

Amendment Sheet

---

**10/2006/021**

TOURISM OFFICER having read all the supporting information I would be happy to support the proposed development. The applicants have clearly done their research and found agencies who are happy and confident that they can rent out the accommodation for tourism use.

---

**24/2006/023**

The applicant has commented that the speed limit of 50 mph has now been reduced to 30 mph. COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY views awaited taking into account this change.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER subject to careful management of the existing hedgerows the proposals will have a limited landscape impact.

PARISH COUNCIL your committee and I have both now had the opportunity to read your Planning Officer's report on the application to double the number of caravans on Mr Orchard's Long Acre site and her recommendation that permission be granted. I am not going to reiterate the history of this case which she has described in her report except to emphasise that the Inspector clearly stated in the "Conditions" of his Appeal Judgement in July 2002 that "I consider it appropriate to limit the occupation of the site to the family in question and to define the number of mobile homes and caravans." and that he also stated "No more than two mobile homes and two caravans shall be stationed on the land at any time". Madam Chairman, this is just one of three applications within this one parish presently being considered by your planning committee in Taunton Deane where the applicants are challenging those very precise concessions that they were granted when their appeals were heard by independent Planning Inspectors. Fourteen days ago I stood in this very room and asked what is the point of having these expensive and time-consuming public enquiries and what is the point of having decisions made by a Secretary of State if the appellants then find that the decisions are not to their liking and try to modify or circumvent them with yet more applications. Then we are back into the circle of more appeals, more public inquiries, and more loss of trust in the legalities of planning regulations that the vast majority of the population accept and obey. Even the European Court of Human Rights has ruled <sup>[1]</sup> that "Gypsies. have no rights above planning law", and not even Circular 1 of 2006 has not changed that. If you accept the recommendation of your officers that this application be granted I would suggest that you are in serious danger of totally devaluing the whole process of planning applications, appeals and public enquiries, and you also pull the rug right from under the feet of another Official Enquiry – North Curry's Oxen Lane. A fortnight ago I also said that somebody must make a stand

against these erosions of earlier carefully considered decisions, and I suggested that somebody should be Taunton Deane Borough Council. If there is to be a credible system where planning applications which go to public enquiry are to remain credible then I suggest that you have no option other than to refuse this application to double the number of mobile homes and touring vans. Madam Chairman – Enough is enough, and the Inspector’s “No” should mean “No”.

1 ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- the adjacent landowner notes the planning history of this site including an application in 1998 for the siting of two caravans and retention of a building; this was refused and the appeal dismissed; in 2002 a further application was refused and the appeal allowed; the Inspector concluded that the proposal caused significant harm to highway safety and the character and appearance of the surrounding area being an AONB; he took account of personal circumstances and allowed the appeal with “no more than two mobile homes and two caravans shall be stationed on the the land at any one time”; this has been violated on more than one occasion and this application seeks to allow double the permitted capacity with the use of the busy highway and appearance of the surrounding countryside; it is a small site and does not have the capacity for 2 more families; I have allowed the hedge along the A378 to be cut at a lower level to allow safer visibility and the siting of a telegraph and electricity pole in one of the adjacent fields to reduce the generator noise; the appeal conditions should be resepcted with no other caravans allowed on site; the nearby kennels 500 m from this site had permission for a mobile home refused as it was in an Area of Natural Beauty; I have not persona I grievences against Mr & Mrs Orchard or the other inhabitants of Longacre, it is the principle and view that every should live by the same rules.

The site is within a Landscape Character Area not an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

---

## **27/2006/015**

PARISH COUNCIL (amended plans) - objects to this application firstly on the two Policy issues, 'The Structure Plan Policy STR6 Development outside Towns, rural centre and villages' clearly requires developments outside towns, rural centres and villages to be STRICTLY CONTROLLED and restricted to that which enhances the environment and does not foster growth in the need to travel. The vehicular traffic flow, during a normal day, excluding those used by individual employees driving to work, is estimated at 100 - 150 vehicles. Due to poor public transport in the area this proposal would ultimately foster considerable growth in the need to travel to the area. The County Highway Authority in their representation acknowledge that Hillcommon is already "an example where the speed limit is not adhered to"; therefore to propose any increase to the traffic flow to the area would be prejudicial to highway safety. Policy 49 Transport Requirements Of New Developments very clearly states that unless a special need for a particular development exists to warrant an exception, proposed developments should not derive access directly from a county Route. The B 3227 is a County Route. Six horticultural nurseries are located within a 6 mile radius of the proposed development. Insufficient supporting evidence exists within the proposal to reasonably show that any special need exists to warrant an exception to the policy. We also feel that the height of the building is totally unnecessary and should only be single storey, whilst the proposals shows a much reduced building the issue still remains as to what the buildings will be used for. The visibility splay exceeds the property being developed and therefore there will be no control of verges that go beyond the boundaries of the property.

3 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION to the amended plans have been received raising the following issues:- moving the proposed access further to the right will be even more hazardous being on a deceptively blind double bend; badgers may be disturbed at the site entrance; technical revisions are tinkering and do not overcome previous objections; the B3227 has a bad accident record, many involving speed as a cause; fatal accidents have occurred opposite the proposed site; Highway Authority accepts that Hillcommon is an example of where speed limit is not adhered to; the proposed design and dimensions of the building whilst have no retail sales requirement, incorporates a feature entrance and space more akin to garden centres in the area.

---

**37/2006/006**

LANDSCAPE OFFICER subject to a substantial landscape buffer to the south it should be possible to integrate the proposals into the landscape of the area.

---

**38/2006/355**

1 FURTHER LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- the height of the garages would be of concern especially the height of the roofs as these could affect light and view to our property.

It is also claimed that three of the letters mentioned in the report are written by the same individual and also that one of these letters has been signed by someone who died in 1999.

---

**42/2006/028**

1 ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- why wasn't a notification sent to the occupier of Goosemoor, a property

immediately affected by the proposed development?; in absence of a site notice being visible from the public highway is the application defective?; if not why not.

Development Control Managers comment:- In response to the notification letter to make sure that neighbours are aware of planning applications which affect them. In this case addresses were taken from the Ordnance Survey plan which did not include a "Goosemoor". Nevertheless the occupant of Goosemoor had been made aware of the application and had responded to the proposals. It is therefore considered pointless to notify him of an application which he is already aware of. A site notice was noted on site on 30th August, 2006 and the 21 days for comment expired on 20th September, 2006. A copy of the weekly list, including this application was sent to the press. In the circumstances I do consider the notification to be acceptable.

Additional condition re removal of GDPO for windows in roof and new windows at first floor and above.

---

**42/2006/031**

As amended by letter and plan received 6th October, 2006.

Amended Recommendation:- Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions of time limit and materials.

---

**15 51/2006/008**

As amended by drawing Nos. 2006/1/4/A, 2006/1/7/A, and 2006/1/8/A received 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2006.

Amendments comprise the deletion of two proposed dormer windows on east elevation; enlargement of existing roof light and installation of additional roof light on east elevation; and deletion of roof light to serve proposed bathroom (inner facing roof slope). Insertion of roof light to serve bathroom (inner facing roof slope).

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