

SWT Planning Committee - 23 June 2022

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Marcia Hill, Mark Blaker, Norman Cavill, Steve Griffiths, John Hassall, Mark Lithgow, Craig Palmer, Vivienne Stock-Williams, Ray Tully, Brenda Weston and Loretta Whetlor

Officers: Alison Blom-Cooper, Martin Evans (Shape Legal Partnership) Briony Waterman, Michael Hicks, Rebecca Staddon and Tracey Meadows

Also Present: Councillor Mansell

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

11. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Aldridge, Firmin, Habgood, Wheatley and Wren.

12. Minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 26 May 22 to be approved at the next meeting).

13. 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 M Blaker	49/21/0030	Ward Member. Spoke to applicant on previous application. Avoided any communication in the community. Discretion 'not fettered'.	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr N Cavill	All Items 48/20/0050	SCC & West Monkton. Contacted by	Personal Personal	Spoke and Voted

		Agent for the past two years. Discretion 'not fettered'.		
Cllr S Coles	All Items	SCC & Taunton Charter Trustee	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr Mrs Hill	All Items	Taunton Charter Trustee	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr M Lithgow	All Items	Wellington	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr C Palmer	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr R Tully	All Items	West Monkton	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr B Weston	All Items	Taunton Charter Trustee	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr L Whetlor	All Items	Watchet	Personal	Spoke and Voted

14. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
48/20/0050	Mrs J Kemp	Senior Planning Manager – LNT Construction Ltd	In favour
49/21/0030	J Pinn A Radcliff T Cherry Cllr Mansell	Local resident Local resident Applicant Ward Member	Objecting Objecting In favour Objecting

15. **48/20/0050 - Erection of a 66 bedroom care home (Class C2) with associated parking, access and landscaping at Heathfield Industrial Park, Hardys Road, Bathpool, HEATHFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK, HARDYS ROAD, BATHPOOL, TAUNTON**

Comments from Members of the public included;
(summarised)

- The development was in keeping with the Local Plan and very attractive in design;
- The development would bring local employment opportunities and would allow the ageing community to remain local in their later years;
- No reason to warrant refusal of this development;
- The development would look more attractive than the 4 industrial units in a prime corner position already on site;
- The Council did not yet have a Phosphate Mitigation strategy in place so Planning permission should be approved;
- There was extant planning permission on the site already for more steel clad work units;

- The applicants had attended meetings with the Quality Review Panel for design and layout;
- The development was fully supported by residents and the Parish Council and Consultees over the steel units;
- Public Art would have been provided as part of our scheme had we been informed that this was requested as part of our application;
- The care home would be energy efficient from onsite renewable resources;
- The site was a windfall site with the 66 beds adding to the 5-year land supply;
- Cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points would be onsite as part of the sustainable Travel Plan;

Comments from Members included;
(summarised)

- No concerns with the care home being in this location;
- Concerns with the look of the building as per QRP findings;
- Lack of public art;
- Concerns with the lack of a Phosphate Mitigation Strategy;
- Concerns with the lack of sunlight in some of the north and east facing rooms;
- Noise concerns from the industrial units and the nearby busy roundabout;
- Traffic concerns with visitors needing to travel to this out of town site;
- Concerns with the impact on Hardys Road due to inadequate parking on site;
- Concerns with the design issues due to lack of communal and open space;
- The development provided employment and would benefit the area;
- The developer has listened to the residents and PC to accommodate the changes requested;
- Local residents would like this development to go through as opposed to the steel clad work units and the noise that it produced;
- Sports pitches, open spaces and shops would be provided in the near future providing great benefits to the local residents within walking distance of this site;
- The care home was an improvement on the existing industrial units;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor seconded a motion for the application to be REFUSED as per Officer recommendation.

The motion was carried.

16. **49/21/0030 - Erection of an agricultural building for the rearing of calves on Simons Holt Farm retained land, Whitefield, Wiveliscombe, SIMONS HOLT FARM RETAINED LAND, WHITEFILED, WIVELISCOMBE, TA4 2UU**

Comments from members of the Public included;

(summarised)

- The application was for a stand-alone barn for the intensive raising of 97 calves in cramped conditions for veal production. Therefore, the operation to undertake this operation in a remote field at an unsupervised location miles away from any available farm staff should not be allowed to proceed;
- Concerns with the negative impact of this development with regards to nearby residents complaining about the smell of ammonia and the noise of the calves bawling in distress all night;
- The site at Langley Marsh was an area of unspoilt pasture with no other working farms in the area;
- There was plenty of room for another barn on the applicants existing site with farm workers already in residence if another site was required;
- Concerns with the lack of a Phosphate Mitigation Strategy;
- Concerns that the application was incomplete due to lack of information regarding no dwelling associated on the site for an essential worker;
- Concerns with a mail drop to the residents of Langley Marsh regarding misinformation regarding the application;
- The proposed position of the agricultural building was a considerable distance from residential properties in the area and the topography of the landscape meant that it would be well screened from the local village and hamlets;
- Our farming practices met with all animal welfare and environmental legislation;
- Wiveliscombe was an agricultural area and agriculture was an important part of its economy;
- The business generated employment and we traded with many local farms and businesses;
- The proposed agricultural building was essential to the security and sustainability of the business model;

Comments from Members included;

(summarised)

- Concerns with the lack of a noise assessment in the report and the impact on the neighbourhood;
- Concerns with the lack of a Phosphate Mitigation Strategy;
- Concerns with the lack of information regarding the numbers of animals that will be housed in the cattle shed;
- Concerns on how the slurry on site will be contained and controlled;
- A worker was needed to be on site to prevent noise;
- Slurry will be minimal due to straw bedding;
- Calves will bawl for a few days when they leave their mother. This will cease once they find fresh grass;
- The shed roof would be gapped to dissipate noise in all directions. Unfortunately, the noise of animals travels in the quiet of the countryside;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Weston seconded a motion that the application be DEFERRED for the following reasons;

1. A noise assessment;
2. Further clarification on the phosphates issue;
3. Whether we can impose a limit on the number of livestock in the building via a condition;
4. How slurry was going to be dealt with;

The motion was carried.

17. **Access to information - Exclusion of Press and Public**

During discussion of the following item it may be necessary to pass the following resolution to exclude the press and public having reflected on Article 13 13.02(e) (a presumption in favour of openness) of the Constitution. This decision may be required because consideration of this matter in public may disclose information falling within one of the descriptions of exempt information in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972. The Planning Committee will need to decide whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption, outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Recommend that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the next item of business on the ground that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 respectively of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the authority holding that information).

18. **Confidential report**

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Weston seconded a motion for approval of the Confidential report as per Officer Recommendation.

The motion was carried

19. **Confidential report**

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Weston seconded a motion for approval of the Confidential report as per Officer Recommendation.

The motion was carried.

(The Meeting ended at 3.30 pm)