

**Planning Committee - WEDNESDAY 16th JUNE 2004
Amendment Sheet**

5 34/2004/022

Withdrawn from Report.

As amended by letter dated 10th June, 2004.

Amended letter deletes proposed conservatory. Proposal for shed considered acceptable and application will be granted under delegated powers.

6 38/2004/139

3 FURTHER LETTERS OBJECTING to amended proposals on the basis that element of 4 storey development is retained.

7 38/2004/172

Letter from Applicant - The piece of land needs to be developed. Currently one tenant parks there but the entrance is extremely dangerous particularly with vehicles parking in the road tight to the access; there has been no trouble from the existing property for the last 5 years and I tend to let to older male occupants. The previous proposal for a unit of multi occupation whilst agreed by officers was refused by Members. The County Highway Authority did not object to the unit of multi occupation (6 bedsits) but object to this proposal for only 2 units, there is a need within the Deane for new dwellings such as these, I am an experienced landlord of 20 years with a good relationship with Taunton Deane.

1 PETITION OF 36 SIGNATURES OF OBJECTION raising the following:- there has been a history of bad tenancy (see "objections" in report for detail); the dwellings would overlook the flats to the rear (as the windows and rear wall of the building are too close) and the dwellings on the opposite side of the road resulting in a loss of privacy; the highway will be disrupted during building work; there is a lack of parking in the area which would be made worse with the needs of two new tenants as well as those in 14 Greenway Road who currently park on the application site and this would be detrimental to highway safety.

9 42/2004/014

Withdrawn from report. Determined under delegated powers.

12 43/2004/042

As amplified by letter dated 9th June, 2004.

15 46/2004/010

CLAYHIDON PARISH COUNCIL (neighbouring parish) make similar points to nearby residents.

16 46/2004/012

Withdrawn from Report.

The applicants have submitted amended plans reducing the size of the proposed garden area to that considered acceptable. The item will therefore be determined under delegated powers.

17 49/2004/016

Letter of amplification from applicant. Confirms proposed barn will be used to house a tractor and various agricultural implements for the upkeep and cultivation of the land on which it will be situated. A proportion of the barn will be given to house sheep to provide cover during bad weather and the lambing season. No plans for any other use of the building. Considers building will be on the part of the land which will least affect local residents and the look of the area. Wishes to retain the land for the purpose of agriculture.

19 52/2004/018

As amended by APG Architect's letter dated 8 June 2004 and drawings 611/PLN/05G and 06F.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY I refer to the above-mentioned planning application received on 24 May 2004 on which I have the following highway observations. The Planning Officer will be well aware of the previous significant concerns regarding the highway issues in relation to access into the proposed development site. The present plan goes a long way to overcoming these issues but unfortunately the Applicants have still not drawn the visibility splays as

previously agreed. I enclose an extract from the drawing No. 611/PLN/03 Revision 'L' which shows coloured yellow the appropriate visibility splays required for the proposed development. These should be suitably conditioned and no obstructions to visibility within the splay areas in excess of 300 mm above adjoining carriageway level. Visibility splays to be provided prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings. The access points to plots 1 and 2 is acceptable. Plots 5 and 6 however have a substandard access. Visibility to the right for vehicles emerging from plots 5 and 6 is severely restricted by the boundary fence of No. 39. I understand however from the Planning Officer that the planning requirements of the development frontage mean that an access has to be achieved at this point. However, I must point out that the access is substandard and I am unhappy with its location. With regard to the internal layout this is generally acceptable now, however, concerns have previously been expressed as to the surface water outfall including the disposal of highway water. I understand that Swan Hill Homes were going to approach Wessex Water concerning adoption of a system. I am concerned that if as previously intended the route will be between the tree and plot 12 and then to rear of plots 12 and 29 that an appropriate easement width will not be available. I would recommend the following additional condition be attached to any consent which may be granted: The proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, cycleways, bus stops/bus lay-bys, 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 parking, street furniture and tactile paving shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before their construction begins. 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. At the meeting the Applicants agreed to provide the missing link of footway opposite No. 48. I note this is not on the plan but it is a requirement of the development that this missing link of footway which is on highway land should be provided.

COMEYTROWE PARISH COUNCIL At their meeting June 2004, the Parish Council discussed the amended plans in some detail and agreed to continue to oppose the above application on the following grounds:-

- 1 again the plans are not accurate or consistent.
- 2 although the number of 3 storey dwellings has been reduced, the Council are still totally opposed to any 3 storey dwellings on the site because they are out of keeping with the prominent location of the site, the sloping nature of the site and the surrounding area and properties. They would be an intrusion in the area and overbearing because of their height and multiple roof structures.
- 3 although they have been moved further into the site, by about 1 m, the 4 dwellings, especially plots 9 and 10, are still far too close to the wall and properties at the rear in Glasses Mead, which have an adverse affect on the privacy of these houses because they are being overlooked from above, on a steep slope.
- 4 although the number of dwellings has previously been reduced from 14 to 12, the Council still feel that this has only been done to accommodate the retention of the TPO tree. The area taken for the 12 dwellings

appears in fact, to be the same area as the previous 14 dwellings were on. In effect, the density of the site has not changed and 12 dwellings are too many for the site, its size and physical characteristics, especially with the 3 storey dwellings. The proposed dwellings are still too close together, especially at the bottom of the site and it is therefore, over development of the site and unacceptable on this prominent location in the Parish.

The Council would still like all relevant comments/observations that they have made in their previous letters on the applications for this site taken into account. ONE FURTHER LETTER OF OBJECTION on grounds of loss of light and overlooking from plot 9.

Additional condition re estate roads and visibility.

Amended recommendation:- subject to a S106 undertaking... (as printed)
