

Amendment Sheet

4 08/2005/014

Amendment in proposal section:- Delete line 9 from "The current proposal to line 13 Tudor and The Stuart".

9 24/2005/034

This site has a history of unauthorised occupation by various people dating back to 1988. Mr Smith first occupied the site in 2002/03 when an enforcement notice was served (18th October 2002). Mr Smith has been taken to Court for breach of the enforcement action. This application is for the retention of that caravan.

9 LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received raising the following issues :- there is a poor access to the site that could cause an accident; the site is too small; the site is highly visible from the public road; NORTH CURRY already has adequate provision of Caravan Sites; the site is detrimental to the scenery of the area; the site is so small it will be impossible to screen it adequately; the small site will result in vehicles parking in the lane restricting the passage of vehicles contrary to highway safety; legal action is presently in progress to enforce the previous refusal; this application is flouting the planning regulations; biking and running past the site we are greeted by snarling, barking dogs that are frightening even though the dogs are behind a fence, the noise of dogs barking at night is disturbing and unsociable the Deane should continue in its efforts to clear the site.

10 36/2005/017

Letter received from applicant establishing that there was a cottage on the site originally that was weather damaged and repaired by reducing the walls to single storey and putting on a shed roof. Later the building was modified with a lean-to used to store hay. The applicant states that the previous boundaries were demarkated by metal gateposts and gate.

11 37/2005/011

Planning permission for the change of use of land and erection of a building for vehicle restoration and storage was refused by Committee in August this year. The current application excludes the restoration of vehicles.

RUISHTON & THORNFALCON PARISH COUNCIL comment it is felt that the building, due to its height at the the lower end of 5.5 m, could be detrimental to the view of the Millennium Wood from the dual carriageway and suggest some form of screening. There will be a need to agree hours of working and noise levels.

12 38/2005/352

Letter received from applicant amending application to 1 dwelling dated 21st October 2005.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY has no objection subject to a condition for parking and pedestrian access for the site and 193 Staplegrove Road.

1 ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- 1.We received the notification dated 26 October 2005 informing us that the matter is due to go before Committee on 2 November 2005.This was received by us late lunchtime on 28 October 2005, although the letter is marked First Class. The letter invited us to attend and at the Chairman's discretion, speak to the Committee for a maximum of three minutes. As we are due to go to Chester later today and are not due back until very late on Wednesday evening, the minimum statutory short notice would preclude us from due process and our democratic and human rights.2.As soon as possible that Friday afternoon, we went down to the Council Offices to collect a copy of the Committee Report. On reading this, we discovered that under the item "Assessment", it was disclosed that the proposal had been for the erection of one dwelling. This was the first we or any of the other objectors, had heard about this, and we have no idea as to the either negative or positive implications of this change in proposal without much more detail, i.e. do we still wish to maintain or withdraw our objections? 3.In the very short time available, we were able to speak and liaise with only the following objectors: The occupant/owner of: 195 Staplegrove Road, Taunton, 191 Staplegrove Road, Taunton, 189 Staplegrove Road Taunton, 32 Dowell Close Taunton, 30 Dowell Close, Taunton. There has been insufficient time or occasion to get in touch with the others. As a result, a meeting was hastily convened yesterday and we are authorised to speak on their

behalf and represent their views as expressed in this e-mail. 4. Moreover, we have spoken with our two local Council Representatives for Staplegrove Ward, i.e. Mrs Bradley and Dr Guerrier. Dr Guerrier was also unaware of the change of the amendment to the proposal and was somewhat mystified by it. 5. The following points arose from the meeting: 5.1 The notes referring to this application as contained in the Committee Report under the heading "Proposal" contains a misleading and conflicting information reference a pedestrian access to Dowell Close as being 191. This should refer to 193 and in any case, has not been discussed with the owner of 191 nor yet agreed. 5.2 The owners of 195 are querying and disputing subject to further legal advice, the coloured plans showing the applicant's ownership of part of the land at the rear of 193/5 and is contested by the owners of 195. 5.3 Under the heading "Consultations and Representations" reference is made to an application referred in one of the letters of objection, was a proposal for a dwelling at the rear of 209 Staplegrove Road. There is no reference whatsoever to a planning application for a development at the rear of 199, nor are there any reasons why it was turned down. This we believe is more relevant to the above application. 5.4 Under the heading "Assessment" there is reference to a Highways Report on traffic still awaited. There is strong feeling among the objectors that this particular frontage to Staplegrove Road is already over-crowded and a very dangerous corner. To remove even one or two vehicles from the ability to have on-site parking at the rear, will increase the danger even more and equally cause further congestion, and reference SI(A), the problems of the parking on Dowell Close, involving increase in fumes, noises, road safety and access and pro rate increase the traffic there on what is an un adopted area have been insufficiently considered. We would, therefore expect, that having waited so long from the application in July until now, there would have been sufficient time to obtain the Highway's input prior to any decision. 5.5 The new owners of 191 are continuing to seek legal advice as to what they are clear, is a misrepresentation of the intent to develop the rear of their property as being entirely withheld from them before and at the time of completion at the end of May 2005 with the above application being submitted in early July 2005, a period of only approximately six weeks. It may well be that they have grounds for damages. (It is appreciated whilst this may not be a concern of the Planners and the Committee, it is yet other evidence of the negative environment in which this particular application is being processed.) 5.6 Reference: SI(D) It is contested that insufficient attention has been paid to the detrimental effect that any additional development in this part of Staplegrove Road with its traditional character of, i.e. Edwardian houses with good garden space, will have on the environment, wild life and overall character of the area. 5.7 Reference: H2(G) There is deep concern that this yet again there is insufficient attention regarding privacy and light of the existing houses will be affected. 5.8 Reference: SI(H) One of the objectors is experienced in the construction industry and is deeply concerned that the additional provision of utility services, especially sewage, will cause problems. 5.9 We are clear in the current state of the residential market that it cannot be seriously argued that there is a shortage of this type of house, i.e. the middle to the upper range, as there are many houses available on the open market anywhere in the range of £200,000/£350,000 which the proposed development is probably going to be. It is certainly unlikely to be for first time buyers. Consequently, there cannot be an imperative for the local authority to see a further erosion of the character and nature of this part of Staplegrove Road at the expense of adding some unneeded housing stock. 5.10 If this application is approved, even in its amended form, is the

Council creating further precedence and signaling that there is "open season" for the remainder of the rear gardens in Staplegrove Road? 5.11 The applicant is reportedly stated to one of the objectors that a main reason for the above application is "for the sake of his pension fund". This would be reasonable and acceptable if it was not at the expense of his neighbours' pension funds. It will be seriously detrimental to the market value of the properties 191 and either side of 193, 191 if the above application is approved. Overall, therefore, we are strongly requesting at least a deferment to the next Planning Meeting to give us all, including those objectors with whom thus far we have been unable to liaise, sufficient time and full and transparent information. We would then be in an informed position to decide whether all or any of us, wish to maintain our objections and subsequently avoid further possible legal and other disputes and avoid unnecessary waste of officers and Committee members' time. Such deferment would give proper meaning to allowing us to have correct representation involving our democratic and human rights and minimise disharmony amongst the neighbours.

Comments from Planning Officer on points; notification of the committee meeting on Friday 28th October 2005 is considered sufficient; the neighbours will all be re notified of the reduction in the application and given 14 days in which to comment further; the pedestrian access would serve 193 Staplegrove Road, 191 has no rear access at present; land ownership is a Private legal matter; an application for a dwelling on land to the rear of 199 Staplegrove Road was refused permission on 25th January 2005 due to backland location with windows in close proximity to neighbours; loss of vehicular access and off street parking facilities encouraging roadside parking contrary to highway safety and the dwelling would be out of character with the area.

It is not considered reasonable to defer consideration of the application until the next committee meeting.

Letter from applicant:- of the 12 letters received, 2 are from the same address; the objection letters object to car parking problems but there has never been a problem with cars parked at the rear of 191/193 Staplegrove Road even when 2 houses were built in the rear of 201 Staplegrove Road, access is clear for emergency vehicles; the owner of 195 has a Commercial business and 2 garages to the rear plus a double gate access to the front of Staplegrove Road, Dowell Close does not reflect the Edwardian Architecture; overlooking and privacy will be dealt with as reserved matters; the site would include on site parking and there is a garage to serve 193.

Additional condition re the provision of details of a footpath entrance to link 193 Staplegrove Road to its garage at the rear.

Amended Recommendation: subject to the receipt of no additional letters raising new issues by 17th November 2005 the Development Control Manager in consultation with the Chair/Vice-chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed)

13 38/2005/356

The new vehicular access would be for use by delivery vehicles only and no parking would be allowed.

14 38/2005/364

1 ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION on grounds it would destroy parkland, increase noise and anti-social behaviour and an indoor facility is favoured.

1 PETITION OF OBJECTION with 19 signatures on grounds of noise, anti-social behaviour, loss of grass oval currently used by everyone; contrary to the environmental qualities of the area associated with the proposal.

15 44/2005/016

As amplified by applicants letter dated 29th October 2005.

Letter received from applicant dated 29th October 2005 in response to Parish Council comments as follows :- "We currently have an existing barn that measures 9 m x 4.5 m and stabling for two horses and a tack room. The existing barn is used exclusively for hay cut from our field and is too small to contain all the hay cut. This means we have to sell a proportion of our hay and then buy more later in the season when it is more expensive. Also at present we have no storage space for straw bedding. Our intention is to buy lambs at market, bringing them on and selling them at a later date. We envisage a small flock of 20/30 lambs at a time. Therefore the use of the proposed barn would be as follows:- 9 m x 9 m area to house the lambs bought from market; 9 m x 9 m area to store the hay cut from our field together with other necessary feed stuffs (nuts etc); 9 m x 9 m area to securely house agricultural equipment as necessary. The existing barn would be used to store the straw bedding for all our animals. I hope you will agree that the size of the proposed barn is not excessive given our plans.

Further to the report and for clarification purposes the holding size is 2.5 hectares (6.17 acres). The applicant has also verbally confirmed that cladding could be used instead of render if required.

1 LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- there is no reason for the need of a shed of this size to be erected in this field; the owners already have a barn as big if not bigger than the stables so I can see no reason for erecting another hay barn for horses, also the size of the land can only cater for 5 horses at the most.

Addition condition requiring the removal of the building should the agricultural use cease.

17 48/2005/045

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objection in principle. The new roads proposed would not be up to adoptable standards and would therefore remain private. There is no turning provision shown leading to the likelihood of vehicles having to reverse considerable distances to turn around. Therefore recommended condition:- Before the dwellings hereby permitted are first occupied, properly consolidated and surfaced turning spaces for vehicles shall be provided for Site A and Site B in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such turning spaces shall be kept clear of obstruction at all times.

Additional condition re submission of plans sharing turning area for each site.

18 49/2005/048

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY the agents additional information has been received, objection maintained, as a proper assessment of flood risk has not been undertaken. Calculations and details of culverts, channel and pond required to show that risk of flooding will not be increased. The proposed diversion and other works will require specific consent from the Agency. Additional conditions and notes suggested should objection be overcome.

DRAINAGE OFFICER re additional information, calculations of attenuation system required, content that a condition requiring full details before works start on site.

Additional condition re plants in pond.

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