

6 04/2006/003

FORMATION OF ACCESS AND ERECTION OF 3 NO.1.5 STOREY TIMBER HOLIDAY CHALETS AT PADDOCKS, BICKENHALL, AS AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 15TH NOVEMBER 2006 WITH ATTACHED DRAWING NOS. 979/1A AND 979/2A

ONE LETTER FROM EXISTING OBJECTOR raising the following issues:- the lets would not be for business purposes or monetary gain but for pleasure; the chalets would only be let on a paying basis for 30% of the time based on the fact that most of the time they would be let to family and friends who would not pay a business rate; this would not sustain a genuine business; what measures are in place to restrict individuals staying and how would it be policed; if business cannot demonstrate reasonable profits on an annual or bi-annual basis the chalets would have to be demolished; if not put as a restriction the application should be rejected; how is business success measured and has a business proposal been received; the droves area is in an awful condition and couldn't support increase in horse traffic; a condition should be imposed to improve drive surface; this is not an honest application and there is no real money in it; there are concerns over who will come into the area; if not refused the application should be postponed for a proper assessment to be carried out.

AN ADDITIONAL OBJECTION received raising the following issues:- don't believe an equestrian based business would be viable and business plans should be available for audit prior to planning consent being considered; based on owner's track record the application is based on false pretences and the intent is to obtain more long term rental accommodation; the accommodation would quickly fall into disrepair; concern over clientele increased traffic and noise; achievement of business plan targets year on year should be conditional of any approval as it is easy to set out a plan achievable on paper; this offers little enhancement so the community in terms of jobs yet presents a number of risks in terms of setting a development precedent on crown land.

Additional Conditions re no additional commercial operation activity other than by occupiers of holiday chalets.

Additional Notes re Wessex Water connection, soakaways, septic tank, consent to discharge.

8 05/2006/035T

APPLICATION TO FELL THREE CEDAR TREES INCLUDED IN TAUNTON DEANE BOROUGH (BISHOPS HULL NO. 1) TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 1997 AT 24 DAWS MEAD, BISHOPS HULL (TD700)

As amended by letter dated 18th January, 2007.

The applicant has withdrawn the proposals for replacement tree planting that were submitted with the original application.

Amended recommendation: subject to condition requiring replanting of one tree of an appropriate species (to be agreed).

5 06/2006/021

ERECTION OF MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 2 UNITS OF HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, CRAFT VILLAGE (A3 PLANNING USE CLASS), 19 OPEN MARKET HOUSES, 22 AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS (COMPRISING 12 HOUSES AND 10 FLATS) AND ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE AT STATION FARM, STATION ROAD, BISHOPS LYDEARD, AS AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 16TH JUNE, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING FINANCIAL APPRAISAL, LETTER DATED 20TH SEPTEMBER, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING REVISED FINANCIAL APPRAISAL, LETTER FROM PETER EVANS PARTNERSHIP TO COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY DATED 15TH NOVEMBER, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING DRAWING NOS. 0837.05B AND 08A, AND AS AMPLIFIED BY LETTERS DATED 10TH NOVEMBER, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING INFORMATION AND 14TH DECEMBER, 2006

HALSE PARISH COUNCIL (Adjoining Parish) – object. Allocation in the Local Plan is for recreation and tourist use rather than residential and some of the proposed site falls outside the plan area. The proposed craft village must have a question mark against its long-term viability and the need for a pub at this location is hard to argue as justification for building 50 properties. Would set a precedent and make it hard to turn down proposals to build anywhere where a builder can make half an argument to do so. Would result in increased traffic though narrow lanes through villages. The need for a new golf club is questionable. No guarantee that craft village amenities will be viable in the long term, particularly when the railway does not operate all the year. This may result in eventual pressure for them to be replaced with additional housing. The experience of the fire museum at Sandhill Park and the initially mooted plan for a museum on Broadguage Business Park (subsequently changed to the current commercial use) gives credence to the view that the inclusion of a craft village is nothing more than a means of

giving leverage to make the development more palatable. The proposed development takes a number of irreversible steps that do damage to the long term continuance of the railway:- i) Pub would take away money from the railway's catering facilities. ii) Railway's operations may be compromised if future occupiers of dwellings complain about smoke emissions. iii)The valued character of the 'village station' atmosphere would be further diminished. iv)The development will remove the availability of parking on fields for significant events.

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS FROM THE BISHOPS LYDEARD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION rather than saying that the scale of Washford Mill's operations has changed over the years – it is more accurate to say that all the craft units and restaurant have closed. The only part of Washford Mill 'in business' is a scaled down version of Mole Valley Farmers. This does not auger well for any craft elements that may be planned for the scheme.

Page 50 of report – second line of section E should read “.....include 3 public houses....”

5 **06/2006/022**

ERECTION OF INN WITH RESTAURANT (A4 PLANNING USE CLASS) AND ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE, AS PART OF PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, CRAFT VILLAGE AND HOUSING AT STATION FARM, STATION ROAD, BISHOPS LYDEARD AS AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 16TH JUNE, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING FINANCIAL APPRAISAL, LETTER DATED 20TH SEPTEMBER, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING REVISED FINANCIAL APPRAISAL, LETTER FROM PETER EVANS PARTNERSHIP TO COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY DATED 15TH NOVEMBER, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING DRAWING NOS. 0837.05B AND 08A, AND AS AMPLIFIED BY LETTERS DATED 10TH NOVEMBER, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING INFORMATION AND 14TH DECEMBER, 2006

Recommendation should read:- I recommend that in the event that the Local Planning Authority was in a position to determine the application, the application would have been refused for the reason set out on Page 2 of the report.

9 **18/2006/017**

ERECTION OF STABLE BLOCK AND CHANGE OF USE TO EQUESTRIAN USE AND JOINT AGRICULTURAL USE AT KILN LANE, ASH PRIORS AS AMPLIFIED BY AGENTS E-MAIL RECEIVED 11TH JANUARY, 2007.

COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST there are limited or no archaeological implications to this proposal and therefore have no objections on archaeological grounds.

2 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following additional issues:- development is not related to agriculture or forestry in the open countryside so is contrary to planning policy; being well away from other buildings – is totally inappropriate in landscape terms; will allow introduction of show jumps; sub-division of field, etc; isolation of site makes it unsuitable on welfare grounds as there is no-one on site to supervise them – therefore likely to result in pressure for a house.

10 19/2006/020

DEMOLITION OF GARAGE AND ERECTION OF NEW DWELLING WITH ATTACHED GARAGE, LAND ADJACENT TO IVY COTTAGE, HATCH BEAUCHAMP AS AMENDED BY AGENTS LETTER DATED 13TH OCTOBER, 2006 WITH ATTACHED PLAN NO. 0616/02B AND FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY raises no objection and recommends that condition be imposed regarding visibility splay.

11 LETTERS OF SUPPORT have been received on grounds of modest development on brownfield site that fits in.

The existing access is used for the new dwelling. The splay requirements would require significant hedgerow loss. Proposal considered acceptable as submitted.

Additional condition re no additional vehicular access to highway.

Additional notes re culvert and watercourse and Wessex Water sewer,

11 20/2006/029

CONVERSION OF BARN TO DWELLING, FORMATION OF ACCESS TRACK AND IMPROVEMENTS TO ACCESS ONTO LODES LANE, THE BARN OS FIELD NO 9138, LODES LANE, KINGSTON ST MARY

In the third paragraph of the proposal at line 5 delete "Commercial Viability Report".

13 27/2006/023

ERECTION OF THIRTEEN HOLIDAY CHALETs AND PROVISION FOR 50 NO. CAMPING PITCHES AND AMENITY BLOCK AT LAND SOUTH OF HARRIS'S FARM, HILLCOMMON

Applicant has e-mailed a letter to all Members of Committee.

Further letter from applicant:- appears that concerns relate to whether or not the proposed chalets are considered to be of permanent construction or not. Considered that proposed chalets are no less permanent than those allowed for 18 units at Millfield Nurseries, Kingston St Mary and 2 units at Pay Plantation, Stapley. Due to the nature of modern construction materials and the need to comply with building regulations, the chalet has developed to the form of that proposed. Similar height to those approved at Kingston and Stapley. Visual impact will not be harmed and the Landscape Officer does not object. Separate development to the nursery. Application submitted with a supporting letter from Tourist Officer and a business plan. No presence of newts. Advised by the Planning Department that the form proposed is acceptable. Willing to delete the use of natural stone.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY the present proposal for thirteen holiday chalets and fifty camping pitches is on land served by an access grant permission in September 2006 under Planning Application 27/2006/015. The Planning Officer will recall that the Highway Authority recommended the refusal of that application on policy grounds, which would equally apply to the present development were it to come in separately in this location with a proposal for a new access. The fact that this has an access which is granted permission makes it unreasonable for the Highway Authority to object to this development in principle. In detail, I am content that the permitted access is technically suitable to serve both the nursery and the camping site as the transport assessment submitted for the previous application devaluated the capacity of the proposed junction for both developments. I have been made aware of concerns expressed by local residents regarding the lack of footways in the area and the fact that any pedestrian movements would be alongside a live carriageway with adequate footways. This is obviously a concern but we have no way of knowing the likely number of pedestrian trips that may be generated to shops and public houses in the vicinity. In conclusion, despite my concerns over the location of the site, I do not propose to raise a highway objection to the development, subject to suitable conditions being attached preventing the commencement of any work on site in respect of this application until the junction granted permission under Planning Application 27/2006/015 shall have been completed and open to traffic and to suitable internal roads, together with adequate on-site parking and turning facilities, shall have been provided in order to adequately serve the proposed development.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY correction to letter - 12th line of above text the word "with" should read "without" adequate footways.

RIGHTS OF WAY TEAM two public footpaths would be affected if planning consent were granted for this development. The necessary arrangements would need to be made to accommodate any change in the definitive lines.

1 FURTHER LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following additional issues:- increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic to area; access unsatisfactory; the B3227 at this point has no pedestrian footpaths or street lighting, so is considered dangerous; may lead to increase in crime in area; likely to be a foot in the door to obtain other approvals; already enough nurseries and garden centres in the area.

4 LETTERS OF SUPPORT (3 from outside the area and 1 with no address) have been received raising the following issues:- appropriate development; planning officers and Tourism Officer have previously supported the proposal; no objection from Highway Authority or Nature Conservation Officer; covert and avert efforts by objectors to stop a well designed development that can prove to be a credit to our much needed rural economy and community; no impact on wildlife or area; site is tucked away and well screened with well established trees and hedges with minimal impact; similar to other ones that the authority has allowed; should encourage our own talented business men; reminder of lack of support for the likes of Taunton Cider and its repercussions; will bring financial benefits to the area; situation is very suitable for exploring the surrounding countryside and nearby coastal areas; proposed chalets will be pleasing aesthetically and are fairly standard designs for holiday chalets; accept that would need to include comprehensive conditions.

16 **35/2006/020**

PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION (REVISED DESIGN TO APPLICATION 35/2006/014) AT BELLA VISTA, CHURCH LANE, STAWLEY, WELLINGTON AS AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 12TH DECEMBER, 2006 WITH ATTACHED DRAWING NOS. 06/0002/102B AND 103B

As amended by letter dated 12th December, 2006 with attached drawing Nos. 06/0002/102B and 103B

PARISH COUNCIL original grounds of objection was on size. These amendments increase the size still more. Therefore the Council's original objection still stands.

17 38/2006/505

ERECTION OF NEW OFFICE BUILDING AT BLACKBROOK BUSINESS PARK, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY LETTER AND DRAWING 3881-2 G, 3881-6H AND 3881-7H RECEIVED 19TH DECEMBER, 2006 AND AS AMPLIFIED BY WILDLIFE SURVEY RECEIVED 11TH JANUARY, 2006

Letter from Agent in response to County Highway Authority e-mail:- "There is an existing Planning Consent for development of the site for the use being sought and which does not include any Section 106 agreement for off-site highways improvements. To our knowledge, this is the first time such a requirement has been suggested for this development, and it has been acknowledged within Somerset Highways e-mail that 'The application in itself probably does not warrant an improvement.....'. The overall cost of this provision is not known precisely, but we would disagree that it is relatively modest improvement and dependent on the complexity, the cost could be in the region of £25,000-£1 00,000. For this magnitude of commitment, it does not appear that any form of detailed analysis of the benefits or need has been carried out. Whilst we are supportive of sustainable transport modes, we would be developing details of the travel patterns to the site, as well as future sites, via a mode accessibility study to enable Green Travel plans to be developed by the end users. We anticipate that these will adequately cater for the requirements to encourage travel to the site by sustainable modes. In conclusion, we have carefully considered the request put forward and are reluctant, for all the reasons stated in the letter, to progress the request further and ask that the Planning Authority also confirm their support of our view that it is an unreasonable requirement to impose on this application."

NATURE RESERVES & CONSERVATION OFFICER recommends wildlife condition.

In light of previous permissions recently granted on the estate it is not considered that the improvement requested by the County Highway Authority can be insisted upon.

Amended Recommendation:- Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions of time limit, materials, landscaping, details of bin store, generator and recycling area, wildlife mitigation and bio-diversity enhancement plan, external lighting details, surface water drainage, site levels, tree protection, construction details. Notes ... (as printed)

18 38/2006/523

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE BUILDINGS AND THE ERECTION OF 24 FLATS AT THE FORMER EAST REACH SALES, EAST REACH, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY AGENTS LETTER DATED 12TH DECEMBER, 2006 AND ATTACHED PLAN NO. 744/01F AND AS AMENDED BY AGENTS LETTER

DATED 19TH JANUARY, 2007 WITH ATTACHED PLAN NOS. 744/01H, 744/20/01D, 744/20/02C, 744/21E, 744/22E AND 744/23E

As amended by agents letter dated 19th January, 2007 with attached plan Nos. 744/01H, 744/20/01D, 744/20/02C, 744/21E, 744/22E and 744/23E

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY 1. I refer to the above-mentioned planning application received on 4th December, 2006. This is a detailed application following the outline permission No. 38/2005/387 where access was a reserved matter. This application proposes a single vehicular access for cars and small vans on the site of the existing eastern vehicular access, with the existing western access stopped up. Subject to certain conditions the access can be made acceptable. 2. The proposed use at the site can be expected to generate lower levels of traffic than the previous use as a petrol filling station or car showroom/garage. However the travel patterns will be different. When the use was a PFS vehicles turned in left at the eastern access and left out at the western access. More recently vehicles used the eastern access only and the use was predominantly left in left out during the busy daytime. 3. It is important that if this proposed development proceeds measures are taken to ensure left in and left out only traffic movements continue to take place. Traffic movements can be expected throughout the day and it is important to ensure vehicles turn left in and left out only in the interests of highway safety. Due to the lack of very close "U turn" facilities drivers would be tempted to carry out right turns, especially at times of relatively low traffic flows. To ensure left in/out only turns are made it is important that the central traffic island (just west of the proposed access) is extended eastwards to prevent right turns into and out of the site. Traffic turning left would access the westbound carriageway between the stop line at the light controlled junction and the nearest traffic detector. Therefore further detectors need to be installed in the carriageway surface to ensure vehicles turning left are detected and are allowed to proceed through the junction. 4. The proposed vehicular access to the site is via a relatively small archway. The existing access is in the form of a kerbed carriageway construction. The new access ought to be of a conventional vehicular crossing to reinforce to drivers that pedestrians have the right of way. 5. I understand that a possible change is to provide a gated entrance through the archway. This would be acceptable provided sufficient space to allow a vehicle to wait is provided between the back of footway and the gates (with due allowance if the gates open outwards). 6. No access to the site will be possible by large vans, delivery vehicles, refuse collection vehicles or fire engines (it is assumed that the local fire service have been consulted). The proposed bin storage is at the western end of the site. There is sufficient width of footway west of the existing traffic light controller for the construction of a "lay by" that could accommodate refuse vehicles and delivery vehicles. This would need to be constructed so as not to give the appearance of a conventional lay by that would encourage car parking, but would need to be of a similar height and outline a conventional footway but with the physical construction thickness and materials capable of taking vehicles. 7. In addition there are several detailed concerns that need resolving as follows:- i. I have asked the Highway Service Manager for this area for their comments, if any, on this application. ii. Where an outfall, drain or pipe will discharge into an existing drain or pipe or watercourse not maintained by the Local Highway Authority, written evidence of the consent of the

authority or owner responsible for the existing drain will be required and will need to be forwarded to the Highway Authority. iii. The use of soakaways will be dependent upon the proven existence of highly permeable strata below the surface. Soakaways should be situated at least 5.0 m away from any structure and they must not be located in a position where the ground below foundations is likely to be adversely affected. Suitable access must be provided for future cleaning and maintenance operations. iv. Private parking bays that but up against a boundary wall (bays 4-10 and 15-16) should have a minimum depth of 5.5 m, with a 6.0 m unobstructed aisle provided immediately in front of them. v. Parking bays 13 and 14 should be 6.0 m in length. vi. No doors, gates or low-level windows/utility boxes/down pipes or porches are to obstruct the publicly maintained footway within East Reach. The highway shall remain free from all private service boxes, inspection chambers, rainwater pipes, vent pipes, meter boxes (including wall mounted), steps etc. vii. A condition survey of the existing public highway will need to be carried out and agreed with the Highway Authority prior to works commencing on site. Any damage to the existing highway as a result of this development is to be remedied by the developer before occupation of the development. The applicant should make contact with the Highway Service Manager (01823) 321501 to make arrangements for the survey to be undertaken. viii. Parking bay 11 should be relocated as its current position may result in awkward manoeuvres in/out of the bay. ix. Can the applicant please advise as to who will be responsible for the future maintenance of the internal areas of this development? Will a Management Committee be set up? 8. There is no highway objection to the development, subject to the completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement to be approved by the County Council, and the imposition of the following conditions in the event that permission is granted:- a. Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway details of which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. b. The proposed development shall be served by a new access constructed as a vehicular crossing in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. c. Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to allow a minimum distance of 5.5 m between the back of footway and the nearest part of the gate when open or in the process of being opened. d. The existing central traffic island in East Reach shall be extended and modified in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. e. Extra vehicle detector loops shall be installed in the carriageway on the westbound approach to the signal-controlled junction in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. f. A service lay by shall be provided in apposition and to a specification in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. g. The existing access shall be stopped up and its use permanently abandoned within 3 months of the new access hereby permitted being first brought into use. Please Note: The alteration of the access will involve construction works within the existing highway limits. These works must be agreed in advance with the Highways Service Manager at Somerset Highways, Burton Place, Taunton (01845 3459155). He will be able to advise upon and issue/provide the relevant licenses, necessary under the Highways Act 1980 (Section 184).

Amended Condition:- boundary wall condition to refer to plan No. 744/01H.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to the acceptable views of the County Highway Authority on the amended plans and no further representations raising new issues by 6th February, 2007 details be approved subject to additional conditions covering detailed highway regulations, obscure glazing and gates.

22 49/2006/069

**CONSTRUCTION OF DORMER ROOFS WITH WINDOWS ON THE
NORTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST ELEVATIONS OF 24 SPRING GARDENS,
WIVELISCOMBE**

TWO LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION from the applicant protesting strongly that the applicant did not know their application was going to the planning committee meeting on the 24th January 2007 until 20th January 2007. The further letter confirmed that the agent had been notified the application was going to the planning committee meeting dated 24th January 2007, but was not told the application was being recommended for refusal. The applicant feels this was an important omission and could have caused them an unnecessary problem

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