

Amendment Sheet

5 06/2007/031

ERECTION OF DWELLING AND GARAGE FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF STORAGE BUILDING AT LAND AT BUILDERS YARD, VICARAGE LANE, BISHOPS LYDEARD (RESUBMISSION OF 06/2007/005), AS AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 17TH JULY, 2007 AND DRAWING NO. 2965.05/B

Correction in Assessment - 10th line "2 m" should read "3 m".

Additional Conditions re archaeology, use of retained land, boundary walls to be at least 3 m.

11 38/2007/299

DEMOLITION OF HOUSE AND ERECTION OF 11 NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS AT 74 SOUTH STREET, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY PLANS NOS. 5606/10A, 14A AND 15 RECEIVED ON 22ND AUGUST, 2007

CIVIC SOCIETY we have now seen the amended plans and have the following comments:- This application initially represented limited improvement over the previous application (38/2006/361) and since amendment (and reduction to 11 flats) better preserves some of the existing amenity of No. 76 South Street. We welcome (a) the more appropriate choice of materials set out in the Design and Access Statement, but would urge that (if approved) very close control be exercised to ensure a good match to the older buildings around the site. (b) The reduction in height. However, we object to the application. Many of our objections to the previous application (38/2006/361) remain, and this is still basically overdevelopment. Six (individually somewhat larger) flats would be a much more acceptable use of this site, although we believe that even these would create unacceptable additional parking pressure. In two particulars this application is significantly worse than the original. Firstly, by being brought forward some 2.5 m towards the road the proposed building will be even more obtrusive from the south, as it is situated at the crest of South St. Furthermore, it is overbearing as regards No. 72 (which is only 3m away) as it protrudes about 4.6 m forward of No. 72's building line and continues as three storeys back to some 3 m beyond the rear of No 72. The proposed building is too large to fit in with the predominantly smaller and older buildings around it, and it will be even more disruptive to the character of the area than the existing modern house. So, although improved, it still fails policy S1(D) & S2(A). Secondly, it would appear that the minimum width of the spaces to either side of the building may be just under 1m. Consequently we consider the access design is even worse than the original proposal, as now the single

door (and fire exit) is on the middle floor, and is thus reached by a 1 m wide path which has at least 7 steps up, after which one must turn a right angle to pass into the interior (and windowless) stairwell. The whole length of that path is constricted between the solid walls of No. 76 and the proposed building. There will be significant safety and delivery issues. Access for waste bins is presumably via the narrow path on the southwest side. Where can they be put for collection without blocking the pavement? Eleven flats will certainly contain several car or van owners, and this is an area with considerable street parking problems. We believe the consequences of this will:- (a) cause the proposal to fail the criteria set out in policy S1(A); and (b) fail policy H4 because the cumulative effects of the number of new dwellings without parking provision in the South Street area is such that any further additions will make the required conformity to policy H2(E) unachievable due to a cumulative erosion of residential amenity. As we noted before there are no details indicating any provision for bathroom ventilation. We now see that some kitchens on the lower ground floor seem to be windowless. Should we be allowing such crude designs to be built?

4 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received on the amended plans raising the following issues:- loss of light; parking; out of keeping; overlooking; unnecessary demolition; no garage; change character; older properties should be converted.

Additional Conditions re details of the external door on the north west elevation; obscure glazing to the side rear window on the north west elevation.

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