



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

A Meeting of the Planning Committee was held on Monday 3rd February 2020, at 7.30 pm, The Amesbury Room, Winscombe Community Centre.

Those present at the meeting:

Committee members: Mr A Forbes (Chairman), Mr K Joyce (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Boase, Mr I Kilpatrick, Mr G Lloyd, Mr T Nicholson (from 7.40pm) and Mrs L Stephens
Deputy Clerk: Ms C McGrath
Members of the public: 18

Committee members absent: Mr M Boddy, Mr C Lomas, Mr G Paterson, Mr V Slater, Mr J Taviner and Dr P Watkins

84. **To receive apologies for absence.** Apologies had been received from Cllrs Boddy, Lomas, Slater and Watkins
85. **Declarations of interest** – None declared.
86. **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.** No dispensations requests received.
87. **To approve the minutes as a correct record of the previous planning committee meeting held on 13th January 2020.** The minutes were approved as a correct record of the meeting.
Proposed: Cllr K Joyce **Seconded:** Cllr L Stevenson
All committee members present at the last meeting were in favour
88. **Update from the previous minutes of the Planning Committee.**
Russett Copse – The issues previously raised have already been reported to North Somerset Council.
89. **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.*
19/P/3180/FUL – Land to the West of Rowington, Bridgwater Road, Winscombe – 3 residents living close to the site, voiced their objections to the development. Which included traffic concerns with vehicles having to come off of and on to the A38, as there has been a number of serious accidents and near misses due to queuing, particularly during rush hour, and that visibility would be poor due to the current 3 meter access. Concerns were also raised with regards to the passing bay, as it was felt that it was in the wrong place and would cause issues, due again to lack of visibility when coming from the A38. Sewage and storm water run off was also mentioned, as it was felt that the development would make the drainage worse due to the amount of land that would be lost, this would be impacted by the fact that the development would also be 11 metres higher than the surrounding properties. Concerns were also raised with regards to whether the properties would be on mains drainage or septic tanks (surrounding properties to the development have septic tanks), as the need for sewage tankers gaining access to the site could become an issue. It was felt that the design of the properties, with the suggested steel roofs and cladding would not be in keeping with the surrounding area and properties. A question was raised with regards to the Ecology report and wildlife corridor. In addition, it was noted that the development would be outside the settlement boundary and is adjacent to the AONB.

It was also mentioned that these properties were not of an affordable design, meaning that there seemed to be no benefit to the community and that the costs involved would be substantial.

Concerns were raised with regards to the amount of properties that were being suggested for the size of the plot and that this would potentially increase vehicle movements significantly and that in some areas, there would be a lack of privacy.

One of the planning agents advised the meeting of the following: The development consisted of 5 no. 4 bedroomed contemporary designed detached houses, with a steel, rubble and wood cladding exterior. The size of the plot is ½ hectare and the properties would be sited towards the centre of the site with a wildlife buffer. The closest that any new property would be to any old property is 35 metres. There would be no loss of trees, but they had received a recommendation to remove a large laurel hedge, which would be replaced with several other indigenous hedge species. The agents advised that a full ecology report had been done and this was one of the reasons for maintaining the suggested wildlife buffer. It was agreed that the entrance was not ideal and that they were therefore widening the access from 3 metres to 8 metres and increasing the splays, giving a 100-metre visibility in accordance with guidance. The agent advised that they were looking to improve the surface water run off with permeable surfaces, planting an additional 8 trees and living roofs on the garages. The agent agreed that the site was outside the settlement boundary, but that NS Council were short on housing numbers and this was an infill site.

A number of the Committee members had questions: - What price would the houses be sold at? The agent advised an approximate cost of £650,000.

There is an obvious lack of affordable housing, was this considered? The agent advised that this was not required, as the development was under 10 dwellings.

There is no mention of what colour the cladding would be – The agent advised that they could not confirm the exact colour, but they would propose grey.

Where in Winscombe is the cladding that is being suggested, already apparent – The agent advised that they had no direct examples of this in Winscombe but that the design with the rubble and wood would blend into the surrounding area.

What is in place to stop any new homeowners removing any of the trees within the amenity areas, if they decide that they are an issue? – The agent advised that there would be a Tree Protection plan in place for the development whilst the building works were carried out and that the North Somerset may include a condition on the planning decision, which stops any removals, following the development being finished. They confirmed that there would be a planning condition in place with regards to the wildlife buffer. The agent also confirmed that there would be a central management scheme and management charge for the communal areas of the finished development.

Church Road Triangle – A resident voiced their concerns with regards to the safety aspect of the re-modelling and felt that pedestrians were being put at risk.

19/P/3164/FUH – 3 Winnowing End, Sandford, BS25 5RS – The applicant advised the Committee that they were looking to extend the house to make a bigger family home.

18/P/3625/OUT – Land to the North Side of Greenhill Lane, Greenhill Road, Sandford – 2 residents spoke of their disappointment with regards to the application still being live. And reiterated their objections.

At the agreement of the Committee, items 10 and 7f were moved up the Agenda

90. Church Road Triangle – To receive an update from North Somerset, following receiving concerns over the new layout. The Chairman advised that the re-modelling of The Triangle had been completed as to the specification that was agreed by the Parish Council last year and that the area that was being suggested for additional footway was not owned by North Somerset Council. It was also agreed that it was safer than it had been, especially for those using the stile. Any further safety or layout concerns would need to be sent to the Highways department at North Somerset Council.

91. Planning Applications for comment or information:

f. 19/P/3180/FUL – Land to the West of Rowington, Bridgwater Road, Winscombe
Erection of 5 dwellings, associated works including access road, parking, and landscaping.

The Planning Committee recommended refusal of the planning application as it was outside the settlement boundary, the exterior of the properties would not be sympathetic to the surrounding area and the site is adjacent to an AONB.

Proposed: Cllr K Joyce **Seconded:** Cllr G Lloyd
6 for, 1 abstention

a. 19/P/3154/FUH - 6 Quarry Road, Sandford, BS25 5RL

Double height side and rear extension to existing semi-detached dwelling.

The Planning Committee recommended approval of the planning application

Proposed: Cllr K Joyce **Seconded:** Cllr I Kilpatrick **All in favour**

b. 19/P/3164/FUH – 3 Wincrowing End, Sandford, BS25 5RS

Single/Two storey side and single storey rear extensions including part garage conversion

The Planning Committee recommended approval of the planning application

Proposed: Cllr C Boase **Seconded:** Cllr T Nicholson **All in favour**

c. 19/P/3184/FUH – 1 Sidcot Lane, Winscombe, BS25 1LA

Double height rear extension to existing semi-detached dwelling.

The Planning Committee recommended approval of the planning application

Proposed: Cllr T Nicholson **Seconded:** Cllr I Kilpatrick **All in favour**

d. 19/P/3186/LDP - Wringstone Farm, Barton, Winscombe, BS25 1DY

*Construction of a single storey rear extension, and associated alterations – **information only***

e. 18/P/3625/OUT – Land to the North Side of Greenhill Lane, Greenhill Road, Sandford

To discuss and decide on the additional information submitted by the developer – The Chairman advised the Committee that an email had been received from the planning officer designated to this application that said the following:- ‘To provide an update and context within which there has been revised interest in the site, the applicant has approached NSC with a proposed amendment to the development comprising (in summary) a reduction in the number of dwellings to 78 and the inclusion of a community hall and business units.

On a procedural matter the new proposal introduces different uses and new elements that were not in the previous / current application. As such this is materially different in terms of character and description, and have not been accepted for, or consulted on, as part of the current application. Instead, these amendments will require a new planning application to be submitted, at which stage consultations will be undertaken. Given the appeal decision on 17/P/0887/O the duplicate application 18/P/3652/OUT can only be recommended for refusal, thus the applicant has been advised again that it should be withdrawn’. The Deputy Clerk advised the Committee that she had responded to the Officer, asking that if the applicant does not withdraw the application that the Committee be given enough time to re-evaluate the amendments and comment.

g. 20/P/0114/FUH – 55 Woodborough Road, Winscombe, BS25 1AG

Enlargement of front porch and erection of single storey rear extension.

The Planning Committee recommended approval of the planning application

Proposed: Cllr T Nicholson **Seconded:** Cllr I Kilpatrick **All in favour**

h. 18/P/5196/FUL – Kildare House, 70 Woodborough Road, BS25 5PD

To review a set of amended proposals and additional information.

The Planning Committee recommended refusal of the planning application due to the location of the new homes in the AONB, concerns for the highway safety for residential traffic using Knapps Drive as an access to the site and with no guarantee that the sale of the land for new homes would be invested in the re-development of Kildare House.

Proposed: Cllr K Joyce **Seconded:** Cllr L Stevenson **All in favour**

92. Notification of Planning Approvals/Refusals/Tree Preservation Orders for information only

Planning Approvals since the last committee meeting

Application no	Address	Brief description
----------------	---------	-------------------

19/P/2998/FUL	Land to rear of Kayos	Change of use of agricultural land
19/P/2717/FUH	Studio Two, Fullers Lane	Retrospective app for carport
19/P/2337/FUL	5 Helens Road, Sandford	2 bed bungalow and parking areas

93. Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP4) – To discuss and consider a request for support with regards to signing a letter to John Penrose MP – *Burrington & Churchill Parish Council*
In the absence of a JSP, it was proposed that the Committee support a letter to oppose North Somerset Council’s adoption of the JLTP4

Proposed: Cllr C Boase

Seconded: None

A member of the Committee proposed that the Committee does not support a letter, to oppose North Somerset Council’s JLTP4 but that members could respond individually in a private capacity

Proposed: Cllr T Nicholson

Seconded: I Kilpatrick

All in favour

94. Matters for information –

- The Chairman reminded the Committee with regards to part of the disclaimer at the bottom of all emails that are sent from the Parish Office, which states:- *This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. It may contain unclassified but sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), you may not copy, use or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the email.*

With there being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.54pm

Date of next meeting: Monday 2nd March 2020

Signed _____ (Planning Committee Chairman)

Date _____