

## **CHURCHILL PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015 at 7.30 pm in War Memorial Hall, Ladymead Lane Churchill.

### **COUNCILLORS PRESENT**

Councillor Brenden Hill      Councillor Trudy Silverton  
Councillor Sue List          Councillor Alan Brown  
Councillor David Hurst      Councillor Jackie Bush  
Councillor Dev Clutterbuck   Councillor Alan Lovell  
Councillor Valerie Langley   Councillor Simon Hegarty  
Councillor Graham Fortune.

**Other Attendees** – Clerk Aleana Baird, District Councillor Liz Wells, 1 member of the press and 9 members of the public.

### **15/16.052 Apologies- to receive apologies from Councillors for non-attendance.**

Apologies had been received from Councillors Bill Carruthers, Simon Glanfield and Parish Liaison Officer Mark Macgregor.

### **15/16.053 Declarations of interest: To receive alteration/amendments to the register of interests: To receive declarations of interest on agenda items.**

### **15/16.054 To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015.**

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015 were confirmed by those present as a correct record and signed.

### **15/16.055 Public Participation.**

**All comments referred to planning application 15/P/1414/O.**

A resident spoke with concern regarding the non-compliance with both local planning policy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal was large and outside the settlement boundary and unsustainable. The traffic implications were very serious for Stock Lane and Smallway junction in Congresbury with gridlock resulting from congestion and the solution was a bypass.

A resident also spoke of the increase in HGV movements on Stock Lane and how very dangerous it was for both pedestrians and cyclists. The problem in Stock Lane was not speed but volume of traffic with a weight limit being a solution to reducing HGV movement at least. The construction period for the development was likely to be horrendous and would destroy the area.

A resident had particular concerns as the school and the surgery in close proximity making Pudding Pie Lane very busy already and that the infrastructure was not there to support 141 additional homes. The development would increase the existing traffic problems on Stock Lane.

A resident highlighted that there was now a lot more traffic using Stock Lane than in the past and the development would add to this problem.

### **15/16.056 To receive report from District Councillor.**

District Councillor Liz Wells advised that the Secretary of State's decision had not been received and reiterated that she had called in to Planning & Regulatory Committee both the decision on the Says Lane and the Bristol University applications should the planning officer be minded to approve them. Councillor David Hurst questioned why the news that NSC would not look at any major applications until the Secretary of State's decision had been reached had appeared in the Weston Mercury and that this information should have come from NSC not via the press.

### **15/16.057 Parish Liaison Officer Report.**

#### **Parish Liaison Officer had given apologies, items to be raised with him as follows:**

The Clerk was asked to again report blocked gullies all along the A38 New Road & Bristol Road as they still had not been done. The hedge from the top of Ladymead Lane along the A38 and Old School Close boundary was making walking along the pavement difficult. The Clerk had reported it. The bamboo on the footway from the Drive to Front Street had not been resolved and another approach needed to be taken to help the resident remove the plant. A resident present at the meeting offered his help.

### **15/16.058 Planning**

#### **To Receive Planning Decision Notices and Information**

##### **Planning approval decision notices.**

- i) 15/P/1344/F – Mr J Bryant, Land at Stonewell Cottage, Front Street, Churchill, BS25 5NB. Erection of a detached bungalow, with shared access to the west of Front Street and following the demolition of outbuilding (resubmission of 14/P/2459/F).
- ii) 15/P/1186/F – Mr Alderson, Oak House, Pudding Pie lane, Langford, BS40 5EL. Erection of a single storey garage side extension, a single storey garden room side extension, a porch to the front of the property, a single storey extension to rear of property and a two storey extension to the rear of property.
- iii) 15/P/1207/F – Mr A Murray, Greenwell Lane, Langford, Churchill, BS40 5HR. Application to remove condition 8 attached to planning permission 14/P/2167/F (erection of a dwelling) which requires the dwellings to be constructed to a minimum of Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

### **Planning Applications**

**i) 15/P/1414/O – University of Bristol, Land off Pudding Pie Lane & Stock Lane, Langford, Churchill.** Outline application for the erection of 141 no. residential units and 1no community building including highway improvements from Stock Lane and associated works; with access for approval; appearance, landscaping, scale and layout reserved for subsequent approval.

**RESOLVED:** that the Parish Council strongly recommend **NOT** supporting application 15/P/1414/O.

## **1. OPENING STATEMENT AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT**

This application by Bristol University for residential development at Langford is wholly unacceptable on grounds of local and national planning policy. It is an unsustainable development outside the settlement boundary of a designated Service Village on prime agricultural land. Moreover, the size of the development would cause a very substantial and unacceptable increase (20-25%) in the population of the village.

The application meets none of the social, economic criteria of the NPPF which delineates the vital strategic role of clearly defined community-led aims within a coherent local planning policy. The village settlement boundary has been defended and widely supported by local opinion and sustained against development proposals several times since its original delineation in the mid-1980s. Furthermore, on two occasions that boundary has been upheld at public inquiries after two separate planning appeals. In each case the presiding Planning Inspector has cited the harm which would be done by large developments outside the boundary to the appearance of the village and its setting. The Churchill and Langford Parish Plan (2008) also demonstrate clearly that this concept has overwhelming local support.

The proposal represents one of numerous speculative developments arising out of planning

policy issues affecting North Somerset and should be strongly resisted.

The Parish Council are fully aware of the current position regarding the Core Strategy remitted policies, the re-examination of CS13 and housing number requirements. However, throughout this process, the position of the weight which can be afforded to remitted policies other than CS13 is clear:

*“While it is unlikely that all the policies would be affected, it is not possible at this stage to predict which would be. However. It will be obvious to any reader of my judgment and this addendum that there is nothing unlawful per se about the policies remitted other than CS13 ....The policies can be still be accorded appropriate weight in any decision making and housing can be brought forward through the development control process.”* (Approved Addendum Judgment 7 March 2013).

The proposal is in conflict with the remitted Core Strategy Policy CS32 Service Villages:

*“Where small scale residential or mixed use schemes which demonstrate clear local benefits are supported by the local community cannot be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries then these must be brought forward as an allocation in the Sites and Policies DPD...”*

CS32 restricts development outside settlement boundaries to small scale with clear local benefits brought forward through a local plan. This proposed 141 dwelling development is not small scale, does not have clear local benefits, is strongly opposed by the local community, and is not brought forward through a development plan.

Weight has recently and appropriately been given to CS32 in the recent refusal of the Barratt Homes application for 80 houses at Brinsea, Congresbury.

As the site is outside the defined settlement boundary of the village, the proposal is also in conflict with planning policies CS5 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Policy GDP/3 of the North Somerset Local Plan which aim to minimise the dispersal of dwellings outside existing settlements in order to protect the character of the countryside and to reduce the need to travel. It is also in conflict with Paragraph 109 of the National Policy Framework which states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

## **2. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The NPPF (para 7) sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- *“An economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*
- *A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*
- *An environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”*

The NPPF (para 8) states that:

*“...to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions.”*

This proposal fails to meet any of these criteria for sustainability:

### **Economic**

No evidence at all is provided by the applicants of direct local employment opportunities arising from this development. No evidence is provided for any boost to the local economy. Any additional income to the one shop nearby (Budgens) and the local pubs will not amount to a significant economic boost. The local community will have negligible benefit from any increase in council tax income.

CS20 supports an employment led economy seeking to increase sustainability by “decreasing out-commuting, provide for a large range of local jobs and reduce carbon emissions from unsustainable car use.” This is a dormitory development for commuters which will achieve exactly the opposite.

### **Social**

The applicants make reference to the various amenities of the village but with the exception of the provision of affordable homes, they provide no evidence whatsoever of the social benefit of the development to the community as a whole. There appears to be none. The local primary school which is already at capacity with no prospect of places being available for the new families. (See Schooling below). The proposed community hall is in the wrong part of the village and would be an unnecessary duplication of existing provisions. Existing amenities of the village will be under severe pressure with the addition of an almost immediate 20/25% increase in population.

### **Environmental**

There are no environmental benefits of adding 141 houses to a small rural village with additional commuter and local traffic and substantial loss of green fields.

In conclusion, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development is sustainable in respect of all 3 criteria.

## **3. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT**

In terms of a “sustainable development”, far from “*contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment*” (NPPF) this development will have a significant adverse visual impact situated approximately 1km from the boundary of the Mendip Hills AONB..

The applicant’s Landscape Report concludes that any changes in the landscape character of the AONB would be largely imperceptible. This is a highly contentious conclusion but not surprising when supported by one photo alone (no 21), of extremely poor quality and seemingly taken on a day of poor visibility. It is therefore not possible to make out the existing settlements never mind the proposed development site.

One of the most significant vantage points is Dolberrow Camp and sections of the West Mendip Way in that vicinity. The development will be wholly visible from here. To suggest that an additional 5 hectare housing estate (which would make up a separate village on its own) will be imperceptible in terms of landscape change is nonsense.

There will also be significant visual impact for all properties within the vicinity of the site. (See comments under biodiversity hedges & trees section). Against the recommendations of the Pre-application Advice Report which states that the perimeter hedges are strong

features and should be retained, the applicants Landscape Report details the removal of a significant section of the hedge along Pudding Pie Lane which is wholly unacceptable.

We reject the conclusions of the applicants Landscape Report. The development will clearly give rise to significant adverse visual impact in the vicinity of the site and from the AONB.

#### **4. BEST AND MOST VERSATILE LAND**

The NPPF (par 112) states that *“Local planning authorities should take into account the economic benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.*

*Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality.”*

The proposed development is on best and most versatile land and the applicant has not demonstrated that land of lower quality is neither available nor suitable. Taking account of other proposed developments at Pudding Pie Lane and in Sandford, Winscombe, Banwell and Brinsea, there is the potential loss of very significant areas of best and most versatile land in what is a small radius area.

#### **5. HOUSING**

##### **Housing needs**

It would appear that the applicant bases housing need purely on housing need for the whole of North Somerset. No local housing need is identified. No assessment of need or suitability was sought from the Parish Council at any stage. Some need for Affordable Housing, if it could be reserved for local people within the village, may be identified in due course through the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the present government’s emerging ‘Right to Buy’ scheme may discourage Housing Associations coming forward to acquire affordable elements of new housing development. It is most likely that the vast majority of houses in this development will be acquired by non-locals and it will form a dormitory development with the majority of residents commuting to work in Bristol and larger conurbations.

##### **Density**

The application is proposing 141 houses on a 5 hectare site. Under the NSC Housing & Land Availability Assessment Dec 2014, the recommendation is that the housing element of any site should constitute 50-75% of the available site with 30-40 dwellings per hectare depending on whether a rural or urban location. Applying a housing element of 50% of the site (2.5 hectares) and the lower ‘rural’ figure of 30 houses per hectare gives a figure of 75 houses. The proposed development is vastly in excess of this and unacceptably high.

##### **Future development**

The plan shows a cul de sac on the west boundary, indicating an intention to give access to yet further development. This is of considerable concern to the Parish Council and residents.

#### **6. HIGHWAYS**

It is noted that the following details submitted by the Applicant conflict with the Pre-Application Advice provided by Mr G Quick of the North Somerset Council, NSC, in 2014:-

##### **Proposed Access**

The submitted design links direct with Stock Lane rather than the NSC preference of Pudding Pie Lane.

Whilst the advice re Jubilee Lane not being used as an access is heeded, it is noted that new footway & possible emergency access arrangements render this existing junction significantly more hazardous than at present.

The proposed Stock Lane improvements to one pinch point and a crossing into the University in the vicinity of Jubilee Lane are of no real benefit to the prospective residents of the site, existing local residents or vehicles using Stock Lane.

### **Capacity Assessments**

On page 17 of the Applicants Transport Assessment Report, WB03572:R005, the applicant acknowledges that, in practice, queue lengths at the B3133/A38 & B3133/Langford Road junctions are presently greater than the theoretical analysis predicts post development of the Pudding Pie site.

This is confirmed by Parish Council observations raising major questions regarding the validity of the capacity assessments.

Furthermore the applicants then attempt to justify these anomalies by seeking causes other than increases in vehicles generated by the proposed development.

The consultants' explanation of the discrepancy based on traffic speeds and their proposed reinforcement of speed restrictions are wholly unconvincing. There seems some danger in relying at all on the modelling in these circumstances when actual observation shows otherwise.

In reality the congestion which frequently occurs at these locations and in Stock Lane is caused by the road layout, proximity of public/private/business access and the frequency of through & turning HGV's. These unsatisfactory conditions can only be made worse by the proposed development and the developers suggested improvements will not mitigate this in any way.

### **South Bristol Link Road**

The Applicants Transport Assessment Report recognises the extreme traffic conditions that presently exist in B3133 Stock Lane, particularly with conflicting movements of HGV's. These can only be exacerbated by all traffic movements generated by the proposed development.

The Applicants suggest that completion of the South Bristol Link Road should lead to a ban on through HGV's on the B3133 and so alleviate this problem.

It is noted that the NSC Pre Application Advice does not make reference to the South Bristol Link Road. Before a valid outcome of the transport implications can be reached the position of North Somerset Council on the following is requested:-

- As Highway Authority, has NSC predictions on B3133 Stock Lane traffic, post construction of South Bristol Link?
- Is a through HGV restriction order on Stock Lane a favoured solution?
- Bearing in mind predicted increases in HGV local movements, would a through Order have significant impact compared to the present?

These questions suggest that the applicant's contention about the relief provided by the South Bristol Link road are as yet wholly unsubstantiated and should be discounted in this application.

NSC Highways recognise a history of personal injury accidents at the Budgens Junction. That situation will be exacerbated by the additional traffic from this proposed development.

The prospect of further congestion at the Budgens Junction also has the potential negative impact of traffic using Lower Langford as a rat run and easier access out to the A38. These are both aspects of considerable concern to residents.

It is necessary to take account of significant traffic issues not only at the junction of the B3133 and the A38 (the Budgens Junction) but also at the junction of the B3133 and the A370 at Congresbury.

In the latter case, NSC have already considered the implications of the proposed Barratt Homes development at Brinsea and concluded that it is a substantial reason in the initial refusal of that application. The 2 offset light controlled T junctions approximately 200 metres apart create significant queuing on the B3133 Congresbury High Street and the B3133 Smallway (from Yatton to the A370). Traffic from both the Pudding Pie and Brinsea developments will exacerbate the situation, also compounded by the significant developments at Yatton. It is inevitable that traffic flow on the A370 will increase on completion of the Bristol South Link Road in 2016. No viable solution has been proffered to deal with effect of these proposed developments.

## **7. DRAINAGE/FLOODING**

It is noted that the following details submitted by the Applicant conflict with the Pre-Application advice of the Local Planning Authority:-

No single, specific proposal for surface water drainage is made. This is contrary to pre-application advice from NSC. Of the three broad options suggested by the Applicant, the NSC Flood Risk Management Team, (1 July 2015), finds only one, a Suds scheme, likely to be acceptable in principle. As the applicant offers no practical detail on the design, construction and effectiveness of this Suds proposal Churchill Parish Council believes the Application should fail.

Specific issues arising from the applicants report (Ref WB03572:R003)

Para 1.7 The Applicant denies responsibility & liability for the information on which their drainage proposal is made. How can this be acceptable after receiving the NSC advice, Pre-application Report, page 6?

Para 3.4 The Applicant recognises the historical record of flooding at Langford & Lower Langford.

Furthermore the Applicant then makes the completely unsubstantiated claim that –

‘The existing land drainage management system on site should adequately convey overland flows from areas outside the site and also areas within the site itself.’ This statement is based on commercial hope rather than real site conditions.

Page 14 The Environment Agency recognises that ground water flooding is a possibility at Langford & Lower Langford. The Applicant provides no scientific evidence to justify ignoring this statement.

A reference to local experience of sewer flooding is not disputed by the Applicant.

Para 4.3 While offering no practical or detailed drainage solution, the applicant claims that no increase in surface water runoff from the development site will occur due to ‘on site storage’.

Para 5.2 Applicant refers to a Suds drainage alternative. None of the detailed requirements of NSC Pre-application report, pages 5 & 6, are met.

To quote the Consultation Reply from the NSC Flood Risk Management (Drainage) Team dated 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015:

*“The applicant has indicated 3 possible drainage options within the FRA & Drainage Strategy provided with the application the first being that surface water will be captured within soakaways around the site (drawing ref WB03572, proposed drainage strategy layout), a review of BGS infiltration maps suggest that this option may not be feasible, although a ground investigation would be required to confirm this; the second option stated in section 5.2.1 of the same document is for surface water to outfall into the existing highway drainage system, North Somerset Council would not approve a design that outfalls to the highway drainage system, the third option, outlined in section 5.2.2 indicates surface water will outfall into a sewer system connecting the development at Broadoak to the watercourse to the East of Ladymead Farm. No detailed information has been provided for any of these proposals”.*

The Consultation Reply concludes that no development shall be commenced until details of the design, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme has been submitted to the LPA and approved in writing. A management and maintenance plan should also be provided for the lifetime of the development at this stage to ensure that any proposed scheme is sustainable long term.

The ominous reservations of the Flood Risk Management Team, the relatively high water table and that the ground water is designated within a source protection zone underline the inadequacy of the Applicants proposal. Furthermore the Parish Council can draw on anecdotal evidence of a history of flooding of the site even in its current state as agricultural land.

As the flood risk issues associated with development at this location are critical, the LPA is urged to reject the application or to insist on the provision of a detailed drainage design and for this to be reviewed and approved before this application proceeds any further. **This should not be a Reserved Matter.**

## **8. TRANSPORT**

The village is very poorly served in terms of public transport with 1 indirect bus per hour to Bristol, and no local cycle routes. There are no taxi businesses based in Churchill or Langford. No local employment will be attracted or generated by this development which will be of a dormitory nature and all residents will rely heavily on private cars and commute to work. Accordingly, this development leads to further undesirable and unsustainable out commuting to work and is contrary to Policy CS20.

## **9. SCHOOLING**

Churchill Primary School is the only school within 2 miles of this proposed development. Applying the calculations adopted by NSC in the Pre-Application Advice Report, 141 properties are likely to yield about 70-85 or more primary pupils. Churchill Primary School is currently effectively full. Next year it is expected to have only 7 spare places, but 5 are in one class, with 6 out of 7 classes full to capacity. The school is on a 1.2 hectare site which is small for a school of its size. It cannot be expanded to accommodate increased pupil numbers beyond its present capacity.

The nearest sizeable primary school at Sandford is full too and they face a significant increase in pupil numbers as a result of an application for a development of 118 units adjacent to the school.

We understand that there are no plans or funds for new primary schools in the area. Therefore the proposed application is unsustainable on grounds that there will be no adequate schooling provision at primary level. Any ‘per pupil’ financial contribution from the developers would be irrelevant. In addition the favoured solution by developers of providing school transport to mitigate a lack of school places is of no value in light of the influx of

development across a so many villages all of which have no capacity to cope with the scale of pupils these combined speculative developments will bring.

## **10. BIODIVERSITY, TREES, HEDGEROWS**

The Parish Council have a group of four Tree Wardens who were asked to give their comments on the planning application under the above heading. Their views are as follows:

Tree Retention and Removal Plan Drawing no: 14-33-08 Rev: A

One tree to be removed - no details of species or age.

Hedge to be removed - again no details of species or age or acceptable ecology survey. We would repeat our previous comments in the landscape section above regarding the existing hedgerows which are strong landscape features and must not be removed.

### Ecology Report

The ecology report appears to be inaccurate and should be rejected. Firstly Ecology Solutions were commissioned in September 2015 apparently - i.e. next month and this is obviously incorrect. The report appears to be based on 10 units with parking etc, this is not what is proposed and an ecology report for 140 houses needs to be significantly more comprehensive in its scope. The area is predominantly rural - with two small rural villages and the veterinary college adjacent. The surrounding area is agricultural land.

Work was undertaken between Sept 2014 and Feb 2015 - and the report states:

*2.3.4. All the species that occur in each habitat would not necessarily be detectable during survey work carried out at any given time of the year, since different species are apparent at different seasons. Although the timing of the surveys did not include the optimal period for undertaking botanical surveys, given the habitats present it is considered that an accurate and robust assessment has been made of the botanical interest.*

This is totally unacceptable and especially where other studies in the area have shown that rare species of bat are known to roost. This report is neither accurate nor robust, and we would urge that further reports are carried out at the 'optimal period' during other seasons in order to gain a full and accurate assessment of the impact on the ecology of this site. **This should not be a Reserved Matter.**

## **11. PARISH PLAN AND COMMUNITY OBJECTION**

Between 2005 and 2008, the Parish produced a very comprehensive Parish Plan following an extensive review of various aspects of the village and full consultation with the all the householders. In respect of Housing and Development, overwhelmingly residents who expressed a view (89% of 1109) felt it was either vital or very important to preserve the character of the villages of Churchill and Langford. 33% were against any further development and 50% were in favour of some new housing but for local people or those in vital services. Whilst this document doesn't have the legal standing of the Neighbourhood Plan the Parish has begun the process of producing, it still has relevance today as the village has changed very little since it was completed in 2008.

After the applicant's public consultation, a public meeting was held by the Parish Council on the 13<sup>th</sup> May 2016 to take villagers' views on this and one further proposed application on Pudding Pie Lane. 250 parishioners attended at the Primary School and overwhelmingly objected to each application.

The feedback from the applicant's consultation process records 'a high level of attendees' at the consultation and a 'very high response rate' in respect of written feedback. The wide range of objections and concerns is recorded at page 7 of the Summary Feedback report. These have been echoed in the substantial a number of on line comments on the planning

website. The applicants were left in no doubt whatsoever about the strength of feeling and opposition to this application centred on virtually every aspect of it. The many online comments are comprehensive and well expressed and all should be reviewed and taken into consideration.

### **13. CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF OTHER APPLICATIONS**

The village is facing a tsunami of speculative planning applications on greenfield sites outside the settlement boundary, 2 now registered and 2 at proposal stage but in all represents the building of over 275 houses in a village of 850 dwellings and is completely contrary to extant local and national planning policies.

Neighbouring villages face similar applications: Winscombe & Sandford (288) houses, Brinsea/Congresbury (150) house, Banwell/Knightcott (220) houses not to mention substantial developments at Yatton and Claverham (850). It is vital that North Somerset Planning give very careful consideration to the cumulative effect of all these applications which are collectively wholly unsustainable and will cause huge and irreversible environmental, social, transport, traffic, employment and schooling problems and, overall, the rapid and irreversible urbanisation of the rural villages of North Somerset.

#### **ii) 15/P/1552/F – Mr H Miah, Nurses Bungalow, Stockmead, Langford, BS40 5JB.**

Change of use from D1 (non-residential) to C3 dwelling house.

**RESOLVED:** to recommend supporting application 15/P/1552/F. There was no change to the footprint of the dwelling or the height. There were no objections at the time the Parish Council looked at the application just one observation which was brought to the Parish Council's attention. Since the building has been vacated by the nurses there has been a reduction in the number of parked cars in Stockmead which was a positive outcome for residents of the road.

#### **ii) 15/P/1639/F – Mr C Higgins, Suncroft, 7, Stock Lane, Langford, Churchill, BS40 5HZ.**

Erection of a detached single garage in rear garden.

**RESOLVED:** to recommend supporting application 15/P/1639/F. The garage had no negative impact on neighbouring properties and other had built garages in the vicinity with no set conformity to which this proposal would need to comply with.

#### **iii) 15/P/1677/F – Mr G Carr, Stock Farm, Stock Lane, Langford, Churchill, BS40 5EU.**

Erection of a single storey rear extension.

**RESOLVED:** to recommend supporting application 15/P/1677/F. The proposed extension was to the rear of the property and single storey, therefore had no impact on neighbouring properties or the street scene.

#### **iv) 15/P/1683/F – Mr & Mrs Houghton, Loose Box, Bath Road, Langford, Churchill.**

Erection of a two storey extension to rear and right hand side including a first floor balcony to rear elevation.

**RESOLVED:** to recommend supporting application 15/P/1683/F. The proposed extensions were on parts of the existing dwelling that did not impact on either neighbours or the street scene. It was considered to be an appropriate improvement on a plot with ample space to accommodate the extensions.

**v) 15/P/1752/F – Mr G Laws - Land adjoining Farmwell, Churchill Green, Churchill, BS25 5QH.** Construction of agricultural field access following removal of hedge, cut away bank to from slope and erect a fence and gate (retrospective).

**RESOLVED:** to recommend supporting application 15/P/1752/F. The entrance caused no parking obstruction as there was ample space to leave the highway when accessing the land. Whilst the visibility of a vehicle emerging from the entrance onto the lane was not perfect due to the mature trees, any vehicle on the lane had good sight of emerging traffic as the lane was very straight for a good distance in both directions and was far enough away from the sports centre entrance and the term time school parking not to cause any problem.

#### **15/16.059 Accounts**

**To receive and confirm the payments for July 2015.**

**RESOLVED:** The payments were agreed and signed with total expenditure of £3,600.39.

#### **15/16.060 Clerk's Report**

- i) Great Western Air Ambulance Charity had asked if there were any suitable sites for a clothing bank which was used for recycling and raising money for the air ambulance. The Clerk was to find out if they wanted 1 or 2 containers.
- ii) The solicitor who was working on the new lease for the former doctors surgery had questions she needed answering to make progress. It was to be looked at by the Finance Committee at their next meeting and they would make recommendations to Full Council n September.
- iii) The Cricket Pavilion had been broken into again but nothing taken.
- iv) The Open Spaces/Allotments Committee walkabout was to be on 18<sup>th</sup> August at 7pm.
- v) The Clerk reminded everyone that the next Tower was due in October and must be ready to go to print by the end of September.
- vi) Further to a request from Bristol University planning agents Alder King to meet with the Parish Council, the Clerk was to arrange a meeting in the first two weeks of September.

#### **15/16.061 Matters for Information**

- i) Councillor David Hurst raised the concern regarding the route HGV's had been designated for the construction of the solar farm at Carditch Drove. It was to come along the A370 from the M5 and enter the Strawberry Line at Congresbury. The concern was that especially the aggregate deliveries if sourced from the quarries at Cheddar would not obey the route and come the shorter way to Churchill and use Stock Lane to get the Congresbury. The Clerk was to seek assurance of how the designated route was to be enforced to prevent this.
- ii) Councillor Dev Clutterbuck raised an issue regarding tree on Windmill Hill at the last meeting which had now been resolved as it had been felled and he mentioned the burial gates were difficult to use, the Open Spaces walk about would assess this.
- iii) Councillor Brenden Hill reported the old fingerpost at the end of Hilliers Lane had been hit and all fingers broken off. He had the fingers and the Clerk was to seek permission from NSC to recover the post to his house to allow the process of repair to begin.
- iv) Councillor Alan Brown had received an enquiry about progress with the possible Post Office and Coffee Shop at Grove Nurseries, Langford. There had been no further developments.
- v) Councillor Simon Hegarty advised the Village Supper tickets for the 12<sup>th</sup> September were now on sale in the Post Office.
- vi) Chair Jackie Bush had received a formal complaint which she had fully investigated and responded too. She wished to highlight to all Councillors that in future if problems came to Committee or Full Council and were of a nature where there were no means of verifying fully the details of the problem then all the people involved must be contacted with a blanket email. Individuals must not be contacted.

**Meeting closed 9.00 pm.**

**CHAIRMAN.....**

**DATE.....**