

You are requested to attend a meeting of the Planning Committee to be held in West Monkton Primary School, Bridgwater Road, Bathpool, Taunton (Main School Hall) on 18 July 2018 at 18:15.

Agenda

- 1 Apologies.
- 2 Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 25 April, 23 May (attached) 20 June 2018 (to follow).
- 3 Public Question Time.
- 4 Declaration of Interests
To receive declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or personal or prejudicial interests, in accordance with the Code of Conduct, in relation to items on the agenda. Such interests need to be declared even if they have already been recorded in the Register of Interests. The personal interests of Councillors who are County Councillors or Town or Parish Councillors will automatically be recorded in the minutes.
- 5 24/17/0061 Erection of an agricultural building for the storage of grain with formation of access on land adjacent to Stonehead Hill, Wrantage
- 6 30/18/0002 Erection of a detached dwelling with associated works to include a change of use of part of the agricultural field to domestic garden on land to the rear and side of The Stonehouse, Sellicks Green, Pitminster (amended scheme to 30/16/0029)
- 7 44/18/0002 Demolition of garage and side extension with erection of 1 No. attached dwelling with associated works to the side of Jessamine Cottage, The Holloway, Holywell Lake, Wellington
- 8 Latest appeals and decisions received

Bruce Lang
Assistant Chief Executive

10 July 2018

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



The meeting rooms at both the Brittons Ash Community Centre and West Monkton Primary School are on the ground floor and are fully accessible. Toilet facilities, with wheelchair access, are available.

Lift access to the Council Chamber on the first floor of Shire Hall, is available from the main ground floor entrance. Toilet facilities, with wheelchair access, are available through the door to the right hand side of the dais.



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

For further information about the meeting, please contact Democratic Services on 01823 219736 or email 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

Planning Committee Members:-

Councillor R Bowrah, BEM (Chairman)
Councillor M Hill (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor J Adkins
Councillor M Adkins
Councillor W Brown
Councillor S Coles
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 – 25 April 2018

Present: - Councillor Bowrah (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Hill (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Coles, Gage, Horsley, Martin-Scott, Morrell, Mrs Reed,
Mrs Smith, Sully, Townsend and Watson

Officers: - Bryn Kitching (Area Planning Manager), Tim Burton (Assistant Director – Planning and Environment), John Burton (Planning Manager, Hinkley Point C and other N.S.I.P.'s), Jo Humble (Housing Development and Enabling Manager), Martin Evans (Solicitor, Shape Partnership Services) and Tracey Meadows (Democratic Services Officer)

Also present: Councillors Berry, Farbahi, Habgood and Nicholls. Mrs A Elder, Chairman of the Standards Advisory Committee.

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm)

30. Apologies/substitutions

Apologies: Councillors Mrs Adkins, M Adkins, Brown, Nicholls and Wedderkopp

Substitutions: Councillor Sully for Councillor Adkins;
Councillor Horsley for Councillor Nicholls;
Councillor Mrs F Smith for Councillor Wedderkopp

31. The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 31 January and 28 February 2018 were taken as read and were signed.

32. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman and the other Members of the Committee all declared that they had received various communications from 'Bluebridge Communications' regarding application No. 42/14/0069. All confirmed that they had not 'fettered their discretions'.

33. 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 **Outline planning permission be granted** for the under-mentioned development:-

Outline planning application with all matters reserved (except points of access) for a residential and mixed use urban extension at Comeytrove/Trull to include up to 2000 dwellings, up to 5.25 hectares of employment land, 2.2 hectares of land for a Primary School, a mixed use Local Centre and a 300 space 'Park and Bus' facility on land at Comeytrove/Trull – reporting back issues relating to affordable housing as a result of viability issues, with all matters remaining as previously agreed by Members of the Planning Committee (42/14/0069)

Considered report previously circulated, which set out in detail the viability exercise that had been undertaken in connection with the application for planning permission that had been previously considered by Members in November 2015 and January 2016.

The Committee resolved to approve the application at their meeting on the 27 January 2016, subject to the conditions and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure, amongst other items, 25% affordable housing. The Assistant Director (Planning and Environment) was authorised to determine the application in consultation with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, on the clear understanding that if it did not prove possible to agree all of the obligations, the matter would need to be reported back to the Committee for further consideration.

Since the matter was considered by Members, the Applicants have formally submitted a Viability Assessment (March 2017) to support their assertion that, with a policy-compliant 25% level of affordable housing, the tenure mix set out in the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents is jeopardising the viability of the overall proposal when infrastructure delivery, CIL and proposed Section 106 Agreement obligations are taken into account. This had been the subject of negotiations and debate in the intervening period. Based on an independent examination of the facts and figures, Officers are now satisfied as to the amount of affordable housing and the appropriate tenure split, that the development can afford.

A recorded vote was proposed by Councillor Mrs Smith, seconded by Councillor Morrell.

In accordance with Standing Order 18(2)(a), the Chairman called for a formal roll call of votes to be taken in respect of the above motion and recorded in the Minutes.

The motion was put and was approved with seven Councillors in favour, four against and one abstention, as follows:-

Yes	No	Abstain
Councillor Bowrah	Councillor Coles	
Councillor Gage		
		Councillor Mrs Hill
	Councillor Horsley	
Councillor Martin-Scott		

	Councillor Morrell	
Councillor Mrs Reed		
	Councillor Mrs Smith	
Councillor Sully		
Councillor Townsend		
Councillor Watson		

Reported this application.

Resolved that:-

Subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following:-

- 17.5% affordable housing with a tenure split of 60% affordable rent and 40% intermediate housing to be transferred to a Registered;
- Provider or such other person/body approved in writing by the Housing Enabling Lead;
- Highway works comprising bus priority measures near school and at Silk;
- Mills roundabout;
- Heatherton Park Crossroads safety scheme;
- Galmington/Trull Road improvements;
- Provision of park and bus and associated junction works;
- Comeytrove Lane Access junction including works to Comeytrove Manor;
- Farm;
- Honiton Road access junction;
- Travel Plan and Car Club benefits;
- Improvements to bus services serving the site
Timing of spine road;
- Provision of on- site play equipment and sports facilities;

Conditions

(a) Approval of the details of the layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping of each phase of the Development (hereinafter called “the reserved matters”) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development in that phase is commenced and the development of that phase shall (unless otherwise agreed with writing by the local planning authority) be carried out as approved. 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-

- (A2) DrNo 9604 Rev K Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan;
- (A2) DrNo 9603 Rev H Access and Movement Parameter Plan;
- (A1) DrNo 9602 Rev k Scale Parameter Plan;
- (A2) DrNo 9601 Rev I Density Parameter Plan;
- (A2) DrNo 9600 Rev L Land Use Parameter Plan;
- (A0) DrNo 9010 Rev M Site Location Plan;
- (A0) DrNo 9003 Rev B Existing Topographical Survey;
- (A1) DrNo 9001 Rev A Site Location Plan (Wider Area);

(c) An application for approval of reserved matters shall not be submitted until there has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority a phasing and phasing and place-making strategy covering (where relevant) the phasing of the delivery of housing, infrastructure, transport links, community facilities and the associated mechanisms and timescales for the necessary land transfers within the Development. The Phasing Strategy shall set out information on how the delivery of these elements will be integrated through green infrastructure to ensure that a cohesive and high quality place is created. The strategy should identify any potential opportunities for the consultation with or the involvement of the local community or other stakeholders in the delivery and/or maintenance of community facilities. Thereafter each application for approval of reserved matters shall include an explanation of how the development of the phase of sub phase it covers relates the phasing strategy of the overall development;

(d) An application for approval of reserved matters for a phase or sub phase shall not be submitted until there has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority a Neighbourhood Masterplan and Design Guide for the Neighbourhood Area to which that application for approval of reserved matters relates. The Neighbourhood Masterplan and Design Guide shall be accompanied by a statement explaining how they accord with the Masterplan Principles Document and Parameter Plans or if they do not so accord why they do not. The Neighbourhood Masterplan and Design Guide shall provide information on the proposed arrangement of development blocks, streets and spaces for the Neighbourhood Area to which they relates. The Neighbourhood Masterplan and Design Guide should demonstrate how the Neighbourhood Area will function and its overall character and grain;

(e) An application for approval of reserved matters which encompasses a geographical area shown in the Urban Design Framework Plan on pages 12 and 13 of the Masterplan Principles Document (September 2015) as being subject to a Design Brief, shall not be submitted until such a Design Brief has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Design Brief shall, for the area to which it relates, provide information on the principles for the detailed design of the following

matters - areas of public open space and public realm, and the landscaping of those spaces; streets; buildings including the proposed approach to architectural design and material; 'Key Buildings' as shown on the Urban Design Framework Plan at pages 12-13 of the Masterplan Principles Document;

- (f) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be accompanied by a statement explaining how they accord with the Parameter Plans, Masterplan Principles Document and with the applicable approved Detailed Masterplan and Design Guide, Appearance Palette, Neighbourhood Masterplan or Design Brief or (where relevant) explaining why they do not;
- (g) No development shall take place in an Archaeological Mitigation Area (those areas hatched in pink in Figure J2: Outline Archaeological Mitigation Area Plan drawing number SDP 782/115 which appears at Appendix 13.5 to the Environmental Statement) or in its immediate vicinity until a written scheme of archaeological investigation for that Archaeological Mitigation Area has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the written scheme of archaeological investigation shall be implemented in accordance with its terms unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority;
- (h) Each application for approval of reserved matters shall include a hard and soft landscaping scheme for the phase or sub phase of the Development to which it relates. The hard and soft landscaping scheme shall include for the phase or sub phase to which it relates details of the landscaping; details of the surface treatment of the open parts of the site; a programme of implementation; and a planting schedule include numbers, density, size, species and positions of all new trees and shrubs. The landscaping/planting scheme shown on the submitted plan shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development phase;
- (i) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development. whichever is the sooner, or at such other time as agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation;
- (j) Prior the commencement of each phase of the Development a foul water drainage strategy for that phase shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local Planning Authority in consultation with Wessex Water acting as the sewerage undertaker. The foul water drainage strategy shall include appropriate arrangements for the points of connection and the capacity improvements required to serve the phase to which it relates. The

foul water drainage strategy shall thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, be implemented in accordance with the approved details;

- (k) The first application for approval of reserved matters shall be supported by an updated outline surface water drainage strategy for the whole site covered by this outline permission based on the Flood Risk Assessment (Ref. 24721/020 and dated May 2015). This strategy (including the design) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall incorporate measures to manage flood risk and water quality utilising sustainable drainage techniques;
- (l) Prior to the commencement of development in a phase of the Development, a detailed scheme for surface water drainage and watercourse proposals for that phase shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The detailed scheme of surface water drainage shall include:
 - (a) evidence that an appropriate right of discharge for surface water and any necessary improvements has been obtained;
 - (b) details of the drainage during construction of that phase or sub phase;
 - (c) details of the final drainage scheme for that phase or sub phase (including, where applicable, gullies, connections, soakaways and means of attenuation) demonstrating how a 2 l/s/ha discharge rate can be accommodated;
 - (d) identification of all future land-use limitations, ownership, operation and maintenance arrangements for the works over the lifetime of the scheme;
 - (e) provision for exceedance pathways and overland flow routes;
 - (f) a plan for the future maintenance and management of the system and overland flow routes; and
 - (g) appropriate use of interception and porous paving/surfacing infiltration techniques detection/attenuation facilities and wetlands. The approved scheme will need to meet the requirements of both the Environment Agency and the Parrett Internal Drainage Board. Prior to occupation of each phase it shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that relevant parts of the scheme have been completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed. The scheme shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority;
- (m) No phase or sub phase of development shall commence (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan for that phase or sub phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. In discharging this condition the following information shall be supplied:
 - (a) Locations for the storage of all plant, machinery and materials

- including oils and chemicals to be used in connection with the construction of that phase or sub phase;
- (b) Construction vehicle routes to and from site including any off site routes for the disposal of excavated material;
- (c) Construction delivery hours;
- (d) Expected number of construction vehicles per day;
- (e) Car parking for contractors;
- (f) A scheme to encourage the use of Public Transport amongst contractors; and
- (g) Measures to avoid traffic congestion impacting upon the Strategic Road network.
- (h) Details of all bunds, fences and other physical protective measures to be placed on the site including the time periods for placing and retaining such measures;
- (i) The control and removal of spoil and wastes;
- (j) Measures to prevent the pollution of surface and ground water arising from the storage of plant and materials and other construction activities;
- (k) The proposed hours of operation of construction activities;
- (l) The frequency, duration and means of operation involving demolitions, excavations, drilling, piling, and any concrete production;
- (m) Sound attenuation measures incorporated to reduce noise at source;
- (n) Details of measures to be taken to reduce the generation of dust; and
- (o) Specific measures to be adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of the Environmental Code of Construction Practice;

The agreed Construction Environmental Management Plan shall thereafter be implemented in full unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

- (n) Before each phase of the Development is commenced the following shall in respect of that phase be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - (a) a plan showing the location of and allocating a reference number to each existing tree on the part of the site within that phase which has a stem with a diameter, measured over the bark at a point 1.5 metres above ground level, exceeding 75 mm, showing which trees are to be retained, the crown spread of each retained tree and which are to be removed;
 - (b) details of the species, height, trunk diameter at 1.5m above ground level, age, vigour, canopy spread and root protection area of each tree identified in the plan prepared pursuant to paragraph (a);
 - (c) Details of any proposed topping or lopping of any retained tree, or of any tree on land adjacent to the site;
 - (d) Details of any proposed alterations in existing ground levels, and of the position of any proposed excavation, [within the crown spread of any retained tree or of any tree on land adjacent to the site];
 - (e) Details of the specification and position of fencing and of any other

measures to be taken for the protection of any retained tree from damage before or during the course of development.

The development of that phase shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the plan referred to in paragraph (a) above;

- (o) The development of a phase of the Development shall not be commenced until a scheme for prevention of pollution during the construction of that phase has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should include details of the following:
- (a) Site security;
 - (b) Fuel oil storage, bunding, delivery and use;
 - (c) How both minor and major spillage will be dealt with;
 - (d) Containment of silt/soil contaminated run-off.
 - (e) Disposal of contaminated drainage, including water pumped from Excavations;
 - (f) 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) 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 to, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with;
- (q) No works (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) shall be commenced on any phase of the development hereby permitted until details of a wildlife strategy (incorporating an Ecological Construction Method Statement [ECMS] and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [LEMP]) to protect and enhance that phase of the development for wildlife has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be based on the advice of all the submitted wildlife reports to date (EDP's Extended Phase 1 survey, Hedgerow survey 2011 and 2013, Bat and Building assessments 2012 and 2013, Breeding bird survey 2012, Hobby Survey 2013, Dormouse Survey 2012 and 2013, Water vole and Otter surveys 2012, Badger surveys 2012 and 2013, Amphibian survey 2012 and Reptile survey 2012.), and up to date surveys and include –
1. An Ecological Construction Method Statement (ECMS) containing details of protective measures to avoid impacts on protected species during all stages of development;
 2. Details of measures to prevent pollution of Galmington Stream and other water courses on site;

3. Details of the timing of works to avoid periods of work when protected species could be harmed by disturbance;
4. Arrangements to secure an Ecological clerk of Works on site;
5. Measures for the enhancement of places of rest for protected species;
6. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) covering a period agreed by the LPA;
7. Details of a sensitive lighting strategy;
8. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
9. The preservation of the Galmington Stream corridor including that of any tributaries, in order to conserve the integrity of the watercourse and its riparian habitats as a linear feature, and to provide connectivity between the downstream Local Nature Reserve and the countryside beyond;

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. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme for the maintenance and provision of the mitigation planting and maintenance of the hibernacula, bat, dormice and bird boxes and related accesses have been fully implemented. Thereafter the new planting and the wildlife resting places and agreed accesses shall be permanently maintained;

- (r) Prior to the commencement of the Development an Ecological Management Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Ecological Management Plan shall demonstrate how the long-term conservation of new and retained environmental resources, including habitats and species of biodiversity value, shall be secured and shall include arrangements for implementation responsibilities for the operation of the Plan following completion of development of each phase or sub phase of the Development;
- (s) No more than 12 months prior to the commencement of works on a phase of the Development in which breeding sites or resting places of European Protected Species may be present, updated surveys for that phase shall be undertaken. The species in question include but are not necessarily limited to:
 - (a) Bats;
 - (b) Dormice;
 - (c) Great crested newts; and
 - (d) Otters;

The survey results shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority together with details of any required mitigation measures and the appropriate mechanism for delivery of such measures;

- (t) No one phase of the Development shall commence until a Lighting Strategy for Biodiversity for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:

- (a) identify those areas/features of the site within that phase or sub phase that are particularly sensitive for bats, dormice and otters and that are vulnerable to light disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- (b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places;
- (c) Show that street lighting will be directed so as to avoid light spillage and pollution on habitats used by light sensitive species, and will demonstrate that light levels falling on wildlife habitats do not exceed an illumination level of 0.5 Lux. Shields and other methods of reducing light spill will be use where necessary to achieve the required light levels;

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority all external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy;

- (u) Prior to the commencement of the phase of the Development within which the road bridge crossing the Galmington Stream will lie, a detailed specification for the bridge shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. In discharging this condition the Local Planning Authority will expect to see design details which assist protected wildlife species associated with the Galmington Stream, particularly dormice and otters, to continue to disperse along the stream corridor unhindered. The agreed bridge specification shall thereafter be implemented in full and retained as such at all times thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- (v) The proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, tactile paving, cycleways, bus stops/bus laybys, verges, junctions, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, carriageway gradients, drive gradients, car, motorcycle and cycle parking and street furniture shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. For this purpose, plans and sections, indicating as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to, the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of each phase of the development, or as otherwise may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;
- (w) The proposed roads, including footpaths and where applicable turning spaces and cycle way connections, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling before it is occupied shall be served by a

properly consolidated and surfaced footpath and carriageway to at least base course level between the dwelling and existing highway;

- (x) No phase of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied or brought into use until the part of the Spine Road that provides access to that phase has been constructed in accordance with plans that shall previously have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority;
- (y) In the interests of sustainable development none of the dwellings in the first phase (as will be agreed by condition 3 of this permission) shall be used or occupied until a network of cycleway and footpath connections has been constructed within the development site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority;
- (z) No more than 150 dwellings within the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a site of at least 2.2 hectares for a primary school (being one of the two sites shown on Land Use Parameter Plan drawing no. 9600 RWL) has been offered for transfer to the Education Authority, unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If the offer is accepted, the site once transferred shall be fully serviced, level and in a condition suitable for the immediate construction of the school with access to the public highway constructed to an adoptable standard in accordance with a timetable to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority;
- (aa) The vehicular access shown off Comeytrove Lane shall be for emergency service vehicles and public transport vehicles only and shall be retained as such at all times by means of a 'bus gate' system, the details of which shall have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority before the road becomes operational. There shall be no vehicular access to individual residential properties whatsoever, except as provided for by this condition;
- (bb) No development shall commence on any phase until a proposed layout scheme and phasing programme for the provision of access to the parts of the allocated site known as Higher Comeytrove farm as identified in Policy TAU1 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan has been submitted for approval in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The layout scheme and phasing programme shall include provision for such access, or temporary means of access, to be provided to the boundary of Higher Comeytrove Farm and will be in a form that is adequate to accommodate public transport, vehicles, cycleways and footpath linkages. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and programme;

(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 entered into pre-application discussions to enable the grant of planning permission; (2) Applicant was advised on WILDLIFE AND THE LAW. The

protection afforded to wildlife under UK and EU legislation is irrespective of the planning system and any activity undertaken on the tree(s) must comply with the appropriate wildlife legislation; BREEDING BIRDS. Nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and if discovered must not be disturbed. If works are to be carried out during the breeding season (from February to August, possibly later) then the tree(s) should be checked for nesting birds before work begins; BATS. The applicant and contractors must be aware that all bats are fully protected by law under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Species (Amendment) Regulations 2012, also known as the Habitat Regulations. It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to structures or places of shelter or protection used by bats, or to disturb bats whilst they are using these places; Trees with features such as rot holes, split branches or gaps behind loose bark, may be used as roost sites for bats. Should a bat or bats be encountered while work is being carried out on the tree(s), work must cease immediately and advice must be obtained from the Government's advisers on wildlife, Natural England. Bats should preferably not be handled (and not unless with gloves) but should be left in situ, gently covered, until advice is obtained; (3) Applicant was advised that the condition relating to wildlife requires the submission of information to protect species. The Local Planning Authority will expect to see a detailed method statement for each phase of the development clearly stating how wildlife will be protected through the development process and to be provided with a mitigation proposal that will maintain favourable status for these species that are affected by this development proposal; (4) Applicant was advised that Dormice and bats are known to be present on site as identified in submitted ecological surveys. Both species concerned are European Protected Species within the meaning of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. If the local population of European Protected Species are affected in a development, a licence must be obtained from Natural England in accordance with the above regulations; (5) Applicant was advised that It should be noted that the protection afforded to badgers under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 is irrespective of the planning system and the applicant should ensure that any activity they undertake on site must comply with the legislation; (6) Applicant was advised that Nesting birds are present on site and all operatives on site must be appropriately briefed on their potential presence. Nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and if discovered must not be disturbed ; (7) Applicant was advised that the point of water connection for the overall Comeytrove development has been identified as off the new 450mm diameter main near Cannonsgrove House. Temporary connections prior to the construction of a trunk main to the point of connection to the south will need to be agreed with Wessex Water under Section 41 of the Water Industry Act. Outline details as follows;

Subject to application 100 – 150 dwellings at the northern extent of the site may connect at an agreed point to one of the mains in the A38 close to Stonegallows. This connection will necessitate some upgrade works to Stonegallows pumping station. System valves are likely to be required with installation proposed at Heron Drive and Heron Close.

The remaining properties and ancillary development (subject to agreement of

demand requirements and application, not exceeding 800 dwellings total, including the 100 - 150 above) will connect to the 300mm DI main in Comeytrowe Lane. Properties above 55mAOD seeking connection to the 300mm DI main will require an on-site booster(s) station; (8) Applicant was advised that Somerset Industrial Archaeological Society (SIAS) have drawn attention to a relatively small but important industrial archaeological site at the former Comeytrowe Farm. Research has traced sales particulars at the Somerset Heritage Centre dated 1901 which identifies the Mill House and the overshot waterwheel driving machinery via six pulleys, shafting and brackets. This particular example is worthy of consideration for retention within the overall planning scheme. It is understood that they are likely to be listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of Comeytrowe Manor. If they are curtilage listed, Listed Building Consent would be required to demolish or alter any of the curtilage structures. If they are not curtilage listed, the water wheel would be classed as a non-designated heritage asset and the applicant would need to make provision for the water wheel within any reserved matters application, as clearly, its loss would represent substantial harm. Every effort should be made to retain this feature; (9) applicant was advised to formulate all physical security specifications of the dwellings i.e. doorsets, windows, security lighting, intruder alarm, cycle storage etc. in accordance with the police approved 'Secured by Design' award scheme, full details of which are available on the SBD website; (10) Applicant was advised that if it is considered that the development would result in any of the outcomes listed below, then authorisation for these works must be sought from Somerset County Council Rights of Way Group. A PROW being made less convenient for continued public use. New furniture being needed along a PROW. Changes to the surface of a PROW being needed. Changes to the existing drainage arrangements associated with the PROW. If the work involved in carrying out this proposed development would make a PROW less convenient for continued public use (or) create a hazard to users of a PROW then a temporary closure order will be necessary and a suitable alternative route must be provided; (11) Applicant was advised that it is noted that there is reference in the flood risk section of the Environmental Statement to the Routes to the River Tone Project. The applicant should be liaising with the Project team to ensure that the development contributes to the Project and vice versa; (12) applicant was that attention is drawn to the agreement made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, relating to this site/property.)

34. (2) That **planning permission be granted** for the under-mentioned developments:-

52/17/0044

Erection of first floor extension and single storey extension on the north east elevation and summer house in the rear garden of 2 Trendle Road, Taunton

(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 that following approved plans:-

- (A4) Location Plan;
- (A4) Site Plan;
- (A4) Proposed First Floor Plan;
- (A4) Proposed Front Elevation;
- (A4) Proposed Ground Floor Plan;
- (A4) Proposed Rear Elevation;
- (A4) Proposed Side Elevation;
- (A4) Front and Side Elevations of Summerhouse;

(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 with the applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission.)

35. Appeals

Reported that two decisions had been received details of which were submitted.

(The meeting ended at 9.05 pm)

Planning Committee – 23 May 2018

Present: - Councillor Bowrah, Brown, Cavill, Coles, Hall, Mrs Hill, Morrell, Mrs Reed, Townsend and Watson

Officers: - Tim Burton (Assistant Director – Planning and Environment), Joanne O'Hara (Wellington Heritage & Risk Project Manager), Martin Evans (Solicitor, Shape Partnership Services) and Tracey Meadows (Democratic Services Officer)

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

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm)

36. Appointment of Chairman

Resolved that Councillor Bowrah be appointed Chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

37. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

Resolved that Councillor Mrs M Hill be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

38. Apologies/substitutions

Apologies: Councillors Mrs Adkins, M Adkins, Gage, Martin-Scott, Nicholls C Hill and Wedderkopp

Substitutions: Councillor Hall for Councillor Gage;
Councillor Cavill for Councillor Martin-Scott;

39. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 14 March and 4 April 2018 were taken as read and were signed.

40. Public Question Time

Mrs Rudland, a resident of Upcott Crescent Taunton declared that a new resident had moved into number 39. The owner had the front garden flattened and now has up to 12 plus cars parked there which are for sale on the internet under various different Christian names and can be viewed at various addresses but still with the same mobile phone number. The owner had stated that the cars were only stored there as he did not have room on his commercial premises.

Taunton Deane Borough Council had investigated this complaint but as long as the owner stated that he was not selling cars from the property there was nothing that could be done to stop this happening.

The owner's activities had increased the traffic in the Crescent, this included car transporters delivering and removing cars from the property.

Number 39 Upcott Crescent was now an environmental eyesore and was detrimental to the pleasant nature of the neighbourhood. If these activities are allowed to persist it would set a precedent and it could mean that it could happen to other properties nearby and spread like throughout other areas.

In response Tim Burton, Director, Planning and Environment commented that this was something that was reported and a lot of information had been submitted. The Planning Enforcement Team had investigated this matter and the facts are a matter of degree and was not clear cut. Cars parked on the residents drive were not a 'Change of Material Use'. Officers had concluded that the extent of car sales on the property did not constitute a 'Material Change of Use'. That was the Council's stance on the position, the situation would continue to be monitored.

Jackie Calcroft on behalf of the Residents of Staplegrove Action Group

All members of the planning committee [except those acting as substitutes] and some officers present will be aware of my letters of concern sent on behalf of RoSAG regarding progress since the Staplegrove outline planning application was granted on October 24th 2017.

This evening I would like to pose several of those related but still unanswered questions.

I appreciate that it was intended to consider the minutes of Oct 24 to-night but it will now be 8 months until the next meeting when these minutes are considered for approval. How can officers carry out duties when members have not approved minutes?

I would like to concentrate on the £7.2 million funding for the spine road. The minutes of Oct 24 clearly state that the member's approval includes Corkscrew Lane as access for the drop down road. There is no reference to the Housing Infrastructure Fund [HIF] £7.2 million to build the spine road and negate the need for this ridiculous and dangerous access point to which Full Council were all publicly opposed in December 15. The Council vociferously celebrated in the media their success in securing this £7.2million fund at the start of February. It is well documented "There will be no drop down road" Hopefully this will not turn out to be another administrative oversight.

In his letter April 25th to RoSAG which was not copied to planning committee members Councillor Williams's states "discussions around the S106 Agreement at Staplegrove West are at an advanced stage. The S106 has had to be drafted largely on the basis of no HIF award as any detail on how and when the money will be available has yet to be determined. When this becomes clearer a separate agreement [outside of the formal planning process] will need to be agreed "-----He goes on to outline the right of appeal on the part of the developers. But says that "I can assure you that the Council would in these circumstances, wish to defend the decision in a robust fashion and I would expect Somerset County Council to support any appeal in the same way"

3 questions: Have officers now secured a definitive timescale with Central Govt for the scrutiny of their bid and a possible release date of monies?

In addition how confident can officers be that the £7.2million funds will materialise before the land promoters push for detailed planning application? How confident are officers that Ptarmigan land promoters would enter into a, separate agreement to build the spine road and not use Corkscrew Lane for access?

I apologise if I appear overly concerned, cynical and even suspicious but hopefully you will understand my rationale.

Many of you seated around the table this evening will be feeling very frustrated, disappointed and even embarrassed. Please play your part in helping to unravel what we all wish to avoid That is --.a potential fiasco.

In response, Tim Burton, Director, Planning and Environment referred to the minutes in October. Before the award of the Housing Infrastructure Fund. In this was not available at that time. An answer could not be given in relation to a definitive time scale. Contact from the Project Manager from Homes England who was administering the fund for the awards in the South West last week that was simply to ask a number of detailed questions as part of the due diligence, some of which the Council would be able to provide a response to and some of which relied on answers from the site promoters and those that had been contacted to that effect. In relation to the housing infrastructure fund being confirmed before they press for a detailed permission, there was no straight answer with no time scale for the detail for the award of the infrastructure fund, there were no ongoing detailed negotiations with any developer on either Staplegrove East or Staplegrove West in terms of a detailed commission. Any background work being undertaken was uncertain at this point. A submission could be some time away but there was no control over when planning applications were submitted. The question of the developers entering into a separate agreement would have to be a benefit to the developers of the site to come forward more quickly as the infrastructure is all around accelerated. Developers looking at that site would want to an accelerated delivery and if it can be achieved without due detriment to their profit which is how the infrastructure fund works. The view was ultimately down to the developers. There was a resolution to grant planning permission

based on a certain set of circumstances which couldn't be taken into consideration at this point, if they chose to implement the planning permission as resolved by Members, there was no choice there, the hope was to see the benefits of any delivery.

41. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Brown declared that he was Ward Councillor for application No. E/0244/43/17.

42. E/0244/43/17 – Unauthorised works to listed building to front of Tonedale House, Wellington

Reported that a complaint had been received in July 2017 regarding alleged unauthorised works being carried out to the interior of Tonedale House, Wellington.

A site visit was carried out on the 20 July 2017, it found that a significant part of the interior of the building floors, ceilings and walls had been demolished. Following this incident, various interviews had been carried out to ascertain who actually carried out the works and on whose orders.

Historic England had assessed the demolition and its effects on the special character of the listed building. A building surveyor accredited in building conservation also assessed the structural integrity of the building.

Following concerns at the poor condition of the building resulting from the demolition, the Local Planning Authority served an S.54 Urgent Works Notice, Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 to prevent the possible collapse of the building.

The owners of the building did not respond to the notice and did not carry out the works as set out. As such the Local Authority had stepped in an appointed contractors through its procurement regulations to carry out the works.

Resolved that :-

(1) To institute prosecution proceedings against the owner, Mancraft Ltd and named individuals associated with that company and the Contractor Haveco UK Ltd in respect of unauthorised works carried out to Tonedale House, Wellington

(2) Delegated authority be given to officers in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in terms of the process of prosecution.

43. Appeals

Reported that two decisions and three appeals had been received details of which were submitted.

(The meeting ended at 6.05 pm)

24/17/0061

MR D HEBDITCH

Erection of an agricultural building for the storage of grain with formation of access on land adjacent to Stonehead Hill, Wrantage

Location: LAND ADJACENT TO STONEHEAD HILL, WRANTAGE, TA3 6BZ

Grid Reference: 328964.122865

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 A - Site Location Plan - Footprint of building reduced

(A3) DrNo Sht-02A Block Plan

(A1) DrNo Sht-01C Proposed Elevations and Floor Plan

(A1) DrNo Sht-03B Elevations from Highway

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

3. Prior to the building hereby approved being brought into use the access to the site shall provided in accordance with the approved plans. The access shall thereafter be retained in the approved form.

Reason: To ensure suitable access to the site is provided and retained.

4. (i) A landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority prior to such a scheme being implemented. The scheme shall include details of the species, siting and numbers to be planted.

(ii) The scheme shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development.

(iii) For a period of five years after the completion of each landscaping scheme, the trees and shrubs shall be protected and maintained in a healthy weed free condition and any trees or shrubs that cease to grow shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area.

5. Prior to the construction of the building/extension samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

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.

Proposal

The application proposes the construction of a grain store on agricultural land to the north of the A378. The building is proposed to be constructed in concrete panels and corrugated steel panels with corrugated fibre cement sheeting to the roof. The building would measure 24m by 18m with a height to the top of the ridge of 10.1m. A new vehicular access is proposed and amended plans showing visibility splays of 2.4m x 215m have been submitted. Native hedgerow planting and a stockproof fence is proposed along the new boundaries and additional tree planting is proposed to the street frontage. A compacted hardcore area is proposed to surround the proposed building.

Site Description

The site lies in an area of open countryside, outside a defined settlement boundary. The site is surrounded by open agricultural land in the ownership of the applicant. The nearest dwelling to the west is Hatch View. A caravan site is located towards Wrantage on the south side of the A378.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultation Responses

NORTH CURRY PARISH COUNCIL - Whilst the Parish Council understands the needs of the farmer, they would need a detailed design and access statement to understand why the building needs to be so large and in such a prominent position.

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP -

The proposal site sits off the classified A378. The posted speed limit is derestricted although observed speeds appeared to be approximately 60mph. Therefore optimum visibility splays would be 2.4m x 215m in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) with no obstruction to visibility greater than 900mm above adjoining road level. However when taking into account the anticipated level of vehicle movement the proposal is likely to generate, a step down below the desirable minimum would be considered in this instance.

LANDSCAPE - I support the proposal to plant native hedging on the new boundaries. However to aid screening from the A378 I would like to see some tree planting and the hedge being allowed to grow up higher. To accommodate this the building may need to be set back further from the highway slightly.

Representations Received

Four representations have been received raising some or all of the following objections:

- noise from unloading, storing and loading of grain would be intolerable
- a strong fuel vapour smell could be generated by the machinery
- dust particles could be detrimental to health
- loss of an established hedgerow and disturbance to wildlife
- increased heavy traffic on already fast and dangerous main road
- significant light pollution
- potential for increased flooding

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,

This takes into account the recent adoption of the SADMP.

Local finance considerations

Community Infrastructure Levy

The development does not attract an infrastructure levy.

Determining issues and considerations

The main issues to consider are impacts of the proposal on visual amenity, highway safety and residential amenity.

Policy DM2 sets out the criteria for development in the countryside and allows for the erection of new agricultural building commensurate with the role and function of agricultural holding. Details of the holding have been submitted which indicate that the applicant owns approximately 100 acres of arable land north of the application site and north of Solomons Hollow on which up to 400 tonnes of crop can be grown.

Visual Amenity

The building is of a traditional agricultural design consisting of a steel framed five bay building with walls constructed in concrete and corrugated steel panels, a corrugated fibre cement sheet roof and a roller shutter door on the eastern elevation. Details of the colour of the steel panels has not been submitted. However a condition can be included to require the details to be agreed. The application proposes planting along the boundaries of the site, which it is considered would help soften the impact of the building in the streetscape and the wider landscape. However a condition requiring the submission of details of landscaping is proposed. It is considered that the building is compatible with the rural character of the area.

Residential Amenity

Confirmation has been received that the building will be used for storage of dry grain only and no drying would be undertaken in the building and as the building is to be used for storage of grain, vehicle movements to and from the building would be sporadic, with the majority of the movements being harvest which, for 100 acres, would normally be over a period of a week. It is considered that the proposed use would not harm residential amenity of nearby residential properties.

Highways

Amended plans have been received demonstrating a visibility splay of 215m in each

direction and providing consolidation for the first 6m of the access into the site which addresses the issues raised by the Highway Authority and as such the proposal would not harm highway safety.

Flooding

The site lies within Flood Zone 1 where the risk of flooding is low. Surface water is proposed to be disposed of via a soakaway. The area around the building is proposed to be compacted hardcore which is porous. It is unlikely that the proposed development would create a greater flood risk or increase surface water runoff.

Conclusion

The building is well located to the arable land from which the grain is harvested and as required by policy DM2, near a public road and compatible with the rural character of the area. Access to the building would be sporadic and there would be no noise generated inside the building. It is considered that the size of the building is commensurate with role and function of the unit and subject to appropriate conditions, approval is recommended.

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

Contact Officer: Denise Grandfield

30/18/0002

MR & MRS R BRAMSTON

Erection of a detached dwelling with associated works to include a change of use of part of the agricultural field to domestic garden on land to the rear and side of The Stonehouse, Sellicks Green, Pitminster (amended scheme to 30/16/0029)

Location: THE STONEHOUSE, SELLICKS GREEN, PITMINSTER, TAUNTON,
TA3 7SD

Grid Reference: 321248.118974

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 1514-PL01B Site Location Plan
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL02A Site Survey
(A4) Site Layout Block Plan
(A3) DrNo 4130 Rev A Proposed Site Access
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1801 Ground Floor Plan
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1803 First Floor Plan
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1804 Section (East/West)
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1805 Detail Section (East/West)
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1806 West and North Elevations
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1807 East and South Elevations
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1808 Roof Plan

(A3) DrNo 1514-PL01C Site Location Plan
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1801A Site Layout & Block Plan
(A3) DrNo PL1802A Ground Floor Plan
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1806A West & North Elevations
(A3) DrNo 1514-PL1807A East & South Elevations

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

3. No construction of the exterior of the dwelling 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.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

4.
 - (i) Before the dwelling hereby approved is occupied, a landscaping scheme, which shall include details of the species, siting and numbers to be planted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - (ii) The scheme shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development, or as otherwise extended with the agreement in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
 - (iii) For a period of five years after the completion of each landscaping scheme, the trees and shrubs shall be protected and maintained in a healthy weed free condition and any trees or shrubs that cease to grow shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species, or the appropriate trees or shrubs as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

5. The area allocated for parking on the submitted plans shall be kept clear of obstruction at all times and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

6. The parking spaces hereby permitted shall be surfaced in permeable materials (not loose stone or gravel) and provision shall be made for the disposal of surface water within the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To reduce the risk of off-site flooding in accordance with Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The applicant shall undertake all the recommendations made in Richard Green's Ecological assessment report dated January 2016, and provide mitigation for bats as recommended.
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.

The development shall not be occupied until the scheme for the maintenance and provision of the new bat roosts and related accesses have been fully implemented. Thereafter the resting places and agreed accesses shall be permanently maintained

Reason: To protect bats.

8. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, the applicant shall investigate the history and current condition of the site to determine the likelihood of the existence of contamination arising from previous uses. The applicant shall:

(a) Provide a written report to the Local Planning Authority which shall include details of the previous uses of the site for at least the last 100 years and a description of the current condition of the site with regard to any activities that may have caused contamination. The report shall confirm whether or not it is likely that contamination may be present on the site.

(b) If the report indicates that contamination maybe present on or under the site, or if evidence of contamination is found, a more detailed site investigation and risk assessment shall be carried out in accordance with DEFRA and Environment Agency's "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CLR11" and other authoritative guidance (or guidance/procedures which may have superseded or replaced this). A report detailing the site investigation and risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(c) If the report indicates that remedial works are required, full details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing and thereafter implemented prior to the commencement of the development or at some other time that has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. On completion of any required remedial works the applicant shall provide written confirmation that the works have been completed in accordance with the agreed remediation strategy.

Reason: To ensure that land contamination can be dealt with adequately to prevent any harm to the health, safety or amenity of any users of the development, in accordance with Taunton Deane Core Strategy Policy DM1(f) and paragraphs 120-122 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any order revoking and re-enacting the 2015 Order with or without modification), there shall be no addition or extension to the building without the further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area or neighbours in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any order revoking and re-enacting the 2015 Order with or without modification), there shall be no further building, structure or other enclosure constructed or placed on the site without the further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

11. The bathroom window in the first floor southern elevation shall be glazed with obscure glass to a height of to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be so retained. There shall be no alteration or additional windows in this elevation without the further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To ensure the privacy of the occupant of the dwelling.

Notes to Applicant

Proposal

The proposal comprises the erection of a new dwelling to the side of Stonehouse and the change of use of agricultural land to domestic curtilage. Off road parking is proposed. The proposed dwelling has a modern design with a flat roof.

The dwelling will be constructed/finished with render White, light grey and dark grey) with elements of timber cladding aluminium framed windows, glass balustrades and timber doors.

The extended domestic curtilage will run along the rear of the proposed dwelling and The Stonehouse.

To allow access for the dwelling, the existing garage for The Stonehouse will be demolished.

The application is an amended scheme to a previous planning consent for a contemporary designed dwelling.

Site Description

The property lies within the village of Blagdon Hill and sits at an end of a small run of properties that are set back from the road with a layby and grass verge forward of the properties at this point. The rear of the property backs onto agricultural land and there is a public footpath adjoining the site; this forms the break between the site of The Stonehouse and the next property.

Relevant Planning History

30/16/0008 - Erection of dwelling to the side of The Stonehouse and change of use of land to domestic curtilage. The application was withdrawn.

30/16/0029 - Erection of a detached dwelling with associated works to include a change of use of part of the agricultural field to domestic garden on land to the rear and side of The Stonehouse, Sellicks Green, Pitminster. The application was approved

Consultation Responses

PITMINSTER PARISH COUNCIL – Objects

The plan moves the house towards the agricultural field and out of line with the other houses. Should the line of the house remain as was there is no need to extend beyond the village curtilage into agricultural field. (this is contrary to Policy DM2 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy).

The proposed size of the house is out of scale both for the plot and the village. It is out of keeping with the surrounding houses as the house does not use any natural or locally sourced materials. Windows and balcony overlooking adjacent houses need to be obscure glass.

The area of land behind the Stonehouse that has been identified to change agricultural land into domestic use extends the village curtilage for that house and should not be entertained (contrary to Policy DM2 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy).

NOTE the refusal of change of agricultural land to domestic curtilage on application 30/17/0022 (adjacent to Selleck's Green Farm).

SCC - RIGHTS OF WAY –

I can confirm that there is a public right of way (PROW) recorded on the Definitive Map that abuts the site at the present time (**public footpath T 21/55**). I have

attached a plan for your information.

We have no objections to the proposal, but the following should be noted:

1. General Comments

Any proposed works must not encroach on to the width of the PROW.

The health and safety of the public using the PROW must be taken into consideration during works to carry out the proposed development. Somerset County Council (SCC) has maintenance responsibilities for the surface of a PROW, but only to a standard suitable for the public use. SCC will not be responsible for putting right any damage occurring to the surface of a PROW resulting from vehicular use during or after works to carry out the proposal. It should be noted that it is an offence to drive a vehicle along a public footpath, public bridleway or restricted byway unless the driver has lawful authority (private rights) to do so.

If it is considered that the development would result in any of the outcomes listed below, then authorisation for these works must be sought from Somerset County Council Rights of Way Group:

- A PROW being made less convenient for continued public use.
- New furniture being needed along a PROW.
- Changes to the surface of a PROW being needed.
- Changes to the existing drainage arrangements associated with the PROW.

If the work involved in carrying out this proposed development would:

- make a PROW less convenient for continued public use; or
- create a hazard to users of a PROW,

then a temporary closure order will be necessary and a suitable alternative route must be provided. For more information, please visit Somerset County Council's Rights of Way pages to apply for a temporary closure:

<http://www.somerset.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/rightsof-way/apply-for-a-temporary-closure-of-a-right-of-way/> .

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP – refer to standing advice

BIODIVERSITY – no comment to make

WESSEX WATER – no comments received

DRAINAGE ENGINEER – no comment to make

LANDSCAPE – no comment to make

Representations Received

7 letters of OBJECTION have been received which raise the following issues.

- Happy with reduction in height, but unhappy that the building has been set back by 2m.
- The building will have a greater impact on the area and would be more prominent.
- Request confirmation that bathroom windows and south facing veranda would be obscurely glazed.
- The site should not extend into the agricultural land at the rear – other application in the area that have done this have been refused.
- Permitted development rights should be removed
- The land could be contaminated and previous planning conditions should be adhered to.
- Overlooking from the balconies
- Although height is lower, the ground floor increases from 153sq m to 225 sq m and the first floor from 136 sq m to 169 sq m.
- The building takes up too much of the plot
- Proposal is out of character with the area and visible from the AONB
- Elevations are boring and should be constructed from natural stone
- Large parking area is out of character with the area
- Original scheme should be built, not this revised one.

1 letter of SUPPORT received stating that the proposal is an innovative and interesting design. Blagdon Hill has an eclectic mix of properties and design styles spanning over five centuries with no particular dominant theme.

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.

ROW - Rights of Way,
EN12 - TDBCLP - Landscape Character Areas,

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 £50,750.00. With index linking this increases to approximately £67,500.00.

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	£6,474
Somerset County Council	£1,619

Determining issues and considerations

Principle

The proposed dwelling would be sited within the curtilage of The Stonehouse, though an additional area of garden for the dwelling is outside of the curtilage and requires a change of use. Other than this additional 9m projection of curtilage to the rear of the proposal, the site is within the settlement limits of Blagdon Hill.

It was previously considered that as the majority of the site is within the settlement limits; there would not be a significant encroachment of built form into the countryside. Planning consent has already been granted for a single dwelling on this site and the principle of residential development has been established

Character and appearance

The proposed dwelling follows the linear pattern of development within this part of Blagdon Hill, continuing development from the north in West View to the detached property of Green Crest to the south. All of these properties have varying set backs from the road, with West View properties close to the road, and the properties of Hollybank and Matson set further back. The proposed dwelling itself is set back from the front of The Stone House and further back from the position that was previously approved by the planning committee. The rear of the dwelling is also set back further than the original approval and extend to the settlement boundary line.

The dwelling has been designed with a largely cubic form. This differs from the previous permission that included a pitched roof. This has allowed the building to be lower in height and the lower basement level has been removed so that the building is 2 storeys.

The proposed dwelling is sited next to The Stonehouse, which is constructed in stone, and adjoins onto a more modern dwelling, that is finished in render. The proposed dwelling is of a modern design, incorporating a mixture of materials but the

natural stone elements from the previous permission have now been removed. Overall it is considered that the design of the dwelling is acceptable when considered against the previous planning consent.

Residential amenity

The proposed dwelling is sited approximately 22m from the end gable of the nearest property of Hollybank and 18m off the boundary (closest point). The position of the windows, combined with the use of the rooms to which they relate and the distance between dwellings results in a development that is not going to have a significant impact on residential amenity.

As the proposed dwelling is sited to the North East of Hollybank there is not considered to be any detrimental loss of light or shadowing.

As the height is lower than the previous scheme (that was found to be acceptable) the proposed dwelling is not considered to be overbearing on any neighbouring properties.

Visual amenity

The site is bound by a hedgerow to the front and side of the site, and the rear of the site shares a boundary with the adjoining field. It is proposed to incorporate some of this field into domestic curtilage, projecting a distance of 9m. The new garden area would be enclosed by a hedge and permitted development rights would be removed to ensure no further buildings or structures would be placed on this land.

Given the extended curtilage is within a corner of a field and does not project out into the middle of the field, the extended curtilage is not considered to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

The dwelling would be visible from the surrounding area, and from the public footpath, however it is considered that a contemporary approach to design is not going to cause significant harm to the character of the area.

Though as the overall height of the dwelling is not significantly greater than the adjoining properties, and that the dwelling would be seen in the context of the other properties, it is considered the dwelling would not contribute any significant harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Highways

The proposed dwelling will utilize an existing underused access that served a garage to The Stonehouse, which will be demolished. The car port that was proposed in the original submission has been removed but the parking spaces retained. There is sufficient space for parking and turning within the site. As the access to the garage is existing and this access adjoins the wide entrance to the public right of way, there is not considered to be any harm to users of the footpath. Furthermore, vehicles

leaving the site would have visibility when leaving. Vehicles enter/leave the site via a layby/service road to a few properties, not the main highway.

Whilst the garage of The Stonehouse will be demolished, the property still has sufficient parking and turning.

Other matters

The public footpath is sited outside of the site, and its current boundaries, and is unlikely to be affected by this proposal, an advisory note with the Rights of Way comments has been attached.

A condition requiring investigation into the previous use of the site has been included following comments received from the public concerning possible contamination.

Conclusion

The proposed dwelling can be accommodated within the extended site without harm to the visual or residential amenity of the area; the dwelling would be within the settlement boundary of Blagdon Hill and not within an isolated location. Design of the dwelling, though different to existing properties, is an acceptable modern addition to the village. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and is recommended for approval.

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

Contact Officer: Saffron Loasby

GREENVIEW DEVELOPMENTS

Demolition of garage and side extension with erection of 1 No. attached dwelling with associated works to the side of Jessamine Cottage, The Holloway, Holywell Lake, Wellington

Location: JESSAMINE COTTAGE, THE HOLLOWAY, HOLYWELL LAKE,
WELLINGTON, TA21 0EJ

Grid Reference: 310667.120497

Full Planning Permission

Recommendation

Recommended decision: Refusal

- 1 The proposed new dwelling would be located outside of development limits and is therefore classed as being located in Open Countryside, where new residential development is not supported and the Local Planning Authority resists the development of land for 'open market' housing. The dwelling would be remote from local facilities and services, fostering the growth in the need to travel and representing an unsustainable form of development. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1 and DM2 of the adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy and policy SB1 of the adopted Taunton Deane Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (December 2016). There is considered to be no reasonable justification to allow for a departure from policy in this instance.
- 2 This proposal is considered to harm the character and appearance of the area and on the streetscene by introducing a new semi-detached property into a predominantly detached area of the hamlet which would have a detrimental impact. The design of the new dwelling is not in keeping with the adjoining Jessamine Cottage in terms of the arrangement of the new window openings and lack of entrance on the principle road elevation. For these reasons it is considered that the proposal does not accord with local policies DM1, DM2 and CP8 of the Taunton Deane adopted Core Strategy.
- 3 The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposal as submitted demonstrates a lack of parking provision and the arrangement of the parking spaces together with the lack of visibility with the adjoining busy road, it is considered that the proposal is not acceptable in terms of Highway safety in terms of a danger to both pedestrians walking along the road and in terms of vehicular parking and therefore the scheme is contrary to local policies DM1, of the adopted Core Strategy and policy A1 of the adopted SADMP and also fails to meet the requirements of Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Recommended Conditions (if applicable)

Notes to Applicant

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council works in a positive and pro-active way with applicants and looks 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

Demolition of garage and side extension and replacement with the erection of 1 attached dwelling with associated works to the side of Jessamine Cottage, The Holloway, Holywell Lake, Wellington. Works to renovate the current cottage have taken place as well re-landscaping to the rear west and southern side. The proposal seeks permission to demolish the single storey extension to the side of the cottage and constructed a new 3 bed two storey cottage with new small external courtyard area and off street parking for 2 cars. The dwelling is proposed to an open market dwelling.

It is also proposed to reconstruct a new post box to replace the existing in the garage wall.

Site Description

Jessamine Cottage is located directly adjacent to the back edge of the highway in the small hamlet known as Holywell Lake that is 2km (1.24miles) south west of Wellington. It is claimed that part of the original cottage was rebuilt following a fire in the past and previous to this there was once a terrace of several cottages in this location. No planning history has been submitted to establish this and having looked at historic maps online, in 1930 the site is shown to have 2 buildings and from maps in 1962 to 1972 and 1993 it is shown as a post office. There is also an existing post box adjacent to the wall of the garage element on the south of the main house structure.

The current site comprises of a 2 storey dual pitched cottage finished in render with a slate roof and also attached to the side (south) is a low mono-pitched single storey extension and garage with an external post box beside it. This is also rendered and clad with a corrugated tin roof. This is also a single storey small outbuilding set back from the road and adjacent to the left (northern) side of the dwelling, as well as 1 parking space.

At the time of the recent site visit, the main house is covered with scaffolding due to renovation works on the main house, the mono-pitched garage/store building still stand on the site and extensive ground works beside the building and the steeply rising land to the rear have also been undertaken.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultation Responses

WELLINGTON WITHOUT PARISH COUNCIL - The PC supports this application for the following reasons, inter alia. The development will greatly improve a tired and rather depressing site and create some additional affordable housing on an existing footprint which will greatly benefit the local community.

Further to previous comments which still stand we would like to add the following, although the general opinion of the village is that this development enhances the streetscene and provides more affordable accommodation we feel that after the receipt of a letter from a local resident and subsequent discussion, consideration of privacy with neighbouring property needs to be addressed.

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP - No comments received at time of writing this report.

BIODIVERSITY -

The application is for the demolition of a garage and side extension with the erection of an attached dwelling to the side of Jessamine Cottage, Holywell Lake.

Blue sky ecology carried out a Bat and Bird Report by surveying the single storey outbuilding only in February 2018. Findings were as follows;

Birds - The surveyor found evidence of historic bird nesting.

Bats - No bats were observed roosting in the building. The building is in a poor condition due to the collapsed roof letting in water.

I support the recommendation to install two bat bricks during the renovation works

Condition for protected species:

The applicant shall undertake all the recommendations made in Blue sky Ecology's Bat and Bird Report dated February 2018

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.

Reason: to protect wildlife

Informative Note

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

WESSEX WATER - Due to a recent change in personnel we have been unable to provide site specific comments for a number of planning consultations received between the end of March and the beginning of April. We are sorry about this and are working hard to get back on track.

As the request for comment on this application is more than 3 weeks old we are not planning to respond unless we are contacted again on current or emerging issues which require attention.

Please note that advice on obtaining new connections to drainage and water supply networks and other development information can be found at www.wessesxwater.co.uk

Representations Received

6 letters have been received from the local community, 1 of objection and 5 of support. They raise the following issues:

Objection

- I object to the application plan 17/830/04 refers to re-landscaping in progress, chapter 6 of the design and access statement refers to landscaping the gardens and providing natural screening and nowhere in the application and associated drawing does it show in detail what this current re-landscaping consists of?
- It is actually the construction of gabion basket terracing giving potential for intensification of use of the rear garden of Jessamine cott, leading to greater overlooking into the rear garden of Fanco significantly impacting on our privacy and residential amenity.
- No specific mitigation has been provided for this invasion of privacy and this needs to be addressed.
- The application form confirms that the current provision for off street car parking for the one existing property is for 2 cars. The proposal for parking for the proposed 2 properties is for 2 cars.
- We all know that irrespective of the applicants claims, the 2 proposed 3 bed homes will attract families that are likely to generate more than 1 vehicle per household. As a result, the 2nd or 3rd vehicles will be forced to park on the public highway and the only location this is likely to occur is outside our property Fanco on Farthing Down next to the junction with the Holloway.
- This area of the highway is already congested with cars of residents of neighbouring residential properties. The likely increase in on street parking will both have an adverse impact on highway safety of the junction and on the appearance of the streetscene.

Support

- Works are considered acceptable as it would improve the appearance of this run-down untidy site and improve the character and appearance of the area.
- An additional new rural dwelling will maintain the rural environment and would also introduce much needed affordable housing in the area.

- The works would develop the existing footprint of a previously developed site.
- It would be fantastic to see this cottage brought back into use.
- The construction of smaller properties should be encouraged as too many properties have now been extended into much larger and more expensive homes.
- The availability of smaller more affordable quality homes in the countryside now seems quite limited.

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.

SP1 - Sustainable development locations,
 DM1 - General requirements,
 DM2 - Development in the countryside,
 DM4 - Design,
 CP8 - Environment,
 SB1 - Settlement Boundaries,
 A1 - Parking Requirements,
 D7 - Design quality,
 D10 - Dwelling Sizes,
 D12 - Amenity space,

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 £11,500.00. With index linking this increases to approximately £15,500.00.

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	£6,474
Somerset County Council	£1,619

Determining issues and considerations

The main issues and considerations in this case are;

- **Principle of development,**
- **Impacts on the character and appearance of the area,**
- **Impacts on residential amenity,**
- **Highway safety.**

Principle of development,

The main policy considerations in this case are the location of the site which is outside of development limits policy SP1, of the adopted core strategy, (Sustainable development locations) and local policy SB1 (settle boundaries) of the adopted SADMP (site allocations and development management plan). Development outside of these areas is classed as being in the open countryside. Adopted core policy DM2, (development in open countryside) supports certain developments in the open countryside, however, the proposals do not relate to the replacement of an existing dwelling or the conversion of a rural building. The application is for an open market dwelling and therefore can not be assessed against the rural exceptions criteria for affordable housing.

The proposals are therefore not supported by the development plan. It is therefore necessary to consider whether the proposals cause any demonstrable harm. In terms of the principle of development, Holywell Lake is remote from a number of day to day services and resident are going to be reliant on the private motor car to access these essential facilities. This is not considered to be a sustainable pattern of development that could repeated too often in areas of open countryside. When considering whether development is sustainable (as defined in the NPPF) it is also necessary to consider other factors such as creating a high quality built environment with accessible local services. It also requires an environmental element to be considered such as minimising pollution and moving to a low carbon economy.

Impacts on the character and appearance of the area,

Holywell lake is a small hamlet with several residential properties both single storey bungalows and also two storey detached and terraced housing along each side of The Holloway (the main road). These are constructed in a range of varying style and materials and include a converted chapel (into residential) and a nearby public house (Holywell Inn), which is the only local facility.

In terms of appearance, the proposed additional dwelling is shown on the submitted detail as having the same ridge height as Jessamine Cottage (2 storey) and be constructed in painted render with timber windows and doors, and have a slate roof to match the existing house. However, the arrangement of windows on the front elevation (particularly) do not match Jessamine and the entrance to the new dwelling is via the southern gable end rather than front and facing the front street. The street elevation has the appearance more akin to a rear elevation and this is out of character with the street scene.

There are also concerns regarding the amount of useable outside amenity area on already restricted site due to the steeply rising topography as the proposed site plan indicates a significant reduction in the amount of rear garden space for Jessamine Cottage and only part useable space which includes a small new courtyard to the western gable end of the new dwelling.

Given the aforementioned it is considered harmful to the character of the area and on the streetscene and that the proposal is contrary to adopted core policies DM1 and DM4, and also local policies D7 and D12 of the adopted SADMP (Site Allocations and Development Management Plan) 2016.

Impacts on residential amenity,

Several letters of representation have been received from members of the local community and can be seen above in this report. The single objection relates to the lack of re landscaping detail and impacts on adjoining privacy, and lack of parking (to be discussed in the next section).

The lack of landscaping and the overall amount of amenity provision is a concern and further details could be required regarding the detail via a condition if the scheme were recommended for approval. However, as previously commented development in rural areas are strictly controlled.

Overall it is considered that the development would not have significant adverse impacts on residential amenity in the area in terms of overlooking, overbearing impact and lack of privacy.

Highway safety.

At the time of writing this report no comments have been received from SCC Highways. However, in their adopted Parking Strategy which includes their Standing Advice, this guides that the site is located within car parking Zone B, which guides that 3 bed houses should provide 2.5 car parking spaces + visitor parking plus cycle spaces of 1 space per bedroom. In this case, the proposal should provide parking for both the existing house and the proposed dwelling.

The proposed Site Plan (dwg. no. 17/830/04, Rev B) indicates only 2 cycle spaces for the new proposed dwelling (an under provision of 1 space). Only one car parking space is shown for the new dwelling and one space for the existing Jessamine Cottage. The parking space for the new dwelling is parallel to the adjoining road The Holloway, and the existing car parking space for Jessamine is beside the gable end, where there is no turning available and therefore would need to either reverse into or out of the single space (which when measured is not the required 6m x 3m (beside Jessamine).

The Holloway is a Classified (Class C) road and therefore, both the lack of parking provision (by at least 3 parking spaces and the arrangement of the spaces together with the lack of visibility with the adjoining busy road, it is considered that the proposal is not acceptable in terms of Highway safety in terms of a danger to both pedestrians walking along the road and in terms of vehicular parking and therefore refusal on highway grounds is advised as the scheme is contrary to local policies DM1, of the adopted Core Strategy and policy A1 of the adopted SADMP.

Conclusion

Given the discussion on the issues and considerations above, and the comments received, the proposal is recommended for refusal on the grounds on development outside the settlement boundaries, the design of the new dwelling adversely affecting the character and appearance of the character and the issues of Highway safety.

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

Contact Officer: Sue Keal

Site: WILSCOMBE WOOD COTTAGE, LANGFORD BUDVILLE ROAD, WIVELISCOMBE, TAUNTON, TA4 1NJ

Application number: 23/17/0027

Proposal: Replacement of dwelling, garage and mobile home with the erection of 1 No. dwelling and detached garage at Wilscombe Wood Cottage, Milverton (amended scheme to 23/16/0039)

Appeal Decision: Allowed

Site: 128 GALMINGTON ROAD, TAUNTON, TA1 5DW

Application number: 52/18/0003

Proposal: Formation of vehicular access at 128 Galmington Road, Taunton

Appeal Decision: Dismissed



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2018

by **S Rennie BA (Hons) BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/W/17/3191277

Wilscombe Wood Cottage, Milverton, Taunton, Somerset TA4 1NJ

- 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 O Hines against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/17/0027, dated 11 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of dwelling, garage and mobile home with the erection of 1 No dwelling and detached garage – Amended Scheme.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the replacement of dwelling, garage and mobile home with the erection of 1 No dwelling and detached garage, at the rear of Wilscombe Wood Cottage, Milverton, Taunton, Somerset TA4 1NJ, in accordance with the application, Ref 23/17/0027, dated 11 July 2017, subject to the following conditions:

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Site Location Plan 1:1250
 - 4816/11 Revision C
 - 4816/8 Revision B
 - 4816/9 Revision A
 - 4816/7 Revision B
 - 4816/6 – Mobile Home (as existing)
 - 4816/12 – Garage/Store (as existing)
 - 4816/1 – Dwelling Footprint (as existing)
 - 4816/2 – West Elevation (as existing)
 - 4816/3 – North Elevation (as existing)
 - 4816/4 – East Elevation (as existing)
 - 4816/5 – South Elevation (as existing)

- 4816/10 – Site Plan (as existing)
- 3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the recommendations contained within the submitted Preliminary Bat Roost Survey, prepared by Halpin Robbins, dated 24 October 2016.
- 4) Prior to the first use of the garage and ancillary accommodation as part of the development hereby approved, the existing mobile home structure and other ancillary buildings should be removed in their entirety from the site, as detailed on the submitted plans and in the supporting information.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr O Hines against Taunton Deane Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. The appeal scheme before me seeks the replacement of the existing dwelling with a new dwelling together with a detached garage with living accommodation above. However since the appeal has been lodged, the Council has granted planning permission for a dwelling of similar size and characteristics as in this appeal but with a smaller-sized garage¹. This permission was amended² to include retention of the extant mobile home which sits on the site; the mobile home having been established as lawful through the grant of a certificate of lawful development³. That amendment was also granted planning permission by the Council.
4. There is therefore little point in me making any finding on the acceptability of the dwelling, and I do not do so in my decision. Instead, I find the area where the difference between the parties lie, and subsequently will form the main issue in this appeal concerns the proposed garage and annexe building,.
5. I wrote to the main parties asking them to comment on whether it would be prudent to impose a suitably worded condition requiring the removal of the mobile home in the event I were minded to allow the appeal. I have taken the responses received into consideration in my decision.

Main Issue

6. Having regard to the above, I find that the main issue is the whether the proposed garage and annexe would represent a substantially larger building than the approved garage and if so, whether other considerations would justify it.

Reasons

7. The site is within the countryside. In this regard, policy DM 2 (Development in the Countryside) of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy 2011 – 2028 (Core Strategy) is pertinent to the appeal. This policy states that outside of defined

¹ Council reference 23/16/0039

² Council reference 23/17/0044

³ Council reference 23/17/0023/LE

settlement limits a number of uses will be supported. Section 5 of this policy relates to replacement dwellings, and 5a stating in specific reference to the appeal that *"a one-for-one replacement and is not substantially larger than the existing dwelling"*.

8. The appellant raises specific concerns as to the applicability of the policy given that the matters of dispute concern only the garage and annexe, and not the dwelling itself. However, I do not share these sentiments. The proposed garage and annexe would be an ancillary building within the residential curtilage of the dwelling and used incidental to its enjoyment. As such, I consider that it is a reasonable interpretation that this policy relates to the replacement of the house and the outbuildings in this case.
9. According to the figures given by the appellant, and not disputed by the Council, the floor area of the approved smaller garage taken with the mobile home, which would be consistent with the approved scheme⁴, would amount to some 58sqm. The enlarged garage the subject of this appeal would measure 86.4sqm. While the overall height difference between the approved garage and that proposed here would amount to some 0.8m difference, I nevertheless find that the garage and annexe building before me would be considerably larger than both the volumes of both the approved garage and mobile home.
10. In applying Core Strategy policy DM 2 (5) in its strictest form, I find that the proposed garage and annexe taken by itself would not amount to a one-for-one replacement and it would be substantially larger than the approved garage and mobile home structure cumulatively. It would, accordingly, not accord with the policy.
11. Having said that, Core Strategy policy DM 2 as worded does not direct refusal of buildings which would be substantially larger. Indeed to do so would I find bring the policy in direct conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Underpinning policy DM 2 is the need to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
12. Here, the Council does not advance an explanation as to the harm that would occur from the garage and annexe building before me; . Moreover, the Council has made clear that there are visual benefits of the scheme, stating the development would result in a more appropriate condensed built form within the current residential curtilage and would improve the character and appearance of the site. I share these sentiments, and moreover find the proposed garage and annexe being set to the rear of the site against a woodland backdrop and would not be prominent from any public view.
13. On this basis, I find that the proposed development would not have any adverse impacts to the character and appearance of the countryside in this area, and would, moreover, result in a visual benefit over the existing arrangement of buildings on site.
14. As stated above, the appeal before would result in the removal of the mobile home structure on the site. However, I am minded to the fact that because of the subsequent establishment of lawfulness and planning permission for it, there is a real possibility of the mobile home structure remaining on the site if the proposed garage and annexe were built.

⁴ Council reference 23/17/0044

15. If this were to be the case, it would amount to some 108sqm of floor space, and would be considerably more built form than the approved garage with mobile home, and on which the Council made its favourable assessment. On this basis I find that the removal of the existing mobile home and outbuildings as part of the proposed development is necessary to preserve the character and appearance of the area. This can be controlled by condition.
16. Considering all of the submitted information, I find balance that the proposed development would not undermine or cause significant harm to the intrinsic character of the countryside, and not significantly more so than the approved smaller garage. This is sufficient, in my judgement, to outweigh the conflict with the Core Strategy policy DM2.
17. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to the Council's concerns in respect to the sustainability of the location. However, as the living accommodation would be ancillary to the replacement dwelling also proposed then this would not constitute a new dwelling in a countryside location. Whilst the site has limited accessibility there is an existing house and mobile home on site and so would not result in a less accessible development than existing.
18. The Council has also drawn my attention to adopted policy SB1 (Settlement Boundaries) of the Taunton Deane Adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan, which is relevant as the proposals are outside of any settlement boundary. The policy states that if outside of any settlement boundary the site is within the open countryside. In these circumstances it refers to the Core Strategy policies it needs to be assessed against, including policy DM2, which I have already carried out.

Other Matters

European Protected Species (Bats)

19. The appellant has submitted a 'Preliminary Bat Roost Survey' dated 24 October 2016, by HalpinRobbins Ecology & Environmental Services. Further letters from HalpinRobbins, as recently as 26 April 2017, have also been submitted to address the issue of bats at the existing site. The surveys state that the roof of the existing house is being used by two species of bat, with the surrounding area being used by bats for foraging and as a commuting habitat.
20. As well as stating that a Protected Species Mitigation Licence would be needed, mitigation has also been advised with the survey conclusions that 'bat lofts' need to be incorporated with the proposed development. A bat loft area has been shown to be incorporated into the proposed garage and ancillary accommodation building. I also acknowledge that the HalpinRobbins letter of April 2017 sets out the benefits of a bat loft in the larger proposed garage, rather than the smaller version of the garage previously approved. Based on the submitted survey information and considering the response from English Nature that does not raise any objections, I am satisfied that the protected species can be safeguarded subject to a condition for a strategy to protect bats and birds.
21. In this regard, Circular 06/2005 states that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Also, the Habitats Directive requires member states

to establish a system of strict protection for European Protected Species (of which Bats are one such species). Regulation 9(3) requires that a competent authority must have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in exercising their functions. Furthermore, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 states that any public authority, in exercising its functions, must have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

22. Because the development would result in a breach of protection to European Protected Species in effectively destroying a bat roost, I have in accordance with the Regulations assessed the proposal against the three derogation tests to ascertain the likelihood of Natural England granting a licence to carry out the works. In this respect, I consider there to be a reasonable prospect of this as:
- (a) the development is in the public interest as it would provide a new dwelling to meet modern building standards;
 - (b) there is no satisfactory alternative to this site given that the proposal is site specific and for the replacement of an existing house on site;
 - and (c) that the works authorised would not be detrimental to maintenance of the population of the Bat species affected.
23. In view of the above, and on the basis of the evidence before me, I have concluded that although the development would result in the loss of the existing Bat roosts, it would nonetheless be acceptable as appropriate measures and mitigation can be provided. The proposal would therefore accord with Core Strategy policy CP8 which, amongst other things, seeks to protect habitats and species.
24. In view of the above, I am also satisfied that the development would accord with the provisions of Circular 06/2005 and Paragraphs 17 (bullet point 7) and paragraph 118 of the Framework which state that local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and refuse planning permission if significant harm from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or as a last resort, compensated for.

Conditions

25. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would be necessary in the interests of certainty.
26. Whilst I acknowledge the recommended condition from Natural England with regards the need for a strategy to protect bats and birds, I believe that the condition recommended by the Council (subject to some changes in the interest of clarity and preciseness) is satisfactory to address the issue. The surveys have been completed in detail and recommendations made, with no objections raised by either the Council or Natural England on this matter. I also have no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect to birds, with the submitted survey referring to bats only.
27. As such, I have attached a condition that requires the mitigation measures should be in accordance with the survey document produced by HalpinRobbins, dated 24 October 2016.
28. As stated above, I find a condition requiring the removal of the mobile home from the site prior to the completion of the proposed garage and ancillary accommodation is necessary to ensure the built form at the site does not undermine the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons outlined above the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Rennie

INSPECTOR



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2018

by **S Rennie BA (Hons) BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2018

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/W/17/3191277 Wilscombe Wood Cottage, Milverton, Taunton, Somerset TA4 1NJ

- 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 O Hines for a full award of costs against Taunton Deane Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the replacement of dwelling, garage and mobile home with the erection of 1 No dwelling and detached garage – Amended Scheme.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is allowed in the terms set out below.

Reasons

2. Written submissions have been made from both the appellant and the Council, which have been fully considered as part of this costs application.
3. The National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that, irrespective of the outcome of the appeal, costs may only be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
4. The PPG makes it clear that a local planning authority is at risk of an award of costs if it fails to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal on appeal and/or makes vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact which are unsupported by any objective analysis.
5. As has been concluded in my decision for this development, the Council has clearly explained why the development would not be in accordance with the relevant criteria of the Taunton Deane Borough Council Core Strategy 2011 – 2028 (Core Strategy). This is on the basis that the proposed development would be larger than existing. However, the Council has not provided any detailed explanation as

to what harm this would lead to, particularly in connection with the aims and objectives of Core Strategy policy DM 2.

6. In the Council's reason for refusal, in reference to Core Strategy policy DM 2, it states that "*the enlarged garage with first floor living accommodation above, would result in unacceptable additional development in open countryside that would be in an unsustainable location and would have unacceptable impacts on the visual amenities of this rural location*". However, neither the unsustainable

location nor the unacceptable impacts on the visual amenities has been explained in any detail in the submitted Council documentation.

7. In regards to the location, it is accepted by all parties that this is a rural location, but the proposed development is a replacement dwelling with ancillary accommodation above a garage. The site currently has a dwelling with outbuildings, including a mobile home used as ancillary accommodation. As such, the proposals would not result in an increase of dwellings at the site and so it is not clear why the issue of the unsustainable location has been included in the reason for refusal, especially when Core Strategy policy DM 2 does allow for replacement dwellings in the countryside, subject to criteria.
8. In regards to the visual impacts, this has not been substantiated with any evidence. Moreover, the Council's delegated report states that the development would result in a more "*appropriate condensed built form*" from the existing arrangement, which would "*improve the character and appearance of the site when the older elements of the site are removed.*" On this basis, it is not clear how the development proposed would lead to an adverse visual impact when there are visual benefits for the site.
9. This demonstrates that the Council has included vague and unsubstantiated reasons for refusal.
10. I have already found Core Strategy policy DM2 of the Core Strategy to be relevant to the decision, and other matters raised by the appellant have also been addressed in the appeal decision, in respect to policy DM1, other examples of similar cases in the area, for example. On these matters I do not find the Council has acted unreasonably.
11. I am also satisfied that the Council were aware of subsequent decisions at the site and the situation with regards permitted development rights. I must therefore assume that this has not changed their opinion on the main issues of the case which is not unreasonable behaviour. I am also satisfied that they are fully aware that this accommodation above the garage would be ancillary and therefore I must assume that there is no misunderstanding as to the proposals.
12. Furthermore, I do not consider that the Council approval of planning application 23/17/0044 is inconsistent, considering their refusal of this appeal case, as there are differences between the cases.
13. However, on the matter of the unsubstantiated and vagueness of aspects of the reason for refusal I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in Planning Practice Guidance, has been demonstrated and that an award of costs is justified.
14. I have taken into consideration the Council's rebuttal, which includes an explanation why conditions or negotiations could not have overcome the reasons for refusal. However, this rebuttal does not sufficiently explain the lack of substantiated evidence or explanation regarding the harm the development would cause that led to this refusal.

Costs Order

15. In exercise of the powers under section 250(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 and Schedule 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, and all other enabling powers in that behalf, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that

Taunton Deane Borough Council shall pay to Mr O Hines, the costs of the appeal proceedings described in the heading of this decision.

16. The applicant is now invited to submit to Taunton Deane Borough Council, to whom a copy of this decision has been sent, details of those costs with a view to reaching agreement as to the amount. In the event that the parties cannot agree on the amount, a copy of the guidance note on how to apply for a detailed assessment by the Senior Courts Costs Office is enclosed.

Steven Rennie

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2018

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/D/18/3200772
128 Galmington Road, Taunton, Somerset 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 against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 52/18/0003, dated 9 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as:
 - 1) *Dropped kerb;*
 - 2) *New vehicle access to existing driveway; and*
 - 3) *Replacement of gravel hardstanding with brindle paviors laid on sand.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal property, together with 126 Galmington Road, was the subject of an appeal decision in July 2017 for a similar proposal (Ref APP/D3315/W/17/ 3170712). I have not been provided with a copy of the plans that were considered as part of the last appeal, but it appears that the principal differences this time are: (i) the exclusion of No 126 from forming any part of the proposal; (ii) a change to the position of a fence to the side of No 128; and (iii) changes proposed to the surface of the existing hardstand to the front of No 128.
-

3. Similar to the previous case, the proposed dropped kerb to the edge of the carriageway along Galmington Road is not contained within the red line that was drawn around the planning application site. Accordingly, for the avoidance of doubt and consistent with the previous Inspector, I have dealt with the development that is included within the red site line as shown on the application plans.
4. At the time of my visit the appeal property had scaffolding erected around it with some significant improvements and alterations underway, which I understand to be part of works to facilitate the appellant, who is registered disabled and partially sighted. There was a van parked on the site directly to

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

the front of No 128, and a car parallel to it and close up to the notional side boundary with No 126.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the construction of a new vehicle access to an existing hardstanding at 128 Galmington Road on highway safety.

Reasons

6. At the time of my visit in the early part of the morning, it was evident to me that Galmington Road was well-used and fairly busy. I also saw that the highway and its surroundings were as described by the previous Inspector. There are grass verges to either side of the road between the footways and the pavements; on-street parking is controlled by double yellow lines for long distances but with some designated parking spaces within the highway; there is a signal controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing close to the appeal site with its zig-zag keep-clear markings extending in front of No 128; and wooden bollards in the verge in front of the appeal site at around 4m intervals to prevent parallel parking at this point.
7. At present there is a fence and gate running perpendicular to the side of No 128 and flush with its front elevation. This attaches to a similar arrangement to the side of No 126, with a fence running from this point along the side boundary between both properties and continuing to the rear. It is proposed to remove the fence that runs between the flank walls of Nos 128 and 126, and to secure the rear garden area with a new fence and gate set much deeper into the site and approximately aligned with the rear wall of the existing dwelling. This revised arrangement would provide space to the side of 128 for a vehicle to enter and park.
 8. Together with the change to the materials for the existing hard surface, the appellant argues that these works would provide extra space to the front of the house for parking and the required turning space to enable vehicles parked on the site to leave in forward gear. However, the turning space that would be available is not clearly shown on the application drawings. Apart from providing the potential for an additional parking space to the side of No 128, I am unable to detect any material difference between the arrangement that is now proposed and that which was considered by the previous Inspector.
9. In the previous appeal the Inspector recognised that the front garden to No 128 was laid to gravel as an existing hard standing. The use of brick paviors as an alternative surface would not increase the space to the front of the house, which as previously recognised, is constrained in nature. A single car parked to the side of No 128 may be able to reverse out and swing into space in front of the dwelling, but this would be dependent upon a turning manoeuvre for a vehicle that is not clearly demonstrated. Moreover, I note that parking is desired by the appellant for a vehicle that they can use as well as that of a carer. In these circumstances any possible potential for a second parked car to be able to turn would be likely to be lost. As was the case previously, reversing manoeuvres would need to occur very close to the controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing. There are no change in circumstances that lead me to conclude other than in accord with the previous Inspector that these movements would be a danger to other users of the highway who would be

concentrating most upon activity in the road, at the crossing, and movements at the nearby junction with College Way rather than the movement of vehicles from the appeal site.

10. I have noted the appellant's assertion that the appeal site has been used by parked vehicles for many years. It is clear that vehicles can access the land in-between the bollards on the verge and that tyre tracks in the verge suggest that this is the case. Nevertheless, the proposal that is before me would have the potential to increase existing vehicle movements beyond any that already occur. This would be to the detriment of others using the public highway at a point described by the Council as a safety zone for the adjacent crossing. In addition, previous concerns with regard to partly restricted visibility for drivers leaving the site due to a lamp post within the footway and a mature tree within the verge are not addressed.
11. I recognise that there is high demand for the available on-street parking locally and that this often means that neither the appellant nor her carers are able to park nearby. However, I understand from the information that has been provided that the appellant's blue badge would enable a car to be parked for prescribed periods near to the front of this property and despite suggestions to the contrary, there is no substantive evidence before me of the potential for serious harm to the free flow of traffic or highway safety as a consequence. In addition, whilst I fully recognise the need for any disabled person to gain easy access to a vehicle in order to sustain a good quality of life there is no information before me that explains how the appellant's disability impacts upon their mobility or ability to walk from the house to a parked car. The inability to park a vehicle within the curtilage of No 128 would not prohibit the appellant from using or accessing a vehicle. Neither would it prohibit a carer from doing so and attending to their duties at the appeal property, including in the case of an emergency.
12. I have taken note of the properties elsewhere along Galmington Road which have driveways, including one near to another crossing. However, I do not know the background to any of these and in any event, I saw none that were directly comparable to the circumstances that prevail at No 128.

13. When all of these considerations are taken together I find that the personal circumstances of the appellant do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to highway safety. I am satisfied that this decision is proportionate having weighed the appellant's submissions against the public interests of the case and that the rights of the appellant under the Human Rights Act 1998 would not be violated.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given I conclude overall that the proposal would lead to road safety problems in conflict with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework as it seeks to ensure safe and secure arrangements for all users of the highway. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan INSPECTOR

APPEALS RECEIVED – 18 July 2018

Site: HILLSIDE, EAST NYNEHEAD ROAD, NYNEHEAD, WELLINGTON, TA21 0DD

Proposal: Erection of 1 No. dwelling with detached double garage and associated works in the garden to the side of Hillside, East Nynehead

Application number: 26/17/0013

Appeal reference: APP/D3315/W/18/3203331

Site: OLANDS, BURN HILL, MILVERTON, TAUNTON

Proposal: Erection of 4 No. dwellings with garaging and associated works with extension to primary school car park facilities at Olands, Burn Hill, Milverton

Application number: 23/17/0020

Appeal reference: APP/D3315/W/18/3203147

Site: LANGALLER LANE, CREECH ST MICHAEL

Proposal: Outline planning application with all matters reserved, except for access, for the erection of up to 200 No. dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with vehicular access point off Langaller Lane, Creech St Michael

Application number: 14/17/0033

Appeal reference: APP/D3315/W/18/3205705
