

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 July 2016 at 4.30 pm

Present:

Councillor S J PugsleyChairman
Councillor B Maitland-WalkerVice Chairman

Councillor I Aldridge
Councillor S Dowding
Councillor S Goss
Councillor A Hadley
Councillor B Heywood
Councillor I Jones

Councillor C Morgan
Councillor P Murphy
Councillor J Parbrook
Councillor K Turner
Councillor T Venner
Councillor R Woods

Officers in Attendance:

Area Planning Manager – Bryn Kitching
Planning Officer – Susan Keal
Legal Advisor Martin Evans - Mendip DC
Democratic Services Officer – Tracey Meadows

P23 Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received for absence, Councillor I Aldridge arrived at 4.47pm.

P24 Minutes

Resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on the 30 June 2016 circulated at the meeting be confirmed as a correct record.

Proposed by Councillor K Turner and seconded by Councillor C Morgan

The motion was carried.

P25 Declarations of Interest or Lobbying

Councillor Morgan declared a perceived prejudicial interests in application No. 3/32/16/010 as he had family links with the applicant. He also declared an interest on application No. 3/10/16/001 as he had close contact with many of the residents at Pickering Close, Dunster. He declared that he would like to speak, and leave the room when the applications were debated and voted on.

Councillor Goss declared a personal interest on application No. 3/32/16/010 as a resident of the parish of Stogursey. She also declared that she had not been lobbied and would keep an open mind on the application.

Councillor Woods declared a personal interest on application No. 3/28/16/002, she declared that she knew one of the people that had written in but had not seen them for some time. Councillor Venner declared that he sat on the Regulation Committee at Somerset County Council and also on the Right Of Way Panel. He declared that he felt that he was being compromised on application No. 3/28/16/002 as this application could come to the Right Of Way Panel at some stage. He did not take part in any of the debate and left the room for the vote.

P26 Public Participation

Min No.	Reference No.	Application	Name	Position	Stance
P26	3/10/16/001	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two live/work units and two dwelling at Land at Marsh Lane, Dunster	Mr S Collier	Agent	In favour

P27 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Other Matters

Report three of the Planning Team dated 28 July 2016 (circulated with the Agenda). The Committee considered the reports, prepared by the Planning Team, relating to plans deposited in accordance with the planning legislation and, where appropriate, Members were advised of correspondence received and subsequent amendments since the agenda had been prepared.

(Copies of all letters reported may be inspected in the planning application files that constitute part of the background papers for each item).

RESOLVED That the Recommendations contained in Section 1 of the Report be Approved (in so far as they relate to the above), including, where appropriate, the conditions imposed and the reasons for refusal, subject to any amendments detailed below:

Reference Location, Proposal, Debate and Decision

3/10/16/001 – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two live/works units and two dwellings at land at Marsh Lane, Dunster

Comments raised by the speaker included:

- The new application was for two live/work units as already consented on the site, the only difference is that this was provided by new buildings rather than the existing buildings;
- No policy protection on the existing buildings;
- No increase traffic movement;
- No objections from statutory consultees on any technical matters;

The member's debate centred on the following issues:

- Happy to see the new access route does not emerge onto the main road;
- Shares the concerns of Dunster Parish Council and cannot see the point of destroying a building that has history;
- Concerns with the application coming secondary to the first application;
- Concerns that the pavement did not go all around the site of the application, could talks be had with the applicant to see if the pavement could be

increased to go all around the corner and joined up with the new pavement so that there was a pavement all along this busy road;

- Disappointed that the modern planning process pays no heed to features and character and also shared the concerns of Dunster Parish Council;
- Dunster was a medieval town and we should do everything that we can to enhance the Conservation area;
- Cannot see any merit in changing the planning permission that was applied for five years ago;

Councillor Hadley proposed and Councillor Morgan seconded a motion that the application be **APPROVED** subject to a S106 agreement.

The motion was carried.

Reference Location, Proposal, Debate and Decision

3/28/16/002 – Erection of dwelling house (Class C3) together with provision of garden and manoeuvring area at Union Quarry, Tower Hill, Williton

The member's debate centred on the following issues:

- Concerns with lack of pedestrian refuges;
- Concerns that smoke emissions and fumes from boilers and wood burners would have an impact on the property and it and Tower Hill;
- Concerns with the emergency services getting to the property;
- Concerns with the cracked wall and steep track with a camber that leads up to it;
- Would like to see a Construction Management Plan in place to deal with any health and safety aspects of this application and to see how vehicles were to get on and off of the site;
- Refuges needed to be built prior to the construction with regards to the footpath;
- This was a missed opportunity on a unique site, the building could be pretty impressive but was boring and lacking imagination;
- Substantial house on a substantial plot and fits in with the local area;
- Despite fears, the track would not deteriorate with the added use of construction traffic;

Councillor Turner proposed and Councillor Heywood seconded a motion that the application be **APPROVED** with an amendment to the start of the sentence of condition 8 to read 'work shall not commence on the construction of the dwelling until the track and passing places have been completed'. An additional condition 11 requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Vehicle Traffic Management Plan prior to works commencing.

The motion was carried.

Reference Location, Proposal, Debate and Decision

3/32/16/010 – Erection of a new residential dwelling with associated garden and car parking (resubmission of 3/32/16/001) at land adjacent to 6 Vicarage Close, Stogursey, Bridgwater

The member's debate centred on the following issues:

- This was a case of shoehorning a bungalow into a small area;
- Over development in this area;
- Issues with tandem parking and no sufficient turning space;
- Parking on the pavement would affect pedestrians;
- Issues with huge parking problems in Stogursey;
- There was no shortage of housing provision in Stogursey;
- Parking issues would make it difficult for emergency vehicles to attend;

Councillor S Goss and Councillor I Aldridge seconded a motion that the application be **REFUSED**.

REASON

1. The proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of a restricted site, and would lead to cramped conditions amounting to town cramming, particularly by its relationship with the surrounding existing residential properties and its restricted parking provision, and would therefore result in a poor level of residential amenity for both the future occupants of the dwelling and for the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. As such the proposal is contrary to saved policies BD/1 and BD/2 of the West Somerset District Local Plan 2006 and policy NH10 of the publication draft of the West Somerset Plan to 2032;

2. The proposed new dwelling and its parking provision would result in the loss of existing parking for other residential properties in the area which would result in parking on the public highway and verges with consequent risk of additional danger to all users of the road and interference with the free flow of traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies BD/1 and BD/2 of the West Somerset District Local Plan 2006;

The motion was carried.

P28 Exmoor National Park Matters

Councillor B Heywood reported on matters relating to West Somerset considered at the meeting in May of the Exmoor National Park Planning Committee. This included:

Following the planning meeting there was an AGM where it was announced that there was a new Planning Committee Chairman for Exmoor National Park.

- Proposed conversion of first floor storage area above stables into affordable home for local person (Full) – White Horse Stables, Exford, Minehead, Somerset; - Approved
- Conversion of Doctors Surgery and residential unit to two houses for sale on the open market (Full) – 3 and 5 Park Street, Dunster, Somerset; - Refused
- Proposed agricultural building (50m²) (Retrospective) – Ranscombe Lodge, Wootton Courtenay, Somerset; - Approved.

- Proposed installation of a ground mounted solar PV system (10kw consisting of 40 solar PV modules) (Full) – Hindon Farm, Hindon Lane, Minehead, Somerset; - Approved

No appeals lodged and no appeals heard.

P29 Delegated Decision List (replies from Officers are in italic)

Week Farm, Wiveliscombe, Are Parish Councils notified that prior approval was not required, as we have had complaints in the past where buildings go up and the Parish Councils have not being informed and are not sure if prior approval was required. *As a result of a meeting with some of the Parishes in the AONB we said that we would look at our procedures and would notify Parishes when we receive Prior Notifications as a matter of course. This will be by way of information only as they are time limited and would not have the usual 21 days to respond. This would apply to the whole of West Somerset.*

Brooklands, The Parks, Minehead, was there any S106 affordable housing gain on this application? This application seems to have gone through without any affordable housing gain. *Yes there was, the reason that it took so long to determine was because of the S106 agreement which was for affordable housing and off site contributions.*

Glen Cottage, Huish Lane, Washford, the Lawful Development was refused, what happens next, do they have to demolish or is an enforcement notice served. *As this was a proposed Lawful Development Certificate for a replacement garage, and this was not approved so there was nothing to demolish as it had not being built.*

Mill Farm, Sampford Brett, please can you expand on this, approval of details reserved by condition 2. *This was a previous planning condition and it obviously had conditions on and there was a condition 2 relating to contamination. When the details were submitted to us we register it as an application type and consulted with the environment health department. This does not come in front of members or committees. It was just to discharge the condition. We will be moving into a situation where they are not treated as applications so will not appear in the list in future.*

Co-op, 57 Liddymore Road, Watchet, are these signs on a time limit as this was a residential area? *Co-op are rebranding and going back to their old colour blue, there was a condition for the signs to be illuminated in opening hours only.*

Oldfield Shed, Middle Stone Farm, Brompton Ralph, what was the difference between Prior Approval on this one and the one on page 58 where prior approval was not required. When clarification was sought with this we were told that we could not turn it down because of government legislation they did not need planning permission for it, nor did the application on page 58, please can you clarify. *This was prior approval under a different part of the General Permitted Development Order which allows agricultural buildings to go to shops, there are two types of these, one where they do not have to notify us and the other is where they apply for prior approval for up to a certain size at which point we have limited reasons to consider and it terms of shops we have to consider the retail impact on other local areas and decided that there was not going to be an adverse impact on other areas. Stated that there were 20-30 types of Prior Approval, which do not happen that often.*

Starhanger, Beacon Road, Minehead, I note that one of the trees is an Oak, Pine trees are faster growing than Oaks, I am concerned that there was a TPO on an Oak and it had been agreed that the Oak can be felled. I am concerned because this was a long standing tree and was there anything within the TPO which stated that another tree must be planted to replace this on site or is it a tree that is lost forever? *As this has a TPO order on it you will need to apply for ground consent to do the work. They are required to replacement planting and the requirement was to plant one broad leaf deciduous tree with details of the location to be reported to us. In terms of the Oak tree although it was essentially healthy it was in close proximity to the house cracks were appearing causing damage to drainage and pavement areas so it was felt that it was one of those when its time had come to grant permission for it to be felled, but did require replacement of a broad leaf tree.*

P30 Appeals Lodged

Appeal against the refusal of the construction of a timber loading bay, new forestry tracks and the upgrading of existing forestry tracks on land at Cordings Cleeve, Brompton Ralph (planning application 3/02/15/002).

Appeal against the refusal of an outline application for the redevelopment of the site to provide a food store (A1), retail shops (A1), professional and financial services (A2), food and drink uses (A3), health services (D1), residential dwellings (C3), vehicle and pedestrian access, associated car parking and landscaping (resubmission of 3/39/11/002) in association with 3/39/14/024 on land at Bank Street/Fore Street, Williton

Appeal against an outline application (with all matters but access reserved) for the erection of up to 480 sq. m. gross of flexible Class A1/A2 floors pace linked to proposed redevelopment of land associated with application ref: 3/39/14/010 to include vehicle and pedestrian access and landscaping on land at J Gliddon & Sons Ltd, Bank Street, Williton.

P31 Appeals Decided

3/28/15/008 – Erection of one dwelling in the garden at the School House, Main Road, Sampford Brett – Appeal Dismissed.

3/37/15/024 – Outline application for the erection of a dwelling house on land off 6 Cherry Tree Way, Watchet – Appeal Dismissed.

P32 Reserve date for site visit – Monday 22 August

P33 Date of next meeting – Thursday 25 August

The meeting closed at 6.40pm