

SWT Planning Committee - 4 November 2021

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Marcia Hill, Ian Aldridge, Roger Habgood, John Hassall, Mark Lithgow, Janet Lloyd (substitute for Cllr Blaker), Chris Morgan, Craig Palmer, Ray Tully, Sarah Wakefield, Brenda Weston, Keith Wheatley and Loretta Whetlor

Officers: Rebecca Miller (Principal Planning Specialist), Alison Blom-Cooper, Martin Evans (Shape Legal Partnership), Jeremy Guise (Planning Specialist), Briony Waterman (Planning Specialist) and Tracey Meadows (Governance and Democracy Case Manager)

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

61. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Mark Blaker

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

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 October 2021 circulated with the agenda)

Resolved that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 14 October be confirmed as a correct record.

Proposed by Councillor Lithgow seconded by Councillor Hill

The **Motion** was carried.

63. **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 I Aldridge	3/39/20/003	Williton resident. Comments on flooding from the wider group of the community	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr J Lloyd	Appeals	Appeals, 8	Personal	Spoke and Voted

		Worthy Drive, Wellington. Worked with the appellant, also Chair of Wellington Planning Committee when this application was refused permission		
Cllr C Morgan	3/32/21/007	Predetermination of the application	Chair of Stogursey of Parish Council	Spoke and did not voted on the application
Cllr L Whetlor	3/39/20/003	Ward Member for Williton and Watchet. Know to public speaker on application.	Personal	Spoke and Voted

64. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
3/01/21/005	Mr K Martin	Local Resident	Objection
	Mr J Anderson	Local Resident	Objection
	Mr S Dowding	Bicknoller PC	Objection
3/39/20/003	Ms K Jones	Local Resident	Objection
	Mr M Terret	Local Resident	Objection
	Cllr L Naylor	(statement read out) Williton PC	Objection
	Mr P Grubb	Agent	In favour
3/32/21/007	Mr S Wardle	Local Resident	Objection
	Mr R Wand	Stogursey PC	Objection
	Mr R Williams	(statement read out) Agent	In favour

65. **3/01/21/005**

Application for approval of reserved matters following Outline Application 3/01/20/016 for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 1 No. dwelling and garage. Land adjacent to Chilcombe House, 30 Trendle Lane, Bicknoller

Comments from members of the public included;

(summarised)

- The proposal for a large Georgian style house would be totally out of keeping for the village and the AONB and would not compliment the adjacent Chilcombe House;
- Concerns with the disruption to water services that would be covered by the concrete;
- Concerns that no mention of permission for a culvert, or proposals for re-routing services was noted in the application;
- The proposed driveway was perilously close to a telegraph pole at the base of which serviced the internet for nearby properties;
- Highway concerns;
- The application was incongruous;
- Concerns with the likely damage to the peripheral trees and watercourse;
- Concerns with the loss of the hedgerow;
- A smaller house should be with the point of access moved. This would minimise the environmental damage to this sensitive area and the ANOB;
- The proposed access was on a dangerous blind bend only 20 metres from an existing access in the ownership of the applicant and would be less obtrusive access to the site;

Comments from Members included;

(summarised)

- The application was different and innovative;
- No real vernacular in the village;
- The development falls within the parameters of planning;
- The existing entrance should be used rather than create a new one;
- Concerns that this development was an infill and over development;
- Concerns with the loss of trees and hedges;
- Concerns with the removal of the telegraph pole and disruption to services;
- Concerns with the visual impact, design and scale of the development on the surrounding area;
- The development would create additional car journeys due to its rural area;
- Concerns that the development would not be carbon neutral;
- Concerns with the Culvert and flooding;
- A difference entrance was needed;
- Concerns with the effects on the AONB
- Concerns with where this development fitted in with the Design Guide;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Lithgow seconded a motion that Reserved Matters be **APPROVED** subject to Conditions.

The motion **FAILED**

Councillor Lloyd proposed and Councillor Habgood seconded a motion for the application to be **REFUSED**

The **motion** was carried.

Reasons - Design, scale, and appearance of the dwelling contrary to Policy NH13. A more sustainable form of development linked to the Climate change emergency and the NPPF. Officers delegated to working on the wording for refusal and agreeing with Chair / Vice Chair.

66. **3/39/20/003**

Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the erection of up to 350 dwellings (comprising a mix of dwelling sizes and types and affordable housing), approximately 1,000sqm of flexible uses within Use class E (limited to offices, R&D and light industrial), vehicle access, public open space, sports and recreational facilities, footpaths, cycle ways, enhancements to the Barrows scheduled monument including information boards, landscaping and associated works. Land to the west of Williton, off Priest Street, Williton

Comments from members of the public included;
(summarised)

- Concerns with the impact of the development on the listed buildings and the town of Williton;
- Concerns with the loss of amenity space;
- The development would change the character of the area;
- The planting of trees on the site would mitigate car fumes and sound and light pollution and flood risk;
- Concerns with the viability impact on the High Street;
- We should be protecting our pasture lands so that we can produce more food for our population not cementing over it;
- We should be looking to develop brownfield sites and convert redundant retail outlets in the high street to meet housing needs. This would protect the environment and the precious green spaces;
- The development would add pressure to the already struggling local surgeries, dentist and schools;
- Traffic concerns on the A39 with the pollution and congestion that this development would cause during the summer months;
- Flooding concerns;
- A traffic and road policy were needed for the area;
- Concerns with access to the businesses for current and future pedestrians;
- The number of homes could comfortably be delivered on site;
- The site was sustainable;
- No concerns from Highways;

Comments from Members included;

(summarised)

- Concerns that there was no flood alleviation plan for Williton;
- Land should be set aside for flooding;
- Traffic concerns with the proposed 4 roundabouts in Williton and the A39;
- Concerns with the remoteness of this application;
- Landscaping issues;
- A safe pedestrian route was needed from the development to make it safer for pedestrians to get into Williton;
- Concerns with flooding on the A39;
- Infrastructure needed to be implemented before this development was commenced;
- Green fields should not be built on;
- Concerns that the aggregate number of houses proposed in the Local Plan would be pushed up by the 350 dwellings proposed;
- Concerns with the statement from the developer in the report stating that adaptations to the homes for use for people with disabilities was only an expectation;
- The site was not sustainable;
- Concerns with the lack of a Housing Needs Assessment;

Councillor Habgood proposed and Councillor Morgan seconded a motion for the application to be **DEFERRED** for a month.

Reason - For more information on the impact of the development on the Environmental Agency flood alleviation management plan;

The **motion** was carried

At this point in the meeting a 15-minute break was proposed.

Cllr Hassell left the meeting.

67. **3/32/21/007**

At this point in the meeting a half hour extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Hill

Erection of 5 No. dwellings with parking, car ports and access there to. Land south of High Street, Stogursey

Comments from members of the public included;
(summarised)

- Concerns that the plans for the garage and car parking areas were changed in October reducing the number of spaces from 18 to 12 without being given the opportunity to make any comment;

- The national and county Council Highways and parking design standards needed to be met for this development;
- There was no regular bus service to Stogursey so the application conflicted with Policy TR2, to reduce the reliance on the private car;
- Concerns with the lack of available parking and the addition of more dwellings with inadequate parking would have the potential to aggravate existing problems;
- Concerns with developing a green field site which was a viable amenity site for the villagers of Stogumber;
- Concerns with the proposed footpath;
- Development, not needed in the village;
- Lack of sustainability;
- The development brought high quality homes and was a sustainable development;
- No objections from Consultees;
- The development did not have any amenity to the community;
- As there was no public access to the site a new footpath would be created;

Comments from Members included;
(summarised)

- The development was not sustainable and a step to far;
- Unwanted and unneeded development;
- A local housing assessment survey was needed to ascertain local need;
- A S106 for play provision was not needed in the village;

At this point in the meeting a further 30-minute extension was proposed. Councillor Hill proposed and seconded by Councillor Lloyd.

- Concerns with the loss of amenity land;
- Concerns with increased parking;
- Concerns that this development was in a Conservation area and the style of homes did not fit with the area;
- Concerns with the number of houses proposed in this small village despite the Executive gave assurances that only 13 houses would be built in the village in any one year;

Councillor Lithgow left at this point in the meeting

- This was a classic infill and back land development;
- Concerns with the access being used for further development in the field;
- Concerns with green fields being built on;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Wakefield seconded a motion for Conditional approval to be **APPROVED** subject to a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the Pedestrian Link.

The **motion** was carried.

68. **Latest appeals and decisions received**

Latest appeals and decisions noted.

(The Meeting ended at 5.10 pm)