

Amendment Sheet

9 14/2005/020

The agents have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment which is currently being considered by the Environment Agency.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY withdraw objection.

PARISH COUNCIL Unanimously support this application

1 LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- the sketch scheme would overlook the front of the existing property and affect the privacy of the lounge and kitchen; the proposed access gives limited visibility to the north, the existing farm access has been unused for at least 18 years and should not be used for comparison; planning policy advises new houses should be strictly controlled in this rural location; the site is approximately 1 m above road level in a focal part of the village street scene where the existing single storey barn nestles into the street scene, a new two storey dwelling would dominate and be detrimental to the entrance to the village; the proposal shows little sensitivity to the character of the area and has only a monetary gain in view, the loss of the building used for equipment and horses will continue to transform Ham from a quiet rural community into an upper class weekend retreat, the area is subject to severe flooding and this house would put further demands on flood prevention measures in times of flood access to Ham is restricted to the lane via Knapp.

Amended Recommendation:- delete reason 02 re flood risk assessment.

10 19/2005/001

Amend description to read: - as amended by agents letter and plans received 30th March, 2005.

FURTHER LETTERS/E-MAILS/FACSIMILES OF OBJECTION have been received from the occupants of Unit 6 Hatch Mews stating the following:- It is stated that the proposed development is situated within 250 m of a landfill site, this is very misleading, it is within 10 m of a landfill site. Were the Environment Agency and Health Officer advised the correct distance and have they given their advice on the correct distance?. The 250 m cannot be a typing error as it is quoted in the last paragraph as well; There is a watercourse that the field and the business park both drain into between the boundary and the scheme.; as site owner of Hatch Mews we

would like clarification of the Environment Agency concerns regarding gas migration and the rational behind it? ; We would like clear and concise view from the Council of their interpretation of the MAFF storage and disposal of waste matter etc. So there are no misunderstandings when it comes to enforcement. This also should be a planning condition. Waste matter is one of the major concerns of objectors and you leave this vital matter open to interpretation; The Environmental Health Officer states that there are "No bonfires are to be permitted on site", this is very clear and precise yet in the one from last paragraph on conditions you use the words "No burning of waste". Why have you changed the Health Officer's recommendation? ; Yet again you have ignored public opinion and the views of the Parish Council who are elected to represent the views of the villagers, brushed aside without comment a planning officers letter stating about no further buildings in this area written this year. Yet again it seems it is a rule for one and not the other; on all planning conditions you make a big thing about visual amenity. This is a area designated a Special Landscape Area and we objected on visual amenity and in the last paragraph you state the scheme will not significantly harm neighbouring amenity or the visual amenities. Yet again you are admitting it does affect the amenity but you are going to ignore it and brush this aside, what is the point of designating an area Special Landscaping whilst you ignore it and make no mention of it?; The submitted plans are on a too high a scale to ensure accurate measurement, it is vague and open to interpretation and we have taken expert opinion and he states that enforcement would not be possible on this scale. This is not good enough. This needs rectifying, how can you state the plans are of sufficient quality when they are to an unworkable scale and drawn on an out of date and now inaccurate plan? So therefore the plans are not of sufficient quality to allow the proposal to be considered; With your remark of adequate publicity, you failed totally to inform the owners of the Business Park, we are clearly shown on land registry and very well known in the planning office and yet again you brush aside a formal complaint to your department; You have missed another very important condition and that the building should not be used until it is finished and all planning conditions have been discharged. I find it also very hard to understand with 47 objections from a small village, the Parish Council objecting with no representations from the objectors and as stated in earlier correspondence one of your officers writing to us and stating that no buildings will be allowed in this area dated 14th February 2005 and it being a designated a special landscape area. How can this application be significantly amended and put to committee before readvertisement and appropriate public consultation?; The plans and boundaries are inaccurate so how can they be used; By using the MAFF as a general guideline this is not clear and concise and open to endless misinterpretation, this will be a bone of contention if passed and it needs to be crystal clear.

11 **30/2005/006**

1 LETTER reiterating previous concerns.

Condition 03 amend wording to read 11 p.m. not 10 p.m.

12 30/2005/009

Condition 09 to read 33 m visibility splay in north easterly direction only.

13 34/2005/007

WESSEX WATER confirm that the site lies within a sewered area.

POLICY SECTION consultation response is reported incorrectly. The comments should read "The application site falls wholly within a site allocated for residential development in the Taunton Deane Local Plan (policy T23 of the Revised Deposit, as amended by Proposed Modification M/T/35). Its development for housing is, therefore, acceptable in principle. However, it is a small part of the allocation, which, if developed in isolation, would establish a pattern of piecemeal development that could be repeated on a number of similar sites along Mill Rise. This would undermine the co-ordinated and comprehensive development of the site as a whole, including the provision of essential infrastructure such as improved access arrangements and a flood mitigation scheme, and the delivery of important contributions to affordable housing and transportation and education facilities. There is, therefore, an objection to the proposal."

Amendment:- ONE LETTER OF OBJECTION should read ONE LETTER OF REPRESENTATION.

14 38/2005/099

Applicant suggests they would be willing to make following unilateral undertaking:- To link the Four Alls and Castle Moat Chambers under the ownership of the Gadd Group, by (a) submitting a full planning application for 8 dwelling, retail and office accommodation for the Castle Moat Chambers site within 3 months of 17th May, 2005. The design reflecting the form and architectural style of the Four Alls scheme. (b) not commencing the Four Alls development until the positive determination of the Castle Moat Chambers application or 9 months from the 17th May, 2005, whichever is the sooner.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY I refer to previous correspondence on this matter. My first preference with regard to this development is for it to be car free with no vehicular access onto Corporation Street, This however, is not before me and in consequence, I have negotiated with the applicant's agents Peter Evans Partnership, to carry out highway works which mitigate against the increased traffic

generated to and from the public highway at this point. The details shown in Drawing No. 1806.01 C are acceptable with the exception of the replacement of two parking bays lost in conjunction with this development. I am afraid those will be unable to be replaced as their location may impinge on buses emerging from Castle Way and turning right. In consequence therefore, subject to the details of access, visibility, parking and turning etc. shown on Drawing No. 1806.01C being provided prior to the commencement of development and being subject of a Section 106 Agreement to secure its appropriate design, construction and Ending, I would have no highway objection to the proposed development. COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST I have now received a Desk Top Assessment of the archaeological potential of this site. It concludes that there is reason to believe archaeological remains will be impacted by this proposal. The DTA also supports the idea that there is a level of disturbance of these remains. I believe that an archaeological investigation should take place as part of the development process. For this reason I recommend that the applicant be required to provide archaeological monitoring of the development and a report on any discoveries made. This should be secured by the use of model condition 55 attached to any permission granted: "No development hereby approved shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority." I am happy to provide a specification for this work and a list of suitable archaeologists to undertake it.

ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANTS COMMENTS we have reviewed all the information sent as well as that available on your website. As you know this site falls within the High Street section of the Design Code (pages 86 -87). There are two key requirements of the Code for this site: the establishing of a small focal space on Bath Place where the route changes direction; and the creation of a new pedestrian route from Corporation Street (which links through to the new space) and would then push further south alongside the Friends Meeting House. Whilst the overall scale and mix of uses in the proposal are broadly acceptable the key concerns are as follows: 1. By splitting the scheme in to 2 phases (apparently to avoid affordable housing) the delivery of the above requirements is unclear and an efficient arrangement is compromised. This approach could potentially lead to two internal car courts and two frontage voids, providing car access, to Corporation Street. As well as being ugly these voids take the place of lively ground floor uses. We believe a single scheme should employ a single car access from the street which could/should be combined with the new pedestrian route to Bath Place. (We cannot believe that it can be this easy to avoid affordable housing. In any case, in order to achieve the best possible scheme - with the right mix of uses, low car parking provision, high quality building, new route, new small public space and retained historic building - we would hope a lesser affordable housing provision could be agreed). 2. The partial demolition of the Four Alls building is not justified or desirable. The remnant in the scheme makes little sense architecturally and is insufficient for this prominent corner. The element demolished is clearly integral to the element retained (whether or not it was built at the same time) and of the same quality. There is also likely to be an uncomfortable junction between the new and old buildings as there is no architectural break in the existing building at this point. The demolition of this wing also provides the opportunity for the new building to loom over the existing, particularly in views from Park Street. Retaining this element

helps limit this possibility - whether it is via new roof forms or later plant additions. 3. The phase 1 buildings are broadly acceptable in terms of height and bulk with certain important exceptions. The three-and-a-half storey plus penthouse component at the eastern end of Corporation Street is the most successful element - with the exception of the fifth floor in the roof which breaks the roofline and upsets the otherwise classical arrangement of base, piano nobile and attic. The western end of the frontage is incomprehensible. Whilst, charitably, it may be playing with the classical language, it does so wholly unsuccessfully and has no redeeming features. The bulk to the rear appears acceptable - stepping down in the form of terraces. Phase 2 would be more important in its impact on Bath Place. 5 Architecturally the scheme adopts a contemporary/contextual/classicism with the best results as set out above. In our view the Corporation Street frontage should read firstly as a terrace of buildings and should not appropriate the scale and proportions of Hunts Court - to the detriment of that building. The Corporation Street frontage is divided in to a series of major bays similar to the proportions of Hunts Court, linked by glass. Hunts Court is a special landmark in the town and should not become confused with this scheme. The breaks in the frontage, using recessed glass, are unnecessary, unwelcome and unattractive. This device used to be common in linking new and old buildings but should not be necessary in a new scheme. The architects should look at The Crescent if they are nervous about designing an unrelieved terrace.

Amended Recommendation:- Permission be REFUSED.

16 38/2005/148

Amend description from A3 to A3/A5.

1 LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- the extractor fans should not be placed to face the living accommodation and 49 Hamilton Road as this would affect health and amenity of occupants.

17 38/2005/160

The Agent has confirmed that the ground floor will be brick with render on the upper levels with a tile roof. They have also asked to confirm that both the bathroom and kitchen windows on the North and South Elevations (facing 2a and 10 Wilton Street) will be obscure glazed.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY the proposed details are considered acceptable subject to conditions to secure the provision of the access, visibility, parking and turning shown on the drawing.

6 ADDITIONAL LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received raising the following issues:- there are four windows on the side of 10 Wilton Street, there is no garage adjacent to 10 Wilton Street, the 6 windows facing 10 Wilton Street will overlook; vehicles travelling along Wilton Street do so at speed and any increase in the volume of traffic, combined with on street parking, will increase the hazards and be contrary to highway safety; the structure will be out of keeping with the area; there is insufficient parking; materials out of keeping; three storey out of keeping should be 2 storey; the development will result in too many units out of character with the area.

Amendments to report:- There are four windows in the southern wall of No 10 Wilton Street. Two of these are at ground level where there is a boundary hedge blocking views from the site. There are two windows at first floor level and these will be facing the rear section of the proposed flats. There is a driveway between the house and the boundary with the site and not a garage.

Additional Condition re access and visibility splays to be in accordance with plan 16 Revision A before occupation and maintained thereafter.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:- Subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement by 27th May, 2005 for contributions for the provision of children's play area and recreational open space the Development Control Manager in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed).

N/A 43/2004/119

Letter from applicants agent dated 16th May, 2005 forwarded direct to Members - mainly in response to the Town Council response.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY (further observations following receipt of clarifying information) - the submitted flood risk assessment is considered by the Agency to meet the requirements of PPG25 and that the proposed development is in accordance with the guidelines contained therein. The Agency therefore do not object to the development on flood risk grounds. Notwithstanding the above, the Agency request that any approval is subject to conditions regarding - scheme for provision of surface water drainage works, minimum floor levels for each building, flood proofing of western wall of Block D, detailed design of flood attenuation lagoon, flood mitigation measures, regime for maintenance and operation of flood mitigation works, contamination, bunding around fuel storage tanks, no discharge of foul/contaminated drainage to groundwater/surface waters, oil interceptor. Advice re need for Land Drainage Consent, liability, climate change, SUDs, off-site waste disposal, contact Wessex Water, pollution prevention measures during construction.

ENGLISH HERITAGE (observations on amended plans) - Summary:- English Heritage has already provided an interim letter in relation to the planning and listed building applications for Tonedale Mills which emphasises the national significance of the site as a surviving historic textile mill complex and highlights the difficult issues faced in securing its beneficial reuse. In recognition of this fact significant resources have been focussed on the site both at a regional and national level within our organisation to assist both the local authority and the owners in achieving the successful reuse of such an important complex. We previously raised a number of issues with the applicants regarding demolition of buildings, retention of machinery, balance of uses and impact of car parking on the site at the same time as making our own assessment of the costs put forward as financial justification for the scheme. What has become clear through this process is the scale of the financial deficit affecting this site which makes it inevitable that unpalatable decisions are going to have to be taken if a way forward for it is to be found. In this respect some compromises are inevitable on significant issues such as demolition of individual buildings or sections of buildings and the balance of residential and commercial uses, which have a fundamental impact on the finances for the site and English Heritage is facing a position of reluctant acceptance of these aspects of the current scheme. However, there are still significant areas where improvements could and should be sought to the proposals particularly in terms of the design of new housing and the impact of car parking on the setting of listed buildings.

English Heritage advice:- As a result of our internal assessment of construction costs associated with this scheme it has become apparent that the site suffers from a large conservation deficit which is only compounded by additional costs such as decontamination and the need for flood alleviation works. Unfortunately we do not have the full financial picture since the Council has not, to our knowledge, undertaken a comparable detailed appraisal of the projected end values for the site as we had expected it to. However, our knowledge of the adverse financial circumstances facing the site, taken with the fact that the applicant's own financial appraisal only identifies a modest profit for the whole project, indicates that the scheme's viability is somewhat precarious. There is a risk, should these applications be approved, of the site, or parts of it, being sold on and the scheme proceeding in a piecemeal fashion with the most profitable elements being undertaken first and the least profitable buildings being left to deteriorate further. This would have to be guarded against with a very robust and comprehensive legal agreement controlling phasing of work which might not actually accord with the phasing currently intended by the applicant. Equally, should these applications be refused there is no guarantee that a more beneficial scheme for the site will emerge and, if anything, the economic indicators are that the financial circumstances facing the site will only worsen. Whilst any demolition of buildings on the site is regrettable, our overall view of this aspect of the revised proposals is that they could be acceptable to English Heritage if they help to secure the reuse of the site as a whole. However, demolition would need to be carefully phased in with re-development to ensure that large-scale site clearance does not occur until a programme of repairs is underway. In terms of specific conservation and design issues we have considered further the problem of surviving machinery although we have been hindered by the fact that internal access to significant areas of the site has not been possible. On balance the loss of some machinery could be accepted where it prevents the reuse of buildings. However, a comprehensive schedule of machinery and fittings should be compiled by the applicant and agreed by the Council detailing what currently exists and what

can be retained prior to any works commencing on site. Whilst we welcome the fact that the amendments made to the scheme take account of some of our previous comments there are still issues of design and setting affecting listed buildings which we believe require further negotiation. In particular, the revised scheme for building D now incorporates a row of new build houses for which the absence of detail in the small-scale drawings suggests a very mediocre design that needs considerably more work to make them acceptable in this context. The provision of car parking poses significant problems for the site and it is unfortunate that the two largest car parks are in very prominent positions where the relationship of listed buildings with their landscape setting will be adversely affected. In the absence of an agreed flood alleviation scheme with the Environment Agency it is not even clear yet whether the design and position of car park 1 is practically possible and it is a matter of concern to English Heritage that such a fundamental issue as flood relief works have not yet been approved in detail. Car park 7 and the access road to it could have a very detrimental effect on the setting of Tonedale House and it has been suggested that legal ownership issues may indeed make this element of the design unimplementable. Recent amendments to the car park design have still not overcome that concern and it is possible that a more flexible approach to parking standards by the Council is needed to resolve this issue satisfactorily in addition to a review of the design issues. Recommendations:- In the experience of English Heritage complex and run-down industrial sites such as Tonedale can often take years to resolve. Whilst we acknowledge the efforts made by the current owners to address the buildings on this site comprehensively there are still elements of the design which significantly undermine what is potentially an exciting regeneration scheme. A rushed decision at this stage could, therefore, be very damaging. Whilst we understand that the Council may wish to endorse the overall approach being taken we would strongly advocate no definitive decision being made until the remaining design and setting issues have been resolved and the final views of the Environment Agency are known. This need not prevent work beginning on the formulation of detailed conditions which we would expect to cover such issues as archaeological recording, landscaping, architectural detailing, repair specifications, retention of machinery etc. English Heritage remains committed to maintaining our involvement with Tonedale Mill to the conclusion of a successful scheme, to the extent of commenting on outline planning conditions and heads of agreement for a Section 106 Agreement. We hope that Taunton Deane will afford an equally high priority to the heritage interest of this nationally important site and take the time necessary to make the right decision for its best long-term interests. Next steps:- We consider that the implications of this application are so significant that we would welcome the opportunity of advising further on the revised proposals. Please let me have the necessary additional information in time for us to comment again if necessary before the application is determined.

GARDEN HISTORY SOCIETY the GHS is concerned about the proposals which will affect the historic setting of Tone Dale House. These gardens are of considerable local historic importance because of the connection between the Fox's of Tone Dale with the Exeter firm of Veitch and Sons, the designers of Wellington Park. Veitch and Sons were important nurserymen and designers. It is believed that they were also involved with Forde House near Wiveliscombe. We share the concerns of Philip White of Hestercombe Gardens as set out in his letter of 27th April and object to the current planning application.

SOUTH WEST TOURISM it is understood that creation of new housing stock is a mainstay of almost all local plans throughout the region, however in this instance the need for a more subtle approach would be of great benefit not only to a rather unique tourist/visitor resource, but also to the landscape/environment of the surrounding area. Judging by the information at my disposal, the following tourism-related factors spring immediately to mind: 1. The condition of the listed building and heritage gardens would undoubtedly be adversely affected, along with the ability for prospective visitors to enter the property via the appropriate driveway, diminishing what is a key contributor to visitor satisfaction: A lasting first impression. 2. A major contributor to the tourist experience is the feeling of leaving behind the 'real world' and being able to act freely without 'annoying the neighbours', something that would become increasingly difficult to do. 3. Not knowing the visitor figures involved with this business makes this next observation rather difficult, but it may be safe to assume that repeat visits from previously overjoyed guests would be greatly reduced, as any subsequent visit would be seen as inferior to a visit prior to development. With less ability to retain repeat visitors, a less attractive product to offer new visitors and the added influence of interaction with, firstly construction workers and secondly new home owners, it is easy to see how the Big House Company, and Wellington as a tourist destination, may suffer. As a result of these misgivings, there appears to be a need for serious mitigation of the activities proposed by Courtleigh Securities Ltd. in light of the negative effect the developments (as they are currently proposed) will surely have on this local business, and of course the knock-on effect that less visitors would have on the economy of Wellington and the surrounding area as a whole.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER Wellington is the second largest town in Taunton Deane and has enjoyed considerable growth in the provision of employment land and premises in recent years; primarily at Chelston and , more recently, at Chelston Phase II. In addition, significant further land is allocated for employment purposes at Chelston House Farm and the Borough Council has agreed to provide a number of new small business units on land in its ownership at the Blackdown Business Park. Unemployment in the town and the surrounding area is in line with the average for the County, as are many other indicators such as economic activity rates; average income levels, etc. Recent work undertaken by consultants Roger Tym and Partners, Lin Cousins and Clive Miller has, however, highlighted a number of issues facing the economy of Wellington. Chief amongst these is the continuing reliance upon a relatively limited number of larger employers, several of whom are in sectors which both nationally and more locally are declining. In 2002, only just over 2% of Wellington's businesses employed 50 or more but these businesses provided work for more than 46% of all employees in the town. 3 of Wellington's top 5 employers are in sectors considered to be declining and, in total, account for about 1,200 jobs-almost one third of the town's total. For these reasons, their report placed importance on diversifying the local economy particularly into growth sectors and through increased support for new and smaller businesses; where the majority of growth in job creation has come from in recent years. These issues are also identified in the emerging Wellington and Area Community Strategy, which makes specific reference to the need to develop Tonedale Mill for a variety of housing and commercial needs and to the need to ensure business retention and encourage and support small businesses. Tonedale

Mill currently accommodates more than 40 small businesses engaged in trades as diverse as instrument making; book binding; antique furniture restoration; musical recording; stained glass window making; motor vehicle restoration, etc. These businesses are precisely of the type which should be supported and encouraged if Wellington's economy is to diversify and grow. Many employees live locally and are able to walk to work and the businesses have created their own 'community' on site where inter-business trading and support is widespread. In my experience, there is no similar/comparable community of smaller businesses trading in such a diverse range of commercial activities on a single site elsewhere in the locality or more generally in Somerset. Two meetings have been held on site involving both the owners/applicants and the local businesses at which a large number of issues and concerns were expressed. Whilst I fully accept the need to safeguard the long-term future of the buildings through a mixed-use development that is commercially viable, it is also in my view imperative to retain and accommodate as many of the existing business as possible within the proposed development. Opportunities for suitable relocation are limited and much of the unique character of this site and its current success for employment purposes stems from the co-location of the businesses in premises suitable to and affordable for the types of trade carried on there. Some of the primarily motor trade related uses will probably need to relocate and discussions are ongoing to try to make suitable land/ premises available on the allocated employment land at nearby Lowmoor. I note that the total amount of 'commercial' floorspace proposed by the applicants at Tonedale Mills is greater than that currently occupied by the existing businesses. I am prepared to support the application provided that every effort is made to accommodate as many of the existing businesses as possible on site and in premises and on terms that do not prejudice the future of the businesses concerned. I would hope that this could be largely addressed through the proposed S106 Agreement although I am more than happy to continue to be involved in any discussions as between the applicants and the businesses if appropriate.

LEISURE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER (further observations) if this site is not viable with a leisure/play contribution we shouldn't allow it on sustainability grounds, but there are other priorities here and the housing bankrolls the retention of the listed buildings so I have to accept that the priority here is restoration not sustainability. There will be a play area on the adjacent development site which will be within 300 m of every home on the Mill development. Access must be made to this for residents of the Mill development and it must be easy and safe - signing or road crossings may be required. As to the provision of equipment on this site by this Council - there is a Greenspaces Forum being set up in June to determine priorities for investment in open spaces in Wellington. There will be more needs than there are resources no doubt. This site can be considered as part of that process.

WELLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL as you will be aware as you made a detailed presentation, the Town Council considered the above plan at a meeting last night (10th May, 2005) attended by well over 50 local residents, tenants of existing business premises at the mill and representatives of the applicants, Courtleigh Securities Ltd, and the Big House Co. (owners of Tone Dale House). After a full and frank discussion, during which the residents, tenants and representatives put their views/objections, the town council decided to ask Taunton Deane Borough Council not to make a decision on this application at its meeting on Wednesday, 18th May,

2005 but to defer it pending further negotiations which it is hoped will result in a scheme that is much more generally acceptable and meets the needs of the various interested parties. The present plans show the access to car park 7 via Millstream Gardens which involves demolishing a substantial listed building. The Town Council is against this proposal and feels that an adequate and safe access to the car park with good visibility in both directions can be provided off the main Milverton Road, virtually opposite the entrance to Wardleworth Way with traffic being governed by a mini roundabout. If this is done, it will not only save the demolition of a listed building and increase the viability of the redevelopment but, equally important, it will retain a building which acts as a sound barrier to noise from functions at the Tone Dale House. You will recall that this was one of the major points made by the public at last night's meeting and that Mr Andrew Brown, for Courtleigh, stated he would be happy with an alternative access which would save the demolition. The Town Council feels that the borough council should not accept the highway authority's view that the access should be via Millstream Gardens. The Town Council is also concerned that, if the present plan is approved, it will lead to the loss of existing viable industrial units and businesses. There are more than 40 small workshops/industrial units and businesses on the site and while it is recognised there is a need to relocate some the noisier/un-neighbourly type businesses, it is felt there might be insufficient non-residential space to accommodate all those who wish to remain on site and who provide much useful local employment. Currently Block H has considerable business usage. Under the plans before the council it is proposed to use it for housing. It was suggested at the meeting that Block H be retained for commercial use so that all such commercial usage was at the eastern end of the site, and that Block F and part of Block G should be used for housing (not commercial as proposed) so that all the housing was together at the western end of the site. The third point the town council wishes to make is the lack of play facilities/play area on the site. It is appreciated that with the difficulties and expense of redeveloping this site and retaining old listed buildings, the normal level of community, educational and social housing provision cannot be expected. However it is strongly felt it would be a serious mistake and storing up problems for the future not to plan for some play provision, even allowing for the fact the majority of the homes will be one and two bedroom dwellings. Mr Andrew Brown mentioned that there was scope for extra amenity space at the southern end of the site and it is felt that this should be explored. Possibly this provision could be financially aided through Section 106 agreements for off-site leisure facilities from other housing developments in the town. Finally it is considered there will be major disruption of existing residential properties caused by the extra construction traffic going in and out of the site.

FURTHER LETTER OF OBJECTION further issued raised:- possibility of rise of crime in this quiet community.

LETTER OF OBJECTION dated 6th May, 2005 from Big House Co. (occupiers of Tonedale House adjacent to the site) with enclosures. It is understood that copies of this letter and its attachments have been forwarded by the objector to all Committee Members. A copy of the letter is attached to this update)

FURTHER LETTER from one of objectors (e-mailed to Members 17th May, 2005) - refers to traffic congestion, access should be from new access onto Milverton Road and impact on structure of dwellings.

Letter from solicitors acting on behalf of the Big House Company (circulated to Members direct) - copy attached to this update.

Letter from surveyor acting on behalf of the Big House Company (circulated to Members direct) copy attached to this update.

Letter from consultant acting on behalf of the Big House Company circulated to Members direct) copy attached to this update.

E-Mail of objection from a local sustainable building consultant (copy attached to this update).

E-Mail received from applicant (copy attached to this update).

Applicants agent has forwarded list of tenants anticipated to remain on site and affected by this developer. The floorspace currently occupied total 29,870 sq ft (2,775 sq m).

Additional Conditions (43/2004/119) surface water drainage, minimum finished floor levels for each building, flood proofing of western wall, detailed design for the flood attenuation lagoon, bunding around fuel storage tanks, no discharge of foul/contaminated drainage to groundwater/surface waters and petrol/oil interceptors, further details to an appropriate scale of the proposed new build within Block D and provision of communal satellite/TV receivers.

Additional Notes re land drainage consent, liability, climate change, SUDs, off-site waste disposal and pollution prevention measures during construction.

Additional Conditions (43/2004/120LB) materials, no removal of sites historic industrial artifacts and materials until relocation approved, detailed schedules of structural work and repairs, repairs approach, submission of specific details, details of new works.

N/A 43/2004/120LB

See previous application.

N/A 46/2004/018

Amended description:- and as amended by letter dated 16th May, 2005 with accompanying geophysical survey report.

The geophysical survey encountered no geophysical anomalies indicative of archaeological targets in any of the sample areas investigated.

WELLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL (further observations) in favour.

MILVERTON PARISH COUNCIL would like to lodge an objection to the above proposed development which I believe is going to Committee next week. The Parish Councils principal objection is that the development will generate a significant increase in traffic particularly slow moving and potentially large livestock wagons as well as tractors and trailers. The village streets are narrow and some are subject to a 7.5t weight restriction. This means that all the traffic will be channelled down Silver Street, Fore Street and Sand Street. The Parish Council are supportive of local farmers and understand the need for a market outlet for stock. However, if constructed the market will serve a huge area of West Somerset and Exmoor and therefore the B3187 through Milverton is likely to be the route of choice of a large proportion of it. The Parish Council notes that this development falls outside the Local Plan and therefore strongly requests that the Borough Council refuse it.

1 LETTER OF OBJECTION raising issues with regard to archaeology and additional HGV traffic passing through Milverton. (full text of this letter appended to this update).

20 47/2005/006

As amended by letter received 10th May, 2005 with attached drawing No. 0412002G.

Amendments comprise hipped roof in lieu of gabled roof.

23 52/2005/017

PARISH COUNCIL support application.

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