

Amendment Sheet

6 20/2007/026

REMOVAL OF AGRICULTURAL OCCUPANCY CONDITION 06 OF APPLICATION 20/1991/027 AT MILLFIELD HOUSE, PARSONAGE LANE, KINGSTON ST MARY

ONE ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- outside settlement limits, Millfield House has been in contravention of planning for over 10 years; size of extension to Millfield House similar to refused second home; contrary to policy.

8 25/2007/023

CHANGE OF USE FROM STORES TO HOLIDAY UNITS AT WICK HOUSE, NORTON FITZWARREN

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT whilst the figures indicated for marketing are significantly under represented, I am satisfied that the applicant has thought through the process to the point where I have no objections to the proposals.

11 35/2007/019

ERECTION OF THREE ECO-CABINS FOR TOURISM USE AT LAND TO THE SOUTH OF LITTLE BRIMLEY, APPLEY, WELLINGTON

A letter from the agent has been submitted in response to the objections received. Summary of contents:- Impact on Potters Cottages – the agent states that pre-application discussions have taken place. The agent is unclear how the proposed access would cause disruptions and a loss of privacy to Potters Cottages. The proposed accommodation is some distance from Potters Cottages and is therefore not likely to affect privacy. Traffic generation and extensive track required – One of the aims of the venture would be to reduce car usage to the site. The Sustrans building will be used for those who are affiliated to Sustrans using long distance cycle ways. Limited parking is being provided adjacent to the road, as a request for off-site parking from the County Highway Authority. There is no long driveway

serving the cabins themselves. Use of the word dwellings/houses. The agent wishes to categorically clarify that this application is not for the erection of a dwelling(s) and are solely for the purposes of holiday making and educational purposes as noted in the supporting planning statement. The agent highlights that there is a balance between protecting the countryside and rural diversification and the promotion of an economy that can sustain rural areas. The applicant has undertaken pre-application enquiries with the planning department, who are responsible for the public consultation once a planning application has been submitted and as such it is refuted that 'there are moves afoot to secure approval of this development without the required opportunity for the interested parties to provide their timely views. Size of the units – The holiday lets are subject to Building Regulations control and the size reflects appropriate access and manoeuvrability for wheelchairs etc. Furthermore the buildings also have deep walls due to their construction methods. Supporting letters – TDBC should consider the genuine supporting letters appropriately. Requirements for a Traffic Assessment and Environmental Assessment – The scale of the proposed development is not at a scale as to require such ancillary documents. It is unlikely that this eco-build would wish to pollute any watercourse and TDBC would be likely to condition suitable details.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY the proposed development is located outside of any development limit and is remote from any urban area and therefore distant from adequate services and facilities, such as, education, employment, health, retail and leisure. In addition, public transport services are very limited. As a consequence, occupiers of the new development are likely to be dependant on private vehicles for most of their daily needs. Such fostering of growth in the need to travel would be contrary to government advice. There may be a presumption in favour of small scale development for the purpose of farm diversification and development which proposes tourism must be viewed in conjunction with other policies, as set out in national, regional, county and local policies. Therefore, it must be a matter for the Local Planning Authority to decide whether the principal of development on this site outweighs the transport policies that seek to reduce reliance on the private car. In detail the proposal is seeking the erection for 3 eco cabins for holiday and educational use. It has been stated that the application is for 3 buildings, which will provide 4 letting units. One unit exclusively for Sustrans for overnight stays for cyclists and walkers of the long distance Sustrans route between Bristol and Padstow. It is proposed that the use of the field and some of Little Brimley's land will be for a green community project with the eco-cabins acting as a base to stay as well as an example of sustainable construction techniques not just for visitors but also for locals. No information has been provided with regard to the likely traffic implications of this element of the use which may lead to additional traffic movements. The proposal is located in the open countryside. The approach roads leading to the site are considered to be substandard in that they are narrow and poorly aligned. Furthermore, there are no footways or street lighting along these stretches of highway, which are subject to the national speed limit of 60 mph. However from personal observation traffic speeds would appear to be in the region of approximately 25 mph past the site. The proposal will result in the creation of a new access/parking/turning area from/onto an unclassified highway and the stopping up of an existing vehicular access. It is essential that parking and turning is provided within the site to accommodate 4 vehicles. Sufficient space should be

provided not only for vehicles to park, but to be able to turn within the site (when the parking areas are occupied) to ensure vehicles leave site in a forward gear. It would appear that the level of the land onto which the parking area will be sited, is higher than the public highway by approximately 1 m, therefore the access should have a gradient of not more than 1 in 10. It has been stated that the development will not generate significant transport movements to the site. The Highway Authority considers that each unit will generate 3 to 4 traffic movements a day, which is not considered significant to warrant refusal in its own right. In the event of permission being granted I would recommend the following conditions are imposed:-

1. Prior to any works commencing on site, plans showing a parking/turning area providing for 4 vehicles shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced. This area shall be properly consolidated, drained and delineated and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.
2. The access over the first 5 m of its length, as measured from the edge of the adjoining carriageway, shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel), in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
3. There shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900 mm above adjoining road level forward of lines drawn 2.0 m back from the carriageway edge on the centre line of the access and extending to a point 45 m north of the access and 33 m south of the access. Such visibility splays shall be fully provided before works commence on the erection of the cabins hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.
4. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a covered cycle rack facility has been provided within the site capable of accommodating 4 bicycles in accordance with a design and specification to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and to be constructed to the satisfaction of the said Authority.
5. The existing vehicular access to the site, shall be stopped up, its use permanently abandoned and the verge reinstated in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such works shall be completed within 1 month of the new vehicular accesses hereby permitted being first brought into use.
6. The gradient of the proposed access shall not be steeper than 1 in 10.
7. Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards and shall be set back a minimum distance of 4.5 m from the carriageway edge.
8. 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.

Notes to Applicant:- Having regard to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that a Section 184 Permit must be obtained from the Highway Service Manager, Taunton Area Office, Tel. 0845 3459155. Application for such a Permit should be made at least three weeks before access works are intended to commence. The Applicant is advised that the Area Service Manager, Taunton Area Office, Tel. 0845 3459155 must be consulted with regard to the required reinstatement of the verge/footway crossing at the access which is to be closed

PARISH COUNCIL although the plans for the application were well presented, the members of the Parish Council are unanimous in objecting to it for the following reasons:-

1. We feel the Business case is less than impressive - the costs of the project are high but there has been no attempt to estimate the payback time.

Indeed, assuming a maximum of 25% occupancy at say £20 per person per night, an annual income of £14,600 could be achieved before expenses. This is considered to be an unrealistic return on the capital and thus there is perceived to be a high risk of project failure. 2. The "green" credentials for the two small cabins with their straw walls are understood but less clear is the expensive cob and thatch construction of the large 8 berth cabin and it is felt that this might be a deliberate fall back position in case of project failure when a change of use to residential could be applied for. It is felt this would not be in the interests of the small community of Appley with approximately 30 inhabitants. 3. Should our estimation of the occupancy of the cabins be incorrect, then an influx of up to 14 additional people into a community of only 30 is deemed to be unacceptable. 4. Should the cabins be full, then the car parking space for only three cars is considered to be inadequate. 5. It has come to the attention of the Council that several people in the village, particularly those with property adjacent to the proposed building site are both unhappy with the project and surprised that they had not been informed of the planning application by letter. Concerns mentioned include:- (i) further erosion of agricultural land; (ii) requirement for a Vehicular Survey; (iii) requirement for an Environmental Survey with particular regard to the disposal of sewage in view of the proximity of the stream feeding into the river Tone. In summary, it is felt that either the venture will fail because of insufficient income from visitors (possibly leading to a request for change of use of the cabins), or Appley would have its population increased by 50% on a regular basis. Neither of these options is acceptable.

TOURISM OFFICER would fully support this application. I have visited Little Brimley and met with Jan Copley. The idea behind the scheme is very sustainable and fully supports the work that both Taunton Deane Borough Council Tourism Unit and the Somerset Tourism Partnership are undertaking.

3 LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received raising the following issues:- site is poorly positioned for vehicle access; siting and construction out of keeping; absence of main services such as electricity and use of candles would with the proposed method of construction represent a fire risk; not notified on development; development would set a precedent for further development in an area of unspoilt open countryside and farmland; development bigger than expected involves substantial 'house-type' buildings rather than 'eco-hut' type buildings; high risk the buildings will become permanent residential homes if the scheme is not viable; Appley does not have the infrastructure and amenities to support such sizeable holiday accommodation; scheme could double the number of residents in Appley; most of those in support are not locally based; development could negatively affect the local environment with regard to light, noise and pollution of local streams; no traffic assessment has been submitted; no Environmental Survey has not been performed;

4 LETTERS OF SUPPORT have been received.

ERECTION OF PHASE 1 OF B1 OFFICE DEVELOPMENT WITH ASSOCIATED TEMPORARY CAR PARK AT FORMER GOODS SIDINGS, FIREPOOL, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 10TH SEPTEMBER, 2007 AND PLANS NOS. 06/51 L01.01D, L02.01F, L02.02E, L04.02C, L04.01B AND SK1212.06.01B

Proposal amendments:- at the end of the last paragraph add the following sentence:- There will be a brise soleil to the large expanse of glazing on the west and south elevations, coloured aluminium framing to the glazing, rendered walling to the front and terracotta coloured tile cladding to the rear and east elevations.

Assessment amendments:-

First paragraph 2nd line add:- "... office building up to 28.5 m high in a prominent ..."

First paragraph 4th line add:- "... in 2004. The use is also considered to be in line with policy T3 of the Local Plan. The main ..."

Fifth paragraph last line add:- "... town inline with policies T33 and T34.

Seventh paragraph add further sentence:- "the design of the building is considered to be high quality and hopefully this will be reflected in the finished build and is recommended for approval."

Amended Recommendation: Details be APPROVED subject to conditions of no development until suitable access has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development until the road layout has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no occupation until the distributor road required for access has been completed and open to traffic, visibility splay, turning, parking, noise, materials samples and details of roof eaves, parapets, coping to render elevation, grey water recycling, landscaping, external lighting, pedestrian crossing position and external canopies. Note re noise.

13 38/2007/545

DEMOLITION OF DWELLING AND ERECTION OF 8 NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS AT 74 SOUTH STREET, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY AGENTS LETTER DATED 5TH DECEMBER, 2007 WITH ATTACHED DRAWING NO. 5606/21

As amended by letter dated 5th December, 2007 with attached drawing No. 5606/21.

CIVIC SOCIETY We object to the application. Many of our objections to the previous applications (38/2006/361 and 38/2007/299) remain, as this is still

overdevelopment. As we said before, we think that at most six 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 third application, like the second, is significantly worse than the first application. 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. Secondly, while we are relieved to see the reduction in height at the rear, which does reduce the overbearing nature of this application, it still remains overbearing as regards the house to the south, No. 76, (which is only 3m away) as it protrudes about 4.6m forward of No. 76's building line. That forward positioning at the crest of the rise in South St. means that it will be over-dominant when seen from the road (and particularly from the southeast). The proposed building is thus still 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 it still fails policy S1(D) & S2(A). There are no improvements to the access arrangements we criticised in the second (38/2007/299) application. To repeat, it would appear that the minimum width of the spaces to either side of the building may be just under 1 m. Consequently we consider the access design potentially unsafe, 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. 72 and the proposed building. There will be significant safety and delivery issues. As there is so little detail in the submitted plans it is not clear that this single exit common stair design meets Building Regulations Approved Document B2 part B. Access for waste bins is presumably via the narrow path on the southeast side. Where can they be put for collection without blocking the pavement? Eight flats will certainly contain some 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 SI (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. One kitchen on the lower ground floor still seems to be windowless.

WARD COUNCILLOR I support the continuing objections of the local community to the proposed development on this site. The proposal is still out of scale to the surrounding street scene, and the way the cubic capacity has been reduced has resulted in an overbearing and unsympathetic block to the rear, and therefore is still detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers. A reduction of pure cubic capacity may have been achieved, but the impact on the street scene or neighbours is not altered at all. The proposal does not achieve natural ventilation/light to all the kitchens either.

ONE FURTHER LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- nothing wrong with existing property which is of a good size; East Reach is well below nationally accepted standards of air quality and the proposed development would compound the problem; any development should respect the protected listed buildings in the area.

14 43/2007/163

ERECTION OF SUPERMARKET (1,965 SQ M) WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND SERVICING, LAND TO REAR OF 36-46 HIGH STREET, WELLINGTON (PARTIAL AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION 43/2004/141)

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY understand that the amendments solely relate to the building and, in particular, the change in location of the store entrance. The highway issues e.g. access, parking, etc remain unchanged and therefore no further comments to make to those made previously in respect of other applications.

TOWN COUNCIL does not object/supports.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to no further representations raising new issues by 21st December, 2007 ... (as printed)

15 48/2007/019

CONSTRUCTION OF A ROUNDABOUT AND ALTERATION OF ASSOCIATED ROADS AND HIGHWAY STRUCTURE AT THE FORMER CHICKEN HATCHERY, BRIDGWATER ROAD, MONKTON HEATHFIELD

Deferred

16 48/2007/055

ERECTION OF EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENTS TO STORE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL RETAIL SALES FLOORSPACE AND THE RELOCATION OF THE CUSTOMER RESTAURANT TO THE PROPOSED MEZZANINE FLOOR AT SAINSBURY'S SUPERMARKET, HANKRIDGE FARM RETAIL PARK, HERON GATE, BATHPOOL

As amended by agents letter dated 27th November, 2007 and attached plans and updated traffic assessment details.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY it is my view that the additional traffic generated by the proposal will affect congestion on the local highway network. As you will know the East of Taunton Park and Ride proposals include the full signalisation of the Junction 25 roundabout. It is expected that this will produce benefits in terms of improved capacity on the local highway network which includes the Hankridge Farm roundabout. This will in turn give benefit to Sainsburys. I have negotiated a contribution of £150,000 towards the Junction alterations. I therefore do not propose to object to the development subject to the applicants entering into a S106 agreement to pay the contribution mentioned above and the preparation and implementation of a Travel Plan.

FORWARD PLAN the proposal will result in the extension of the Hankridge store from 7215 sq m gross to 8838 sq m gross (a total of 1623 sq m). Due to the historic nature of the original consent, the store has no existing condition restricting the retail activity. Thus the shop could cease trading as a foodstore and open as a 'comparison' outlet (e.g. clothes, electrical etc) without the need for any planning permission. This is clearly inconsistent with government policy objectives. Comparison retailing in particular should 'sequentially' be located within town centres where they are easily accessible by a range of transport modes. Discussion with the agent/operator has resulted in the willingness to bring the enlarged retail unit under a more defined planning control through a new condition restricting comparison goods retailing to a maximum of 30% of net sales area. This is a positive outcome and is supported from a policy perspective. The range of goods that could be sold should also be controlled (further discussion as part of S106) as agreed, together with no subdivision of the retail unit. As part of negotiations with the agent/operator there was also verbal agreement that they would make a commitment to local recruitment and training initiatives for local residents (the site being on the edge of socially deprived wards), green travel plan, public transport improvements, environmental enhancements to their town centre site and incorporation of carbon reduction technologies in materials and energy use (and incorporation of display info 'instore' so customers could see what output these technologies were achieving). I cannot see that these issues are addressed in the application. Some of these matters are required to make the application acceptable. Others should be pursued in 'good faith' through notes attached to any decision notice.

Additional Conditions re list of comparison goods not to be sold (including prescription medicines, leisure and sport items, cars, motorcycles, optician, antiques), details of improved access to the bus for shoppers.

Additional Notes: re improvements for Sainsburys connection to the town centre, use of low carbon footprint for the extensions.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to a S.106 Agreement covering the following matters:- highway contributions towards local road improvements and travel plan, the Development Manager in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine subject to the following conditions of ... (as printed)

In the event that Heads of Terms have been agreed but the S.106 not signed by the 5th January, 2008 the Development Control Manager in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair to add a Grampain condition requiring the signing of the S.106 agreement before works commence.

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