

A meeting of the **Planning, Highways and Transport Committee** was held
on **6 February 2018** at Greenfylde School, Silver Street, Ilminster
commencing at 19:30hrs

Present:

Chair: Cllr A Shearman

Councillors: D Belobaba, J Dewick, J Fagan, J Fowler, M Gunn, V Keitch, I Mackillop, R Swann
and T Walker

In Attendance

Officers: Miss J Norris (Town Clerk), Mrs D Salt (Admin Officer (Information))
Mrs J Skinner (Admin Officer (Support)) and Mrs D Speed (Deputy Town Clerk)

30 members of the public attended the meeting.

P156 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Burton, James and Shepherd.

P157 Declarations of Interest

No Declarations of Interest were made regarding any of the agenda items.

P158 Planning Applications

The Committee considered the following application as detailed below:

A) Application No. 18/00082/FUL – Lane South West of Canal Way, Ilminster

Erection of 144 No. dwelling houses with open space, landscaping and other associated works. Formation of access.

Note: 19:37hrs the meeting went out of sessions for members of the public to speak

Speaker 1 S Gay Rees, raised points about the application which included:

- The harmful effects on the landscape
- No phasing plan has been submitted so it is difficult to understand how the various phases will fit together
- Buffer zones are required on the south of site
- 144 homes is 35% of the total of the maximum of 400 but the proposal for the 144 is in less than approximately 20% of total land area
- Lack of green corridors throughout the proposal
- Lack of parking –provision on the proposal is for 1.5 cars per dwelling but modern living requires at least 3 parking spaces per household
- Materials need to be in keeping with the heritage and character of buildings in Ilminster.

Speaker 1 continued, with the Chair's permission on behalf of Henrietta Vanden Berg who was unable to attend the meeting.

The key points were:

- Density of the proposed dwellings
- Height of some of the proposed dwellings – 3 storeys is too high.
- Proposed building materials are not in keeping with local distinctive homes, or ham stone, double roman tiles, or even thatch would be more appropriate
- Vehicular access is not sufficient
- Safety on the bridle way
- Potential that the proposed development will increase flooding elsewhere in the town; people are already being refused insurance due to flood risks
- Management of local ecology including wildlife habitats
- Need green spaces and buffer zones within and adjacent to the proposed development

- Lack of infrastructure and amenities e.g. school, roads, Drs and parking to meet the needs of an increased number of residents

Speaker 2 R Mellish

- 35% houses going on a disproportionate size of the development land
- The outline planning permission was for 400 houses but the documents currently being considered refer to 450 again
- The 3rd emergency access has moved
- The density of housing is far too high
- The number of proposed car parking spaces is too low.

Speaker 3 Jonathan Alan:

- Concern over the roundabout lay out – it does not seem that any plans have been submitted adjusting the roundabout lay-out to suit the increased volume of traffic that would be generated by the new development
- 3 storey houses seem to be incorporated in the detailed plans whereas originally it was stated they would be a maximum of 2.5 storeys.
- A lot of the information submitted is outdated for example the transport statement is dated December 2016 and refers to the Nippy Bus which no longer operates; similarly, the Risk Assessment is dated 2015
- Some of the plans are contradictory
- The secondary / emergency access route and information is not consistent

Note: the formal session resumed at 19:48hrs

Note: 19:52hrs Councillor Fowler declared a personal interest in the agenda item as a member of the Canal Way Action Group. Cllr Fowler spoke and voted upon the agenda item

Issues raised during consideration of the application included:

- Many of the documents have not been updated
- The documents submitted do not appear to have been prepared with care for example some of the plans say Ilminster, Devon
- 2 previously requested documents / pieces of information do not appear to have been submitted: the programme showing the phasing of the development and the details of the new Zebra crossings, both requested by the South Somerset District Council (SSDC) Regulation Committee
- Some of the detail on the plans is difficult to read e.g. construction materials
- The proposals do not match the number and types of dwellings recommended by the SSDC Housing Development Officer for affordable housing nor is there any provision in the submitted phase for housing suitable for the elderly or disabled
- The height of the proposed dwellings
- The amount of proposed car parking spaces is insufficient
- The emergency access route requires clarification – it is referred as Adams Meadow in some documents and Herne Vale in others
- Persimmon should hold a public consultation meeting about the reserved matters as referred to in their Planning Statement (para5.15)
- Concern that the play areas will not be provided until the second phase
- The density of the development in phase 1
- Maintenance responsibility of the existing drainage ditches that are within the site
- There is no specific flood risk assessment for any of the development phases
- The impact of the development of the existing sewage pumping station

[Type here]

- The potential impact of the development on surface water drainage
- An up to date traffic survey is required
- The impact of the construction traffic on the traffic flow along Canal Way and the side roads
- The bus service information needs to be updated and the reduction in service recognised in that it means more people will use their own vehicles and thus additional parking will be needed
- There is a lack of green spaces in the submitted proposal
- There is no acknowledgement nor mitigation of the damage to ecology and wildlife

RESOLVED to recommend refusal on the grounds of

- Insufficient information
- Submitted documents are outdated
- An up to date transport survey is required
- Lack of flood risk management information
- Density of the proposed dwellings / over development of the site for phase 1
- Affordable housing provision not meet the requirement suggested by the SSDC Housing Development Officer
- There is no provision for housing suitable for the elderly or disabled
- No phased plan as required by the SSDC Regulation Committee is available

The meeting closed at 20:12hrs