

Amendment Sheet

5 07/2006/003

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT supports the proposal - this proposal supports the Economic Development policy to promote diversification of farming and the re-use of agricultural buildings for commercial rather than residential purposes. It is important to the continuation of farming in the Deane that farmers are encouraged to develop a wide range of income streams to help subsidise currently "low profit" farming activity".

10 25/2006/003

As amplified by agent's letter dated 16th March, 2006.

Amplifying letter indicated that Environment Agency confirm that an abstraction licence not required for the works because of de-watering for mineral extractions works does not required an abstraction licence. Applicant's consultants are confident that effects on the local licensed abstractions within the vicinity of the works will be negligible. There will be no effect on the movement of otters. Post works the ground will be returned to agriculture to approximate existing ground levels, which would be neutral to otters. In accordance with the previously approved applications, there will be planting within the northern areas for otters to follow, this will form a hedge line and fencing which will be constructed to allow otters passage. Although the reinstatement will put the soil back to a level that would be acceptable for arable uses, an agreement has been reached between the developer and the landowners, which states the land will only be used as pasture land.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objection subject to detailed highway works agreed on previously approved application being provided. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY no objection. Abstraction licence may be required for the abstraction of water from any inland water or underground strata, including groundwater seepage, which may ingress into the borrow pit. Applicant advised that it is their responsibility to ensure that the development does not adversely affect any existing legal water interests in the area. Continued concern regarding the potential impact of the proposed works on otter movement as some to the landscape planting that would have screened the development and doubled as a corridor for otter movement

when the culvert is flooded has been omitted. Careful planning of fencing needed to ensure otters can move around the dam easily when the culvert is flooded. Work should be planned to ensure that the river corridor remains available for otter passage during the night throughout the construction phase. Clarification of after use required to ensure that good agricultural practice follows. Waste management licence not required.

Amended Recommendation:- Permission be GRANTED... (as printed)

11 38/2006/041

Amend condition to read no additional first floor windows as well as obscure glazing.

12 38/2006/047

FORWARD PLAN general principle of a mixed-use development comprising residential and office uses in a town centre location such as this is acceptable. The site falls within the area subject to the site allocation policy T23 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan. Although the policy makes no reference to residential use the supporting text, at paragraph 8.223, does, and identifies Telephone House specifically as presenting a suitable opportunity. It also recognises that the inclusion of Telephone House is not fundamental to the redevelopment of the wider Crescent site, and that proposals for it can therefore be considered on their merits. In this respect the current proposals do not appear to compromise the options for the longer-term redevelopment of the Crescent site. This separate treatment of Telephone House from the remainder of the Crescent redevelopment site is carried through into the Taunton Urban Design Framework (UDF), where it is excluded from the area for which the consultants have produced their proposals. There is therefore no conflict between the current application and the Taunton Vision as expressed in the UDF. In general policy terms this application is acceptable, although this view excludes any consideration of detailed issues such as parking and access or residential amenity. If permitted, a residential development of this scale should provide an appropriate proportion of affordable housing in accordance with policy H9 of the Local Plan. The provision, or financial contributions towards off-site provision, of recreational open space, will also be required, in accordance with policy C4. Contributions towards the provision of educational facilities, in accordance with policy C1, may also be necessary.

Letter from agent confirming that the correspondence submitted by Lloyd Maunder is to be considered as part of the application.

Letter from applicants confirming that "the free range poultry houses would not at any time be converted to intensive fan ventilated houses in the future. I have no interest in this type of poultry production." Furthermore details of a management plan have been submitted as follows:- The proposed poultry unit is to have two houses each containing 6000 free range broiler birds per crop. Each crop has a growing time of 56 days followed by a 7 day house clean, = 63 day cycle time. This gives 5.8 crops per year. Total production equally 6000 birds x 5.8 crops x 2 houses = 69600 birds per year. From EA figures, litter production works out to 1.32 kg per bird place per year. For 69600 birds this works out to 92 tonnes per year of litter to be spread. The code of practice gives a maximum of 250 kg N per ha, per year. EA figures indicate that poultry litter provides 29kg N per tonne. To provide 250kg N from 29kg N per tonne would require 8.6 tonnes of litter. So 92 tonnes would require 10.7 hectares of land bank per year. Analysis of broiler manure and litter by the Lloyd Maunder's contracted consultants on these matters gives a spread rate of 8.3 tonnes per hectare per year (to give 250kg/ha nitrogen). So, 92 tonnes would require 11.1 hectares of land bank per year. (EA figures and analysed figures are therefore in agreement.) A suitable land bank of at least 1.11 ha is required, and 58.68 Hectares have been identified.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER no objections. I have the following observations and comments after an informative visit to similar units in the local area and operation details submitted by Lloyd Maunder. ODOUR - We found the smell and odour emanating from the naturally ventilated poultry buildings to be very slight and not at a level, which would give concerns of the possibility of a nuisance or detriment to the local residents. Ensuing good management of the housing and waste storage should reduce potential odour problems from the site. As such I would recommend the following condition:- Regard should be given to The Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Air published by DEFRA to prevent odours affecting residential or other odour sensitive premises. NOISE - Noise originating from the site on a daily basis appears to be minimal with increased noise and vehicle activity and at the end of the growing period. In light of this I would recommend the following condition:- With the exception of when 'catching' takes place, on site vehicle movements shall not take place, nor shall vehicle loading or unloading operations be carried out, except within the following times:- Monday - Friday 07:00 - 20:00 hours and Saturday - Sunday 07:00 -17.00 hours. WASTE MANAGEMENT - There is a perceived risk of odour problems arising from the spreading of the chicken litter, which if stored in the open and allowed to become wet can become anaerobic. As such we would recommend:- The applicant should submit a Waste Management plan for approval prior to commencement of works. Particular attention should be paid to the location and operation surrounding the chicken litter and the possible odour resulting from their activities. Regard should be given to The Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Water published by DEFRA. LIGHT - External lighting shall be so located, installed and

permanently maintained that inconvenience from glare, whether direct or reflected, shall not be caused at any other premises.

COUNTY COUNCILLOR CHRISTOPHER WOLVERSON for the Lydeard Division Leader of the Conservative Group Somerset County Council - I share the concerns of the residents of Tolland about this application and am disturbed that the officers are recommending acceptance. I am aware of the site within the village and was present at a recent parish council meeting when the proposals were discussed. Whilst I am glad to note that two further applications for units have been refused under delegated powers on visual impact grounds, I am not convinced that the same reason should not be used in relation to the above application. The site is very similar and has a virtually similar impact on adjacent properties. I am disappointed that the Environmental Health Officer has not yet commented as his views are needed. He should have done so by now, considering how long this application has been in the pipe line. I have to say that in view of the fact that almost everyone in Tolland has objected, I do feel that the Committee should visit the site to see for themselves what impact this proposal could have on the quality of life, the visual and residential amenity and indeed the rural character of this small community. Many of the residents appreciate the need for this sort of development but it is in the wrong place and too near to where people live. There are other alternative sites. I apologise for sending my views by this means, but cannot be at the meeting as I leave at 4 o'clock tomorrow morning to go to Brussels to visit the European Parliament and Commission.

14 41/2006/004

Letter from agent confirming that the correspondence submitted by Lloyd Maunder is to be considered as part of the application.

Letter from applicants confirming that "the free range poultry houses would not at any time be converted to intensive fan ventilated houses in the future. I have no interest in this type of poultry production." Furthermore details of a management plan have been submitted as follows:- The proposed poultry unit is to have two houses each containing 6000 free range broiler birds per crop. Each crop has a growing time of 56 days followed by a 7 day house clean, =63 day cycle time. This gives 5.8 crops per year. Total production equally 6000 birds x 5.8 crops x 2 houses = 69600 birds per year. From EA figures, litter production works out to 1.32 kg per bird place per year. For 69600 birds this works out to 92 tonnes per year of litter to be spread. The code of practice gives a maximum of 250 kg N per ha, per year. EA figures indicate that poultry litter provides 29kg N per tonne. To provide 250kg N from 29kg N per tonne would require 8.6 tonnes of litter. So 92 tonnes would require 10.7 hectares of land bank per year. Analysis of broiler manure and litter by the Lloyd Maunder's contracted consultants on these matters gives a spread rate of 8.3 tonnes per hectare per year 9to give 250hk/ha nitrogen). S0, 92 tonnes would require 11.1 hectares of land bank per year. (EA figures and analysed figures are

therefore in agreement.) A suitable land bank of at least 1.11 ha is required, and 58.68 Hectares have been identified.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER no objections. I have the following observations and comments after an informative visit to similar units in the local area and operation details submitted by Lloyd Maunders. ODOUR - We found the smell and odour emanating from the naturally ventilated poultry buildings to be very slight and not at a level, which would give concerns of the possibility of a nuisance or detriment to the local residents. Ensuing good management of the housing and waste storage should reduce potential odour problems from the site. As such I would recommend the following condition:- Regard should be given to The Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Air published by DEFRA to prevent odours affecting residential or other odour sensitive premises. NOISE - Noise originating from the site on a daily basis appears to be minimal with increased noise and vehicle activity and at the end of the growing period. In light of this I would recommend the following condition:- With the exception of when 'catching' takes place, on site vehicle movements shall not take place, nor shall vehicle loading or unloading operations be carried out, except within the following times:- Monday - Friday 07:00 - 20:00 hours and Saturday - Sunday 07:00 -17.00 hours. WASTE MANAGEMENT - There is a perceived risk of odour problems arising from the spreading of the chicken litter, which if stored in the open and allowed to become wet can become anaerobic. As such we would recommend:- The applicant should submit a Waste Management plan for approval prior to commencement of works. Particular attention should be paid to the location and operation surrounding the chicken litter and the possible odour resulting from their activities. Regard should be given to The Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Water published by DEFRA. LIGHT - External lighting shall be so located, installed and permanently maintained that inconvenience from glare, whether direct or reflected, shall not be caused at any other premises.

COUNTY COUNCILLOR CHRISTOPHER WOLVERSON for the Lydeard Division Leader of the Conservative Group Somerset County Council - I share the concerns of the residents of Tolland about this application and am disturbed that the officers are recommending acceptance. I am aware of the site within the village and was present at a recent parish council meeting when the proposals were discussed. Whilst I am glad to note that two further applications for units have been refused under delegated powers on visual impact grounds, I am not convinced that the same reason should not be used in relation to the above application. The site is very similar and has a virtually similar impact on adjacent properties. I am disappointed that the Environmental Health Officer has not yet commented as his views are needed. He should have done so by now, considering how long this application has been in the pipe line. I have to say that in view of the fact that almost everyone in Tolland has objected, I do feel that the Committee should visit the site to see for themselves what impact this proposal could have on the quality of life, the visual and residential amenity and indeed the rural character of this small community. Many of the residents appreciate the need for this sort of development but it is in the wrong place and too near to where people live. There are other alternative sites. I apologise for sending my views by this means, but cannot be at the meeting as I leave at 4 o'clock tomorrow morning to go to Brussels to visit the European Parliament and Commission.

16 42/2006/005TEN

Additional condition re the submission of materials.

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