

4 06/2002/035

As amended by letter dated 17th August, 2002 with accompanying drawing Nos. 539/010A, 02, 03A and 04.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objection in principle. Car park layout option 1 is wholly inappropriate, as it has vehicles obstructing the entrance. It is desirable to have turning space for vehicles within the car park area, so as to avoid the potential vehicle conflict caused by vehicles reversing across the footway and back into the carriageway. If each parking space is taken to be standard dimension of 2.4 m x 4.8 m it will be possible to maintain the number of spaces proposed and include a turning facility. Note the car park is proposed as a gravel surface and not a consolidated one. If this is the case it will be difficult to mark the parking bays, and this may cause confusion to pedestrians and drivers alike as well as carrying loose material from the car park onto the adjoining highway. If a hard surface is applied and marked parking bays are provided, it will be easier for drivers, mothers with buggies, and those using wheel chairs to access the car park and facilities available. In the event of permission being granted would ask that conditions be applied re (1) visibility splays 33 m x 2 m; (2) properly consolidated and surfaced car parking area with parking bays marked; (3) provision to prevent discharge of surface water onto the highway.

ENGLISH HERITAGE the over-riding reaction is one of disappointment that the application represents overdevelopment and yet does not take advantage of the potential of the site. On a basic level more could be made of the interesting roof structure if the bedrooms etc. were on the ground floor and the living rooms above. We strongly recommend reduction of accommodation to a single unit in addition to the pub. In detail we recommend that more information is needed about ventilation systems in relation to roofs and elevations; about the treatment of window glazing; and about the relationship of the inserted floors to the existing windows. We also recommend that new openings are arranged in sympathy with the character of the building (and certainly not paired in the manner proposed on the west elevation of the north transept) and that they are set in reveals. The detailing is important: we would find it easier to approve bronzed glass doors set back in reveals than standard plank doors set flush. We also recommend that consideration be given to sensitive landscaping. In summary, we regard this as a missed opportunity. We do not oppose the uses proposed but are concerned about the intensity. We have reservations about the detailing. While we recommend that the exterior of the church be respected and largely left unaltered, any intervention will need to be sensitively detailed. We accept the sub-division of the interior but would encourage more to be left intact and visible.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS SOCIETY whilst the lack of clear differentiation between survey and proposal in separate drawings has hindered a proper understanding of this proposal, initial reading gives the impression that it is a scheme where far too much is being crammed into the building, which was designed in 1897 by Giles Gough and Trollope. The nave, which is to accommodate a shop, function room and flats above, will become unrecognizable as a space. There will then be a full-height screen in concrete blockwork sitting into the entrance to the crossing. Over that will then be a substantial new gallery with a partly canted front with no echo of the symmetrical balance which Giles Gough and Trollope intended. Approach will be by a stair set

at the same canted angle. The only section to remain open will be the existing east end apse where we note the stained glass is also to stay. The plan contains various references to "brick piers", two of them apparently in the nave and one in the crossing, which look to be large scale in section and crude in outline. No cross sections are provided which is a serious omission. They prevent any clear understanding of how the inserted floors are to be reconciled with the existing windows. All in all, this is a disappointing scheme. St Luke's nature as a purpose built auditorium is hardly exploited at all. The degree of subdivision is excessive and apparently irreversible. Something more low key, more loose fit, perhaps less capital intensive, although well funded, would be far more appropriate.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER the lime tree to the south of the chapel has a canopy spread of approximately 10 m within which no building or excavation works should be undertaken to meet BS5837. The cars need softening/screening from the road to the north and west to the street scene. Recommends hedgerow planting to at least 1.2 m high with one or two smaller growing trees where practicable. CONSERVATION OFFICER (comments on amended plans) main objection re roof over nave now overcome.

ONE FURTHER LETTER OF OBJECTION raises similar points to those reported to Committee previously, plus:- this part of Graham Way is a hill with several bends and is intersected with a roundabout; parking on Graham Way already causes visibility problems, these problems will increase; Cotford St Luke is a rural village and is already home to rabbits, foxes, hedgehogs and other animal species and several vermin such as rats and mice, therefore the preparation, disposal and storage of foodstuffs should be made a matter of priority; insufficient notification of the proposal; query the original proposals for a pub and shop.

DIOCESE OF BATH AND WELLS note with some concern the proposal to turn the former hospital chapel into a pub. The chapel is consecrated and is subject to the faculty jurisdiction and no works can be done to it without the consent of the consistory court of the Diocese of Bath and Wells. Assuming that planning permission is forthcoming, the Bishops could be requested to make an order directing that the building and land shall not be subject to the legal effects of consecration. LETTER FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND VICAR WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR COTFORD ST LUKE true to say that many in Cotford St Luke still feel that church should be in the chapel building and from that point of view support the ideas; sadly the church does not have capital which it can put into the pot, but would want to rent the function room for church purposes, provided the ambiance felt right once the project was completed; there should be a separate entrance to the function room rather than to trail through the bar/restaurant area.

Comment of the Chief Planning Officer:- whilst the concerns of the amenity bodies are acknowledged, I consider that this scheme provides the opportunity for a viable after-use for the redundant chapel building to be provided and the amended plans go some way towards meeting their concerns. The Conservation Officer's main objection has been overcome. Hard surfacing of the whole of the car park area, as requested by the County Highway Authority, would have a

detrimental impact on the adjacent trees and would also detract from the setting of the listed building.

Additional Conditions re hardsurfacing or access 6 m back from edge of carriageway and car parking details.

Amended Recommendation:- Permission be GRANTED ... (as printed).

5 06/2002/036LB

See 06/2002/035.

As amended by letter dated 17th August, 2002 with accompanying drawing Nos. 539/01A, 02, 03A and 04.

Amended Recommendation:- Consent be GRANTED ... (as printed).

6 10/2002/014

PARISH COUNCIL support the proposal.

10 17/2002/004

Additional Note:- re the Local Planning Authority will be looking for a modest 3 bedroom dwelling of traditional cottage design on this site.

Amendment on 3rd line on page 4, delete "erected" and insert "substantially complete".

12 23/2002/008

Further submissions of support from applicant's agents enclosing copies of school reports of applicant's children; noting that there will be an additional bus service operating in the rural area of Milverton; and requesting that permanent permission be granted in view of inability to raise finance for the cost of the

mobile home over a period as short as 10 years and the fact that applicant's children will not have completed education within 10 years.

Amendment to Recommendation:- delete condition re temporary (10 years) permission.

14 30/2002/013

Additional Condition:- no additional caravans beyond that hereby approved.

15 38/2002/162

Additional Condition:- the shop units shall be used as ancillary to teaching facilities only and not as independent retail units.

17 38/2002/250

SOMERSET PLAYING FIELDS ASSOCIATION having carefully considered the details of the planned development we have no further objection to the planning application as it stands. However, we do have a concern that the site plan attached to the application delineates the hospital site to include that piece of the Galmington Playing Field on its northern edge which comprises a children's playground and sports pavilion. This is physically not the case and is a matter which should be drawn to the attention of the planning committee when it meets on 21st August to consider the planning application. Further it is a matter which we feel TDBC should, as Trustees of the Galmington Playing Field Charity, dispute with Taunton and Somerset NHS Trust and their agents Parsons Bickerstaff Ltd so that an obvious and unfortunate stated error of fact may be rectified.

18 38/2002/259

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY indicated that they will maintain their objection unless pull in bay for delivery vehicles provided. The agent has indicated that he

does not wish to do this. However, visibility has now been maximised and it is not therefore recommended that the application be refused.

Additional Conditions re turning and visibility.

Amended Recommendation:- Permission be GRANTED ... (as printed)

20 38/2002/287

2 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received on the following grounds:- the only difference with the new plan is that the porch has been shortened to 2 m, this is still not acceptable as demonstrated by the replica we built; the Committee are welcome to come and look at the proposed loss of amenity; the plans do not show our bay window which has existed for over 20 years and was built to increase light into the property; the proposal will block light and affect the character of Whitehall; the proposal is detrimental to street security as our house will not be seen properly; Whitehall has limited parking and we have to park at the bottom of the street, we will not be able to see our cars which will affect insurance; it will devalue our property by at least £15,000; the plans do not show how close our front door is to the proposal, only just over 1 m, therefore we would be stepping out into a dark void; the boundary lines on the plan are not accurate, our boundary resides on the boundary of the porch, not through the middle of the passageway; the plans do not show the height of the extension; it is of interest that they intend using our drainage in order to channel rainwater from the porch, our deeds state that we are responsible for this as it resides on our property; is it an extension or a porch, its more like an extension or an aircraft hangar; the porch is far too large and out of character; the size of our porch is adequate (in projection).

Additional Note re drainage.

23 42/2002/024

As amended by applicants plan received 19th August, 2002.

TWO FURTHER LETTERS OF SUPPORT on grounds that structure would be very much in keeping with the main property and enhance its visual impact.

As the proposal stands at present it is considered that the building will not be so harmful to the residential amenity of the neighbouring property as to be contrary to Policy H19 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan.

The applicant has stated that he is not prepared to submit amended plans reducing the height of the building, which would have reduced the impact on the neighbouring property. The application therefore has to be determined as originally submitted. The height of the building is not considered to be so detrimental in terms of loss of light to the neighbouring property as to warrant refusal.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to no further representations raising new issues by 27th August, 2002 the Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed).

25 **42/2002/027**

Withdrawn

26 **42/2002/029**

LETTER OF OBJECTION received from owner of adjoining property on grounds that two storey development on side will reduce gap which would adversely affect both properties.

27 **43/2002/085**

Deferred

28 **46/2002/006**

Amend description to " ...continued siting ...".

29 49/2002/028

As amplified by agents faxed letter dated 12th August. 2002.

Letter from the agent addressing the points of concern raised. The natural stone wall will have a proper damp proof course where it abuts the gable wall. Adequate damp proofing is to be provided to ensure no damp seepage from the garden enters the neighbouring property. The new tarmac drive is not to be used for parking of cars or buses that will obstruct the windows of the neighbouring property. The revised access is not part of some future commercial scheme. Buses have been entering and leaving this access for many years. The present access is very poor and the reorganisation of this access is simply a measure to provide better and safer usage.