



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 Wednesday 24th May 2017, 7.30 pm, Sandford Village Hall.

Councillors present: Mr C Ballard, Mrs M Ballard, Ms C Boase, Mr A Forbes (Chairman),
Mr K Joyce (Vice-Chairman), Mr C Lomas, Mr G Luckett, Dr P Watkins,
and Mr M Williamson.

Clerk: Mrs L Rampton
Members of the public: approximately thirty five
Press: Ms V Angear, NS Mercury

- To elect a Committee Chairman & to receive the Chairman's Declaration of Acceptance of Office.**
Nominee Cllr. A Forbes (1 nomination received for Mr. Forbes).
Proposed: Cllr M Williamson Seconded: Cllr C Ballard
Cllr Forbes was unanimously elected Committee Chairman.
The Declaration of Acceptance of Office was duly signed and received by the Clerk.
- To elect a Committee Vice Chairman & to receive the Vice Chairman's Declaration of Acceptance of Office.** Nominee Mr K Joyce (1 nomination received for Mr. Joyce)
Proposed: Cllr M Williamson Seconded: Cllr C Lomas
Mr Joyce was unanimously elected Committee Vice Chairman.
The Declaration of Acceptance of Office was duly signed and received by the Clerk.
- To receive apologies for absence.** Apologies were received from Parish Councillors M Boddy,
I Kilpatrick, G Lloyd, V Slater and J Westlake
- Declarations of interest.** Cllr Lomas declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 9a, planning application 17/P/0887/O as a neighbouring land-owner. Cllr Williamson declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 10 as a Trustee of Winscombe Community Association.
- 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 a written request received, dispensation was granted by the Clerk to Cllr Williamson's request to speak but not vote for this meeting only on support for the s106 applications as the member's interest was not deemed significant enough to exclude him from participation.

It had been requested that the council decide upon the dispensation application to speak and vote by Cllr Lomas. **It was proposed that for this meeting only, Cllr Lomas, as a representative for Sandford residents be permitted to both speak and vote on the planning application**
Proposed: Cllr A Forbes Seconded: Cllr K Joyce
7 in favour, 1 abstention. Cllr Lomas took no part in the voting
- To approve minutes as a correct record of the previous planning committee meeting held on 8th May 2017**
The minutes were approved as a correct record of the meeting
Proposed: Cllr K Joyce Seconded: Cllr M Williamson
All committee members present at the last meeting were in favour
- Minute Update from previous minutes of the Planning Committee.** There were none

8. **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.*
17/P/0887/O.

Representatives speaking on behalf of the Sandford Neighbourhood Group (SNG) – it was requested that should the planning application for 93 homes on land to the north of Greenhill Road be approved, that the Parish Council support the SNG Section 106 request to the developer for improvements/facilities in Sandford. It was advised that this request had been compiled following recent consultation with the Sandford community and that local facilities should be available to residents without having to travel in a car.

Reasons for the SNG objection to the planning application included overdevelopment for the village (a 90% increase in the population for Sandford over the last 10 years), unsustainable location with further recent losses in community facilities and spaces, concern for the future of public transport service and the increased traffic resulting from this along with limited space for expansion at the primary school and current village hall. The SNG stated that the Srongvox appeal decision for 118 homes in Sandford did not mean that further large development in the village was sustainable.

A further three Parishioners spoke in opposition to the application citing reasons of over-development of the site, concern for the future of a willow tree on Greenhill Road and lack of community facilities and support for the project.

WinSpace – a Trustee of the Winscombe Community Association (WCA) explained reasons for a s106 request towards a new centre in Winscombe. All residents of the Parish were members of the WCA and the proposed new centre in Winscombe was hoped to compliment plans for Sandford Village Hall rather than duplicating facilities. It was hoped that the Parish Council would support both s106 requests for developer contributions on the proviso that the WCA would defer their request should the developer be minded to make a suitable site available for a new hall in Sandford.

Representatives from Walsingham Planning, Progress Land and Hydrock explained the proposals for up to 93 new homes on a single site within the parish. Plans indicated how the site could look to accommodate a mixture of houses up to 5 bed with 30% of this being affordable housing. The developer hoped to work constructively with the Parish Council, school and community groups to progress plans for a school extension and village hall.

In response to questions from the public and members, the following points were made:

- I. Affordable homes would be transferred to a housing association
- II. It was planned that apartments could be three storey
- III. The plan was fairly fluid at this time with the location of the pumping station (confirmed that there would be no noise from this) open for discussion.
- IV. Generous gardens are planned, especially for those backing on to existing residences on Greenhill Road.
- V. Although it appeared that a willow tree close to the site entrance had been removed (on the plan), it was confirmed that that was not the intention with as many trees and hedgerow to be retained as possible.
- VI. Differing opinions were aired with regard to linking roads and footways to the neighbouring Srongvox site.
- VII. The proposed pumping station would feed into existing sewers, which had capacity to accommodate the additional development.
- VIII. Planning policy parking standards have been met and the proposed access will be tested to ensure compliance (especially for emergency vehicles) when the transport assessment is reviewed by NSC as part of the application process..
- IX. Electric vehicle charging points would be offered to properties and at parking bays should vehicle omissions be an issue.
- X. Subject to planning consent being granted, work on the site was anticipated to commence end of 2018.
- XI. Some considered that the planning authority had not taken into account the accumulative effect of developments on the village with limited employment opportunities and public transport available.
- XII. Of the 13 designated 'infill villages' in North Somerset, Sandford had by far, been subject to the most new housing applications.

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

9. **Planning Application for comment:**

a. **17/P/0887/O, Progress Land (Sandford) Ltd and Aurora Land and Design, Land North of Greenhill Road, Sandford, Winscombe.**

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.

In addition to concern raised by parishioners, it was noted that an archaeological survey had not been submitted as part of the planning application. Members spoke of the lack of facilities, especially for children and youths provided as part of the planning application and concern was raised over a 'holding objection' to the application from the NSC Flood Risk Management Team as discharging of surface water into the ordinary watercourse was not considered a full 'sustainable' drainage system. The applicant had been advised that the layout would need to be extensively revised before the drainage objection was removed.

Infill only village. Sandford had been designated as an 'infill only village' by NSC and this application abutting, but outside the settlement boundary for the village does nothing to preserve the rural character of the area. Sandford village was not considered able to support further development of this scale, especially as 118 homes had 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 cannot 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.

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 but 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.

Public Transport. Whilst it has been advised by NSC that there are no planned changes to bus services through Sandford at this time, it is understood that First Group will be reviewing all their routes in September 2017 and there is great concern about the viability of the A2 subsidised bus service to Bristol Airport (then linking with other routes into Bristol) following the introduction of the Weston Flyer Service. Lack of public transport will add to increased traffic generated by the development.

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 the local community, especially primary school children with the school located on the main A368.

Impact from 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, the Parish Council has 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.

In consideration of the application, the Planning Committee object to the siting of the siting of the development access. It was considered that for safety reasons the road access should 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.

Proposed: Cllr P Watkins **Seconded:** Cllr C Lomas **All in favour**

The Planning Committee consider the application to be extreme development for an 'infill village' and totally unsustainable. It is therefore recommended to NSC to refuse the planning application.

Proposed: Cllr C Lomas **Seconded:** Cllr C Boase **All in favour**

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.

10. Section 106 applications.

a. Request by Sandford Neighbourhood Group (SNG) for the Parish Council to support their 106 application for land and financial provision for a new community hall and other provision in respect of the proposed Aurora development of up to 93 dwellings, on the land North of Greenhill Road, Sandford.

It was proposed that the Parish Council support the s106 contribution request from the SNG

Proposed: Cllr C Lomas Seconded: Cllr C Boase

8 in favour. Cllr Williamson abstained from voting due to a previously declared interest

b. Request by Winscombe Community Association; Winspace Project for the Parish Council to support their 106 application for financial provision for a new community hall and other provision in respect of the proposed Aurora development of up to 93 dwellings, on the land North of Greenhill Road, Sandford.

It was proposed that the Parish Council did not support the s106 request in this instance from the WCA for a contribution towards a new build centre in Winscombe.

Proposed: Cllr C Lomas Seconded: Cllr C Ballard

8 in favour. Cllr Williamson abstained from voting due to a previously declared interest

11. Notification of Planning Approvals/Refusals for information purposes only

Planning Applications Approved

Application no	Address	Brief description
17/P/0140/F	Land adj to Premier Inn, Bridgwater Road	Erection of a 3 bed dwelling
17/P/0668/F	Land Adjacent to 19 The Lynch	New 3 bed dwelling
17/P/0358/F	Shutefield, Oakridge Lane	single garage store and car port
17/P/0486/CUPA	Barn at Westerleigh Farm, Mead Lane	Change use from Barn to dwelling
17/P/0739/F	1 Brimridge Road	Single storey side extension
17/P/0786/F	Buttercliff Winscombe Hill	Two storey Extension plus balcony

Planning/TPO Refusals

Application no	Address	Brief description
17/P/0768/F	1 Underwood End Sandford	Rendering external brickwork/ cedar cladding

Clarification has been sought, and a meeting requested with NSC and AONB Planning Officers regarding a number of recent approvals for new-build properties in the AONB

12. Matters for information. There were none

Meeting Closed: 9.00 p.m.

Date of next meeting: Monday 5th June 2017

Signed _____ (Planning Chairman) Date _____