

Amendment Sheet

6 12/2004/004

As amended by drawings 0341/10C and 11C attached to agent's letter dated 3rd August 2004. (Revised drawings show tree planting on front boundary and retaining wall to rear garden to prevent any damage to roots of oak tree).

LANDSCAPE OFFICER is satisfied on basis of revised drawings received. CONSERVATION OFFICER observations on revised proposals "as amended my only objection now, relates to the dormer, as detailed in my formal consultation response. If permission is granted, suggest a sample panel of chert/brick, erected on site for approval.

CORFE PARISH COUNCIL (obs on revised drawings). Corfe Parish Council reviewed the revised application by Quantic Properties, at their meeting held on Tuesday 10th August 2004. This meeting was also attended by 13 members of the public representing neighbours and others from Corfe, all of whom were objecting to this application. Many have again sent letters of objection to the TDBC Planning Department.

The Councillors looked at key aspects of this application and in particular, addressed the basic questions: 1. Does the proposed dwelling preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area ? 2. Does the proposal overcome the reasons given for the refusal of the previous applications ?

The Councillors have noted that the applicant has made some small modifications to the previous plan, namely, the garage has been slightly reduced in size, the roof height has been reduced by 30 cms, and the building has been realigned so it is now parallel to the road.

However these changes were regarded as small and did not overcome their main objections, which are:

House size

The house size has not been modified and as this is a Conservation area it is regarded as being far too large for the small plot, and much larger than the surrounding cottages. It will dominate the street scene, in this part of the Conservation area, in terms of its volume, and also in its height.

Loss of gap between houses

Because the house is so large for this plot, it has been positioned very close to Forge Cottage and the Old Forge, and one of the gaps between houses will be lost.

The gaps between houses in the Corfe Conservation Area, has been stated as one of its key characteristics and thus should be preserved.

Risk to Preserved Oak tree.

Although the applicant's letter dated 27th July states that the realignment of the house improves the distance of the house from the oak tree, inspection of the plans shows the opposite. The house will now be closer to the oak, and the risk of building works to its root system is increased.

Impact on Forge Cottage and the Old Forge

The Parish Council continues to be concerned about the impact of this house on Forge Cottage. The submitted plans continue to omit the conservatory at Forge Cottage and thus do not represent the true and close proximity of the new house to the Cottage. Again the applicant's letter suggests that the re-alignment of the house lessens the impact on Forge Cottage, and the Old Forge, but inspection of the plans shows that the house will dominate both buildings and create a problem of light by causing shadow. This new house will therefore have a major impact on light and privacy because of its size and proximity.

Road access

The Council continues to have a concern over the intention to have an additional access onto B 3170. The road is very narrow at this point, and traffic flow is fast even though there is a 40 mph limit, so that an additional access would be dangerous.

Because of these concerns the Councillors were again unanimous in their objections to this application, and they voted to recommend refusal of this application.

LETTER FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAMS As the Ward Councillor for Neroche, I attended Corfe Parish Council meeting on 10th August 2004 when the above planning application was considered.

The meeting was well attended by members of the public and there was a clear indication of the strong feelings against this application from both the Parish Council and members of the public present. These concerns and objections were substantially based around the fact that although this was a revised submission with re-design of the property and re-positioning of it, in no way did it meet the concerns expressed previously about its inconsistency with the conservation area status that the site is within.

The size, scale and positioning of the property was criticised as being wholly unsatisfactory and it appears that the Parish Council had received word that the application is likely to be recommended for approval and there was a total lack of understanding as to what had changed from previous applications.

As noted above the basic criticisms centred on the scale, design and positioning of the property as being totally incompatible with the conservation area status. In addition, being set back off the road as the present design, not in line with other properties, it is in danger of encroaching upon the protected oak tree at the rear of the site. In addition, there was considerable concern that the position of the property as now set down would encroach upon the privacy and light of the adjacent property to the rear. I would ask that you carefully consider these points when preparing your recommendation.

Corfe Parish Council were unanimous in their decision that the same objections as set down to the previous application prevailed for this application as they were unable to see any substantial difference or concession to the conservation area status for this new proposal.

As the Ward Councillor for the area, I would strongly support the objections of the Parish Council and members of the public and request that this application be recommended for refusal which in my view is the only result possible if we are to be consistent with previous decisions.

36 LETTERS OF OBJECTION to revised proposals on grounds that earlier concerns have not been overcome.

Amended recommendation... (as printed) GRANT PERMISSION... (as printed).
Additional condition re material sample panel.

7 20/2004/017

PARISH COUNCIL supports this application, in the absence of any views to the contrary.

10 38/2004/243

As amended by agent's letter dated 10th August 2004 and attached plan indicating the following:

64 cycle parking spaces, bin store, relocation of Flat no 51-53 to minimum 20 m away from the canal bank, unilateral undertaking for 8 social housing units. Still awaiting clarification of the County Highway Authority.

Further observations from Environmental Health.

Re. Contaminated land. The planning condition requires that a site investigation report is carried out; any unacceptable risks are identified and a remediation strategy is produced to deal with them.

Information and site investigation reports have been provided for previous applications for this phase of the site and for the SWEB site as a whole. The fax from Richard Young at Crest on 11 August 2004 confirms that they propose to carry out the same remediation strategy as used on phases 1 and 2.

No Report has been received specifically for this application; however, there is plenty of information available from previous reports which should allow the developer's consultant to carry out the required risk assessments to confirm that the proposed remedial works will also apply to this part of the site.

Re Noise The Condition on the original application requires a report that shall be submitted to the council with details of measurements, calculations and recommendations of any noise reduction schemes.

A noise report was submitted with app 38/04/23 (Parsons Brinkerhoff Jan 2004) however this was not acceptable. Another report was received by TDBC Planning on 2 June 2004 (Woodward Acoustics Technical Report, 28 May 2003 (should this be 2004?). This referred to monitoring that had been carried out as part of a previous report (No 1236) and covered the whole SWEB site. The report estimates the noise levels at the facades of the proposed flats and calculates that a noise reduction of 30.5 dB will provide satisfactory internal noise levels.

It is recommended 10-8-6mm glazing for all noise sensitive rooms facing or perpendicular to the road; and "Glidevale" or "Silavent SM2/C" mechanical ventilator and soundproofing on top storey ceilings.

I can accept that the recommendations in this report will reduce the noise levels in the flats to within the recommended levels given in various guidance. However, even with these measures it is likely that noise from traffic on the viaduct will still be audible inside the flats. It would have been preferable for the developer to design the flats so that noise sensitive rooms were facing away from the road.

Crest did send in some technical details of glazing and ventilation (faxed on 11/08/04). The fax from Richard Young confirms that the windows parallel or perpendicular to the road will use 10-8-6mm glazing or better and Glidevale Acoustic Vents. However, the details that have been sent in are for glazing by Munster Joinery (p4 of fax) and refer to 5 different types of glazing, only one of which (10.5 laminated -12-6 provides the level of attenuation of traffic noise recommended in the Technical Report. There is also a note (p5 of fax) from Munster Joinery saying that "depending on the LA requirements there may well be several ways to solve the problem". It has not been made clear which type of glazing is to be used.

Re the Ventilation. Details have been sent in of Passivent acoustic Grilles. These are stated to give a noise reduction of 48dB. I did contact passivent and obtained some more technical information which confirmed that this is the averaged level of attenuation across a range of frequencies

The information that has been submitted is for materials different to those recommended in the Technical Report.

If the developer proposes to use the materials given in the Report they should provide the relevant technical details. If they propose to use different materials they should provide details and also provide the calculations reasoning to show that the specification meets the requirements given in the Report.

Rec. subject to acceptance of the unilateral undertaking and the submission of and agreement of amended highway plans the.... as rec.

11 38/2004/244

SOMERSET COUNTY COUNCIL (HIGHWAYS) Further to my letter dated 9th August 2004 and the enclosed drawing no. 649/OIB. The drawing shows a Zebra Crossing to the North East of the site access. This crossing should be provided by the applicant and be included in the Grampian Condition. It will also need to be included in the legal agreement.

Individuals are advised that by replying to, or sending an e-mail message to Somerset County Council, you accept-that you have no explicit or implicit expectation of privacy.

In line with the Surveillance and Monitoring Policy, any e-mail messages (and attachments) transmitted over the Council's network may be subject to scrutiny.

I refer to the above-mentioned planning application received on 14 June 2004 and have the following observations on the highway and transportation aspects of this proposal:-

Whilst there are no objections to the proposal there are concerns regarding the width of the footways on the site frontage and the visibility at the access. The footways should have a minimum width of 1.8m on the western frontage and 2.0m on the northern frontage and be resurfaced on both frontages. Flush dropped kerbs and tactile paving should be provided at the site access. All these works will be subject to a legal agreement.

The existing access on the western frontage is to be stopped up. The adopted highway includes the existing footway but not the area between the back of footway and the existing gates and boundary wall, which are set back to form visibility splays. Ownership of this land should be confirmed. It would appear that the boundary wall could be constructed along the back of footway, 1.8m from the existing kerb face. The applicant will have to reinstate the kerb to full height and raise the footway adjacent to the raised kerbs.

The applicant should be aware that it is likely that the internal layout of the site will result in the laying out of a private street, and as such under Sections 219 to 225 of the Highways Act 1980, will be subject to the Advance Payments Code (APC). Given the constraints of the existing access, it will not be possible to construct an estate road to a standard suitable for adoption. Therefore in order to qualify for an exemption under the APC, the road should be built and maintained to a level that the Highway Authority considers will be of sufficient integrity to ensure that it does not deteriorate to such a condition as to warrant the use of the powers under the Private Streetworks Code.

The comments of the Estate Roads Section are enclosed for your information. There are numerous details that require amending. The details are also shown on the copies of the drawing no. 649/01 B, which are also enclosed. The details when amended will need to be agreed with the Highway Authority and may be subject to section 38 Agreement.

The widening and resurfacing of the footway on the site frontages will need to be included in a Grampian condition and will be the subject of a legal agreement.

In the event of permission being granted I would recommend that the following conditions are imposed: -

1. No work shall commence on the development site until the footway works and all associated works including drainage have been carried out in accordance with a design and specification to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and to be fully implemented to the satisfaction of the said Authority.
2. Having regard to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that a Road Opening Notice must be obtained from the Highways Service Manager Somerset County Council Taunton Deane Area at Burton Place, Taunton, Somerset TAI 4HE before access works commence.
3. The applicant is advised that the Highways Service Manager, Somerset County Council, Taunton Deane Area at Burton Place, Taunton, Somerset TAI 4HE must be consulted with regard to the required reinstatement of the verge/footway crossing at the access which is to be closed.
4. 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, laid out and maintained 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, method of construction and proposals for future maintenance shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

5. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 600 mm above adjoining road level within the area of land shown coloured green on the attached plan. Such visibility shall be fully provided before the access hereby permitted is first brought into use and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

6. The proposed access over the first 8m of its length, as measured from the edge of the adjoining carriageway, shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

7. Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards and shall be set back a minimum distance of 8m from the carriageway edge.

8. The gradient of the proposed access shall not be steeper than 1 in 10.

9. Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

This communication is intended solely for the person (s) or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient (s), you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender and copy the message to ICTDHelp@somerset.gov.uk

The applicant will be required to enter into a legal Agreement with the Highway Authority.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER There is a dire shortage of freehold employment land around Taunton. The issue is being addressed in the medium term but currently there is a significant problem. There is very little employment land available in the Borough generally- however when you consider Taunton itself the situation becomes dire. In the medium term land at Monkton Heathfield will come forward. However currently there is virtually none available on a freehold basis in or around Taunton. There is about 5 acres of Crown land at Priorswood which is currently available but only on a leasehold basis. We are trying to persuade the Crown to change this policy however this is unlikely to be a short term solution. Essentially the land at the Tarmac works in Henlade is not going to come forward until the A358 /A303/ Henlade bypass issue is resolved. Nothing is happening at Norton Fitzwarren- everything is on hold because of the major development scheme,

12 38/2004/260

As amplified by agents letter dated 9th August, 2004.

Further letter from the Rural Dean raising concerns about local traffic effects of construction and business traffic, and potential misuse of church's open plan parking area.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to the receipt of amended car parking and access plans the Development Control Manager ... (as printed)

Additional condition to allow public use outside of Surestart hours.

14 38/2004/277

One further LETTER OF OBJECTION on similar grounds to those already received.

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