

Amendment Sheet

---

**6 23/2006/001**

As amplified by wildlife survey received 19th April, 2006.

The wildlife survey indicates no protected wildlife species on the site, suggests work to the bunds; badgers may be present and operatives should be advised not to disturb badgers if found, and a further wildlife survey needed in the summer months.

Additional letter from agent. Re flood risk assessment the applicant considers that minimal loss of flood plain storage which might result is negligible when set against the overall size of the flood plain; the applicant is prepared to reduce the bund to 1.8 m from the maximum of 2.5 m. It is impossible to erect the fence 2 m from highway as this would impede access to a building, but the applicant is willing to erect a fence a minimum of 1 m and change the design to the Local Planning Authority approval. A wildlife survey has been faxed - there are no indications of protected species.

---

**7 27/2006/002**

As amended by letter dated 3rd April, 2006 with drawing Nos. MED.AP185 P1C

---

**8 30/2006/007**

ORCHARD PORTMAN PARISH COUNCIL raise concern if this results in a more intensive use of that part of the racecourse within the Parish (either for Sunday market or existing car boot sales) with vehicular traffic gaining access from the Orchard Portman site.

Additional conditions re gates set back 10 m, drainage to prevent water flowing onto highway, closure of existing vehicular access except for emergency vehicles.

---

**9 35/2006/002**

Additional notes re no tree planting within the visibility splays and need to contact Drainage Officer re localised flooding.

---

**12 38/2006/031CA**

Withdrawn

---

**13 38/2006/033**

1 ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- the proposal will obscure our views across Taunton Vale to the Blackdown Hills; the proposed height of the blocks should be no greater than existing; proposed windows will directly overlook our garden and windows; the proposed flats will be imposing and dwarf our property and amenity; there is inadequate parking for the number of units and this will exacerbate the existing on street parking problems and increase the amount of traffic using the adjacent residential roads as a rat run; the scale of the proposal is out of keeping; the existing SCAT building should be retained as it is an attractive period building.

1 LETTER OF SUPPORT has been received from the owner of the site:- the monies from the letting of the site have helped the foundation to support educational enterprises, schools and pupils; to continue we must receive the maximum sum possible which is based on the number of units granted planning permission; the existing SCAT building is of dubious architectural value and its retention will deprive young people of Taunton a substantial sum of money.

---

**4 43/2006/016**

Additional recommendation: -

(vii) additional information is submitted to justify any free standing office floor space above 600 s m permission be granted as per the report item recommendation.

Additional Condition: - The use of the buildings as described as Trade Counter/B1C use on the schedule of building uses received 13th January, 2006 shall be restricted to a Trade Only or other uses within class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order and shall not be used for the direct sale of goods to the general public. Reason. The Local Planning Authority does not wish to see the establishment of retail premises in this location beyond any recognised settlement boundary in accordance with Policies S7 and EC12 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan.

Additional Note:- The application site does not utilize the whole area allocated in the Local Plan. The layout of the estate, to be considered at the Reserved Matters stage, should not prejudice the future development of the remainder of the site identified in Policy W4 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan.

PLANNING POLICY UNIT (additional response) concern over condition 11 that states "details of the proposal shall broadly" equate to the schedule of uses submitted. Concern is raised that the word broadly is not binding/accurate enough and the development should be carried out in strict accordance with the schedule. No evidence has been provided to suggest the non-employment uses are ancillary and assist the enablement of the development. A restrictive trade counter condition should be imposed. It does not appear that Planning Policy concerns have not been met and the item should be withdrawn from the agenda. The starting point for consideration is still S38 of the 2004 Act, i.e. decisions must accord with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

---

**17 44/2006/004**

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY there is an existing use on the site for a nursing home and previous consent granted for an extension, therefore taking into account the current use it may be unreasonable to raise an objection on sustainability grounds. Whilst the existing access is narrow, it is proposed to widen this to accommodate the additional traffic movements resulting from the development and ensure vehicles entering do not come into conflict with those exiting the development, which could have resulted in vehicles backing up onto the highway. There is a track to the north east of the site, which is a rupp (road used as a public path). The Highway Authority would not want this utilised in any way to serve as any form of access to the site. In the event of permission being granted would recommend conditions re widening of access, parking, cycle parking and no surface water discharge onto highway.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER there have been complaints of pollution from foul drainage, the matter is still outstanding. Recommends additional condition on foul drainage.

---

**19 49/2006/006**

As amended by agents letter dated 7th April, 2006 and drawing Nos. 01/02/2006 and 02/02/2006 revised 7th April, 2006.

The revised drawings amend the proposed curtilage of the new dwelling and show visibility splays as recommended by the Highway Authority.

For clarification the entire policy H8, relating to replacement dwellings outside settlement limits, is shown below:- H8 Outside the limits of a defined settlement, the demolition of an existing dwelling and its replacement with a new dwelling will not be permitted, unless: (A) the residential use of the existing building has not been abandoned; (B) either 1) the appearance of the existing dwelling is incompatible with a rural location or; 2) it would be uneconomic to bring the dwelling to an acceptable state of repair or standard of amenities; (C) it is a one-for-one replacement which is not substantially larger than the existing dwelling; and (D) the scale, design and layout of the proposal in its own right is compatible with the rural character of the area.

---

**21 52/2006/004**

Withdrawn

---

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