

A meeting of the **Planning, Highways and Transport Committee** was held on **12th January 2021** via Skype commencing at 19:30hrs

Present:

Chair: Cllr A Shearman

Committee Members Cllr L Taylor, Cllr L Wilcock, Cllr M James, Cllr V Higgins and Cllr I Mackillop

In Attendance

Councillors: P Burton, B Hamilton, V Keitch and S Shepherd

Officers: Julie Earp (Deputy Clerk) Hayley White (Town Clerk)

One speaker

Speaker - The speaker spoke about Agenda item 5(b) the planning application for Letham Court. The speaker owns property abutting the proposed new property. The speaker wished to object to the planning application. The speaker explained that the site has remained undeveloped for many years, the area provides privacy, peace, quiet and light for adjacent and neighbouring properties. The speaker advised that the properties in Highfield and Letham Court currently have uninterrupted views over the south east of the town. The speaker explained that the area was a valued piece of wild habitat. The speaker said that the design and footprint would have an adverse impact on the surrounding landscape and neighbouring properties. Due to its position with its ground level over and two metres above those in neighbouring properties, the property will be highly visible and overlook these properties. There will be a loss of light and loss of privacy. There will be a loss of open space and wild habitat within the built up environment. The speaker mentioned that there would be increased run off and flooding from the removal of flora and fauna. There will be increased pollution and noise from additional development of the land. The speaker commented that the application does not go far enough to minimise the adverse impacts on neighbouring property, residential amenity and visual impact. Also, does not seem to address climate emergency, sustainability or biodiversity gain. The speaker had concerns that they had not been contacted to consult on the application, particularly as the application includes a 1.6 metre high stone wall to be built on the speakers eastern boundary. How would the wall be constructed? The speaker has not agreed for the applicant to build on their wall. The speaker said in summary that they have submitted images to SSDC for consideration. The footprint is too large, the roof line needs to be changed, issues with the boundary wall, the changes to the landscape and topography will cause issues and the planning team at SSDC need to consult neighbours about their concerns.

The chair thanked the speaker for their comments.

P382 Apologies for absence

Cllr R Swann

P383 Declarations of Interest

Name	Agenda Item	Minute No	Nature of Interest	Type of Interest	Action
Cllr V Higgins	Agenda 5(a) – Planning Application - 20/03712/R13 – Greenfylde First School Silver Street Ilminster TA19 0DS	P386(a)	Works at the School	Personal	Did not vote

P384 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5th January 2021 were considered.

The minutes referred to an anonymous letter received from a resident in Fairfield. It was mentioned at this point that SSDC had been advised about the letter. The land is still owned by Persimmon but SSDC has the intention of adopting the land hopefully in April.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 5th January 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

P385 Hillview/Highfield Salt Bin

An update was provided on the situation with the request for a salt bin at the top of Hillview Terrace. The Chair had been to visit the site last Thursday. A discussion had taken place with one of our SSDC representatives. An area was earmarked, and the matter was resolved that afternoon. SSDC have given consent to the positioning of a bin. The bin has been ordered and should be in place next week. A request was made that the Town Clerk let the resident know.

P386 Planning Applications

The Committee considered the following applications:

(a) 20/03712/R13 – Greenfylde First School Silver Street Ilminster TA19 0DA

The proposal to demolish the reconstituted stone/concrete block shelter with a concrete slab roof. (SCC/3776/2020/LB)

The discussion included reference to a massive crack and that this was considered a health and safety issue for the children. That the committee have received confirmation that the landlords are aware of the demolition and are satisfied.

RESOLVED to recommend that the proposed works go ahead in accordance with the landlords agreement.

(b) 20/03045/FUL – Land South of Letham Court, Ilminster

The erection of one dwelling

Issues discussed during consideration were:

- Whether any environmental assessment had taken place.
- The proposed building is next to a conservation area.
- The proposed style is not in keeping, although it was noted that the same could be said for some of the properties in Highfield.

- Access to the proposal was discussed, which included how wide the access was for emergency vehicles, the works vehicles if the construction went ahead, only a single point of access and that it was a tight site to access. When construction took place children would be applying next to a building site. It would affect the neighbouring streets. More cars into the site could be a problem as it's only a small estate road.
- The possible increase of noise with another property.
- The plans show the property will overlook other properties so they will be a loss of privacy for those properties.
- The area where the proposed property is to be built currently has long established vegetation. With the removal of the vegetation flooding could be increased. It was mentioned that tarmac is less porous than vegetation. A question was raised as to the drainage proposed for the new building, no detailed reports on drainage were submitted with the application. There could be increased run off from surface water so the drainage would need to be addressed to stop it running into the properties below.
- The proposal has a large footprint. An additional property could be contributing to overdevelopment of the land.
- The design shows a loss of parking for the estate.

RESOLVED to recommend to South Somerset District Council refusal on the grounds as detailed below:

- Loss of privacy. Property would overlook others.
- Loss of enjoyment with increased noise.
- Addition of the property will cause overdevelopment of the land.
- Loss of parking.
- Access – unsuitable for construction vehicles.
- Access – unsuitable for emergency vehicles.
- Access – single point of access.
- Possible flooding to neighbouring property.

P387 Planning Appeals

No planning appeals.

P388 Planning Decisions made by SSDC

Decisions made by South Somerset District Council are reported for information. For more details please see South Somerset District Council website: <http://www.southsomerset.gov.uk/planningsearch>

The meeting closed at: 20:12hrs