

YEOVIL TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES of a meeting of the **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE** held in the Town House, 19 Union Street, Yeovil on **Monday 25 February 2008**

(7.00pm to 8.25pm)

Present:

Wes Read – Chairman
Philip Chandler
Clive Davis
Julian Freke
Pete Goodman
John Grana
Simon Hester
Tom Parsley
David Recardo

Also Present:

Andy Cato – Deputy Planning Team Leader (SSDC)
Sally Bing – Assistant Town Clerk

7/156 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 February 2008, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

7/157 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from J Vincent Chainey and Tony Lock.

7/158 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Julian Freke, Tom Parsley and David Recardo referred to their membership of South Somerset District Council and indicated that whilst they might speak and possibly vote on applications which may be referred to that Council for determination, they would reconsider such applications at District level taking into account all relevant evidence and representations made at that tier.

Clive Davis declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application number 08/00270/FUL; Residential development at 24-30 and 36-46 and 53-75 Milford Road, 176, 178, 103 and 105 Hillcrest Road and land south of 28 Wingate Avenue as he was a member of South Somerset Disability Forum who had contracted work to the applicants' agent.

7/159 **PLANS LIST**

1. Officer Report On Planning Application: 07/05695/FUL

Site Address:	10 Sherborne Road Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (East)
Proposal :	Proposed installation of air condenser, demolition of existing attached studio flat toilet to create access to main building (GR 356204/116078)
Recommending Case Officer:	Greg Lester
Target date :	14th March 2008
Applicant :	Mr Steve Frampton
Type :	Minor Other less than 1,000 sq.m or 1ha

Andy Cato informed the Committee that the demolition works for the application would be internal only and it was confirmed that listed building consent would also be required for this application but only full planning permission was under consideration at the meeting.

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL

2. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00135/FUL

Site Address:	98 Eastland Road Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	Demolition of existing garage and erection of 2 no. studio flats. GR (356189/116572)
Recommending Case Officer:	Greg Lester
Target date :	14th March 2008
Applicant :	M.S. Birnie & M.B. Brooks
Type :	Minor Dwellings 1-9 site less than 1ha

Andy Cato informed the Committee that four letters of objection had been received raising concerns including loss of light, that a tree may have to be felled and insufficient parking.

Andy explained that no off-road parking was proposed to be included in the application and that this could cause increased on-road parking and interrupt the flow of traffic in the area.

David Matthews, objector, reiterated the points made by Andy Cato.

RECOMMENDED REFUSAL on the grounds that the proposals would cause a cramped development, poor relationship with neighbours and lack of off-street parking which would exacerbate existing parking problems in the area.

3. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00270/FUL

Site Address:	24 - 30 & 36 - 46 & 53 - 75 Milford Road, 176, 178, 103 & 105 Hillcrest Road & Land South Of 21 Wingate Avenue
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	Residential development consisting of the demolition of 26 existing concrete dwellings and the erection of 42 new dwellings (GR 356147/117148)
Recommending Case Officer:	Andrew Collins
Target date :	12th March 2008
Applicant :	South Somerset Homes
Type :	Minor Other less than 1,000 sq.m or 1ha

Andy Cato explained that seven letters of objection had been referred to in the case officer's report and one more letter of objection had since been received.

Concerns raised included overlooking and that the poor practice of lack of maintenance of the existing pathways between properties would continue.

Andy explained that a similar application for the same site had very recently been refused with reasons for refusal including concerns about security due to rear access ways to properties, blank gable ends fronting the roads and no chimneys on houses which meant that the design was out of keeping with the area. Other reasons for refusal included insufficient off-street parking provision and concerns over design of layout causing unnecessary enclosed long pathways.

Andy further explained that the application under consideration at the meeting included proposals for chimneys, porches and front doors on the properties to improve design and make the scheme more in keeping with the area.

Dawn Jones, objector, stated that she had objected to the previous application due to overlooking of her property by the proposed houses. She stated she had previously requested obscure glazing and only one of the properties overlooking her house in the new application included obscure glazing. She also raised concern regarding the closure of the footpath which she understood would be for 6-9 months during construction of the redevelopment. She stated that the footpath was well used and also the only access to her property. She added a further concern regarding the alley ways which would be created by the design of the application stating that they would exacerbate existing anti-social behaviour in the area.

Andy Cato explained that the pathway Dawn Jones referred to, was not a public footpath and would therefore not require a diversion order so would become a civil matter with the applicants.

Shaun Travers, agent, explained to the Committee that the 26 dwellings proposed to be demolished to make way for the application were all proposed to have, or to be prone to concrete cancer. He added that South Somerset Homes planned to replace the existing dwellings with modern houses which would have eco ratings far in excess of that of existing properties. He stated

that the application site was in a highly sustainable area and that the principle of replacement had been accepted so the application would be to consider the design of the proposed development. He added that design developments had been improved including lockable gates at the rear of properties to improve security issues along with the design of the two properties in the courtyard - proposing that they face the street and have hipped roofs in line with other dwellings in the area. He stated that alterations had been made to windows on at least five of the properties to improve privacy for existing residents.

David Recardo stated that he had raised concerns when the previous application for this site had been considered regarding the development of existing allotments. The Committee felt it would like to be reassured that the strict rules regarding disposal of allotment sites had been adhered to, particularly if the allotment sites were still in use.

Committee Members raised concerns regarding the over-development of the site and whilst they accepted that the design of the buildings had improved and the inclusion of obscure glazing had helped with problems of privacy they did not feel that the design complied with the street scene and was still out of keeping with the area. A major concern was also the alleyways included in the application which regrettably historically had not been well maintained by the landlords.

Concern was also raised regarding the statement 'run off from proposed development to be no greater when developed to that in its existing state at present' as it was felt that the increase in surface area development and the inclusion of a tarmac courtyard would have an adverse effect on surface water in the area.

RECOMMENDED REFUSAL on the grounds that the proposals would cause over-development and be out of keeping with the area; the proposals would be intrusive with the existing street scene and detrimental to neighbouring properties.

In addition it was requested that assurance be given that the strict rules on the closure and redevelopment of allotment sites had been adhered to.

4. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00271/REM

Site Address:	Land Off St Michael's Avenue Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (East)
Proposal :	Residential development of 14 no. dwellings, 5 no. flats over garage units, 18 no. flats with associated roads, footways, parking, drainage and landscaping. (Reserved matters of 04/02981/OUT) (GR 356229/117506)
Recommending Case Officer:	
Target date :	1st May 2008
Applicant :	Barratt Homes Ltd
Type :	Major Dwlgls 10 or more or site 0.5ha+

Andy Cato explained that the site had been allocated in the Local Plan as land suitable for development for residential purposes. He added that outline planning permission had been sought and obtained and that the application under consideration was for reserved matters - so all matters regarding the design and layout with the exception of the principle of development of the site. He further added that planning permission had previously been sought and obtained for access to the site for residential purposes. He explained that whilst the outline permission granted had referred to the site being suitable for 15 dwellings, no limitations on number of dwellings had been added as a condition.

Stephen Williams, objector, explained to the Committee that local people were led to believe that the access road that had been granted permission in 2007 was to be used only by the school for coaches and to cope with the increase in number of vehicles requiring access to and parking at the school. He raised concerns that the properties would overlook 1,100 school children who attended the adjacent school and felt that it was unreasonable to remove 50% of the school grass playing area. He stated that the addition of 40 to 50 cars accessing the properties would exacerbate the existing problem with parking and traffic movement in the area.

Andy Cato reiterated that the Local Plan had allocated the site for residential development, that outline planning permission had been sought and obtained and that the application for access to the school and residential area had been approved in 2007.

The Chairman added that he understood that the access to Bucklers Mead Community School had been considered as the third worst entrance in the County and the access had been improved following the approval of the application.

The Committee considered the application and felt that it would cause over-development of the site and included insufficient off-street parking in an area which already suffered from congestion. The form and layout of existing properties in the area were looked at and it was considered that the density of the new development was out of keeping.

RECOMMENDED REFUSAL on the grounds that the layout of the proposed development was out of keeping with the area, would cause over-development, would be inappropriate in scale and form and would not comply with Policy ST6 of the Local Plan.

5. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00379/FUL

Site Address:	The Tannery Eastland Road Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	The erection of a building comprising 10 flats, together with 14 parking spaces and 48 bicycle spaces (GR 356119/116215)
Recommending Case Officer:	Mr Adrian Noon
Target date :	1st May 2008
Applicant :	Laidlaw Services Ltd
Type :	Major Dwlgls 10 or more or site 0.5ha+

Andy Cato outlined the application for this section of site adjacent to the Old Tannery building and explained that planning permission had formally been granted on the site for 6 flats and sufficient parking spaces to include a method for parking vehicles belonging to the residents of the proposed development of the Tannery building. He explained that the proposal under consideration was for 10 flats and included a reduction in the number of vehicles able to park in that area.

During the ensuing discussion, concern was raised regarding the reduction in parking and lack of provision for parking for residents of the Tannery building. Concern was also raised regarding air quality in that area.

RECOMMENDED REFUSAL on the grounds that a reduction in parking from that previously approved would result in demonstrable harm to the adjacent listed Tannery buildings and lead to on-street parking in an area where on-street parking was restricted and at a premium.

6. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00401/FUL

Site Address:	Marks & Spencer Plc 5 - 9 Middle Street Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	The installation of two cold stores, gantry access steps and handrail (GR 355732/115985)
Recommending Case Officer:	Andrew Collins
Target date :	18th March 2008
Applicant :	Marks And Spencer Plc
Type :	Minor Other less than 1,000 sq.m or 1ha

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL

7. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00404/FUL

Site Address:	16 Highfield Road Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	Erection of a four bedroom dwelling house (GR: 356132/116615)
Recommending Case Officer:	Mr Adrian Noon
Target date :	7th April 2008
Applicant :	Mr David Keirle
Type :	Minor Dwellings 1-9 site less than 1ha

Andy Cato explained that the Case Officer for the application was querying the car parking proposed on site for this application as 1.5 parking spaces had been included for the proposed property and 1.5 parking spaces for the existing house. It appeared that there would be insufficient space for 3 parking spaces in front of the two properties and this was to be further investigated.

David Keirle, applicant, explained that by utilising the front garden of 16 Highfield he would be able to provide 4 parking spaces, 2 for each property. He added that the new building would be in keeping with the adjacent

property and built sympathetically to those in the area. He added that it would be set back from the road, that pedestrian access would be available from the rear of the property and that a garden would be provided as half of the existing garden of number 16 would be included.

The Committee discussed the application and felt that the design was inappropriate and out of keeping with other houses along the street, particularly as it proposed a gable end facing onto the road.

RECOMMENDED REFUSAL on the grounds that the proposal would be cramped and that the inappropriate architectural form would appear incongruous and out of keeping in the street.

8. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00629/FUL

Site Address:	St Margarets Hospice Little Tarratt Lane Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (South)
Proposal :	The provision of an additional 17 no. parking spaces with associated construction and landscape works (GR 355008/114489)
Recommending Case Officer:	Mr Adrian Noon
Target date :	2nd April 2008
Applicant :	St Margarets Hospice
Type :	Minor Other less than 1,000 sq.m or 1ha

Andy Cato explained that the Case Officer had received an additional plan which further explained the landscaping and assured the Committee that only three trees would be removed to allow for the construction of the car parking area.

Members were pleased that substantial screening by shrubs and trees would remain and welcomed the extra car parking in that area.

Andy Cato added that some trees would be relocated and many new trees would be planted.

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL

7/160 **REPORT TABLE**

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL to the applications set out in the Report Table.

7/161 **PLANNING DECISIONS**

RESOLVED

that the Planning Decisions be noted.

7/162 **CORRESPONDENCE**

The Assistant Town Clerk informed the Committee that Advice of Appeal Receipt had been received in respect of application decision reference

07/02017/OUT. Location: 40 Sunningdale Road, Yeovil, BA21 5LX. Proposal: Erection of dwelling.

The Assistant Town Clerk also informed the Committee that notification had been received from Somerset County Council informing the Town Council that conditional planning permission had been granted in respect of planning application 07/05495/R3C. Proposal: Construction of new school and demolition of existing school buildings; works to include 14 class primary school, early years centre, new access, car parking, 2.4 metre high fencing and ancillary works at Parcroft School, Summerleaze Park, Yeovil, BA20 2BP.

RESOLVED

that the items of correspondence be noted.

Chairman

SB/JW
29/02/08