

Amendment Sheet

---

**4 11/2004/003LB**

As amplified by letter dated 31st March, 2004.

Letter from applicant:- agrees boundary fence shown incorrectly; the proposed garage eaves will not extend over the objector's property; discussions recently taken place with objector with a view to the rear wall being shared; notes that ownership is not a planning issue; in proportion to the existing property, the proposed extension is not massive - in terms of height, it is the same height as the party wall, as the party wall separating the two properties and the elevation also shows it currently to be lower than the existing house; the proposed south facing proposed window is angled considerably away from the objector's property, which is some distance away and any sight would be unlikely - additional retrospective measures could be taken if breach of privacy demonstrated once constructed; does not believe application to be an illegal act.

---

**5 11/2004/004**

As amplified by letter dated 31st March, 2004.

Letter from applicant:- agrees boundary fence shown incorrectly; the proposed garage eaves will not extend over the objector's property; discussions recently taken place with objector with a view to the rear wall being shared; notes that ownership is not a planning issue; in proportion to the existing property, the proposed extension is not massive - in terms of height, it is the same height as the party wall, as the party wall separating the two properties and the elevation also shows it currently to be lower than the existing house; the proposed south facing proposed window is angled considerably away from the objector's property, which is some distance away and any sight would be unlikely - additional retrospective measures could be taken if breach of privacy demonstrated once constructed; does not believe application to be an illegal act.

---

**7 21/2004/005**

1 LETTER OF SUPPORT need for this type of accommodation in our village; friends visiting recently had to stay at the Holiday Inn, Taunton; proposal would help

to ensure that our village will prosper and will help to keep alive essential part of the fabric of local society; attracting holiday makers to village will mean a boost for whole area's tourist trade.

---

**8      23/2004/007**

As amended by letter dated 15th March, 2004 with accompanying drawings.

---

**9      23/2004/008LB**

As amended by letter dated 15th March, 2004 with accompanying drawings.

Last line of proposal section 'next' should read 'previous'.

---

**10     36/2004/003**

Letter received from agents:- 372 sq m of existing agricultural buildings are to be demolished as part of the office/residential conversion so the overall increase in floor area is less. There are internal access roads which link the new buildings with the slurry pond without having to use the adjacent highway.

---

**11     36/2004/004**

Letter received from agents:- 372 sq m of existing agricultural buildings are to be demolished as part of the office/residential conversion so the overall increase in floor area is less. There are internal access roads which link the new buildings with the slurry pond without having to use the adjacent highway.

---

**12     38/2004/024CA**

Withdrawn

---

13     **38/2004/025**

Withdrawn

---

14     **38/2004/061**

As amended by agents letter dated 31st March, 2004 with attached plans.

Amended plans reduce the scale of block C taking out the top flat, made a note that the windows looking out over the rear garden area at second floor level are to have obscure glass and set back block A at first and second floor levels to the existing building line.

AN ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received from the SOMERSET HOUSING GROUP raising the following points:- the three storey flats will block natural light from adjacent properties and the laundry area; the windows are overlooking gardens and rear of the existing dwellings will be intrusive, occupants with anxiety issues may become paranoid that they are being watched; the noise and disruption from the building works will have a detrimental effect on tenants and their visitors; existing tenants have a friendly relationship with their neighbours and locals but new residents may object to them and their mental health status.

Letter from agent (circulated to members of this Committee) raising the following points in favour of the proposal:- the scale of existing building on the site is already quite large and used as a private house and tyre fitting/general motor repair business; the proposed development has only 8% more footprint area than the existing; the proposal is in line with Government Guidance on maximising development on brown field sites; the scheme provides for small affordable housing units, it could be reduced in scale but this would result in a smaller number of units with 2 or 3 bedrooms that are not as affordable; a primary goal of PPG3 is to ensure the development of sites where reliance on the private car can be minimised, this site is within 2 minutes walk of a range of shops (including supermarket, bakery, greengrocers, post office, chip shop and butchers), public park, library and church; it is within 5 m walk of schools, doctors and leisure complex, the site has a bus stop adjacent to the site which has a bus service every 15 minutes from 6 a.m. in the morning until 6 p.m. at night; the reallocation of the bulk does not cause closest neighbours any undue loss of amenity; the report does not make it clear that there are windows on two levels of the existing dwelling which re to be replaced by windows at three levels, these windows would be to bedrooms and could be obscure glazed to avoid any overlooking; the ground levels of the site are significantly lower than the second floor level of the proposals and the bungalow window was allowed at such close proximity to the existing site when originally permitted, a 1.8 m high boundary fence would stop overlooking to the adjacent

bungalow, concerns of overlooking and scale/bulk are therefore non-issues or areas that can be handled with negotiation, the main issue is therefore one of parking. PPG3 requires:- Car parking standards/or housing have become increasingly demanding and have been applied too rigidly, often as minimum standards. Developers should not be required to provide more car parking than they or potential occupiers might want, nor to provide off-street parking when there is no need, particularly in urban areas where public transport is available or where there is a demand/or car-free housing. Local authorities should revise their parking standards to allow for significantly lower levels of off 'street parking provision, particularly for developments: (i) in locations, such as town centres, where services are readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport; (ii) which provide housing for elderly people, students and single people where the demand for car parking is likely to be less than for family housing; and (iii) involving the conversion of housing or non-residential buildings where off-street parking is less likely to be successfully designed into the scheme. Taking into account the nearby services as identified above I consider this scheme to be acceptable without car parking. Furthermore the surrounding streets show no sign of on-street parking and any parking from this development could easily be accommodated on them without any detriment to amenity or public safety. I consider this scheme is in line with the thrust of Government policy and parking should be considered with flexibility. There is a vehicular right of way over the access and drive and there is no intention for cars to park along it. The proposed scheme provides a paved area that is sufficient for delivery vehicles to park and unload. The scheme complies with fire regulations; the scale of building adjacent to the neighbour remains essentially the same although a single storey extension is to be increased in height to match the existing dwelling height, overlooking of the garden would not be significantly worse and second floor windows will be obscure glazed; the existing chimney will not be affected by the proposal and the party wall dealt with under the Party Wall Act, the scheme has a reduced footprint and a similar volume of building on site and is not overdevelopment, over massing, taking account of overlooking concerns the 2nd floor windows will be obscure glazed, the increases in roof height will be below the height of the apex of the adjacent bungalow, the proposal for 15 flats should be compared against the existing use of the site as a dwelling plus an industrial business.

Planning Officer's Comments:- The proposal is considered unacceptable as submitted, clearly an overdevelopment of the site with insufficient space for adequate off-street parking. The neighbour has confirmed that Eastwick Cottage has rights of access over this drive.

Additional comment from applicant:- considers that the existing car park surface will have vegetation growing on it to soften the existing stark appearance; a similar surface was put down for the farm several years ago and this now appears as grassed area.

Additional condition re limit number children to 18. Amend condition 08 to reflect equipment positions.

In recommendation should read play equipment not play areas away from listed building.

---

**17 52/2004/001**

As amended by drawings attached to APG Architects letters dated 16th March, and 18th March, 2004.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY amended drawing no. 611/PLN/03 and the outline planning application, I have the following concerns:- 1. The footway links and the visibility splays for two private accesses to the front are not available - currently shown as land outside the developer's control. 2. The junction visibility of 4.5m x 60m as per the outline application is not available on the layout shown. 3. The estate road proposed is not to an adoptable standard in terms of layout - the road width, turning for refuse vehicles within the site, larger vehicles turning in to the site use all the carriageway due to the narrow access road and the 5m access radii. There is a need to get pedestrians safely into the site. The access to plots 3 and 4 has difficult manoeuvres. There are also concerns regarding the disposal of surface water from the road. 4. The turning manoeuvres for a large refuse vehicle need to be proven. The applicant should also be aware that as the laying out of a private street it will attract a charge under the Advance Payment Code; should consent be granted provided that the Highway Authority can be satisfied that the construction, including drainage, street lighting, surfacing etc is to a standard that will be of sufficient integrity to ensure that it does not deteriorate to such a condition as to warrant of powers under the Private Street Works Code, then an exemption may be considered. I would recommend that this application be refused on highway grounds for the following reasons:- 1. The proposed splays are considered to be inadequate to secure the visibility necessary for the safety and convenience of the traffic associated with the proposed development. 2. The Local Planning Authority and the Local Highway Authority, in adopting the Somerset County Council publication 'Estate Roads in Somerset', have agreed standards for the layout of new streets. The proposed access roads do not conform to these agreed standards and are not, therefore, adequate to serve the development proposed.

SOMERSET WILDLIFE TRUST we have studied the response of the Somerset Environmental Records Centre; As the proposal involves the demolition of an uninhabited barn, it is possible that the application site is being used by bats and/or nesting birds (including barn owl), all species of which are legally protected under

the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981; the Somerset Wildlife Trust therefore strongly recommends that, if this has not already occurred as a condition of the outline permission, a survey be conducted to ascertain the importance of this building for protected species; we understand that a bat mitigation scheme has been produced and we would welcome the opportunity to comment on this report. We would also recommend that if nesting birds are to be affected by the development, mitigation measures be secured and incorporated into the proposals prior to the granting of any planning permission. Such measures might include avoiding work during the nesting period or providing bird boxes in nearby locations; English Nature can provide further advice on bats and all other protected species and should be able to recommend a list of suitable consultants to undertake the survey work. Contact: Linda Tucker, Species Protection Officer, English Nature, Roughmoor, Bishops Hull, Taunton TA1 5AA, Tel. 01823 283211; the Hawk and Owl Trust can provide barn owl nest boxes, as well as practical advice regarding their positioning and will survey buildings for signs of use by barn owls prior to conversion. Contact: Chris Sperring, Conservation Officer, The Hawk and Owl Trust, 32 Hollis Avenue, North Weston, Portishead, Bristol BS20 8NB, Tel. 01275 849287; although we would prefer to see the retention of the existing trees where possible, especially the one under a tree preservation order, we welcome the inclusion of additional planting as compensation for that which is to be lost; however the Somerset Wildlife Trust strongly recommends that such planting be limited to the use of appropriate native species, ideally of a local provenance.

7 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION received raising the following issues:- still overdevelopment; should be no three storey; 9. 10 and 11 will still tower over properties to rear; 2 m fence will block light to rear of 9 Glasses Mead; gateway houses will appear even more obtrusive.

LETTER FROM WARD COUNCILLOR PAUL I have attended all the Comeytrove Parish Council meetings when the application to develop the site at New Barn was considered, and I fully support the objections raised by Comeytrove Parish Council in every particular.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to further comments of the County Highway Authority and submission of any revised proposals resulting from by 8th April, 2004 the Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed).

---

Copies to:  
CHAIR/NTN/TB/JM/CDW/AG/DA/JH/KM/JLH/IC/TAB/CJW/HM/H&L/RWF/  
Planning Reception/JJ/RB/17 Committee Members/15 Public