

## SWT Planning Committee - 25 February 2021 held via Zoom Video Conference

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

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

Officers: Jo Humble (Lead Specialist - Affordable Housing), Rebecca Miller (Principal Planning Specialist), Simon Fox (Planning Specialist), Martin Evans (Shape Legal Partnership), Nick Bryant (Assistant Director, Strategic Place Planning), Amy Tregellas (Monitoring Officer), Tracey Meadows and Marcus Prouse (Democracy and Governance) Gillian Sanders (Wessex Water)

Also Present: Councillors Farbahi, Hill, Hunt, Rigby, Wakefield and A Wedderkopp

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

### 131. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Mark Blaker.

### 132. **Minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee**

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 4 February 2021, circulated with the agenda)

**Resolved** that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 4 February 2021 be confirmed as a correct record with a minor amendment to a spelling error on the list of participations.

Proposed by Councillor Morgan, seconded by Councillor Palmer

The **Motion** was carried.

### 133. **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 D Darch	42/20/0042	A member of the Taunton Area Cycling Campaign.	Personal	Spoke and Voted

		Discretion not fettered.		
Cllr R Habgood	42/20/0042 42/20/0056	Declared that he knew to a member of the public who sent in representation on this application. A member of the Taunton Area Cycling Campaign. Discretion not fettered.	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr A Sully	42/20/0056	Declared that he knew to a member of the public who sent in representation on this application.	Personal	Spoke and Voted

134. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
42/20/0042	A Stainthorpe B Lestrangle B Lawrence C Briggs H Starsmeare H Jaeschke J Stainthorpe J Warren J Foster R Hartland J Rasell M Yeo Mr & Mrs Sullivan-Russell Mr & Mrs Bull Mr & Mrs Garrod Mr Roberts J Briggs P Briggs Friends of Galmington Stream R Jaeschke R Walsh	All Local Residents	Objecting

	S Warren S Reekie S Walsh T Lestrangle V Dawson S Smith Ms Clements Trull PC		
	Lawrence Turner	Consortium	In favour
	Cllr Nicholls	Ward Members	Objecting
	Cllr Wakefield		
	Cllr Farbahi		
	Cllr Hunt		
	Cllr A Wedderkopp		
	Cllr Martin Hill		
42/20/0031	C Warburton Mr Sweetland Trull PC	All Local Residents	Objecting
	Vistry and LiveWest	Developers	In favour
42/20/0056	C Burton M Sweetland M Oliver Mr & Mrs Grant Mr Salter Ms Catchpole Trull PC	All Local Residents	Objecting
	Vistry & LiveWest Cllr Farbahi	Developer Ward Member	In favour Objecting

135. **42/20/0042**

**Erection of foul pumping station, water booster station and gas pressure reducing station to serve the permitted 2000 dwellings under outline application 42/14/0069 on land at Comeytrowe/Trull**

**Comments by members of the public included;**

- The wet well proposed was not compliant with current Design and Construction Guidance;
- Concerns that no foul water equipment could be completely sealed;
- Mixing gas and sewage was a known safety risk;
- Concerns with the location of the pumping station. The entire facility should be moved further south with an access off the spine road;
- What assessment has been made of the transport difficulties of bringing a generator to the site on a narrow lane which can be busy and flood on occasions should this facility fail;
- Concerns with how the storage tank operates;
- What preventions were there in preventing overflow from entering Galmington Stream and then the river;
- Concerns that there were no details of the downstream piping;
- Concerns with the storage capacity of the existing sewers;
- Concerns that no environmental impact or noise, vibration or environmental assessment for the application has been carried out;
- Concerns with odours;
- Concerns with the cycleway being so close to the site;
- Concerns with heavy traffic entering and leaving the site;
- Concerns with the increase of vermin on the site;
- No consideration for existing residents has been taken;
- Concerns that this was a premature application;
- Concerns with the impact on the wildlife on the Galmington Stream and the River Tone due to increased risk of flooding and pollution;
- A further opening to allow vehicular access would be needed to protect emerging cyclists and pedestrians;
- Concerns with hours of operation, use of equipment, lights and nuisance factors;
- Can the developer and the planning authority confirm that the proposal would not exacerbate the existing high levels of phosphate pollution in the River Tone, its tributaries and Somerset Levels;
- How did this proposal fit with Somerset West & Taunton's vision as a Garden Town;
- Concerns that the application did not satisfy DM1 and DM5 of the Core Policy requirements;
- A great deal of work had been undertaken in partnership with SWT and County Officers to help bring forward the new urban extension;
- The vast majority of utilities infrastructure would be installed below ground. Above ground the only visible plant and equipment was contained within standard green kiosks, with water booster station and foul pumping station enclosed within a palisade fencing compound. Additional landscaping including the planning of hedging and trees to screen the kiosks and vehicle hard standing;
- There was no flood risk associated with this development, confirmed by the consultees responses from the Environmental Agency and Lead Flood Authority;
- There was no risk of pollution to the Galmington Stream, confirmed by Wessex Water in their consultees response to SWT;

- There would be no unacceptable noise, odour or health and safety issues arising from the installation of the pumping station;
- The application proposed would include a standard pumping station that meets all the requirements of the National Guidance and had a minimum distance of 18 metres to the nearest residential property ensuring that residents were unaffected by odour, noise and vibration;
- No impacts on residential amenity;
- The proposed utilities were an important and timely element of infrastructure that was required to deliver the Council's urban extension at South West Taunton;

**Comments by Members included:**

- Concerns that the developers were not taking the residents' concerns seriously;
- Concerns with the impacts on the wildlife and noise vibration all year around;
- Concerns that the developers choose the cheapest location for the pumping station;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood.

- Concerns with road safety on the site;
- Flooding concerns;
- Concerns with harm to nearby properties;
- Bat survey and light condition was required for this application;
- Concerns with the cumulative impact of the development on nearby residents;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood.

- Concerns with the lack of consultation from the developers with residents;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood.

Councillor Morgan proposed and Councillor Habgood seconded a motion for Conditional approval **APPROVED** as per Officer Recommendation with an additional Condition 10 for noise emissions and amendment to Condition 01 as per update sheet;

The motion was carried.

136. **42/20/0031**

**Application for approval of Reserved Matters in respect of appearance, landscape, layout and scale, following outline application 42/14/0069, for Phase H1A for the erection for 76 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 on land at Comeytrove/Trull**

**Comments by members of the public included;**

- A Habitat Regulations Assessment should be completed before this development goes ahead;
- Concerns with the Phosphate Mitigation Strategy;
- The scheme could not be implemented without major fundamental amendment to the Outline Permission. This should be done through a new application;
- Concerns on how the interim position of site fencing was to be addressed;
- This development will be the gateway to Taunton from the A38 so it is important to get this right;
- Concerns with the density of the properties on the site;
- The placemaking specialist objects to this proposal as the site was bland, indistinctive and monotonous;
- The development makes a mockery of the Garden Town Status;
- The site would deliver new and affordable homes that Taunton needed to help young people to get on the housing ladder;
- Public consultation had been undertaken over the years with local people, businesses, schools, stakeholders, officers and Central Government to help prepare a Masterplan for this site;
- Many of the issues raised by local people have already been addresses and approved by the Planning Committee in the Outline Permission and the obligations contained within the S106 agreement;
- The application was in full accordance with the approved Outline Planning Permission and the approved Design Guide for the site;
- The proposal had not received any technical objections from any consultees;
- The application was supported by a comprehensive and detailed Phosphate Mitigation Strategy for the site;
- 35% of the development would be developed as affordable homes;

**Comments by Members included;**

At this point in the meeting an extension of 30 minutes was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood. Councillor Morgan left the meeting;

- Concerns that the standard of homes was not high enough for the gateway frontage to Taunton;
- Happy with the affordable housing aspect of the development;
- Pleased with the external finish of the homes;
- Concerns with the fallow land and the right of way being fenced off;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood. Councillor Weston left the meeting.

Councillor Habgood proposed and Councillor Sully seconded a motion for Conditional approval to be **APPROVED** as per Officer Recommendation with Condition 5 rewritten and Condition 6 amended as per update sheet;

The motion was carried.

137. **42/20/0056**

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood.

**Approval of Reserved Matters in respect of the appearance, landscape, layout and scale, pursuant to planning permission reference (42/14/0069) for the erection of 64 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 Conditions 7,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21, and 23 at Phase H1C on land at Comeytrove/Trull**

**Comments from members of the public included;**

- The application should be deferred to allow the applicant to provide more Public Open Space and Fallow Land as much of what is being promoted as Public Open Space consists of water retaining attenuation basins;
- Concerns that the Local Equipped Area for Plan (LEAP) south of the site was being proposed to be fallowed with public access denied;
- The proposal was contrary to the Core Strategy Policy CP5, inclusive Communities;
- Concerns with the impact of the development on properties on Jeffreys Way. Previous views of the Blackdown Hills were now being replaced with a huge construction site and the peace shattered due to heavy plant noise and the ground rumbling on a daily basis;
- Concerns with the unsightly metal Heres style fencing running directly along the south boundary of the site;
- Concerns with overlooking;
- Concerns that a previous proposed buffer area and hedges to soften the impact of houses on the properties of Jeffreys Way had now gone and the development was up to the properties boundary;
- Could the developers consider adding bungalows for the elderly in the development;
- Concerns with the density of the development;
- The Placemaking Specialist objects to the proposal due to poorly designed bland houses;
- Concerns with the lack of a Phosphate Mitigation Strategy;

- This application was for the second phase of 64 homes which included 33 affordable 'tenure-blind' homes. The application was full in accordance with the approved Outline Planning permission and the Design Guide for the site;
- LiveWest and Vistry proposed to build approximately 52% of the development as affordable homes and significantly exceeds both the requirement of the S106 agreement and the Council's affordable housing policy. This will reduce the number of people requiring accommodation;
- There were no outstanding technical objections to the proposal;
- This development reflects the Taunton's Garden Town Vision;
- The development has gone through numerous rounds of design revisions to reflect the concerns of local residents;

#### **Comments from Members included;**

- The development was a dull, boring unimaginative scheme;
- A Condition for frosted windows and the erection of a fence was needed as soon as possible;
- Concerns with the lack of visitor parking spaces;
- Concerns with the comments regarding the Fallow Land Management Plan;
- Concerns with the impact of existing trees on Jeffreys Way;
- Pleased with the affordable housing aspect;
- Concerns that there were no bungalows proposed on site;

At this point in the meeting a 30 minute extension was proposed by Cllr Coles and seconded by Cllr Habgood.

Councillor Lloyd proposed and Councillor Hill seconded a motion for Conditional approval to be **APPROVED** as per Officer Recommendation with Conditions 01 and 3 amended, Condition 5 rewritten, Condition 6 amended, new Condition 7 as per update sheet. Condition 01 was further amended during the presentation;

The Committee also asked for a Condition for fencing to be erected before the build process started along the boundary of Jeffreys Way and a Condition for obscure glazed windows in the rear roof slopes of Plots 101/102 and 114/115 (2.5 storey units) as follows;

- New Condition 08 - A scheme shall be submitted detailing the timing (as soon as possible) of the erection of the approved fence along the Jeffrey's Way boundary, and thereafter the approved fence should be erected in full in accordance with the agreed scheme;
- New Condition 09 – The roof lights in the rear roof slopes of Plots 101, 102, 114 and 115 serving the ensembles of those respective properties shall be fitted with obscure glazing prior to the first occupation of that respective dwelling;

The motion was carried.



138. **Latest appeals and decisions received**

Latest appeals and decisions noted.

(The Meeting ended at 8.20 pm)