantial' as meant by paragraph 134 of the Framework. However, the benefits of the proposal would largely be private and in favour of the appellant. There would be no public benefits arising from the proposal that would outweigh the harm to the CA.

**Conclusion**

16. The proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the CA and it would not accord with the Development Plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Stephen Hawkins*

INSPECTOR

---

## Costs Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by **Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 June 2017

---

### **Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/W/17/3168514 Applebrook House, Lydeard Down Hill, Lydeard St Lawrence, Taunton TA4 3SB**

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
  - The application is made by Mr Maurice Hartnell for a full award of costs against Taunton Deane Borough Council.
  - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for change of use from orchard in agricultural use to domestic use for adjoining property.
- 

## Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

## Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 'Appeals' section advises that parties in planning appeals should normally meet their own expenses. However, costs may be awarded where a party has behaved unreasonably and that behaviour has caused another party to incur unnecessary or wasted expenditure in the appeal process (paragraphs 028 and 030). Guidance on what is meant by 'unreasonable' is in paragraph 031. The application for costs was made in writing, in accordance with the guidance at paragraph 035.
3. The application for an award of costs is made on both substantive and procedural grounds. In summary, the applicant claims that the Council has not provided any evidence to substantiate its reason for refusal and has only referred to the officer report. Its reason for refusal is generalised and is not supported by a full and clear assessment. The Council does not explain the significance of the appeal site. The Council failed to consider whether conditions would overcome its objections. The Council sought to expand on its case in its costs response and referred to an additional policy.
4. Procedurally, the applicant says that the Council did not engage with them during the application process and it did not look to find solutions to enable permission to be granted, contrary to paragraphs 186 & 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The applicant had agreed to an extension of time and the case officer indicated that permission might be forthcoming but the application was refused without warning.

5. In response, the Council says that reliance on the officer's report to support its case at appeal is good practice. The report explains why the proposal would have an adverse visual impact. Conditions would not overcome this harm. Procedurally, the proposal was unacceptable in principle and additional

---

engagement with the applicant would not have addressed this. No pre-application enquiry was made by which the Council's position would have been made clear in advance of an application. The appeal site is clearly outside the defined settlement limits. Policy SB1 of the recently adopted Taunton Deane Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (DMP) re-affirms the

Council's approach to development in the countryside.

6. At paragraph 049, the PPG provides a list of examples of when a Council might be at risk of an award of costs due to unreasonable behaviour concerning the substance of the case. These include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy and any other considerations; failing to produce evidence to substantiate their reasons for refusal at appeal; making vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact which are unsupported by objective analysis, and; refusing permission where suitable conditions would enable the development to go ahead. The list is not exhaustive.
7. Consideration of matters such as character and appearance can often involve judgements being made and parties can legitimately hold different views. Provided those views are underpinned at appeal by a robust body of evidence, a parties' case would be substantiated. The Council's officer report clearly sets out the reasons why it considered that there would be harm caused to the character and appearance of the Lydeard St Lawrence Conservation Area (CA), in a manner proportionate to the scale of the proposal. Its evidence concerns specific impacts of the proposal and is not vague, generalised or inaccurate. The appeal site is in the CA. A more detailed assessment of its contribution to the CA would have been disproportionate, given the scale of the proposal. It is also apparent from the officer report that conditions would not have addressed the majority of the harm identified by the Council. Therefore, there was no good reason for the Council to go into a detailed consideration of conditions. In terms of the appeal, the Council did not suggest a condition to remove 'permitted development' rights for residential outbuildings for a similar reason.
8. The Council's response to the costs application largely responds to the points made by the applicant. It is always likely that there will be some overlap between the merits of a case and responding to a costs application in part made on substantive grounds. However, I do not read the Council's response as making additional submissions on their case at appeal and have not treated it as such. In particular, I do not interpret the reference to Policy SB1 as other than an illustration of a materially unchanged policy background following adoption of the DMP. The applicant was already aware of Policy SB1 as they had referred to it in their own written statement.
9. The use of the Council's officer report to present its case in written appeals is encouraged<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, I do not agree with the



applicant's criticism of the Council for mainly relying on the report, in particular as for the reasons explained above it is sufficiently detailed to address the matters at issue.

10. For the above reasons, I consider that the Council's case is supported by evidence and it has been substantiated at appeal. Conditions could not overcome the harm identified in the reason for refusal. Consequently, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals - England Planning Inspectorate August 2016.

Council has not prevented or delayed development which clearly should have been permitted.

11. The procedural matters raised by the applicant largely concern the processing of the application, rather than the appeal itself. Therefore, there is no firm evidence before me that the Council acted and behaved in any of the ways listed at paragraph 047 of the PPG or otherwise in a manner which could be regarded as unreasonable in relation to appeal procedures.
12. At paragraph 048, the PPG details when the Council's handling of the planning application might lead to an award of costs. However, this is mainly concerned with cases where the Council fail to determine applications, as opposed to when planning permission has been refused. Otherwise, paragraph 033 advises that costs cannot be claimed for the period during the determination of the application, although behaviours and actions during that time can be taken into account.
13. Whilst the case officer might have verbally indicated that the application would be supported, there is no firm evidence in this respect. Moreover, officer advice is not binding on the Council and is not in itself evidence of unreasonable behaviour. I can appreciate the applicant's sense of frustration at the manner in which the application appears to have been determined after agreeing an extension of time. Even so, the Council's behaviour and actions in relation to the application, although perhaps falling short of the proactive approach encouraged by the Framework, were also tempered by their fundamental objections to the proposal which were incapable of resolution. Consequently, these matters do not fall within the scope of what could be regarded as procedurally unreasonable behaviour under the PPG.

## **Conclusion**

14. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated.

*Stephen Hawkins*

INSPECTOR

# Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 13 June 2017

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

**by Thomas Shields MA DipURP  
MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 July 2017

---

## Appeal Refs: APP/D3315/C/16/3162172, 3162174, 3162175, 3162176

**The Little Barn, Burts Farm, Ford Street, Wellington, Somerset, TA21 9PG**

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
  - The appeals are made by Mr Steven Wright, Mrs Kim Wright, Mr Stephen Spiller and Mrs Holly Spiller against an enforcement notice issued by Taunton Deane Borough Council.
  - The notice was issued on 3 October 2016.
  - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission:
    - a) The erection of a new building on the site ("The Little Barn"); and
    - b) The use of The Little Barn as a residential dwelling.
  - The requirements of the notice are:
    - a) Permanently cease the use of the building known as The Little Barn for residential purposes;
    - b) Demolish The Little Barn and permanently remove all resulting demolition materials from the site.
  - The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
  - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (d) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (the Act).
- 

## Decision

1. The enforcement notice is varied in Sections 5 and 6 by deleting within them all of sub-section (b).
2. Subject to the variations the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

## Preliminary matters and background

3. The appeal property is a detached single storey building located within its own plot of land at Ford Street, Wellington. It is occupied by three generations of the same family as their main dwelling house; the adult members of the family being the four appellants.
4. The appeal was initially made on ground (d) only. As such, part of the appellants' submitted written case was that in 2012 substantial repairs and restoration of an older building (used as a separate dwelling) had been carried out following heavy storm damage, and that no new building had therefore been erected. In this regard I wrote to the parties<sup>1</sup> before the Inquiry to advise

---

<sup>1</sup> Pre-Inquiry Note

that I considered that part of the submitted written evidence conflicted with the ground (d) appeal and appeared more consistent with an appeal on ground (b).

5. However, subsequent to the above the appellants conceded that the building subject of this appeal is in fact a new building which replaced the older one that had occupied a similar (but not the same) position. That being the case it was confirmed on behalf of the appellants at the Inquiry that the ground (d) appeal remained, and I was requested to also consider an appeal on ground (f). The Council did not object to the ground (f) appeal being introduced at that stage and I have therefore determined the appeal on these two grounds.
6. In reaching my decision I have also taken into account the further documents submitted at the Inquiry.
7. All oral evidence to the Inquiry was given under oath or affirmation.

## Reasons

### The appeal on ground (d)

8. The enforcement notice was issued on 3 October 2016. The breach of planning control alleged in Section 3 of the enforcement notice contains two elements. Firstly; that a new building has been erected, and secondly; that it is used as a residential dwelling. In the reasons for issuing the notice at Section 4 the Council say that the erection of the building occurred within the last 4 years<sup>2</sup> (hence since 3 October 2012). With regard to the use of the building as a residential dwelling the Council's reasons state that the breach occurred within the last 10 years<sup>3</sup> (hence since 3 October 2006).
9. The appellants argue that the building was substantially completed more than 4 years prior to the issue of the notice, such that it is immune from enforcement action. Also, that before the building's erection the land was already in residential use for more than 10 years prior to the issue of the notice, such that the use of the existing building as a residential dwelling is also immune from enforcement action.
10. In pursuing an appeal on ground (d), the onus is on the appellants to establish, on the balance of probability, that at the time the enforcement notice was issued, it was too late to take enforcement action against the matters alleged in the notice.

### *Evidence in support of the appeal*

11. Steven Wright gave oral evidence in support of the appeal. He stated he carried out most of the building works in the construction of the new house starting in July 2012, with assistance from friends, family members, and paid contractors to carry out certain elements of the work. At that time of the works he and his wife (Kim Wright) were living in the separate dwelling house (Burts Farm) while his daughter (Holly Spiller) and her husband (Stephen Spiller) temporarily occupied a mobile home brought onto the site. Mr and Mrs Wright sold Burts Farm and moved into the appeal building with the Spillers in 2014.
12. He stated that by around the end of August or the beginning of September 2012 the building was fully constructed with walls, roof, doors and windows,

---

<sup>2</sup> S.171B(1) of the 1990 Act

<sup>3</sup> S.171B(3) of the 1990 Act

and internal layout completed including bedrooms, bathrooms, kitchen and living areas and electrical and plumbing works installed. At that point he stated that his daughter and her family moved into the building and began permanently occupying it as their main dwelling.

13. In cross-examination he stated that at the time of a visit to the site by the Council's enforcement officer, on 29 October 2012, the outside of the site looked like a 'bomb site' because a lot of the remnant materials had not yet been cleared from the site. However, he insisted that the appeal building was finished and had already been occupied by his daughter and her family since at least the beginning of September 2012. When asked how he could be so sure of the date he stated that he could remember his wife's (Kim Wright's) birthday party on 29 September 2012 which was held in their house (Burts Farm). He recalled that the appeal building was finished and had already been occupied by his daughter and her family at the time of the party.
14. No contractors or suppliers invoices or receipts were produced by Mr Wright, nor any bank statements showing any payments. In cross-examination he stated that he paid Mr Oakley and others in cash for those elements of the build he did not do himself. With regard to the copies of contractors' quotations<sup>4</sup> for carrying out of future works I consider that they are not evidence in themselves of when any works took place and hence they add no weight in support of allowing the appeal in that regard. However, I note that simply in terms of when they are dated they are not inconsistent with Mr Wright's oral evidence regarding when works to erect the building were undertaken.
15. Andy Oakley also gave oral evidence to the Inquiry. He is a building contractor and also a long-standing family friend. He stated that he arrived at the site during the first week of August 2012 and stayed on site throughout that month to help construct the appeal building. He also recalled his birthday (21 August 2012) at the site; that Holly Spiller had made a birthday cake for him in Burts Farm, and that she and her family moved into the completed appeal building a few days afterwards, by the end of August at the latest.
16. In cross-examination he confirmed that the building had been completed, with the kitchen installed and connected, toilets and water connections finished, and most of the electrical wiring work finished, and then occupied by the end of August 2012. He confirmed that the building was fully finished and occupied by the Spillers by the time of Kim Wright's birthday party which he attended on 29 September 2012.
17. Becky Wright gave oral evidence to the Inquiry also recollecting that her sister (Holly Spiller) and her family moved into the appeal building prior to her mother's birthday party on 29 September 2012.
18. Mandy Love is a family friend and gave oral evidence to the Inquiry that she recalled attending Kim Wright's birthday party on 29 September 2012. She remembered that at that time some of the food for the party celebration was stored with Holly Spiller in the appeal building and that it was fully finished and lived in by the Spillers at that time.

<sup>4</sup> Documents 36 and 37 within Document 1 submitted to the Inquiry

19. Sean Nightingale is a family friend. He gave oral evidence to the Inquiry that the appeal building was externally completed around the end of May or beginning of June 2012. Under cross-examination he conceded that that date differed from the date recalled by other witnesses. He accepted that his recollection was imprecise and that he had not at any time seen the inside of the appeal building.
20. I have also taken account of documentation that had previously been submitted by the appellants to the Council as part of an earlier application for a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for *existing use as a single dwelling house*. I should point out that all of that evidence was submitted on the appellant's claimed belief that the appeal building was a restoration of the existing building, rather than it constituting a new building subject of this appeal. The Council considers that change casts a shadow on the reliability of the appellants' evidence in this appeal. Nonetheless, I consider it retains a degree of relevance to this appeal in terms of *when* building works and occupation of the appeal building occurred. In this regard I consider the LDC evidence overall does not undermine the appellants' claim that the building works commenced in July 2012 and were substantially complete and the building occupied by early September 2012.
21. Due to his uncertainty of when the works took place I attach no weight to the oral testimony of Mr Nightingale. With regard to the four other witnesses in support of the appeal, I consider that their testimony was unambiguous, precise (in terms of pinpointing completion and occupation of the building to before 29 September 2012 - the date of Mrs Wright's party) and corroborative of each other. Taken together their oral evidence was credible. It was given on sworn oath and in the knowledge of the serious criminal liability that could arise if it was later discovered that it included statements which they knew to be false or did not believe to be true.
22. For these reasons, I find the appellants' evidence convincing and attach substantial weight to it in support of the appeal.

*The Council's evidence*

23. Oral evidence was given to the Inquiry by Matthew Bale, an Area Planning Manager employed by the Council.
24. With regard to the events that took place in 2012 his evidence on this ground of appeal is based on his professional opinion following his examination and analysis of the relevant documents submitted to the Inquiry, rather than that of a first-hand witness to those events. That of course is no different an exercise than is before me in reaching my decision. However, given his considerable experience and his professional planning expertise I attach due weight to his evidence.
25. He referred to his analysis of photographic evidence of the site and a hand written letter from Mr Steven Wright<sup>5</sup>. Reference was also made to the following documents: a complaint<sup>6</sup> received by the Council on 23 October 2012 alleging building works taking place at Burts Farm, the subsequent Council

---

<sup>5</sup> Appendices A-E to Mr Bale's proof of evidence

<sup>6</sup> Document 2 submitted to the Inquiry

officer's (Mr Hardy's) record<sup>7</sup> of his site inspection on 29 October 2012; and a letter from Mr Hardy to Mr Wright dated 6 November 2012<sup>8</sup>.

26. With regard to the photographic evidence Mr Bale acknowledged that within the timeline of the images there was a gap from March 2011 to 2014. Consequently, I find that the images do not therefore contradict the appellants' evidence that the works were carried out in July/August 2012.
27. The note of the complaint received by the Council on 23 October 2012 is unclear; it says "*an extension being built or may be new structure*". It does not indicate when building works commenced or what stage they had reached. The description could be either of a building at an early stage of construction, or one substantially completed but with minor finishing works in train. I consider it is of limited evidential value since it is no more than a cursory reference to describe the generality of the subject of the complaint.
28. Mr Bale considered it unlikely that if the building was substantially complete and occupied by early September the complainant would have waited until 23 October to contact the Council. However, that is speculative. There are many potential reasons why there may have been a delay in contacting the Council. For example, if the complainant was unable to see the site every day it could have been the first time he/she had seen the site in several weeks or months, perhaps if on holiday, or away from the area for any other reason. That of course is equally speculative. Ultimately, the complainant did not give evidence to the Inquiry to explain the circumstances, and hence on balance I consider that the date of the complaint does not make the appellants' case any less probable.
29. The site inspection record is also regrettably short on detail. It states in a box titled "Activities or Development Observed": "*Timber framed building being constructed*".

And then in a box titled: "Notes of any Discussions":

*"Met Mr Wright who would not let me in so we talked over the wall. **He explained that the building that stood on the site was falling down and they had to replace it. The new building is on the same footprint and same height but the end wall has been moved away from the highway.** I said I think p.p (planning permission) is required but he was not convinced. Could not take photos or enter site".*

30. Mr Wright in his oral evidence denied refusing access and Mr Hardy is retired and was unavailable to give written or oral evidence to the Inquiry.
31. Mr Bale took the view that the highlighted text in Mr Hardy's note simply records what Mr Wright told him at the time. I agree that must be so with the first highlighted sentence. I accept that it may also be so with the second sentence, but I am not convinced that is the case. It could equally be interpreted as being a record, albeit quite limited, of what Mr Hardy saw himself; *The new building...etc.* If that is the case Mr Hardy arguably described a fully formed building. If I follow Mr Bale's interpretation; that the second sentence is merely a record of an exchange of words, it is curious that Mr Hardy did not note



any detailed description at all of what he saw for himself in

---

<sup>7</sup> Document 3 submitted to the Inquiry

<sup>8</sup> Document 4 submitted to the Inquiry

terms of the stage of completion of the building, other than: “*Timber framed building being constructed*”. That description is again very cursory in nature and does not give any real sense of what stage the building had reached.

32. In re-examination Mr Bale made the point that if the building had its external walls at that time, the timber frame would not have been visible to Mr Hardy. However, that interpretation assumes that it was indeed visible. It is not clear to me from the brief and limited notes, taken as a whole, that that is what Mr Hardy did see. It could be a loose description of the fully formed timber clad building. On balance I find that the record is open to some interpretation and calls for speculative conclusions by the reader. As such, it is not clear and detailed enough to convincingly contradict the appellants’ evidence.
33. Mr Hardy did not see inside the building (substantially completed or not) and hence nothing can be taken from the record with regard to whether occupation had commenced. It is the appellants’ case of course that the building was fully finished and occupied at that time, although the site still had the ‘bomb site’ appearance Mr Wright described in his evidence.
34. The letter from Mr Hardy to Mr Wright dated 6 November 2012, and Mr Wright’s reply letter dated 13 November 2012, provide no greater clarity as to whether the building was substantially completed and occupied by the time of the site inspection on 29 October 2012.
35. In conclusion, and with particular regard as to whether the building was substantially completed and occupied prior to the 3 October 2012, I find that that these documents, taken together, are of questionable weight due to their lack of detail and clarity. In making that finding I make no criticism of Mr Bale in interpreting them in the way that he did so. It was a reasonable interpretation, but equally they could be interpreted differently as I have set out above.

#### *Assessment*

36. The documentary evidence to the Inquiry does not significantly diminish the appellants’ case. Additionally, as I have set out previously, the oral evidence of witnesses in support of the appeal was unambiguous and credible. For these reasons, I find the appellants’ evidence convincing and attach considerable weight to it in support of the appeal.
37. However, against that I must weigh the evidence of the Council. The judgment in *Gabbitas v SSE and Newham LBC [1985] JPL 630* makes it clear that if the Council has no evidence of its own, or from others, to contradict or otherwise make the appellant’s version of events less than probable, there is no good reason to dismiss an appeal in an LDC appeal provided the appellant’s evidence alone is sufficiently precise and unambiguous. That test equally applies to an Inspector in an appeal against an enforcement notice on ground (d).
38. The Council’s evidence comprised of a professional opinion based on an examination and analysis of the relevant documents in the Inquiry. In my view, as I have already said, the Council’s interpretation was a reasonable one. However, in weighing the Council’s evidence against the weight of the sworn testimony of witnesses to the events in 2012, I find on balance that it does not

make the appellants' version of events less than probable.

39. I therefore come to the conclusion that on the balance of probability the appeal building was substantially completed and occupied as a residential dwelling house prior to the 3 October 2012, and probably by August/September 2012, hence more than 4 years before the issue date of the enforcement notice. Consequently, the appeal building itself was immune from enforcement action when the notice was issued. However, that is not the end of the matter.
40. It was argued for the appellants that the land occupied by the appeal building was already in residential use previously when the former barn was as an overspill to Burts Farm. It was said that friends of the appellants and others stayed in it when visiting. From 2009 the former barn was permanently occupied by the Spillers as a separate dwelling house until its replacement with the current appeal building in the summer of 2012. Thus, it is argued, the land has always been in continuous residential use.
41. However, I find this argument to be without merit. When the Spillers occupied the (first) Little Barn as a single dwelling house in 2009 it constituted a material change of use from its previous use as ancillary accommodation to Burts Farm, sub-dividing the single planning unit of Burts Farm into two units. That being the case the change of use of the first Little Barn to use as a single dwelling house would have become lawful after 4 years, that is to say in 2013. But that did not occur because, as has been found, the first Little Barn was replaced with the new appeal building in the summer of 2012. When the appeal building was erected and occupied in 2012 it began a new chapter in the planning history of the site, with no lawful use of the land for two single dwellinghouses.
42. Moreover, the Courts<sup>9</sup> have established that if a dwellinghouse is erected unlawfully and used as a dwellinghouse from the outset, the unlawful use can properly be the subject of enforcement action within 10 years, even if the building as a structure becomes immune from enforcement action after 4 years. That is the case here. The appeal building was erected and occupied as a residential dwelling house in the summer of 2012. Its unauthorised use as such commenced at the same time, and thus falls short of the 10 year period for immunity<sup>10</sup> referred to in the notice.
43. For all the above reasons I conclude that breach (a) in the enforcement notice is immune from enforcement action, while breach (b) in the notice is not immune. The appeal on ground (d) therefore succeeds to this limited extent and I have varied the notice accordingly.

## **The appeal on ground (f)**

44. An appeal on ground (f) is a claim that the steps required by the notice to be taken exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control.
45. Given that I have found the building, as a structure, is immune from enforcement action, it is now only the use of the building as a residential dwelling house that is relevant to this ground of appeal.
46. The appeal on ground (f) was argued on the basis that if the building was found to be lawful it should be put to a good use, rather than remaining

---

<sup>9</sup> Inquiry Documents 5 and 6 - *Lawson Builders Ltd, Paul Lawson and Jennifer Lawson v SSLG and Wakefield MDC* [2013] EWHC 3388 (Admin) applying *Welwyn Hatfield DC v SSCLG and Beesley* [2011] UKSC 15.

<sup>10</sup> S.171B(3) of the 1990 Act

unused. However, there is no ground (a) appeal and deemed planning application for the use of the building as a dwelling house before me, and I am unable to grant any planning permission under ground (f). Thus any future use of the building would be a matter to resolve between the Council and the appellants either through a planning application or, if necessary, by way of a LDC application to confirm the lawfulness of any proposed use.

47. The notice requirement is to permanently cease the use of the building for residential purposes. Hence, it goes no further than simply requiring the unauthorised use to cease. It therefore does not exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control.

48. The appeal on ground (f) therefore fails.

*Thomas Shields*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Robin Upton	Director – Planning WYG
He called	
Steven Wright	Appellant
Andrew Oakley	Building contractor/family friend
Becky Wright	Appellants' daughter
Mandy Love	Family friend
Sean Nightingale	Family friend

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Gavin Collett	Magdalen Chambers
Of Counsel	
He called	
Mr Matthew Bale	Area Planning Manager

### DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY:

- 1 Folder containing LDC application and related documents 1-54
- 2 Copy of complaint form dated 23 October 2012
- 3 Copy of enforcement officer site inspection record
- 4 Letter from Mr Hardy to Mr Wright dated 6 November 2012
- 5 Transcript of judgment *Welwyn Hatfield BC v SSCLG & Beesley [2011] UKSC 15 (J.1188)*
- 6 Transcript of judgment *Lawson Builders Ltd, Paul Lawson and Jennifer Lawson v SSLG and Wakefield MDC [2013] EWHC 3388 (Admin)*

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

**by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 July 2017

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/W/17/3170712**  
**126/128 Galmington Road, Taunton**  
**TA1 5DW**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mrs Joan Viveash and Mrs Gemma Richards against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 52/16/0029, dated 25 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
  - The development proposed is the construction of new vehicle access to existing hard standings, to include lowering kerbstones.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The original application description proposed the construction of a new vehicle access to existing hard standings, and also the lowering of kerbstones. From my visit it was apparent that the kerbstones are not within the red application site line area. Consequently, for the avoidance of doubt I have dealt with the development that is included within the red site line as shown on the submitted drawings.
3. The front garden of 128 Galmington Road was laid to gravel, and between 128 and 126 Galmington Road was an area of hardstanding, with the rest of the front of No 126 being lawn. Although not referred to in the original application description, the drawing entitled "Proposal new acc" shows part of the front garden of No 126 to be gravelled. Notwithstanding the description above, it is clear from the submitted drawings that the proposal includes the provision of hardstanding in front of No 126. I have determined the appeal having regard to this.
4. As part of their appeal submission the appellants have provided a drawing entitled "Proposed Amended", which shows a revised parking scheme. However, there are several differences between the appeal scheme and that considered by the Council. The scheme differs significantly from the original application and as others have not had an opportunity to comment I am unable to accept it as an amendment to the proposal. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the proposal as considered and refused by the Council.

## Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the construction of a new vehicle access to existing and proposed hard standings on highway safety.
- 
-

## Reasons

6. The appeal properties are two semi-detached houses positioned within a mostly residential area comprising similar aged and styled dwellings. Like many of the nearby houses, the appeal properties are set back from the footway behind regular shaped front gardens. To either side of Galmington Road there are grass verges that separate the carriageway from the footways. On-street parking is in places restricted by double yellow lines, although designated parking areas are provided within the highway.
7. There is a signal controlled pedestrian and cycle path crossing close to the appeal properties, and the crossing's zig-zag keep-clear markings extend in front of the gardens of both the houses. There are also wooden bollards within the grass verge to prevent parallel parking near to the crossing. Just beyond the crossing is the junction with College Way. From what I observed during my mid-day site visit, I do not disagree with the Council's description of the road as being well-used.
8. Even with the provision of gravelled areas for both houses, the constrained nature of the parking would be such that vehicles would not be able to enter and leave in forward gear. Reversing manoeuvres would have to occur, particularly if other cars were parked, and these actions would be very close to the controlled pedestrian crossing. Such movements would thus be a danger to other users of the highway particularly as these users would be concentrating on the activity within the road, the crossing and nearby junction, rather than what is occurring within the appeal properties.
9. At my visit I saw cars were parked within the appeal site. It was evident that vehicles could pass between the bollards in the grass verge, and from the tyre marks present that manoeuvring into the existing spaces includes using the footway and verge. I appreciate parking is already occurring at both properties. Nevertheless, the proposal would increase movements beyond that which already occurs, to the detriment of users of the public highway.
10. Furthermore, in addition to negotiating the bollards, there would also be partly restricted visibility due to a lamp-post within the footway and a mature tree within the verge. These circumstances when taken together with the proximity of the junction and crossing, as well as the limitations of the proposed access and parking layout would not be the safe and secure arrangements for all users of the highway sought by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
11. The appellants have drawn my attention to the parking difficulties in the area, and consider the Council have not responded to local circumstances, as required by the Framework. However, the requirements of the occupiers of the houses to have off-road parking would be a personal benefit that would not outweigh the harm I have found. Moreover, on-street parking was present nearby, although I accept that this would be available for anyone to use.
12. I noted that elsewhere along Galmington Road there are properties that have driveways, including some that are near a crossing. However, I do not have the full planning history of these properties before me, nor are they in such close proximity to a road junction as the appeal site. In any case each scheme has to be treated on its own individual merits in accordance with the



requirements of the current development plan and all other material considerations, as I have undertaken in this instance.

13. Thus the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to the requirements of the Framework and Policy DM 1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012). This requires amongst other things, development not to lead to road safety problems.

### **Other Matters**

14. Finally, the appellants concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application are procedural matters. Such matters fall to be pursued by other means separate from the planning appeal process and are not for me to consider.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*J J Evans*

INSPECTOR

**APPEALS RECEIVED – 19 JULY 2017**

**Site: BARE GRILLS, 45 BRIDGE STREET, TAUNTON, TA1 1TP**

**Proposal: Installation of 3 No. bulkhead light fittings to the front elevation of 45 Bridge Street, Taunton (retention of works already undertaken)**

**Application number: 38/17/0045LB**

**Appeal reference: APP/D3315/Y/3173605**

**Start Date: 19 JUNE 2017**

---

**Site: SPRINGDALE, 41 GREENWAY, MONKTON HEATHFIELD, TAUNTON, TA2 8NF**

**Proposal: Erection of detached dwelling with associated works to the rear of 41 Greenway, Monkton Heathfield**

**Application number: 48/16/0045**

**Appeal reference: APP/D3315/W/17/3172397**

**Start Date: 20 JUNE 2017**

---