### **SWT Planning Committee - 13 October 2022**

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Marcia Hill, Ian Aldridge, Roger Habgood, John Hassall, Mark Lithgow, Craig Palmer, Vivienne Stock-Williams, Ray Tully,

Brenda Weston, and Gwil Wren

Officers: Alison Blom-Cooper, Martin Evans (Shape Legal Partnership), Simon Fox,

Denise Todd, Briony Waterman, Gareth Clifford and Tracey Meadows

Also

Councillors Farbahi, Johnson and Kravis

Present:

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

### 50. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Firmin, Griffiths and Whetlor

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

(Minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 15 September (to follow)

#### 52. **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	Description of Interest	Reason	Action Taken
Cllr M Blaker	Ward Member for application 3/05/22/006. Discretion 'not fettered'	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr S Coles	SCC & Taunton Charter Trustee	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr R Habgood	Is acquainted with one of the speakers for application 42/22/0043	Personal	Spoke and Voted

Cllr C Palmer	Minehead, acquainted with two of the objectors from application No. 49/21/0030. Discretion 'not fettered'	Personal	Abstained
---------------	--	----------	-----------

### 53. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance/Attendance
3/05/22/006	A Potter	Local resident	Objecting -in person
	C Magill	Local resident	Objecting- in person
	M Wilson	Applicant	In favour-Statement read
			out
	Cllr Kravis	Ward Member	Objecting –in person
49/21/0030	Dr & Mr	Local resident	In favour- statement read
	Arthurs		out
	P Pepperell	Local Vet	In favour- statement read out
	Mr Orton	Local resident	In favour- statement read
	IVII OITOIT	Local resident	out
	E Jones	Local resident	In favour-statement read
			out
	C Farrington	Local resident	In favour-statement read
			out
	R Excell	Local resident	Objection-statement read
			out
	J Pinn	Local resident	Objection- in person
	A Radcliff	Local resident	Objection-statement read
			out
	Mr Cherry	Applicant	In favour-statement read
	Olla Mara a a ll	Manal Manala an	out
	Cllr Mansell	Ward Member	Objection-statement read out
46/22/0005	J Halton	Planning	In favour- in person
		Consultant.	рогоси
		Tetra Tech	
		Planning	
42/22/0043	A & J	Local resident	Objection-statement read
	Stainthorpe		out
	T Smith		Objection-statement read
			out
	T Dean	Parish Council	Objection-statement read
	I. T	D D' '	out
	L Turner	Boyer Planning	In favour-via Zoom
	Cllr Johnson	Ward Member	Objection-in person
16/22/0003	Cllr Farbahi	Ward Member Local resident	Objection-in person
10/22/0003	R Crocker R Crocker	Local resident	Objection- in person Objection-in person
	A Crocker	Local resident	Objection (read out by
	A CIUCKEI	Local resident	Mr Wilsdon)
			IVII VVIISUUII)

F Swatton		Objection (read out by
r Swallon		Mr Wilsdon)
N Foster	Applicant	In favour-in person
T Hiscock	Parish Council	Statement read out

54. 3/05/22/006 - Variation of Condition No. 02 (approved plans) of permission 3/05/20/004 to change the final height of the building as updated on drawings The Paddock, Carhampton Road, Blue Anchor

# Comments/statement from members of the public included; (summarised)

- Concerns with the height of the ridge;
- Concerns with the loss of privacy on near neighbours;
- Concerns with the dumping of rubble hardcore, topsoil and turf into the rear garden of the paddock without provisions being made of a retaining wall or drainage;
- Previous bungalow on the site never overlooked properties;
- This development would set a precedent to other developers;
- A site visit was needed to assess the site:
- The area of the Paddock to the west of the Paddock has been for a longtime poor amenity land separate to the main garden.
- The recent removal of significant vegetation including hedges and shrubs inside the boundary of Four Winds, does little to mitigate any view they now have of the house;
- In terms of Haze Lea, the existing position of an outbuilding and hedges provides adequate screening. On the other boundary there is a permitted path running down the side and rear allowing fairly unrestricted views across all properties;
- Crucially the views over either property at ground floor level from inside remain unchanged since when the site was purchased in April;
- The owners of Four Winds were asked what they would like to see in place of the fence and vine currently in situ. The offer of hedging was declined;
- The project was fit for modern living and eco friendly;
- The original dwelling had fallen into disrepair and the site overdeveloped with many structures added over time including a boat house on the boundary of Haze Lee with concrete double garages in between;
- The neighbours have benefitted from recent improvement of the site;
- The dwelling is basically the same as previously approved, save for the exception that there is a benign difference in height that falls below the ridgeline of the former building;
- Concerns with the impact on the amenity area in the garden;
- Previous overlooking from the bungalow was from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. This
  development was significantly higher and made a big difference;
- Conditions needed for loss of privacy and loss of amenity needed;

### **Comments/statements made by Members included;** (summarised)

- Concerns with the increased ridge height of the building;
- Concerns with the floor level difference;
- Concerns with overlooking;
- Concerns that this was a retrospective application;
- Concerns with the reasons submitted for raising of the sewer levels as there was already a bungalow on site;
- Concerns with the loss of privacy and the heights of the windows;
- The development was lower than the original building so cannot see any harm;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Lithgow seconded a motion for the application to be **GRANTED** subject to conditions, with an amendment to read within paragraph 2.1 that the height of the building is 450mm, this should read 550mm as per update sheet.

The motion was carried.

# 55. **49/21/0030 - SIMONS HOLT FARM RETAINED LAND, WHITEFILED, WIVELISCOMBE, TA4 2UU (deferred from 23 June 2022)**

# Comments/statements from members of the public included; (summarised)

- No perceptible odours from calves;
- Calves have been heard less than 5 times over a period of 30 months;
- No perceptible increase in flying insects had been observed;
- The housing conditions were of a high standard and the welfare of all the animals to be excellent:
- The erection of a new agricultural building would allow for optimal calf health, lower stock density levels, better isolation should any disease outbreak occur, longer rest periods for the building between batches of calves, good management number with no significant noise or odours;
- Sheep had been previously grazed on and off this field for the last tow years along with cutting the field for silage;
- Manure from the building was used on arable crops as part of a crop nutrient plan to help reduce artificial fertiliser use. Manure helped improve soil organic matter and aids water retention reducing run off;
- Agricultural business is an important part of the rural economy in the Wiveliscombe area and should be supported;
- Concerns that no calves had been on the land in question for at least 30 years plus;
- Concerns that the applicant installed a handful of calves in temporary shelters on the field in question following the last committee meeting:
- Concerns with moving livestock around;
- Concerns that no noise assessment had been provided for this location;

- There has been an increase in noise from this location with only a small handful of calves in residence particularly when the site is visited;
- The main field has been used for cropping with no livestock present whilst this type of farming was undertaken;
- Suitable landscaping should be required along the building sides that are not alongside current hedging;
- Concerns with noise and smell from the development;
- Concerns with the calves left overnight with no herdsman present on site;
- Concerns with the increase of traffic movement;
- All calves were purchased from a single dairy farm and rear them through the milk feeding stage. Calves are then sold to other framers to graze and grow on;
- The agricultural building was to improve facilities for the calves to better facilitate the all-in-all calf rearing system and optimise health;
- Small groups of calves on separate sites provides better biosecurity and meets the Animal Plan and Health Agency's requirement for isolation facilities:
- No impact on local residents;
- Wiveliscombe Town Council have visited the site and stated that there
  were no concerns regarding the location of the barn;
- This development was supported by the Parish Council;
- No objections relating to noise has been commented on by the EHO;
- The application has been assessed by the Council as phosphate neutral;
- Calf movement records have been submitted to the Council;
- There appears to be no evidence from the applicant on the herd size previously at the site of the planning application;
- Concerns regarding lack of mitigation for the increase in herd size and for the potential of this application to cause noise and odour disturbance to local residents;
- This development will allow an increase in herd size on the site, and so the application should be subject to a proper Habitats Regulations Assessment;

### Comments/statements from Members included;

- Summarised)
  - This was a working farm in a farming community and the farmer had a right to make a living;
  - Calves only make a noise when they are first removed from their mothers;
  - The straw was mitigating any phosphate issues;
  - We need to keep with new agricultural practices;
  - Concerns with the lack of detail regarding manure or feed storage on site;
  - Residents have a right to continuing tranquillity where possible when living in the open rural communities;
  - Concerns with the criteria for phosphate load on the site;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Tully seconded a motion for planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions set out in the report

to Planning Committee dated 23 June 2022 and an additional condition to limit the total number of animals on the site:

The motion was carried.

56. 46/22/0005 - Erection of 1 No. 3 bed detached house with garage and formation of access in the garden to the side of Llantarnam, Chelston Nurseries, Nursery Lane, Chelston (resubmission of 46/20/0023)

Comments/statements from members of the public included; (summarised)

- The site was a small visually contained infill plot which will deliver a sustainable and well-designed three-bedroom home;
- There were seven letters of support from neighbouring properties;
- The Parish Council supported this application;
- No objections had been received on the application;
- The site was a sustainable location for a single dwelling with services only 400 metres from services and facilities at West Park Business Park which include a petrol filling station which sold groceries and day-to-day essentials, various cafes, a nursery and various employment sites;
- There was an established pedestrian route that exists along the verge which is kept closely mown at all times of the year and provides opportunities for access to services on foot;
- The owners of the path have stated that this will be maintained for the benefit of their own site and for local residents who wish to access West Park:
- Charging point to be included in the development;

# **Comments/statements from Members included;** (summarised)

- This was a house in the middle of the countryside with no facilities and the proposed footpath was just a grass verge that the neighbour cut;
- The application goes against Policies;

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

The motion was carried.

57. 42/22/0043- Variation of Condition No. 02 (approved plans), for the inclusion of a turning head at the entrance of the approved pumping station compound, of application 42/20/0042 at Orchard Grove New Community, Comeytrowe Rise, Taunton

Comments/statements from members of the public included; (summarised)

- Concerns that this turning head was poorly planned and an unsafe space for pedestrians and cyclists;
- The turning head should be located elsewhere for safety reasons;
- The cycle route needs amending to come around the north west side of the Honeysuckle house to join the park on the other side;
- Walkers and cyclists safety would be compromise if this application was approved;
- The application sought to make some minor amendments to the vehicular entrance to the compound area and did not affect the operation or design of the permitted pumping station, water booster station or gas pressure reducing station facilities;
- The purpose of this Section 73 application is to vary the approved plans to allow for a larger vehicular turning head off Comeytrowe Lane at the entrance to the Pumping Station. These amendments have been included at the request of the County Council; and its inclusion will enable vehicles sufficient space to manoeuvre and turn around at the end of Comeytrowe Lane once the road is closed to through traffic;
- Since approval in 2021, further improvements to the site wide cycleway have also been reque4sted to meet the County's latest guidance on cycleway specifications. For completeness, we have therefore identified the latest cycleway details on the revised pumping station compound drawings for which approval is sought. The updated cycleway proposals are very much a betterment for cyclists;
- The pumping station equipment and facilities remain unaltered with the increase of the perimeter of the compound enclosure to meet the very latest 'Design and Construction guidance'. The Gas Governor has also been rotated in orientation to better suit the proposed new width of the vehicle turning head and footway/cycleway;
- The proposal was detrimental to existing residents;
- Concerns with vehicles reversing over a cycle walkway;
- Further audits needed before the application is decided;
- The turning point needed to be sited elsewhere for the safety of residents and children using this route;
- Concerns with flooding in the area:
- The Parish Councils have registered their objections to the current proposals;
- The application needs to be deferred for the developers to come up with a safer option;

At this point in the meeting (4:20pm) an extension of 30 minutes was proposed and seconded.

## **Comments/statements from Members included:** (summarised)

- Concerns with the safety of the tactile part on the cycleway/walkway;
- This was an improvement and safer than the current lane;

- The developers have a blank canvas, so this is a perfect opportunity to reroute the cycleway;
- Concerns with the multi-use cross roads;
- Concerns with the loss of trees in the development;
- Alternative sites need to be considered;
- Cycle route needs re-routing with the turning head left in place;
- Concerns with the safety of the staggered barriers to slow cyclists down before they reach the bottom due to the gradient drop between the top of the site and the bottom of the road;
- The path needed to be generous to accommodate both cyclists and walkers. It also needs to be kept free from hedgerows/weeds;
- Concerns with the area being used for parking for leisure purposes;
- Google Maps would need to be informed that the road would be closed for satellite navigation systems;
- Accessibility needs needed to be met so that people using trikes ect can get through the gates;
- This application needs to be deferred for a site visit;

At this point in the meeting (4.50pm) the final 30-minute extension of time was proposed and seconded.

Councillor Coles proposed and Councillor Habgood seconded a motion for the application to be **DEFERRED** for a site visit.

The motion was carried.

At 4:55pm Councillor Mark Lithgow left the meeting.

58. 16/22/0003 - Installation of solar panels, extension of patio area and implementation of water treatment plant at Warrs Farm, Glastonbury Road, Durston (retention of part works already undertaken) (resubmission of 16/22/0002)

Proposed and seconded that as this application was in progress before the final 30-minute extension expired that it would be determined.

Comments/statements from members of the public included; (summarised)

- This was a retrospective planning application;
- Concerns with noise and acoustic interference;
- Concerns with the applicant using neighbouring private access route;
- Concerns with the outflow to the local culvert;
- Conditions were needed for the new foul treatment plants specifically to Warrs farmhouse and the new annexe;
- A vehicular and access parking plan seeds submitting before approval of this application;
- Permitted development rights should be removed for the site;

- No work on the property had commenced until planning permission had been approved;
- Concerns from neighbours regarding connecting the barn to the current 24
  year old sewage treatment plant had been listened to and offers to share
  the cost to replace the current system had been refused;
- The position of the solar panels were to minimise the impact on the countryside view and would be shielded by hedgerows;
- Confirmation needed to confirm that Warrs farmhouse and the new annexe would be permanently disconnected from the EA licensed shared Kargester installed in 1996/7;
- The plant room was intrinsic to the solar panels installation and creation of various EV charging points location was deemed critical as believed to be located on the restricted shared access and should not hinder forward gear movement of traffic using that;
- Concerns had been raised with regard to the potential electromagnetic noise emanating from the 'plant room' which could cause interference with electrical items in adjoining properties including but not solely broadband, telephones, TV and any other devices functionality;

## **Comments/statements from Members included**; (summarised)

- Confirmation sought on whether the water treatment plant was governed by the Environmental Agency;
- Concerns raised relating to the solar panels creating radio noise would depend on the size and the design of the system;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor seconded a motion that permission be **GRANTED** subject to Conditions as per Officer recommendation.

The motion was carried.

59. 38/21/0463 - Demolition of public house and garages and erection of 8 No. zero carbon dwellings for council owned affordable accommodation with formation of landscaping and access at The Oxford Inn, Outer Circle, Taunton

This application will be heard at the next planning meeting on the 10 November.

#### 60. Latest appeals and decisions received

The latest appeals and decisions will be heard at the next meeting on the 10 November.

(The Meeting ended at 5.45 pm)