



Clerk: Mrs. L Rampton  
Parish Council Office,  
Winscombe Community Centre,  
11 Sandford Road, Winscombe,  
North Somerset BS25 1JA  
Tel: 01934 844257 Fax: 01934 844292

## A meeting of the Planning Committee was held on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> July 2018, 7.30 pm, Amesbury Room, Winscombe Community Centre.

**Committee members present:** Ms C Boase, Mr A Forbes (Chairman), Mr K Joyce (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Lloyd, Mr C Lomas, Mr G Lockett, Dr P Watkins, Mr J Westlake and Mr M Williamson.

**Committee members absent:** Mr C Ballard, Mrs M Ballard, Mr M Boddy Mr I Kilpatrick, Mr V Slater,

**Clerk:** Mrs L Rampton

**Members of the public:** Eleven

22. **To receive apologies for absence.** Apologies were received from Parish Councillors Mr C Ballard, Mrs M Ballard, Mr M Boddy Mr I Kilpatrick and Mr V Slater
23. **Declarations of interest.** As a Sandford resident, Cllr P Watkins declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 7f. (land south of Greenhill Lane for up to 93 homes).  
Cllr K Joyce declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 7 a & i (land at the rear of Corner Close, 6 Church Road (family member application) and Pimple Barn, Mead Lane (family member objecting to application)).  
Cllr G Lockett declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 7c as a lease holder at Dunster Court.
24. **To consider & decide upon any requests for dispensation from members to allow them to participate in a discussion or vote on a matter in which he/she may have a disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest.**  
*Dispensations are granted to Parish Councillors under section 33 of the Localism Act 2011 and the Parish Council delegated the power to grant dispensations (s 101 of the Local Government Act 1972) to the Clerk or appointed Deputy (see PC meeting 23.07.12 min 52 iv.)*  
In response to written requests received, dispensation was granted for this meeting only to Cllrs K Joyce and P Watkins as the interests were not deemed significant enough to exclude them from the discussion or vote on the items. Cllr Lockett had not sought a dispensation, with the member to withdraw from the meeting at the appropriate time.
25. **To approve minutes as a correct record of the previous planning committee meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2018**  
The minutes were approved as a correct record of the meeting  
**Proposed: Cllr J Westlake                      Seconded: Cllr K Joyce**  
**All committee members present at the last meeting were in favour**
26. **Minute Update from previous minutes of the Planning Committee.**  
*Minute 21 – Garden Villages- the concept and relation to strategic development locations in NS.* The meeting scheduled for 25<sup>th</sup> July had been postponed due to the increased amount of consultation invites for a number of emerging planning documents. It would be rescheduled to a later date.
27. **Public Participation.** *The Chairman suspended the meeting to allow public participation and stated that this was the only time during the meeting members of public present would be allowed to address the Planning Committee.*  
*18/P/3558/FUL, land at rear of Corner Close.* Two neighbours spoke in opposition to the application. Reasons included the negative impact the two storey dwelling would have on their homes through overbearing impact due to the close proximity of this to the site boundaries, loss of light into existing properties and impact on their privacy. There was little green open space associated with the property and increased development in this area would have an adverse affect on road safety through increased on-road parking on Church Road. The planning applicant advised that previous applications for the site had been refused because they were too small and the design of the new

application matched the design of a neighbouring property. As Winscombe village had been classified as a 'service village' by NSC, the addition of an affordable one bedroom property should be viewed as an asset to the community. The land was currently overlooked by neighbouring properties. 18/P/3625/OUT, land to the south of Durleigh. Two Sandford residents spoke in opposition to the application for two new homes accessed off a single lane track and 'public right of way' that they considered to be totally inappropriate for increased traffic. Residents were responsible for the up-keep of the unadopted road and increased use of this by construction vehicles would further add to the deterioration of surface.

*With no further members of the public wishing to address the committee, the chairman re-opened the meeting*

**28. Planning Applications for comment or information:**

**a. 18/P/3558/FUL, Land at the Rear of Corner Close, 6 Church Road, Winscombe, BS25 1BG.**

*Erection of a one bedroom dwelling with two parking spaces on the land to the rear of Corner Close.*

Four comments of objection to the application from close neighbours appeared on the NSC website.

Although the dwelling was described as a dormer bungalow, in the supporting planning application documentation the ridge height of this matched the height of the neighbouring 3 bedroom, two storey dwelling. Reference was made to the NSC adopted Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning document that stated the new two storey development should be 12m distant from neighbouring properties – this application fell far short of this. Previous reasons for refusal by NSC had been identified as failing to meet the Technical Housing Standards and result in sub-standard accommodation (due to its size as advised by the applicant). As the size of the property had been amended to meet those standards, the impact on neighbours had been intensified.

Concern was expressed that with increased development in this area, existing residents from the close would be forced to park on Church Road. Due to approved consent for an additional 175 homes, parking restrictions through road markings would not permit this.

**The planning committee recommended refusal of the planning application**

**Proposed: Cllr P Watkins                      Seconded: Cllr C Boase                      7 in favour, 2 against**

**b. 18/P/3608/NMA, Land at Woodborough Road, Winscombe.**

*Non material amendment to 15/P/1979/O (Outline planning application for up to 175 dwellings with access, landscaping and drainage infrastructure. All matters reserved except for access) to alter the wording of three planning conditions (10, 22 and 23) stipulated on the outline permission.*

*Notification Only.*

*Due to a previously declared interest, Cllr Luckett left the meeting*

**c. 18/P/3136/TPO, Flat 1, Dunster Court, Woodborough Road, Winscombe, BS25 1AG.**

*T1-Ash-Crown lift epicormic growth to 5m, reduce limbs over car parking spaces by 2m to a suitable growth point. T2- Lime-Crown lift to 4m and a 2m reduction of limbs over car parking areas to suitable growth points.*

**Although the T2 Lime Tree was in actual fact a Sweet Chestnut, the planning committee supported approval of the TPO work application so long as works were restricted to the dormant season for the trees.**

**Proposed: Cllr C Lomas                      Seconded: Cllr K Joyce                      All in favour**

*Cllr Luckett returned to the meeting*

**d. 18/P/3516/FUH, 19 Woodborough Drive, Winscombe, BS25 1HA.**

*Single storey rear extension.*

**The planning committee supported approval of the planning application**

**Proposed: Cllr G Luckett                      Seconded: Cllr M Williamson                      All in favour**

**e. 18/P/3623/OUT, Land to The South of Durleigh, Hill Road, Sandford.**

*Outline planning permission for the erection of 2no. 4 bedroom dwellings with attached garages.*

*Access via a track off Hill Road. All matters reserved for subsequent approval.*

Although an outline planning application at this stage, information had been submitted as part of the application to protect the privacy of close neighbours to the site. The location was situated inside the settlement boundary of Sandford, and to address one previous reason for planning refusal, existing hedgerow would be retained. The application for two, rather than three properties would decrease suggested use of the track, and highway access onto Hill Road. Although comments from the NSC

Highways Department were not known at this time (another reason for previous refusal of the application), details of visibility splays from the application were conveyed to the meeting. A member commented that Sandford needed more smaller affordable housing rather than large 4 bedroom properties.

*It was proposed that the planning committee support approval of the planning application*  
*Proposed: Cllr K Joyce* *There was no second, and the motion failed*

**The planning committee recommended refusal of the planning application due to overdevelopment of the site (in an area characterised by medium to larger properties standing in large gardens), increased use of the lane having an adverse impact on neighbours, and inappropriate access onto Hill Road via a substandard lane with poor visibility at its junction with Hill Road which constituted a highway hazard.**

**Proposed: Cllr G Lloyd** **Seconded: Cllr P Watkins**  
**6 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention**

**f. 18/P/3625/OUT, Land To The South Side Of Greenhill Lane, Greenhill Road, Sandford.**

*Outline planning application for a residential development of up to 93 dwellings and associated infrastructure, with all matters reserved for subsequent approval except for access.*

The planning agent had advised that due to the failure of NSC to determine the original proposal (17/P/0887/O), an appeal had been lodged with the planning inspectorate. To avoid a lengthy appeal process, a duplicate application had been submitted to NSC to enable the council to make a decision at local level. The new application had a revision to the master-plan and reduced proposed numbers to 85 dwellings. NSC had advised that planning application 17/P/0887/O would be considered by their Planning & Regulatory Committee on 8<sup>th</sup> August.

Members considered only the application before them, as described by NSC for a development of up to 93 homes.

**The planning committee recommended refusal of the planning application for reasons as specified in the previous planning application 17/P/0887/O:**

i. **Infill only village.** Sandford is designated as an ‘infill only village’ by NSC and this application abutting, but outside the settlement boundary for the village will do nothing to preserve the rural character of the area. Sandford village is not able to support further development of this scale, especially as 118 homes have already been granted planning approval at appeal on the adjacent site (15/P/0583/O Strongvox). By definition, due to the lack of facilities and services, infill villages are not able to sustain growth at this rate and it is apparent that Sandford is the only infill village in North Somerset to be targeted with this level of extreme development. Since the Strongvox planning application in 2015, no new facilities have been added, or are likely to be added in the foreseeable future, and therefore this application is considered to be totally un-sustainable.

ii. **Highway access.** It is noted that plans include the demolition of a dwelling and construction of an apartment block in its place to allow a single access road into the development? With two differing illustrative masterplans showing on the website, and with the weekly list notification issued to the Parish Council differing in housing numbers to that now shown on the NSC website, there was some confusion as to which plan should be commented on? In both instances, the location of the site entrance is considered to be highly unsuitable due to the splay of the road and the poor visibility when looking back towards the village centre. There is no footway opposite the site entrance, only the wall of a Grade II listed building and members would ask if English Heritage have been consulted about the position of the site entrance? It was considered that for safety reasons the road access would need to be substantially set back from the proposed location, with ideally the highway to be re-routed to allow a new continuous footway to be installed on the opposite side of the road.

iii. **Public Transport.** Changes to bus services through Sandford had taken place since submission of the original application. Lack of public transport will add to increased traffic generated by the development. **It was highlighted that transport data submitted (especially in regard to bus services through the village) as part of the previous application, having being collected in January 2015 was sadly out of date.**

iv. **Inadequate highway infrastructure.** Due to the lack of employment opportunities in the village, the volume of traffic generated by the development through out-commuting would lead to an increased bottleneck in Banwell and queuing traffic at the Churchill traffic lights at peak times. Additional traffic from this and the Strongvox approved application in the parish will lead to unacceptable traffic pollution and health implications are of concern for our local community, especially primary school children with the school located on the main A368.

v. **Impact on the AONB and on listed buildings.** It was recommended in the pre-planning advice given that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (including views from the AONB) should accompany any planning application. At this time, we have been unable to locate this assessment. The development will be visible and detrimental to views from the close by Mendip Hills AONB, especially from Sandford Hill and night lighting will not respect the 'dark skies' of the AONB. There is a Grade II listed residence immediately opposite the proposed site entrance and it is claimed by the developer that the three storey apartments/flats have been included to respect and reflect this. The Council disputes this as the mentioned property is in fact a thatched cottage and three storey buildings are not in keeping with Sandford Village.

**Whilst strongly opposed to the planning application and development, the Parish Council does however recognise that some planning applications may be viewed differently by North Somerset Council and/or the Planning Inspectorate at a Planning Appeal. Should this be the case and the application were to be approved, the Parish Council would request that to assist a rapidly expanding community, that an area of land is set aside within the final plan for the proposed development of a new village hall, along with parking facilities. The Parish Council would further fully endorse the Section 106 application from the Sandford Neighbourhood Group for additional facilities and services for the village to mitigate the detrimental effects of this development.**

**Proposed: Cllr C Boase                      Seconded: Cllr G Lloyd                      All in favour**

g. **18/P/3648/FUH, Folly Cottage, 93 Sandford Road, Winscombe, BS25 1JJ.**  
*Replacement/rebuild of existing conservatory with extension of the same footprint.*

**The planning committee supported approval of the planning application**  
**Proposed: Cllr G Lloyd                      Seconded: Cllr M Williamson                      All in favour**

h. **18/P/3704/LDP, Southwinds, 13 Well Close, Winscombe, BS25 1HG.**  
*Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for proposed creation of a single storey rear extension. **Notification Only***

i. **18/P/3685/FUL, Pimple Barn, Mead Lane, Sandford, Winscombe, BS25 5RG.**  
*Replace poly tunnel with agricultural building.*  
**The planning committee supported approval of the planning application**  
**Proposed: Cllr M Williamson                      There was no second and the motion failed**

The site was considered to be a small-holding rather than farm and it was considered no justification for agricultural need.

**The planning committee recommended refusal of the application as there was no justification for agricultural need.**

**Proposed: Cllr P Watkins                      Seconded: Cllr C Boase**  
**3 in favour, 4 against, 2 abstentions      MOTION FAILED**

As the committee had failed to reach a decision on this application, no comments should be submitted to NSC.

**29. Notification of Planning Approvals/Refusals/Tree Preservation Orders for information purposes only**

*Planning Applications Approved*

<b>Application no</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Brief description</b>
18/P/2502/FUL	Land to rear of Yew Tree House	Erection of detached dwelling
18/P/2869/FUL	The Barn, Hillyfields	Erection of 1 no detached house & garage
18/P/3230/R32	Strawberry Line near Recreation G	Advertising consent pole mounted sign.
18/P/3243/TPO	9 Church Road	Reduce in height & reduce lateral branches
18/P/3392/R32	Railway Bridge, Woodborough Rd	Advertising board non illuminated

*Planning Application withdrawn*

<b>Application no</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Brief description</b>
18/P/3229/FUL	Plot 24 The Chestnuts	Change Condition 2 - add single garage

**30. NSC Consultation;**

- a. The NSC Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). An updated document has been produced and is available to view and comment through the North Somerset Council consultation webpage. The consultation will close at midday on 10<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018.**

The importance of this document was stressed as it was used in appeals and other planning matters by developers. The North Somerset Landscape Character Assessment 2005 was adopted as a supplementary planning document in 2005 but the document was becoming increasingly out of date, with a need to refresh references, photos, and incorporate recent built development, consequential changes to boundaries and descriptions and note any changes in condition since 2005. The main visual difference between the 2005 and 2018 replacement version of the SPD being that the original character areas excluded the towns but “washed over” the villages, whereas the refreshed study works to the Core Strategy settlement boundaries for the larger villages and expansion of settlements, notably Weston-super-Mare Villages, Yatton (north), Nailsea (south-west).

The new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes reference to the creation of a Green Belt to separate new large developments such as Garden Villages (para 72). It was questioned if NSC would consider including such a gap for the Churchill/Sandford Garden Village site and Sandford Village? No information had been included on the Cheddar Valley Railway Walk in appendix 5 to the SPD

If this document was intended to replace rather than update the 2005 document, the usefulness of its approach to planning for this parish was considered to be deficient with it not being entirely clear in its objectives. A clear and concise planning strategy would be welcomed.

**31. Matters for information.**

- **Street Naming.** NSC has requested that councils start to consider and submit potential new street names to their Street Naming and Numbering Department early into the planning process. Members considered that this could take place at discussion of the Reserved Matters application for larger planning applications.

**Meeting Closed: 8.55 p.m.**

**Date of next meeting: Monday 20<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Planning Chairman)

Date \_\_\_\_\_