

To Peter Gubbins, Chair Regulation Committee

Meeting March 17th (Cancelled) Informal Online Meeting 21st April

Planning Application 19/01604/OUT Land at Coombe Farm and West Street, Templecombe

The Application in my view should be refused as it fails to comply in a number of policy areas with the SSDC local plan which is currently in place

1. Historically this site has had two previous applications in 1970 and in 2000 both of which were refused on appeal.

From the report the SSDC specialist on strategic planning, the 2018 population of Abbas and Templecombe Parish is 1572, with another further 58 completions plus 96 net dwellings commitment for a total extra in the Parish of 157.

2. To quote from the report, page 36 "This proposal would result in an overall level of growth within the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy SS1 and be contrary to policies SS2 and SS5"

3. The Application fails Policy SS2, extract below from the officer report

"Policy SS2 also sets out that the development should be commensurate with the scale and character of the settlement, be consistent with community lead plans and generally have the support of the local community following robust engagement and consultation. (report p 41 and 42). This application does not have this support and there has been very little engagement

From the report page 42 "The proposal does not provide employment opportunities or necessarily meet an identified housing need in the community. In addition, it does not create community facilities or services in terms of such onsite provision."

The report on page 43 mentions the Village status proposed for the unapproved new local plan. It is not relevant and has no weight as this application has to be considered on our current local plan.

4. Policy SS5 in the local plan sets out housing targets for 14 named settlements, Templecombe is not included.

Templecombe is in the bottom tier of the settlement Hierarchy, it is a rural settlement (In the Local Plan a rural settlement should be treated as Open Countryside Policy SS1 (Page 41 of the report)

Rural centres, the next tier above have set housing targets which vary from 51 to the Highest (Milborne Port) of 279. Taking into account all applications and completions there is a potential for 289 dwellings to be built in Templecombe. From page 44 of the report "Should this application be approved for a further 49 dwellings, this would potentially result in a 22% increase in the number of dwellings (not people) in the village since 2011"

From the report on Page 44-45, "Granting Permission for this application would result in a level of growth commensurate with a rural centre." **This would therefore breach the policy concerning the settlement hierarchy.**

5. The lack of a 5-year land supply by South Somerset is taken as having considerable weight in weighing up planning applications, but as the planning officer report states "the absence of a five-year land supply is not necessarily conclusive in favour of granting planning permission. (Page 43)

The report continues “there are various Supreme court and High court judgements in this respect and makes it clear “the absence of a five-year land supply of housing land is not necessarily conclusive in favour of the grant of planning permission”

6. The application to build 49 new homes as up to 100 more cars, would fail our policy of TA5 (Road Safety) from the Map and pictures supplied by others, routes to and from the proposed building site go through narrow single file access, either up Vine Street/West Street, or along Bowden road or Westcombe.

There are cars parked on one side of the road in West Street, Westcombe and Bowden Road. There are three blind points on the access, West Street junction with Bowden Road, Westcombe Junction with Bowden Road and the corner at the top of West Street by West Street Farm.

Any access for 100 more cars would fail policy TA5, points 2 and 3

Point 2. Securing inclusive, safe and convenient access on foot, cycle, and by public and private transport that addresses the needs of all. **The extra traffic on these narrow roads would not be safe.**

Point 3. Ensuring that the expected nature and volume of traffic and parked vehicles generated by the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character or amenity of the area and would not compromise the safety.