

20/2005/022

MILLFIELD NURSERIES LTD

**ERECTION OF 13 LOG CABINS FOR HOLIDAY LET AT LAND AT MILLFIELD NURSERY, PARSONAGE LANE, KINGSTON ST MARY (REVISED DESIGN TO 20/2005/012).**

22138/29124

FULL PERMISSION

---

**PROPOSAL**

Members will recall that application 20/2005/012 for 13 log cabins was approved at Planning Committee on 7th September, 2005. This application seeks to amend the style and dimensions of each cabin. Under the previous scheme the cabins were of 1 and a half storey construction and measure 7.71 m x 9.81 m x 5.19 m to the ridge. The cabins are still proposed to be of 1 and a half storey construction however the proposed dimensions are 8.4 m x 10.5 m x 6.5 m to the ridge. Two cabin types are also proposed "cabin 2ES" and "cabin 5H". The main external difference between the two cabin types is that "cabin 5H" incorporates a balcony under the eaves of the roof. The two cabins do also however vary in their internal design.

**CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objections. No comments to add to those in respect of the previous application.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER No objections. No comments to add to those in respect of the previous application. TOURISM OFFICER the tourism unit is happy to support this application. The cabins should be independently inspected for quality by "Quality in Tourism". DRAINAGE OFFICER No objections. No comments to add to those in respect of the previous application.

PARISH COUNCIL comments awaited.

ONE LETTER OF REPRESENTATION has been received raising the following issues:- it is unclear what the variations in design are.

TWO LETTERS OF OBJECTION has been received raising the same objections to the previous application 20/2005/012:- Swallows Barn does not appear on any plan and is not a properly registered address; access is dangerous; the previous application offered bicycle usage, education activities and horticultural activities that seems to have been deleted from this proposal.

50 LETTERS OF OBJECTION WERE RECEIVED IN RELATION TO APPLICATION 20/2005/012 raising the following issues that are split into 4 separate categories:- (1) Highways - The traffic through Kingston is already quite heavy along a narrow main road and any more traffic around the Mill Cross, Parsonage Lane crossroads area would add to the already dangerous situation to vehicles and pedestrians; the 30 mph

speed limits are regularly exceeded; the village struggles to cope with existing traffic volumes and from the crossroads at Mill Cross all directions are extremely hazardous with speed limits being disregarded by very many; where will the holiday makers shop? You cannot walk through the village safely as there are no pavements or lighting; there has been no accurate assessment as to the impact of the increased traffic; Parsonage lane is an accident blackspot (between 8-10 per year) and is particularly dangerous where it is exacerbated by the narrowness of the lane that is almost single track within yards of the Kingston Road. The proposal would therefore lead to more congestion plus present a hazard to walkers; it is unclear whether the existing access or the access approved by application 20/2005/008 will be used; the traffic movements associated with 18 holiday lets will be significantly greater than the existing movements on the site; Currently only movements for office use with limited delivery/pick up as most commercial vehicles are located off-site; movements are nothing like 150 per day as previously quoted; new movements will be 7 days per week; the County Highway Authority commented on the application for 5 units that they would not wish to see any further development of the site; application 20/2005/007 refused permission for a dwelling as it is "located outside the limits of a settlement area in an area that has very limited public transport services. The development will increase reliance on the motor car". This proposal will multiply the grounds for refusal at least 13 fold; the developer should pay for improvements to the road network and contribute to a footpath through the village; there is a bus stop at this junction with no pull in area to allow passengers to board or leave the bus this presents a safety issue to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. (2) Detrimental impact to the area - Concern about the Woodland Trust Spinney area to the north of the site that is a beautiful, quiet place but how would you keep visitors in any numbers from spoiling this as it is next door to the nursery; the proposal of this scale outside settlement limits, will change for ever the look, feel and nature of this quiet village environment situated in the open countryside; by any stretch of the imagination the proposal would not enhance the lovely and much admired Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation Area at the gateway to the Quantocks; the proposed development will be overlooked from neighbouring properties and will have an overbearing affect on the residential amenity of the area; substantial increase in noise pollution will occur from vehicles, tourists and entertainment activities; this is an attractive Greenfield Land, not brownfield there are continuing applications which is changing the face of this end of the village; the 5 units already approved are well hidden in the north part of the site, however the additional 13 units would be seen from the road and surrounding properties; there would have to be some form of illumination that would cause light pollution to surrounding properties; the value of many of the properties within the area would be reduced; there will be an increase in litter in the area. (3) Future speculation - Holiday lets would not stop here! There would be a need for a site office shop, laundry room, club house, swimming pool and who knows what else; Question 17 of the previous applications did not state that the application form part of a larger scheme and no details about the ultimate development were given; once an access road and services have been established, will planning follow to convert the cabins into permanent dwellings as there are doubts over the profitability of the scheme?; we have spoken to several local people who offer such a service for holidaymakers and each one has told us that it would be extremely unlikely that they would be unable to offer accommodation at any time throughout the year should it be required; it will have to be lit for Health and Safety Grounds and will there be any security staff?; concern if the site is sold to become a holiday park; how would the holiday let use be controlled; who would occupy the cabins when not in use seeing as there is a homelessness problem or

problem families or ...?; there is already an increased level of vandalism in the area and police have advised to note the presence of strange people and vehicles, the proposal would attract 70 different strangers in our midst every week; A small village such as Kingston can not warrant holiday lets in such numbers as there are no amenities here other than one pub and post office; unsuitable for this predominantly residential village; what business plans the proposed development based?; permission to build Millfield House was given on appeal on the basis that it would provide a home for the manager of Millfield Nurseries. By granting permission for the access drive to Millfield House you have made it possible for Millfield House to be sold without any restriction on its use; this application should be viewed in a wider context of other applications to follow and additional uses sought for the cabins when they become redundant. (4) Miscellaneous - It would require significant planting to comply with the plan as no such planting exists where the polytunnels are, have no planting; planting would take time to mask the development and many trees have been removed from the site; the Flood Risk Assessment requires quote "located the log cabins as far away from the nursery stream as possible ... locate the log cabins as far up the site as possible". The plan does not reflect this. The assessment also identifies potential flood areas, one of which is at the existing Parsonage Lane access which suggests this is an inappropriate access point; is there to be detailed plans for looking after the families in this camp? How long would the lets be?; as this is a nursery is it agricultural land? Why is it not kept as a nursery?; why make two separate applications?; would the existing businesses that operate from the site cease?; we view with horror the encroachment of "holiday-let cabins" into the environs of Kingston as being only marginally less awful than an invasion of travelers; there would be no benefit to Kingston St Mary itself; what arrangements will be made for refuse collection; is change of use permission required from horticultural/nursery use to holiday use; the five cabin are not yet built but would have provided evidence of demand or not; what are the plans for sewage services, electricity supply, gas supply?; how many staff would be employed, would there be a reduction in employment compared to the existing level?

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review the following policies are considered relevant:- Policy STR1 on sustainable development is relevant. Policy STR6 states that development outside towns, rural centres and villages should be strictly controlled and restricted to that which benefits economic activity, maintains or enhances the environment and does not foster growth in the need to travel. Policy 49 states that proposals for development should be compatible with the existing transport infrastructure and provide safe access to roads of adequate standard.

Taunton Deane Local Plan the following policies are considered especially relevant: - Policy S1 requires that proposals for development should ensure that: - (A) additional road traffic would not lead to overloading of access roads or road safety problems; (B) the accessibility of the site for public transport, walking, cycling, and pedestrians would minimise the need to use the car; (D) the appearance and character of any affected landscape, settlement, building or street scene would not be harmed as a result of the development; Policy S2 requires development to be of a good design; Policy S7 requires that outside development limits new buildings will only be allowed, amongst

other criteria, that they accord with a specific Development Plan Policy and supports the viability and viability of the rural economy; Policy EC24 requires that proposals for holiday chalets will only be permitted provided that the proposal would not harm the landscape and be adequately screened and has good access to the main road network; Policy EN6 requires the protection of trees and hedgerows, Policy EN12 requires that the distinct character and appearance of Landscape Character Areas should be maintained, Policy EN14 requires that proposals affecting Conservation Areas should preserve or enhance their character and appearance, Policy EN25 requires the protection of the water environment, Policy EN29 requires that development should not cause additional flooding concerns and Policy EN34 requires that new lighting should not impact on the night sky, road safety or residential amenity.

## **ASSESSMENT**

The principle of the development has already been established through the granting of the previous application for 13 holiday cabins on this site, application 20/2005/012, dated 16th September, 2005. The only variance to the latter permission is the cabin design and an increase in the footprint of each cabin by 12.46 sq m and an increase in ridge height by 1.31 m.

The design of the cabins are typical for this form of development incorporating timber walls and tiled roof. Considering the abundance of screening afforded to the site and a comprehensive landscaping scheme the increase in footprint and height would not detrimentally affect the visual amenity of the area. Consequently the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area and Landscape Character Area would not be detrimentally affected. The chalets are also located sufficient distance away from neighbouring properties not to cause any overlooking or overbearing affects and therefore the residential amenity of the area would not be detrimentally affected.

The previous concerns raised through representation relating to application 20/2005/012 have already been considered by the Committee. In terms of the new issues raised, the registration of Swallows Barn as an address is not a relevant planning consideration. The proposals are considered acceptable independent of whether the applicant wishes to provide bicycles, educational activities or horticultural activities or leaves holiday makers to their own devices.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions of time limit, materials, accordance with Flood Risk Assessment, landscaping, trees to be retained, holiday let only, removal after 24 months if use ceases, visibility, services underground, details of western stream bank levels and the emergency spillway, removal of PD rights for extensions, gates, walls, fences, and outbuildings and badgers . Notes re Disabled Persons Act, lighting,

energy and water conservation, health and safety and connection to Wessex Water infrastructure, prevention of access to The Spinney.

REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION:- The site is adequately screened and the proposal is not considered to be harmful to the landscape and has good access to the highway network, the visual and residential amenity of the area would not be detrimentally affected and the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area would be maintained/enhanced and therefore is compliant with Taunton Deane Local Plan Policies S1, S2, S7, EC24, EN6, EN12, EN14, EN25, EN29 and EN34.

**In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.**

**CONTACT OFFICER: 356586 MR R UPTON**

NOTES: