

SWT Planning Committee - 27 March 2023

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Marcia Hill, Ian Aldridge, Steve Griffiths, Roger Habgood, John Hassall, Mark Lithgow, Vivienne Stock-Williams, Ray Tully, Brenda Weston, Keith Wheatley, Loretta Whetlor and Gwil Wren

Officers: Alison Blom-Cooper, Roy Pinney, Sarah Stevens, Briony Waterman, Denise Tod, Russell Williams, and Tracey Meadows

(The meeting commenced at 10.00 am)

123. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Palmer

124. 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 I Aldridge	All Items	Williton	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr S Coles	All Items	SCC, Taunton Charter Trustee & Shadow Taunton Town	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr S Griffiths	Item 6	Building used as campaign site for election	Personal/pecuniary	Spoke did not vote
Cllr R Habgood	Item 5	Ward Member	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr Mrs Hill	All Items	Taunton Charter Trustee & Shadow Taunton Town	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr M Lithgow	Item 7	Application came before Wellington TC. Discretion not	Personal	Spoke and Voted

		fettered.		
Cllr R Tully	All Items	West Monkton	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr B Weston	All Items	Taunton Charter Trustee & Shadow Taunton Town	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr K Wheatley	All Items	Wellington	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr L Whetlor	Items 6 & 9	Applicant know for item 6. Discussions on the item but did not fetter discretion.	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr G Wren	All Items	SCC & Clerk to Milverton PC	Personal	Spoke and Voted

125. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
TPO	Ms S Smith	Neighbour	Objection
3/26/22/013	Ian Duncan	Old Cleeve PC	Objection
43/21/0061	Ms A Boyd Mr C Hansard Mr D Mitchell Cllr J Lloyd	Local resident Local resident Applicant Wellington ward	Objection Objection In favour Objection
46/22/0011	Mr J Venton	Agent	In favour
3/26/21/002	Ian Duncan Matt Tucker	Old Cleeve PC Agent	Objection In favour

126. **TPO West Buckland No.2 (SWT69)**

comments made by members of the public included:
(summarised)

- There is no risk to the trees. The only trees that have been removed in the past 50 years were removed because damaged or dangerous;
- The TPO was applied without the owner's permission, and without anyone asking for her permission;
- Concerns with the hedge obstructing the gateway;

Comments made by Members included:
(summarised)

- Concerns that if we were to start putting TPO's on farmers land we would get a lot of these going forward;
- Concerns with the lack of comments from the Landscape Officer;

- Concerns with the blocked gate due to the hedgerow;
- TPO's were needed to allow mature trees to grow in the countryside;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Habgood seconded a motion that the Tree Preservation Order is confirmed but modified slightly with regards to G4.

The motion was carried.

127. **3/26/22/013 - Installation of solar panels on main building and static caravans along with ground mounted solar panels in the north-western garden area. Anchors Drop, (The Blue Anchor) Blue Anchor, TA24 6JP**

Comments from members of the public included:

(summarised)

- Old Cleeve PC support the principle of solar panels, but they need to be of a scale that is appropriate to the location;
- The site is in a highly prominent location between the cliff edge and the B3191 Road;
- Concerns with the visibility of the ground mounted panels;

Comments from Members included:

(summarised)

- Concerns with the number of panels on the caravans for a short life span;
- Concerns with the ground mounted panels on unstable ground;
- Concerns with the visual landscape impact;
- Concerns that there was no time limit condition on the solar panels;
- The development conflicts with Policies CC3 and CC4 of the West Somerset Local Plan to 2032;

Councillor Habgood proposed, and Councillor Aldridge seconded a motion for the application to be **REFUSED** –

Reasons (1) The site is located within an area identified as a coastal change management area and a coastal zone which is vulnerable to rapid coastal erosion and where development will only be permitted where a coastal location is essential, and which cannot be located elsewhere. The proposed ground mounted solar panels do not constitute tourism related development nor has any evidence been put forward to indicate that the scale of the proposed development is essential to support tourism related development on this site. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with Policies CC3 and CC4 of the West Somerset Local Plan to 2032.

The motion was carried.

At this point in the meeting a 10 minute break was proposed;

128. **43/21/0061 - Application for Outline Planning, with all matters reserved, for**

the erection of 3 No. dwellings on land to the west of Haymans Mill, Westford, Wellington as amended by agents email of 15th September 2021 "Application for Outline Planning, with all matters reserved, for the erection of 2 No. dwellings on land to the west of Haymans Mill, Westford, Wellington"

Comments from members of the public included;
(summarised)

- Concerns that no comments had been received from the Heritage Officer;
- Concerns with the steep embankment;
- A full structural and environment survey was needed;
- Concerns with the loss of habitat in the area;
- Development not supported by new infrastructure;
- Highway concerns;
- Concerns that this was not a sustainable development;
- Concerns with the insufficient visibility splay;
- Incongruous development;
- The Clay bund at the leet was fragile;
- The development would impact the Rockwell residents;
- The Mill was not a listed building;
- No objections from Highways;
- The Dye ponds on the site are to be used for Phosphate Mitigation purposes only;
- The land was of historic value;
- Concerns with the blind corner and lack of pavements;
- Flood risk concerns;
- Concerns with the lack of a Heritage impact statement;

Comments from Members included;
(summarised)

- Concerns with the lack of comments from the Highways Department;
- Concerns with the lack of a Heritage report for the Mill Pond and Leet;
- Concerns with the typography of the site;
- Concerns with the access road;
- Highway concerns with children walking to school from the site with no pavement;
- The site was not sustainable;
- Impact concerns with the traffic on an already busy road;
- No planning reasons to refuse this application;

Councillor Hill proposed, and Councillor Coles seconded a motion that permission be **GRANTED** subject to Conditions and a Legal Agreement to secure the phosphate mitigation measures;

The motion was carried.

129. **46/22/0011 - Demolition of bungalow and erection of 1 no dwelling and garage at Catsbeer Farm, Ruggin Road, West Buckland (revised design - reduced scale/chane to finish materials)**

Comments from members of the public included;
(summarised)

- The immediate landowner has supported this application;
- No objections from statutory consultees;
- The building has significantly deteriorated over the years with asbestos on site;
- The building is to be constructed on the exact footprint of the existing property;
- The proposal would be a huge improvement visually;

Comments from Members included;
(summarised)

- Pleased that the agricultural tie was to be maintained;
- Concerns that this bungalow was only 46 years old and has to be rebuilt;
- A note to consider Bee bricks and House Martin boxes was needed to protect the local habitat;

Councillor Habgood proposed, and Councillor Hill seconded a motion that permission be GRANTED subject to conditions. With additional conditions for House Martin Boxes and Bee Bricks to be added.

The motion was carried.

130. **3/26/21/002 - Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access for the erection of 8 No. dwellings (amended scheme to 3/26/19/024) | Land north of Huish Lane, Washford**

Comments from members of the public included;
(summarised)

- The development was not sustainable in this small community with poor infrastructure and facilities;
- Highway concerns, no safe route from the development site for pedestrians or cyclists;
- Flooding issues;
- Additional traffic concerns;
- The cumulative effect was detrimental to Washford;
- Disappointed that the developer would not be contributing to other infrastructures, for example recreational facilities or Highway improvements;
- The site was difficult and complex and would create problems for existing residents
- The development conforms to Policy SC1 in the local plan;

- The development would preserve the Grade II listed building of the Lin Hay setting;
- No objections from technical consultees;
- The development was Policy compliant for social housing;
- The development would help the Council's 5 year land supply;
- The creation of 8 new households will help support the vitality of local businesses and facilities in the village;

Comments from Members included;
(summarised)

- Highway concerns;
- Concerns with the poor access in and out of the site;
- Concerns with the unreliable, infrequent Bus service;
- Concerns with the loss of the green field;
- This was not a sustainable development;
- Concerns with the lack of employment in the area;
- Concerns with the lack of amenities;
- Concerns with the already undeveloped sites in Washford;
- Concerns that the site will be car reliant;

At this point in the meeting, Cllr's Lithgow and Wheatley left the meeting;

Councillor Habgood proposed, and Councillor Aldridge seconded a motion for the application be **DEFERRED**.

Reasons - That the application be deferred to allow Officers the opportunity to review the sustainability of Washford as a Primary settlement suitable for accommodating further new residential development. The review will allow Officers to assess the level of services and facilities currently available within and serving the settlement and for this to be considered against the evidence base supporting the adopted West Somerset Local Plan. This will allow further consideration as to whether the proposed development complies with Policy SC1 and OC1 of the Local Plan.

The motion was carried.

(The Meeting ended at 2.50 pm)