

## YEOVIL TOWN COUNCIL

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE** held in the Town House, 19 Union Street, Yeovil on **Monday 10 March 2008**

(5.30pm to 6.55pm)

### **Present:**

Wes Read – Chairman  
J Vincent Chainey  
Philip Chandler  
Clive Davis  
Pete Goodman  
John Grana  
Simon Hester  
Tom Parsley  
David Recardo

### **Also Present:**

Jean Marshall – Planning Team Leader, SSDC  
Helen Ferdinand – Planning Officer, SSDC  
Greg Lester – Planning Officer, SSDC  
Sally Bing – Assistant Town Clerk

### 7/163 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 February 2008, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 7/164 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Julian Freke and Tony Lock.

### 7/165 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

J Vincent Chainey, 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.

## 7/166 **PLANS LIST**

### 1. Officer Report On Planning Application: 07/00384/FUL

Site Address:	Penn Mount Penn Hill Park Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (Central)
Proposal :	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 flats and 1 maisonette (GR: 355539/115548)
Recommending Case Officer:	Helen Ferdinand
Target date :	17th April 2007
Applicant :	Paull & Co Ltd
Type :	Minor Dwellings 1-9 site less than 1ha

Helen Ferdinand addressed the Committee explaining that amended plans had been received for the application which no longer included the maisonette but just the 4 apartments and 8 parking spaces. She added that two additional letters of objection had been received in respect of the latest consultation and within those concern had been raised regarding the automatic sliding gate which was deemed to be out of character with the area.

Information had also been provided regarding the retaining wall, however this had been labelled confidential and whilst it could not be disclosed at that time, Helen explained that confidential information was not appropriate within a planning application process.

Trevor Clark, objector, stated that the contemporary design and size of the proposed building was out of character with the area. He also raised concerns as he felt that many details on the plans were misleading or inaccurate. He referred to the access road to the site which he stated was owned by South Somerset District Council, explaining that access permission was only granted to one property which would prohibit access to four additional units on the site. He was also concerned that heavy plant vehicles would require access along the road which was only suitable for light vehicles. He was concerned that surface water run off from the new build would have an adverse impact on the land and explained that one only private sewer served the existing dwellings and that it was to capacity.

Ceri Stephens, objector, stated that the building was out of keeping and would have a harmful impact on the immediate surrounding area. She was concerned that Penn Hill Park would not cope with additional traffic caused by the proposed development.

Craig Poole, agent, explained to the Committee that the proposals were for four high quality two bedroom flats, the scheme having been reduced following discussions with the planning authority. With regard to concerns raised about stability of the land on that location, Craig explained that the developers were prepared to commission a fully engineered solution to the satisfaction of South Somerset District Council Building Control and the structural engineer. He stated that the bungalow on site was derelict and that the scheme to redevelop the site would add housing and improve the area in the long term.

With regard to access, he explained that negotiations were currently taking place with South Somerset District Council regarding access to the land.

Helen Ferdinand explained to the Committee that the access road served the application site and also the Country Park. She further explained that access rights were only in place for one property and that the access road was suitable for service and maintenance vehicles gaining access to the Country Park. She added that the right of access was not a material planning consideration.

During the ensuing discussion, Members noted that the site suffered from significant changes in level and felt that further information regarding the boundary wall, particularly the retaining wall, was required before permission could be granted for this planning application.

It was generally agreed that the design of the building was out of keeping with the area but that the replacement of the bungalow with a similar structure would be acceptable.

With regard to a question about flat roofed buildings in Penn Hill, it was confirmed that one other property had a flat roof.

Jean Marshall clarified the position regarding the access to the land, explaining that if planning permission were granted but access over the District Council owned land to the site was not agreed, the permission could never be implemented.

**RECOMMENDED REFUSAL** on the grounds of over-development of the site, that the design was out of character with the area and due to lack of information on the retaining boundary wall.

## 2. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00210/FUL

Site Address:	Land Off Stiby Road & St Anne's Gardens Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (West)
Proposal :	Demolition of 1 No. block of flats, 6 bungalows known as 23-28 St Anne's Gardens, 281 and 283 Stiby Road and 1 No. garage block and erection of 29 No. dwelling houses with highway improvements (GR 354103/117020)
Recommending Case Officer:	Simon Fox
Target date :	11th April 2008
Applicant :	South Somerset Homes Ltd
Type :	Major Dwlg's 10 or more or site 0.5ha+

Jean Marshall explained to the Committee that an update to the Case Officer's report was required with regard to parking as it had been established that 1.5 spaces per dwelling were available (not 1 short as stated in the report).

Charles Park, objector, informed the Committee that numbers 80 and 82 were ex-Police houses. He raised concerns regarding overlooking of his and his

neighbour's property by five homes in the proposed development. He also asked whether due consideration had been given to the inclusion of an alleyway within the development as he understood that it was prudent to aim to design out crime which would be particularly relevant in that area due to issues with anti-social behaviour. He also asked about the materials to be used to mark the boundary as he considered a brick wall would be more appropriate than fencing.

In response, Jean Marshall explained that the alleyway was an access route to the properties only and would not provide a through means of access. She further added that the access way would be gated and locked with access being provided only to residents of the properties. She explained that it was a requirement of South Somerset Homes schemes that a secondary means of access was provided.

The Committee considered the proposals and it was felt that the proposed dwellings were cramped and provided little amenity space or places for children to play.

Jean explained that the homes met the standards required by government guidelines and factors laid down by the Housing Corporation. She added that the duty on the District Council to address homelessness was not restricted to families.

The Committee felt that provision of cramped housing would not encourage a sense of well being.

In answer to a question regarding the lifetime homes policy, Jean explained that South Somerset Homes had adopted the lifetime homes policy but she could not confirm whether the scheme under consideration complied.

**RECOMMENDED REFUSAL** on the grounds that the development was out of keeping with the area and provided insufficient amenity space.

### 3. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00243/FUL

Site Address:	21 The Park Yeovil Somerset
Ward :	Yeovil (West)
Proposal :	Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and the erection of ten flats with associated parking (GR 355272/116232)
Recommending Case Officer:	Andrew Collins
Target date :	11th April 2008
Applicant :	D N Richards
Type :	Major Dwlg's 10 or more or site 0.5ha+

Jean Marshall explained to the Committee that six further letters of objection had been received since the report had been written. She explained that the area was under consideration for a Conservation Area designation and the letters had included objections to the application stating that the design was inappropriate in light of the proposal being within a proposed Conservation Area. She explained that all letters received were from objectors who had already written regarding other objections set out in the report.

David Fuller, objector, raised concerns regarding highways and the increased traffic movement in the area which would conflict with the number of pedestrians, particularly school children, using The Park for access to and from school.

Kenneth Lamb, objector, representing residents of The Park raised the issue regarding the Conservation Area and explained that residents wished to ensure that the new development did not harm the existing street scene. He stated that the proposals would cause unnecessary removal of a respectable property that was in keeping with the area. He explained that the proposed new block of flats would be inappropriate, out of keeping and seriously detrimental to the area.

Tom Parsley realising at this point that he was a friend of a resident in a neighbouring property declared a personal and prejudicial interest and left the room taking no part in the consideration of the application, the discussion or voting thereon.

Alex Dunn, objector, raised concern regarding the visibility splay from the site, explaining that many school children used The Park to access their school. Alex added that he objected to the overall size of the proposed development, that there was no provision for children to play and no room for clothes airers. He added that his property would be overlooked and understood that opaque glass would be installed in some windows but only in the lower half of the windows and not at all in the roof lights.

Jean Marshall explained that by the nature of the angle of the roof lights, they would not cause overlooking and that where obscure glazed windows were included, they would be fully not half obscured.

During the ensuing discussion, concern was raised regarding the lack of visibility splay from the planning application site. The existing building was considered to be out of keeping with the area and it was felt that it would be detrimental to The Park to support its removal. The increase in traffic flow to and from the site was also a concern particularly due to the large number of school children and pedestrians using the area.

**RECOMMENDED REFUSAL** on the grounds that the design was out of keeping with the proposed Conservation Area which caused over-development of the site due to the size and bulk of the property; and due to highway safety issues as the proposal would cause conflicting traffic and pedestrian movements.

4. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00358/FUL

Site Address:	Former Seatons Garage West Hendford Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (South)
Proposal :	The re-roofing of existing former commercial vehicle workshop and change of use to Use Class B1/B8 and D1 (GR 354941/115608)
Recommending Case Officer:	
Target date :	14th March 2008
Applicant :	Abbey Manor Group Ltd
Type :	Other Change Of Use

Jean Marshall explained to the Committee that amended plans had been received in respect of the application which introduced one amendment: the removal of the bollards to be replaced with a continuous wall.

**RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

5. Officer Report On Planning Application: 08/00460/COU

Site Address:	Flushing Meadow Sherborne Road Yeovil
Ward :	Yeovil (East)
Proposal :	Change of use of land for the storage of plant and machinery, vans, lorries, tools and containers in connection with plant hire business. GR (357095/116341)
Recommending Case Officer:	Greg Lester
Target date :	3rd April 2008
Applicant :	David Scanes
Type :	Other Change Of Use

**RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**

7/167 **REPORT TABLE**

**RECOMMENDED**

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

7/168 **PLANNING DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED**

that the Planning Decisions be noted.

7/169 **FINANCIAL STATEMENT – PERIOD ENDING 31 JANUARY 2008**

The Committee considered the report of the Finance Administrator (Agenda item 8 refers).

**RESOLVED**

that the Financial Statement for December 2007 and January 2008 be noted.

Chairman

SB/JW  
13/03/08