

Amendment Sheet

4 02/2004/006

Delete "as amended by" from description as no amended plans were being awaited.

Letter from agents - I confirm that the applicants have no objection to the use of the stables being restricted to full board livery, and not for any other purpose, including livery where the owners look after the horses themselves, or use as a riding stables. I would also like to take the opportunity to address some of the comments made by the Ash Priors Parish Meeting. I can confirm that the proposal is for an outlying yard to be operated as part of the applicant's racing stables, based near by at Tugwell Farm. There will not therefore be a requirement for four to five staff to be accommodated on site, as the Parish suggest. The horses will continue to be exercised at Tugwell Farm as is the case at present, and there is no intention for horses to be exercised on Ash Priors Common. Also, the route between Three Oaks and Tugwell Farm does not pass through the village, and hence no riding of horses will take place through the village. It is the applicant's intention to remove waste from site and hence there should be no nuisance caused in this respect to neighbouring properties. The applicants agree to the Environmental Health Officer's recommended conditions with regard to siting of dung heaps, and prohibiting any burning of waste on site.

Additional Condition re landscaping.

Replace Condition 03 with "The stables hereby approved shall be used for the purpose of an outlying yard as described in the agents letter dated 16th December, 2004 and for no other purpose including livery where owners look after the horses themselves or use as a riding stables except from full board livery use."

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to the receipt of no adverse comments from the Environmental Health Officer and no further representation raising additional comments by 1st February, 2005, the Development Control Manager consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed)

5 04/2004/005

Assessment has a line omitted, third line should read "... prominent siting may be acceptable. The currently proposed siting meets this criteria ..."

6 06/2004/062

PARISH COUNCIL several members were of the opinion that the principle of amenity open spaces had been established throughout the Cotford St Luke development and that owners of properties adjacent should not be permitted to encroach upon the areas. It was essential that the planning authority established amenity status of the area to the south of Bethell Mead and prevent further similar applications. It was agreed not to support the application.

9 20/2004/026

Amended description ... 23 dwellings .." as amended by letter dated 24th January, 2005 with accompanying drawing Nos. 201/01/009A, SK3.A, SK4, 04/HV/V1, V2 and V3.

WILDLIFE SPECIES CO-ORDINATOR a wildlife survey of the site must be done.

FRIENDS OF QUANTOCK are of the opinion that this site should be suitably screened, bearing in mind the potential visual impact on the AONB.

Additional conditions re submission of wildlife survey, submission of additional elevation details of units.

Penultimate line of Page 1 '251' should read '25' .

Amended Recommendation:- Also subject to submission of design statement, conclusion of Section 106 Agreement providing for contributions towards sport, recreation and off-site highway works (previous agreement not concluded) and no further representations raising new issues on the amended plans by 10th February, 2005 the Development Control Manager ... (as printed).

In the event that the design statement, has not been received by 21st February, 2005 and/or the Section 106 Agreement has not been concluded by 7th March, 2005, permission be REFUSED for reasons that the proposal does not have adequate provision of off-site childrens play and public open space and necessary off-site highway works contrary to Taunton Deane Local Plan Policies C4 and KM1(D) and/or it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and be in conflict with Taunton Deane Local Plan Policies KM1(C) and EN15.

10 25/2004/032

Additional verbal representation received referring to inadequacy of the foul drainage system.

13 38/2004/492

As amended by agents letters dated 21st January, 2005 and associated flood risk assessment and 14th January, 2005 with attached plan Nos. 648/02A, and 25th January, 2005 with attached plan Nos. 648/01B, 648/03B and 648/04B.

The agent has forwarded confirmation that the proposed surface water drainage will be connected to the existing combined sewer in Wood Street.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY raise objection due to lack of a flood risk assessment.

Flood risk assessment has now been received. Amended plans raise floor levels within the site to 16.45. This results in an increase in the overall height of the development by 0.8 m to 8.5 m (the same height as the 2000 scheme).

E-MAIL OF OBJECTION FROM GREEN BROOK RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (on amended plans) When the first application was made for the erection of 33 flats we objected to this scheme, primarily on the grounds that a 3 storey development was not acceptable on this small site and was not sympathetic to other properties in the area. We also had grave fears concerning lack of privacy which would be suffered by those residents who live on the south side of our terrace. Other issues were also raised. The amended plans have certainly addressed our two main concerns and we must congratulate the developers for listening, and acting upon, genuine concerns. However, our residents are still concerned about several issues regarding this proposal and we would like these to be considered when the decision making takes place - a) Security - there are still some concerns regarding security for our residents should this application go ahead. The existing dividing rear wall of our residents on the south side is in a poor state of repair and if the trees that are in situ are removed this is likely to cause even more damage. It is therefore requested that the developers replace this wall in it's entirety and that the height of same be increased by a substantial amount to provide better security. It is noted from the plans that a bike/bin shed is provided against the said wall thereby perhaps affording an easier access to climb over the wall. Could that shed be moved to stand against the proposed development near the pedestrian entrance to the property? One resident has already been advised that their insurance premium would rise if the development went ahead in it's planned state. Needless to say they are not happy about this. b) Car Parking - we are part of the WO5 parking permit

area and our terrace is already over populated being the nearest street to the town centre and having to face the fact that humans are basically lazy individuals!! We understand that this development is primarily; for non car owners, but in reality there will be car owners. We would like an assurance that whatever solution is cobbled up for car owners that they are not allowed to use the WO5 area for parking as this will cause great inconvenience to our residents. c) Occupancy - It is appreciated that as an authority you have a duty to try and provide low cost housing and we take on board the latest government directive that brown field sites should to fully utilised for this purpose. However, we also understand that StrongVox Ltd is a company that provides accommodation for homeless people and this fact is causing great concern amongst many of our residents. Whilst it is again appreciated that the homeless have to be catered for somewhere or other it is feared by our residents that should this development take place it could well be filled with the homeless and might well then bring with it so many of the problems that often follow such occupancy. We were initially advised by the developers that the flats would be for private purchase in the £70,000 price bracket, which, of course, fits very neatly into the new government directive. It does not stop speculators or local authorities purchasing these properties with a view to letting out to DSS and the like. If this transpires it would certainly have a detrimental affect on the value of the existing properties in our terrace and that is something that no property owner relishes or finds acceptable. Obviously, as with any house sale, you cannot control who might buy the property next to you or across the road from you, however, when a development such as this is planned which might well be solely for the housing of the homeless, grave issues for concern are then raised, and we would like this recorded and taken due note of.

4 ADDITIONAL LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received reiterating the concerns in the report and raising the following points:- the small area of grassland should remain undeveloped; three storey is too tall and will dominate the area casting a shadow over existing dwellings; there is not 21 m distance from the upstairs bedroom windows of 20 Greenbrook Terrace to the development; the building will allow access to the rear reducing security and a higher boundary wall should be erected (1-1.5 m) these flats should not be used by housing association as this may affect the value of existing in properties; there should be off-street parking as the existing parking in the area is already under pressure; rear access to Wood Street and Greenbrook Terrace via an alleyway should be provided to give access for wheelie bins (these cannot be pushed through the dwellings) and to store them at the front would be insecure, an eyesore and used by late night revellers for fun; in the event of a fire would residents be safe, at present they can escape onto the application site over the wall and how will the residents escape; the proposal would affect an existing right to light; the site is within a flood area and should not be allowed; patio garden to rear of Greenbrook Terrace will be dominated by the bin and cycle store; noise and smell will be inevitable; the bin and cycle store roof may be used to gain access to dwellings at the rear.

Additional Condition re obscure glazing.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to the views of the Environment Agency, Fire Officer and the County Highway Authority on the amended plans and no further letters of representation raising new issues by 10th February, 2005 and the

completion of a Section 106 Agreement regarding contributions to local recreation provision the Development Control Manager ... (as printed).

14 **38/2004/520**

Withdrawn

15 **43/2004/131**

Further letter from applicant's agent - subject to grant of this permission, applicants have approved the principle of a relocation site acquisition within the town centre and their solicitors are instructed accordingly.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE further letter received from president - expresses feeling of anger at the statement made by the applicant's agent which believes verges on the libelous by its misrepresentation of the facts; was consultant to Haunch Lane some 6 years ago, but instructions were withdrawn when took up present full time appointment and have had no professional relationship with them since then; the application has been fully debated by the Executive Committee of the Chamber of Commerce and writer was appointed to make objections known.

Further letter from agent acting on behalf of Haunch Lane Developments Ltd - concern that no comments contained in report on the validity of comments from applicant's agent; clients do not have to have an interest in land which is allocated in the adopted local plan in order for their comments to be valid; for representations from any source to be material to the consideration and determination of the application they simply have to be planning based; client's representations are so based and are therefore a material consideration; to describe them as 'academic' shows a complete misunderstanding and ignorance of planning law on the part of the applicant's agents; the writer of the letter confirming the Chamber of Commerce's views is not retained by Haunch Lane Developments Ltd to speak on their behalf on this matter and believe that he is solely responsible to the Chamber itself; not surprised that the Chamber should be concerned with regard to the renewal of this application and demonstrates the validity of my client's representations; Council should share their concerns and in making their decision on this proposal should review their policies towards retail development in Wellington to ensure that its retail status is enhanced and lost expenditure recovered; if they did this believe they would have no hesitation in refusing planning permission for the very valid planning reasons set out both in client's representations and those of the Chamber of Commerce.

18 48/2004/074

Additional Note re the applicant is advised that commercial usage of the building is unlikely to be acceptable.

19 49/2004/074

As amended by drawing No. PVW/81/475.02 REV A received 17th January, 2005.

Revised drawings received show improved parking/turning arrangements.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objection to the revised drawings subject to conditions.

WILDLIFE SPECIES CO-ODINATOR no objections subject to a condition requiring a wildlife survey in response to the possibilities of Slow Worms being found on the site. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER raises no objections and recommends notes regarding land contamination and noise.

Additional condition re wildlife survey (slow worms).

Additional notes re contamination and noise.

Amended Recommendation:- 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