

04/05/247 **PRESENT:** Cllrs Westmaas, Mackay, Chilcott, Fraser and Hamblyn.

04/05/248 **ALSO PRESENT:** 10 members of the public.

04/05/249 **IN ATTENDANCE:** Clerk to the Council

04/05/250 **14/05/00003/CG - Erection of three dwellings, garages, erection of double garage and extension for existing dwelling, demolition of outbuildings and formation of access at land combining The Old Bakery and No.1 Manor Road.** Following considerable discussion it was agreed that the Clerk should write a letter of objection. The following letter resulted from the discussions:

- a. Catcott Parish Council held a special meeting to discuss this application which, if permitted would have a considerable detrimental impact on the village. The Parish Council **STRONGLY AND TOTALLY OBJECTS** to this application.
- b. Several members of the public were present and the unanimous feeling of those present (councillors and public alike) was that this application should not be allowed.
- c. It is important to note that the site is in the oldest part of the village with original neighbouring buildings being built in stone. The demolition of old buildings and old walls would greatly impinge on the character of this important part of the village as they are recognised as being of vital importance in the retention of the character of the village. With regard to the previous application for the corner site, whilst the PC had very serious reservations about the application, it did at least retain these old walls. This latest application does not. A NEW building on this site is almost guaranteed NOT to blend with the surrounding old stone properties.
- d. The Council is extremely concerned about access to the properties and was amazed that SCC had no reservations at all regarding the previous application re: traffic danger. It is felt that a site visit by Highways is imperative in order for them to make a meaningful assessment for this application. To achieve any sort of adequate visibility, walls would need to be largely demolished and this is not acceptable.
- e. It was noted that there has inevitably been an increase in traffic since the previous application in 2001. In addition Catcott PC considers it would be totally inappropriate to create additional vehicular movements in this area which is frequently congested and which has poor lines of visibility.
- f. The layout of the drive does NOT appear to be adequately large enough to allow proper vehicle circulation, especially if vehicles are parked within the site. There is inadequate room for sufficient parking on site and it would be unacceptable for parking to take place on the road. The drawing presented does not appear to be to scale (we are aware that this is an outline application - but it does not present a true picture).
- g. The proposal is regarded as creating backland development which will be strongly resisted by the Parish Council. Backland development has hitherto been totally unacceptable to Catcott PC and SDC, the latter having rejected previous applications (ref: Trevor Jones on an almost adjacent site c.1998). This would set a precedent whereby many other sites (larger houses and gardens, orchards, etc within the village envelope) would immediately be put forward for similar development. The alteration to the village character would be unacceptable.
- h. The site is noticeably elevated. Houses built on this site would inevitably overlook neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of privacy. Certainly those to the east and to the west as well as the Old Bakery itself, will inevitably be severely overlooked with major impact on their privacy.
- i. Such a large development in this area would result in a significant increase in water run off resulting from the increase in hard area.
- j. We believe that bats probably roost in the barn.
- k. A survey has recently been carried out showing a need for affordable housing in the village but this scheme

Chairman

Date

would not appear to address this problem.

- l. Catcott PC regard it as essential that not only do Highways need to visit the site but so does the planning committee.
- m. Catcott Parish Council wishes to be kept informed of any meetings being held to evaluate or discuss this application.
- n. Catcott Parish Council endorses all the points made in the letter you have received from Roland Haynes dated 21st March.
- o. Catcott Parish Council endorses all the points made in the letter you have received from Mr and Mrs Rigden.
- p. We enclose some photographs as follows:-
 - i. Looking out of Langland Lane. Weares Lane goes off to the left up the hill. Steel Lane goes off to the right down the hill. Manor Road runs ahead.
 - ii. Looking down Weares Lane (by the site on the left). Langlands Lane goes off to the right. The road bends sharply to the left into Manor Road.
 - iii. Looking out of Langlands Lane. Across the bottom of Weares Lane is the site.
 - iv. Looking out of Langlands Lane. Weares Lane goes off to the left. Steel Lane off to the right. Vehicle travelling from Manor Road into Weares Lane.
 - v. Looking out of Manor Road. Steel Lane off to the left. Langlands Lane ahead. Vehicle turning out of Manor Road into Weares Lane.
 - vi. Looking out of Steel Lane. Langlands Lane goes off to the left in front of the pink cottage. Manor Road is in front and bends round to the right into Weares Lane. The site is behind the wall where the Manor Road sign is sited.
 - vii. Road junction - Langlands Lane, Weares Lane, Manor Road - Steel Lane dropping down hill to the foreground.
 - viii. Road junction - Langlands Lane, Weares Lane, Manor Road - Langlands Lane running to the foreground.
- q. Please note the predominance of original old structures in this vicinity and the converging roads with blind corners immediately adjacent to the site.
- r. We particularly draw your attention to your own Local Plan.
- s. Policy H3 is certainly not complied with - either in its original version or as the modification. *Within the development boundary of a Rural Centre or Village, residential development will be permitted if it comprises infilling, conversion or small scale development or redevelopment and meets all the following criteria:*
 - i. *is of a scale, density and layout compatible with the size and form of the village;*
 - ii. *is of a design which in its massing, proportions, materials and detailing is sympathetic to the established vernacular character of the village and locality;*
 - iii. *the site can be satisfactorily accessed with sufficient space for circulation within the site (subject to the level*

Chairman

Date

of parking provision agreed with the Planning Authority);

- iv. *it would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.*
- t. Or Modification: *Within the development boundary will be permitted, provided it meets the following criteria:*
 - i. *it would be compatible in scale, density and layout with the size and form of the village;*
 - ii. *its design would be sympathetic with the vernacular character of the village and locality;*
 - iii. *the site can be satisfactorily accessed, and contains sufficient space for circulation and any required parking;*
 - iv. *it would not harm the character or amenity of any adjoining residential property.*
- u. *Policy STR2 Development in Rural Centres and Villages should be such as will sustain and enhance their role and will be commensurate with their size and accessibility, and appropriate to their character and physical identity. We cannot see how this application can possibly claim to sustain and enhance the centre of the village.*
- v. *Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review:*
 - i. *STR1 - This development is contrary to the second bullet point;*
 - ii. *STR5 - Development in Rural Centres and Villages should be such as will sustain and enhance their role and will be commensurate with their size and accessibility, and appropriate to their character and physical identity.*
- w. *It is understood that Highways considers the number of vehicular movements per house as follows: each household would generate at least 7+ vehicle movements per day on average explained as follows: 1 movement to take children to school; 1 movement return trip; 1 movement to shops; 1 movement return trip; one movement to collect children from school; 1 movement return trip = 6 to start with and doesn't account for the head of the household making daily and return trips or even a working wife making two trips per day. A four bedroom house could include a young adult making additional trips to college etc by motor bike or car. This is all based on their being a limited public transport service in this area. It is therefore likely that this application would result in an increase of at least 24 vehicle movements each day in this sensitive part of the village.*
- x. *It is noted that when changes to the previous application were proposed the applicants themselves stated: "The revised access may not be as favourable, as stone walls exist to either side, the one to the east being part of the accommodation and cannot be lost easily. **Such original walling is also a valuable contribution to the village fabric.**" They also stated: "Sensible but minimal arrangements for the vehicles to two properties would need significant alterations to the rear. Additional space for car standings, garaging to be repositioned, and turning space would require a large area of hard paving **which would be detrimental to the enjoyment of the area. West facing windows from the Old Bakery would also overlook the rear garden area formed.**" They also stated: "The shared access drive would not be desirable. **The impact on the existing house would be intrusive, hazardous and unnecessary and potentially difficult to resolve** neighbour concerns." It would seem that a significant and substantial change of mind has since taken place!*
- y. *We ask that this application be rejected.*

Chairman

Date