

## SWT Planning Committee - 22 August 2019

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Sue Buller, Marcia Hill, Martin Hill, Mark Lithgow, Craig Palmer, Ray Tully, Brenda Weston, Gwil Wren, Mark Blaker (In place of Loretta Whetlor), Norman Cavill (In place of Roger Habgood) and Caroline Ellis (In place of Simon Nicholls)

Officers: Tracey Meadows, Rebecca Miller, Andrew Penna, Denise Grandfield and Sarah Wilsher

Also Present: Helen Vittery (SCC), Mrs Anne Elder and Councillor Phil Stone

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

### 44. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Aldridge, Habgood, Morgan Nicholls and Whetlor

### 45. Minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1 August 2019 circulated with the agenda)

**Resolved** that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 1 August 2019 be confirmed as a correct record.

Proposed by Councillor Marcia Hill, seconded by Councillor Coles

The **Motion** was carried.

### 46. 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	Minute No.	Description of Interest	Reason	Action Taken
Cllr C Buller	Item 7	Ward Member	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr C Ellis	All Items	Taunton Charter Trustee	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr M Lithgow	Item 5	Wellington Ward Member	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr G Wren	Item 6	Ward Member	Personal	Spoke and Voted
All Councillors	Item 7			

declared that that they had received an email regarding				
---	--	--	--	--

47. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
3/17/19/001	Mr D Quartly	Applicant	Infavour
24/19/0021	Mr Jolliffe	Local Resident	Objecting
	Mrs S Carter	Local Resident	
	Mr J Carter	Local Resident	
	Mr A Meehan	Local Resident	
	Mr T Turner	On behalf of North Curry PC	
	Mr A Lehner	Applicant	Infavour
	Cllr Stone	Ward Member	Objecting

48. **Public Question time**

Questions from Mr Martin Pakes

Application No. 38/19/0119 – Michael Paul House.

The development proposed 25 car parking spaces for 57 flats. The original application was refused in part to the lack of car parking spaces. However the latest application had been approved even though 23 spaces was significantly lower than the Somerset Parking Strategy. The Council's own approved scheme for Coal Orchard envisages 42 flats with no dedicated car parking spaces. Why are there dual standards?

Application 38/19/0075 – former Cattle Market site works

Did the Council proceed with construction works without planning permission?

Response from the Garden Town Coordinator, Andrew Penna was that Mr Pakes would receive a written response to his questions from Officers.

49. **3/17/19/001**

**3/17/19/001 - Change of use from agriculture to agriculture and equestrian with erection of stables at The Barn Huis Moor, Cleeve Road, Huish Champflower, Taunton**

**Comments made by the public included:**

- No comments from Highways;
- There were no problems with access onto and out of the site;
- Concerns with security;
- Horses were checked twice daily;

**Comments made by Members included:**

- Concerns with the mixed usage;
- Concerns with the hard standing and where the muck was going to be stored;
- Concerns that the development was in flood Zone 1;
- Concerns with the Rights of Way;
- Concerns that as the site photos were taken in the summer the site would look differently in the winter;
- This development would not look out of place in a rural setting;

Councillor Mark Hill proposed and Councillor Lithgow seconded a motion that the application be **APPROVED**

The **Motion** was carried

50. **18/19/0012**

**18/19/0012 Erection of balcony to side of Mil House, Halse Road, Halse**

**Comments made by members included;**

- This balcony would enhance the building;
- As the development was in a conservation area down lighting on the balcony was needed;
- Out of keeping with the area;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Marcia Hill seconded a motion that the application be **APPROVED**

The **Motion** was carried

51. **24/19/0021**

**24/19/0021 Erection of bungalow on land to rear of 16 Town Farm, North Curry (resubmission of application 24/18/0012)**

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

- Concerns that the development was on a blind road with no pedestrian footpath or visibility splay;
- Concerns with the large farming vehicles using the narrow road daily;
- The 30mph limit on this road was not acceptable for the amount of traffic;
- Concerns that this development would set a precedent for future developments;
- The development was unsuitable and not necessary for the village;
- This was a back land development;
- This development went against Policies, EMDI, permanent loss of historic orchard area, CP8 and DM1D, back land development and detrimental to the character of the area;
- 16 Town Farm and the community had access to this land for the last 15 years;
- Concerns with Highway comments;
- Orchard listed on Traditional Orchard Habitat Inventory and had been identified as a habitat of principle importance;
- 7 Trees were felled before a TPO was issued;
- Concerns that the remaining 8 trees were damaged by ring barking;
- The planting of new trees on the other side of the village was not a substitute for the loss of this orchard;
- The site was of ecological value and not worth the sacrifice of one single bungalow;
- The newly erected fence was not erected when Highways made their observations;
- Concerns with parking on the Public Highway;
- Knapp Lane was a hazard to road users;
- The area was part of a S106 to act as a green buffer between the new Town Farm development;
- Concerns that residents had not been consulted;
- Concerns that there was only a standard response from Highways;
- The County Archaeologist had no objection to this application;
- SWT Tree Officer stated that no trees were worthy of protection on the site;
- Highways stand by original conclusion that they did not have any concerns with this development;
- Development has separate access;
- The Wildlife survey was still ongoing;
- Application was fully compliant within the settlement limit in a sustainable village;
- The area was under private license for 15 Town Farm;
- Previous refusal reasons had been fully addressed;

#### **Comments made by members included;**

- Concerns with traffic issues;
- Concerns with the loss of an historic orchard;
- North Curry had had a vast amount of development, why destroy this parcel of green land for a bungalow;

- The residents and PC were against this application;
- This piece of land needs to be accessible to the public;
- Concerns with harm to the Community;
- Biodiversity issues;
- Access issues;
- Policy ENV1, the value to local people should count;
- Highway concerns and the impact on cyclists;
- NPPF Para 109, protecting natural landscapes, we should be seeking to positively promote this;
- The Orchards were a recognised habitat and of recognised value;
- Over development of the site;
- Climate change was real, we needed to keep the trees onsite;

Councillor Buller proposed and Councillor Marcia Hill seconded a motion that the application to be **REFUSED**

### **Reason**

The applicant's preliminary ecology report failed to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on biodiversity, contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks minimisation of impacts on biodiversity and promotion of net gains for biodiversity. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to the NPPF and Policy ENV1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

52. **42/19/0021**

**42/19/0021 Erection of a two storey extension and a single storey extension to the sides of 4 The Paddock, Honiton road, Trull**

### **Comments made by members included;**

- Concerns with the size of the garage;
- Impact on neighbours;

Councillor Marcia Hill proposed and Councillor Lithgow seconded a motion that the application be **APPROVED**

The **Motion** was carried

53. **Latest appeals and decisions received**

### **Latest appeals and decisions received**

Noted that four appeals and five decisions had been received

(The Meeting ended at 3.45 pm)