

SWT Planning Committee - 24 June 2021

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Marcia Hill, Mark Blaker, Roger Habgood, John Hassall, Janet Lloyd, Craig Palmer, Sarah Wakefield, Brenda Weston and Loretta Whetlor

Officers: Rebecca Miller (Principal Planning Specialist), Martin Evans (Shape Legal Partnership), Simon Fox (Planning Specialist), Alison Blom-Cooper and Tracey Meadows (Democracy and Governance) and Marcus Prouse (Democracy and Governance)

Also Present: Councillor Johnson

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

18. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Aldridge, Firmin, Lithgow, Tully and A Wedderkopp

19. Minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee (to follow)

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 10 June 2021. (to follow))

20. 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 Wakefield	42/21/0004	Ward Member. Correspondence received from members of the public. Spoken to the Planning Specialist about the site.	Personal	Spoke and Voted

21. Public Participation

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance	Attended
-----------------	------	----------	--------	----------

42/21/0004	Mr T Smith	Local Resident	Against	Via Zoom
	Ms C Warburton	Local Resident	Against	Via Zoom
	Mr E Orr	Higher Comeytrove Farm	In favour	Via Zoom
	Mr M Oliver	Local Resident	Against	In person
	Tessa Dean	Chair Neighbourhood Plan Group		Statement read out
	Mr L Turner	Associate Director, Boyer	In favour	In person
	Cllr D Johnson	Ward Member		In person

22. **42/21/0004**

Application for approval of reserved matters following outline application 42/14/0069 in respect of the appearance, landscape, layout and scale for the erection of 166 No. dwellings, hard and soft landscaping, car parking including garages, internal access roads, footpaths and circulation areas, public open space and drainage with associated infrastructure and engineering works together with additional details as required by Condition No's. 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 23 on land at Parcel H1d, Comeytrove/Trull

Comments from members of the public included;

- Concerns with the developer's noncompliance of conditions;
- Concerns that the homes were not adapted for climate change;
- Issues with access, flooding, and designs;
- Concerns that the allocated Public Open Space was to become fallowed land for the foreseeable future;
- The current closure of footpath T29/11 has highlighted the dangers of crossing the A38 close to or at the Jeffreys' Way junction. Clearing and levelling that land will facilitate construction of the footway and greatly improve forward visibility towards and beyond the road's existing bend, that will extend and tighten as you approach the new offset roundabout.;
- Extending the proposed footway on the south side of the A38 roundabout to Jeffreys' Way would allow pedestrians to cross safely in two stages via the new roundabout's splitter island that has a footway proposed across it;
- The allocated S106 monies would be better spent on the A38;
- Disappointed that this fourth parcel of land has come forward for consideration today;
- The houses were not aligned with the Garden Town requirement to respect traditional settlement pattern and respect the integrity of historical settlement forms;
- The homes were generic, mostly semi-detached and crammed together as tightly as possible;
- The Placemaking Specialists recommended refusal for this application;

- The Neighbourhood Plan called for Lifetime Home Standards in at least 25% of new homes and houses built to Wheelchair Design Standards in at least 10% of new homes. We had neither and in addition a high proportion of houses had several steps to the front door further limiting access;
- Concerns that the application did not have an acceptable SUDS scheme in place;
- A huge amount of public consultation has been undertaken over the years. The applicants were committed to work with the Council to deliver this important site that delivers new and affordable homes that Taunton needs to help young people get onto the housing ladder;
- Many of the issues raised by members of the public had been resolved with the Planning Officer and would hopefully provide some comfort and clarification;
- There were no objections on the application from consultees;
- The application pre-dated the Council's Design Guide, Garden Town and Climate Emergency agenda status by several years;
- An approved high-quality landscape scheme that would provide Parks and Gardens, Children's play spaces, allotment, orchards and the planting of nearly 500 new trees and over six acres of new native pitches woodland for future residents to enjoy;
- Concerns that comments from the place making specialist were yet again dismissed;
- The development lacked imagination and seemed to be based on a 1980's style estate;
- Concerns that despite the needs of our community, we have many elderly, infirm and disabled no proposed bungalows were being erected on the vast site;
- Concerns with the lack of wheelchair accessible properties;
- Concerns with the lack of on street visitor parking;
- Concerns that the storage for refuse storage was inadequate and impossible for disabled householders to carry their recycling for distances that required this to be carried through their properties;
- Concerns that the development did not reach the Somerset West and Taunton SADMP policy 10 that "a minimum of 3% of new dwellings on developments of 30 dwellings or more should be built to full wheelchair standards";

Comments from Members included;

- Concerns with the boundary (ransom land) that is the Higher Comeytrowe farm adjacent to the Equestrian Centre;
- Concerns with Condition 26 – (No dwellings are to be occupied until a network of cycleway and footpath connections had been constructed within the development);
- Concerns with accessibility and the number of properties that had steps up to them, not only for the disabled but also families that had pushchairs;
- There needed to be more emphasis within the play equipment for accessibility for the disabled;

- Concerns with the public open space on H1D and it's requirement in the S106 to this being constructed;
- The properties were bland for a Garden Town;
- Concerns that the 3% allocation for people with disabilities was to low;
- Concerns had been raised within the Committee that the Policy on accessibility building percentages had not been met. The Committee asked the developer to make sure that this practice did not carry forward into the future phases of this site;

Councillor Habgood proposed and Councillor Hill seconded a motion for **Conditional Approval** with alterations to stated conditions 01 and 06 and delegated to Officer's in collaboration with the Lead Planning Specialist and Chair to resolve the final points of negotiation regarding Outline Conditions 26 and 29;

The **motion** was carried.

23. **Latest appeals and decisions received (Previous meeting 10 June 21)**

Appeals and decisions noted.

24. **Appeals received**

Appeals noted.

(The Meeting ended at 2.45 pm)