

SWT Planning Committee - 20 August 2020 held via Zoom Video Conference

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Marcia Hill, Ian Aldridge, Sue Buller, Dixie Darch, Roger Habgood, Mark Lithgow, Janet Lloyd, Chris Morgan, Craig Palmer, Andrew Sully, Ray Tully, Brenda Weston and Loretta Whetlor

Officers: John Burton (Planning Nationally Significant Infrastructure Specialist), Rebecca Miller (Principal Planning Specialist), Roy Pinney (Shape Legal), Alex Lawrey (Planning Specialist), Denise Grandfield (Planning Specialist), Denise Todd (Planning Specialist), Jeremy Guise (Planning Specialist) and Tracey Meadows (Democracy and Governance)

Also Present: Councillors Cavill and Rigby

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

58. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Blaker

59. **Minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee**

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 6 August 2020 to follow)

60. **Declarations of Interest or Lobbying**

Members present at the meeting declared the following personal interests in their capacity as a Councillor or Clerk of a County, Town or Parish Council or any other Local Authority:-

Name	Application No.	Description of Interest	Reason	Action Taken
Cllr S Coles	38/19/0426	Discussed, not fettered	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr D Darch	38/19/0426	Architect known to Cllr. Discretion not fettered	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr R Habgood	06/20/0025	Applicant known to Cllr. Discretion not fettered	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr C Morgan	06/20/0025		Prejudicial	Did not speak or vote
Cllr C Palmer	3/21/19/034	Chair of Minehead TC Planning	Personal	Spoke and not voted

Cllr L Whetlor	3/21/19/034	Applicant known to Cllr. Discretion not fettered	Personal	Spoke and Voted
----------------	-------------	--	----------	-----------------

61. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
06/20/0025	Mr R Burgess Collier Planning Cllr Rigby	Local Resident Agents Ward Member	Objecting In favour
38/19/0426	H Lazenby J Payne M Raby Baker Ruff Hannon D White Cllr Cavill	Planning Agents for Magdalene Court Taunton Heritage Trust RIBA Architect Hatfield White Trustee	Objecting In favour In favour In favour In favour In favour
41/20/0001	Mr Burt Mr Marshall Cllr Trollope-Bellew	Applicant Chair Lydeard St Lawrence and Tolland Parish Council Cllr for South Quantock Ward	In favour In favour In favour
3/26/19/024	Mr Priddy Mark Richards	Local Resident Savills	In favour In favour
3/21/19/034	Mr Bloys Emma Norman Richard Holman	Proprietor Agent Bush Consultancy	In favour In favour In favour

62. **06/20/0025**

Variation of Condition No. 02 (approved plans) of application 06/19/0021 for amendments to the location and design of field gates and to set back the fencing further from driveway on land either side of the driveway at Sandhill Park, South Drive, Bishops Hull

Comments from members of the public included:

- Only one double gate is needed for access to limit movement of agricultural vehicles up South Drive which is well used by pedestrians and other road users;
- Concerns with the use of the historical parkland;

- Only a minor amendment is sought for planning permission granted earlier this year;
- The amendments do not alter the design and materials of the proposed fencing, which was agreed by Historic England;
- No objections received from Historic England;

Comments from Members included:

- Concerns with the impact on pedestrians;
- Concerns with the construction of the gates;
- Concerns with the impact on the change of use;
- Condition for there to be no wire;
- Need to make sure the site is protected;
- Changes not explained properly;

Councillor Tully proposed and Councillor Hill seconded a motion for the application to be **APPROVED** subject to amended wording to condition 1 to read; The fencing hereby granted approval shall be erected before 27 January 2021. Once erected the fence shall be retained and maintained as per the approved drawings number SH.PK 02 200 Rev P07 and SH.PK 02 300 P4 in perpetuity;

63. **38/19/0426**

**Demolition of Corfield Hall and erection of 11 No. Almshouse flats
Community room and ground floor offices for Taunton Heritage Trust with
external alterations at Corfield Hall, Magdalene Street, Taunton**

Comments by members of the public included;

- Concerns with the impact on the residential amenity of those living in Magdalene Court;
- The height and bulk of the proposed building would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of those residents with facing windows;
- Concerns with the overbearing and oppressive impact within apartments and the garden area;
- Concerns with the lack of information regarding the machinery to be used in the laundry and plant rooms;
- The proposed bin store was not big enough to take the rubbish of 11 Alms Houses;
- Over development of the site;
- Concerns with the development on heritage grounds;
- Concerns with the harmful impact on the significance of the grade I listed Church;

- Concerns with the harmful impact on the significance of the scheduled monument of the town defences through furtherer damage to the continuation of these remains within their setting;
- There was a need to improve the site to minimise antisocial behaviour and criminal activities;
- There was a need to provide accommodation for some of the less fortunate members of Taunton society ;
- The Almshouses were a perfect fit for the site given the historic association with the Church and the Conservation area;
- The scheme has undergone substantial reviews;
- The scheme will bring substantial community benefit and will be a beautiful additions to our town;
- Corfield has had many commercial occupiers which have not succeeded as viable commercial enterprises due to the location being remote, unsuitable physical configuration, poor thermal quality of the existing building, poor structure and high running cost in terms of repairs and maintenance;
- This development will bring a reuse of a brownfield site;
- Well insulated and airtight homes;
- This will be the flagship of new build Almshouses to sit well alongside the trust's historic listed properties;
- Homes will be heated by green energy;
- The development will have a sustainable drainage system including rainwater planters, rainwater attenuation, sedum blanket roof to mobility scooter store and landscaped to increase biodiversity;
- No objections from neighbours;

Comments by Members included;

- Happy that the visual amenity of the site will be improved;
- Right place, right scheme;
- This development would eliminate antisocial behaviour;
- This was improve antisocial behaviour in this area;
- Concerns with the scale of the building in relation to the Church
- Concerns with the impact on the Church;
- Concerns that this would set a precedent for other buildings in the town to be demolished;
- Concerns with the loss of light;

Councillor Sully proposed and Councillor Tully seconded a motion for **Conditional approval** to be granted subject to a S106 agreement to secure affordable housing;

The motion was carried

At this point in the meeting a 10 minute break was proposed.

64. **41/20/0001**

Replacement of agricultural barn with the erection of home studios with agricultural storage at Burts Farmhouse Barn, East Town Lane, Tolland, Lydeard St Lawrence

Comments from members of the public included;

- The proposal has mixed usage for agricultural and business use;
- The development would mean that travel was not needed for work purposes;
- Materials would be agricultural in style and not domestic appearance;
- The development does not affect the landscape
- Local support for the development;
- There is already an existing building on site;
- The new building though slightly bigger would be less unsightly;

Comments from Members included;

- The building would be used for business use only;
- The building was obscure from public sight;
- Sustainable development;
- This would reduce the carbon footprint;
- The only increase would be the roof height, not the foot print;
- The development was a blot on the landscape;
- Policy DM2 needed to be adhered to;
- The development was detrimental to our Core Strategy
- This was not a domestic building as per Office report;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute was proposed and seconded

Councillor Sully proposed and Councillor Habgood seconded a motion for the application to be **APPROVED** against office recommendation and our Policy;

The motion was lost

Councillor Lloyd proposed and Councillor Buller seconded a motion for the application to be **REFUSED** as per officer recommendation with the words domestic removed from the refusal decision;

The motion was carried

Councillor Perry joined the meeting for this application but was unable to vote as he was not present for the start of the application.

65. **3/26/19/024**

At this point in the discussion an extension of 30 minutes was proposed and seconded

Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access for the erection of 14 No. dwellings on land to the rear Land north of Huish Lane, Washford, Old Cleeve

Comments made by members of the public included;

- The application conflicts with Policy SC1;
- Concerns that the north east side of Washford has already taken the bulk of new development with schemes already approved at Huish Mews and the former Nursery site;
- An alternative site is available at Station Road which has the support of consultees and was the preferred option for the Parish Council;
- The development would deliver 5 affordable homes on-site;
- The development would help the Council maintain a five year supply of housing sites;
- The development can be delivered in a manner that safeguards the amenity and privacy of local residents;
- The development would not exceed the 31-31 homes over the plan period;
- The creation of 14 new households will help to support the viability of local businesses and facilities in the village;
- There are no objections from technical consultees;

Comments made by Members included;

- Concerns that this was a green field site with no facilities in the village;
- Concerns that this development would triple the amount of housing in Washford;
- This application was against Policy SC1;
- The Parish Council did not support the development;

At this point in the discussion an extension of 30 minutes was proposed and seconded

- No objections were received from local residents;
- Concerns with the impact on Washford;
- Back land development not sustainable;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Sully seconded a motion for the application to be **REFUSED** against officer recommendation;

Reasons

The proposed quantum of development does not meet stipulations in policy SC1.2 of the adopted West Somerset Local Plan to 2032 for limited development. It is not considered that the provision of new affordable housing as a planning benefit would outweigh the policy conflicts;

The motion was carried.

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension and a 10 minute break was proposed.

66. **3/21/19/034**

Demolition of commercial laundry building to construct 7 apartments and 164sqm of retail/financial and professional services, café/office (A1, A2, A3, B1) with associated cycle parking, refuse facilities, infrastructure and landscaping Julians Laundry, Market House Lane, Minehead

Comments made by members of the public included;

- The demand for commercial laundry facilities has increased and our small aged premises has become unsuitable for commercial laundry use;
- Important that the business remains in Minehead;
- The business will create additional employment;
- This modern development will allow us to reduce our carbon footprint;
- The development will enhance the look of the immediate area as the existing building has become dated and in poor condition and no longer serves a useful purpose;
- The proposal was a car free development located less than a 2 minute walk of local shops and facilities;
- The development was bring back to use a brown field site and will also be providing good quality residential accommodation;
- The proposal will vastly improve and retain the appearance and character of this part of Minehead's central conservation area;

Comments made by Members included;

- Concerns with the ease elevation;
- The architecture was not in keeping with the area;
- Not sympathetic to the conservation area;
- Concerns that the shape of the windows were out of keeping;
- Concerns with the lack of affordable housing;
- Concerns with the access to the site;
- The development meets the housing need in Minehead;
- Great idea that the development is combining employment with accommodation;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minutes extension was proposed;

Councillor Aldridge proposed and Councillor Whetlor seconded a **DEFERRAL** of the application;

The motion was lost

Councillor Buller proposed and Councillor Coles seconded a motion for the application to be **APPROVED** as per officer recommendation;

The motion was carried

67. **Latest appeals and decisions received**

Latest Appeals and decisions noted

(The Meeting ended at 6.58 pm)