

43/2006/018

MR T KLIMPKE

DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 1 NO. FLAT OVER NEW ARCH AND ACCESS ROAD TO EXISTING BUSINESS, 58 - 60 MANTLE STREET, WELLINGTON AS AMENDED BY AGENTS LETTER DATED 30TH MARCH, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING DRAWING NOS. 0434/29, 30, 31 AND FURTHER AMENDED BY LETTER DATED 5TH APRIL, 2006 WITH ACCOMPANYING DRAWING NO. 0434/33

13678/20345

FULL

PROPOSAL

The proposal provides for the demolition of the existing building on the Mantle Street frontage and the erection of a new frontage building. The application was initially submitted for the provision of two flats over the arch. The amended plans reduce the overall height of the proposed new building to that similar to the existing building on the site frontage and provide for a single flat. The site currently comprises a car showroom on the ground floor with a residential flat with three dormers in the first floor above. The area of land to the rear of the site is mostly hard surfaced and has been used for car parking, storage of accident damaged cars and general storage. The applicant's business has now relocated to premises elsewhere in Wellington and the application buildings and site are now unused. An ecology survey submitted with the planning application found that bats and owls were not found to be using the property and therefore concluded that there is no need for any mitigation measures to be put in place in this instance.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY the proposed flats will be constructed over an archway that will have a minimum 4.2 m vertical clearance from the access road below. As the structure may be considered as a low bridge adequate signing will be necessary. Such a vertical clearance will allow access to the site for fire engines and small service vehicles but not for large service vehicles. This may result in on site parking arising on Mantle Street. A turning head has not been shown and a full size turning head would be required for any adoption purposes. If the site is not adopted, a separate drainage system for surface water would need to be provided. Various detailed points raised. In the event of planning permission being granted would recommend conditions re no discharge of surface water onto highway, estate road requirements and dwelling to be served by a properly surfaced footpath and carriageway. Views awaited on amended plans. COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST there are limited or no archaeological implications to this proposal and therefore have no objections on archaeological grounds. WESSEX WATER the development is located within a sewered area, with foul and surface water sewers available. Points of connection for this and water supply should be agreed. There is a public combined sewer crossing the site. Wessex Water normally requires a minimum 3 m easement width on either side of its apparatus, for the purpose of maintenance and

repair. Diversion or protection works may need to be agreed. An informative referring to this should be included on any consent.

CONSERVATION OFFICER existing garage façade does not make a positive contribution to the street scene, so the principle of redevelopment is to be welcomed. Views on amended proposal for one flat – still feels the proposal is inappropriate, the problem from the start being the cost of access from the rear and / or the reluctance to provide an unadopted road from the front. However this is not a factor that can override the previously expressed objections to the proposal. In evaluating the impact on the character of the Conservation Area, none of the options put forward demonstrate that no harm will arise, which is a pre-requisite of development in the Conservation Area. NATURE CONSERVATION & RESERVES OFFICER ecology survey was undertaken outside the optimum time of bat surveys. However satisfied that the survey did not identify any signs of bats and therefore advise that further survey work or mitigation is not necessary in this case. Suggest advisory note re possible presence of bats and nesting birds in the event of planning permission being granted. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER recommends conditions re contaminated land. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICER no observations to make.

Two letters of objection to the initially submitted plans have now been withdrawn.

SIX LETTERS OF SUPPORT the proposed new elevation top Mantle Street, replacing the old garage front would be a definite improvement to the nature of the area, both complementing and enhancing the neighbouring properties; pleased to see a brownfield site being used; it is the type of development much needed for the future growth and regeneration of Wellington; can only benefit the community as we are all aware that more housing is needed; the erection of the archway is very impressive and in keeping with the surrounding buildings; believe the town would benefit from a high quality residential development and would significantly improve the look of the frontage; the proposal presents an ideal opportunity to make good use of what is otherwise a redundant area; concern at the amount of green belt land being developed when brownfield sites such as this should be being used.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy S1 of the Taunton Deane Local Plan includes general requirements for new developments. One of these requirements is that the accessibility of the development by public transport, cycling and pedestrian networks would be consistent with its likely trip generation and minimising the need to use the car. Policy H2 states that housing development will be permitted within defined limits of settlements provided certain criteria are met. One of the criteria is that a coherent approach to the overall design should be adopted to create locally distinctive developments well related to their surroundings. It is considered that this criteria is not met with the current proposal. Policy EN14 of the same plan states that development within or affecting a Conservation Area will only be permitted where it would preserve or enhance the appearance or character of the Conservation Area. I consider that the proposal will meet with this criteria. Policy EN15 goes on to say that proposals involving the demolition of buildings within a conservation area will not

be permitted unless acceptable proposals for any redevelopment or new use for the site have been approved.

ASSESSMENT

The principle of redevelopment of the site is considered to be acceptable, but it is considered that the existing form of frontage development should be replicated. I consider that the proposed scheme is being driven by the wish to provide an access road to adoptable standards, with the resultant need for a high and wide archway under any frontage development. A private drive serving a parking court would not attract these requirements. Given the site's location within the Wellington Conservation Area, any proposals need to demonstrate that they do not have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area. No appraisal and complementary design statement has been submitted to demonstrate such a case. In my view none of the options put forward by the applicant meet the minimum test, i.e. that they have a neutral impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

RECOMMENDATION

Permission be REFUSED for reason that the proposed design is not of sufficiently high architectural standard for this prominent and important site within the Conservation Area and, if permitted, the development would detract from the architectural and historic character of the area.

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

CONTACT OFFICER: 356461 MR J HAMER

NOTES: