

CHURCHILL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 6th July 2015 at 7.00 pm in War Memorial Hall, Ladymead Lane Churchill.

COUNCILLORS PRESENT

Councillor Brenden Hill Councillor Bill Carruthers
Councillor Sue List Councillor Alan Brown
Councillor David Hurst Councillor Jackie Bush
Councillor Dev Clutterbuck Councillor Alan Lovell
Councillor Simon Glanfield Councillor Simon Hegarty

Other Attendees – Clerk Aleana Baird, District Councillor Liz Wells, 1 member of the press, John Alderson, Kit Stokes of Aspect 360 and 13 members of the public.

15/16.038 Apologies- to receive apologies from Councillors for non-attendance.

Apologies had been received from Councillors Valerie Langley, Trudy Silverton, Graham Fortune and Parish Liaison Officer Mark Macgregor.

15/16.039 Declarations of interest: To receive alteration/amendments to the register of interests: To receive declarations of interest on agenda items.

Councillors David Hurst & Dev Clutterbuck both declared a non-disclosable pecuniary interest in application 15/P/1344/F as they lived in the area of the application. Councillor Alan Lovell declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in 15/P/1313/O as his property was very close to the proposed development.

15/16.040 To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 8th June 2015.

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting held on 8th June 2015 were confirmed by those present as a correct record and signed.

***** Councillor Simon Glanfield arrived.**

15/16.041 To receive a presentation by Aspect 360 on the emerging proposal for the development of 35 dwellings at the site of the former Stock Nurseries on Pudding Pie Lane, Langford.

A presentation made by Aspect 360 and John Alderson outlined the proposal for land on Pudding Pie Lane Langford and was for 31 detached dwellings with garages on the 1.5 hectare site (9 x affordable homes of 2,3&4 bed size, 2 x 5 bed, 8x4 bed and 12 x 3 bed) . The proposed density of 31 dwellings was lower than the 45 recommended by North Somerset Council for a site of that size. It was the smallest of the four prospective developments that were at a variety of different stages of the planning process and were aimed at local people wishing to down size which had been an identified need in the 2008 parish plan. It was to be a mix of 30% affordable homes, retirement properties and family homes. They felt that its close location to the school, surgery and Budgens was a good location to build though it was outside the settlement boundary. They wished to stress the evening's presentation was not a consultation, a full public event was planned in due course.

Members questioned the following issues:

The downsizing principle and its links to the price of the dwellings, the general layout of the site in terms of its long narrow design with a higher number of properties at the rear of the site and therefore the impact of a higher traffic volume passing the lower density remainder of the entire site to exit. The three exits from the site (one which was shared with existing properties) all close together opposite the school and the possible neighbouring large Bristol University development and the cumulative impacts of this. The infrastructure impact on schools, highways and the lack of employment.

The Parish Council had always taken a view that they were not in support of development outside the settlement boundary and on agricultural and unless a clear community benefit could be demonstrated and it was supported by the community. It was also very difficult under the current deluge of planning applications to express any views or encouragement for a smaller proposal in light of the uncertainty of what the village may face in housing numbers

15/16.042 Public Participation.

A resident who had recently moved to the village from Cambridgeshire where exactly the same situation had happened, it had created dormitory villages without the infrastructure to cope and even if there was a need for housing it is imperative the roads, schools and surgeries are equipped to respond to the increasing demands on those services. If not checked it would lead to sprawling and merging of villages and the cumulative impact must be the key approach when assessing the influx of applications. Chair Jackie Bush encouraged all the residents present to write to North Somerset Council with their views

15/16.043 To receive report from District Councillor.

District Councillor Liz Wells advised that the Secretary of State's decision on housing numbers was due in July and the review of the inconsistencies in how the 5 year supply is calculated. She confirmed that the 5 year supply was met and 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. She had reported the opening of an access onto land off Churchill Green to Planning Enforcement.

15/16.044 Parish Liaison Officer Report.

The Clerk was asked to report blocked gullies all along the A38 New Road & Bristol Road.

15/16.045 Planning

To Receive Planning Decision Notices and Information

Planning approval decision notices.

- i) 15/P/1485/NMA – University of Bristol, Stock Lane, Langford, BS40 5DU. Mon-material amendment to planning permission 15/P/0116/F (Erection of a single storey MRI and Theatre Unit) to allow an additional room for medical gas.
- ii) 15/P/0934/F – Mr Stephens, Vale Edge, Bath Road, Langford, BS40 5DJ. Formation of a new front vehicular access to new front driveway/parking areas.
- iii) 15/P/1080/F – Mr Bois, Wisteria House. Langford Road, Churchill, BS40 5BL. Erection of a front porch, raise height of existing stone wall on front elevation to 2 meters and installation of 1.8m remote controlled gates.
- iv) 15/P/1266/WT – University of Bristol, Langford House, Stock Lane, Langford, BS40 5DU. T1 x Sycamore – fell, T2 x Lime – Fell.

Planning refusal decision notices.

- i) 15/P/0831/MMA – Mrs Sacoff, The Pool House, Churchill Green, Churchill, BS25 5QH. Minor material amendment to permission 11/P/0002/F (Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling) to allow the construction of a rear extension and alterations to windows and doors.

i) Yatton Parish Council were hosting an Open Evening on Housing Development across the area and representatives of Churchill Parish Council were invited. Chair Jackie Bush and a member of the development working group were to attend.

ii) The Parish Register had an application 15/P/1552/F for the nurse's bungalow in Stockmead. Councillor Brenden Hill agreed to look at the details.

iii) A letter of objection to the Says Lane development had been emailed to the Clerk; a copy had been submitted to NSC.

Matters for decision regarding development in the Parish.

None

Planning Applications

****** At this point Councillors Simon Glanfield and Alan Lovell withdrew from the meeting having declared disclosable pecuniary interests in the next planning item.**

i) 15/P/1313/O – Mr J Burge and Edward Ware Homes. Land to the west of Says Lane, Langford. Outline application for residential development (up to 43 dwellings) with means of access from the A38 to be approved only and all other matters reserved for subsequent approval.

RESOLVED: that the Parish Council recommend **NOT** supporting application 15/P/1313/O.

1. OPENING STATEMENT AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

This is an unsustainable development outside the settlement boundary of a designated Service Village on prime agricultural land in a sensitive location adjacent to an AONB. The development is an incongruous encroachment of the countryside, harmful to the landscape and which poses a flooding risk to surrounding properties. It is not in keeping with the character of the settlement. The location and proposed access on to the extremely busy A38 is of major concern and will exacerbate an already problematic traffic issue at the junction to the B3133 at Budgens. 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 CS13The 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 43 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 even during the build of the site and such jobs if any would only be temporary.

No evidence whatsoever is provided for the “significant boost to the local economy”. Any additional income to the one shop nearby (Budgens) and the local pubs does not amount to a significant economic boost.

The local community will have negligible benefit from the 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.

In summary, the applicants’ assessment of economic sustainability is an unsubstantiated series of generalisations.

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. Much is made of the proximity of the local primary school which is already at capacity and is unfortunately on the other side of one of the busiest arterial roads of the south west but with no prospect of places being available for the new families. (See Schooling below).

The development is in truth very poorly positioned indeed. It is on the wrong side of the A38 in a self-isolating location which does not add at all to social cohesion and integration with the existing village. The creation of a substantial block of housing within what is exclusively strip development on that side of the A38 will be an incongruous oddity.

Environmental

This development does not enhance the natural, built and historic environment. Please see Landscape, Transport, Housing and sections below.

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

3. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

The applicants' consultants, SLR Global Environmental Solutions, conclude that the proposed development will have very little impact on appearance or the landscape setting.

This is a wholly erroneous conclusion deriving from a selective assessment of selected data within a view almost entirely concentrated on a few particular viewpoints.

The boundary of the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty lies only half a kilometre to the south. AONBs are, unlike National Parks, rather small areas and so much of their highly valued scenic quality derives from regions near their boundaries; consequently views outwards, from hills within the AONB, into the surrounding regions, may assume great importance for the scenic integrity of the AONB itself.

This is certainly the case at Dolebury Warren. Here the prospect north from the extensive east-west ridge contains, in the middle ground view, the settlement patterns of Churchill and Langford village as a substantial part.

A notable feature of this settlement is the way it is broken up into small and varied built components, each separated from the others by trees, hedges and open fields. The proposed insertion, into this pattern, of a substantial block of uniform development would serve visually to join the built components together and to confer an urban appearance on an otherwise rural scene. This is indeed one reason why village settlement boundaries have become an important part of Local Authority planning policy. This visual transformation would be apparent within the AONB, not only along the Dolebury ridge but on Lyncombe Hill to the west and on Burrington Ham to the east.

The consultants have chosen to concentrate their attention on local (<0.5km) and medium distance (0.6 to 2 km) viewpoints but it should be pointed out that the proposed development is also visible from the north, from many viewpoints on Wrington Hill extending westwards to Cadbury Hill (3 to 4 km).

The assertion (para 3.27) that the potential visibility of the site is limited to "just over 1km distance from its boundaries by the existing built form of Langford, the rising wooded landform of the limestone escarpment to the south", is entirely mistaken. It arises from an uncritical and mistaken interpretation of the "zone of theoretical visibility" data.

Specifically (para 5.9) this assessment also asserts (erroneously) that the visibility of the proposed development "is limited to local viewpoints directly overlooking the site and a few glimpsed views further from the site at key elevated viewpoints on Dolebury Warren to the south and intermittent viewpoints to the west on rising land." A more accurate description would substitute the word *open* for the adjectives *few glimpsed* and *intermittent* used in the report.

Consequently the concluding assertions made in paras 6.17 to 6.19 are all erroneous since the development would affect the character of the AONB and finally para 6.20 asserts, quite

wrongly, that “residual landscape effect on the Mendip Hills AONB to the south will be of no notable importance.” In fact, the deleterious effects may diminish somewhat over the decades, but they will remain profound and certainly will not gradually disappear.

In consequence, the consultants’ conclusion (para 6.22) that “the appearance of the village and its landscape setting will not be appreciably altered” is entirely wrong. This development will indeed have a significant adverse visual impact in a very sensitive rural location. In addition the visual impact for the residents currently living opposite the access to the proposed site is highly significant with the removal of existing screen of trees and hedging being replaced by housing. There is no indication of replanting that screen to reduce the detrimental visual impact for those residents.

It is also notable that an application for a solar farm sited only a very short distance away from this proposed site was required to submit an EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) because of the proximity to the AONB, this has not materialised which indicates the scheme may not have been viable in that location.

In terms of a “sustainable development”, far from “ *contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment* “ it has a significant deleterious visual impact in very close proximity to an 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 seems that the developer has had some difficulty in demonstrating need other than quoting “The Housing need is based on the requirement of North Somerset in general” and deeming this as “local need” and no assessment of need or suitability was sought from the Parish Council prior to the public consultation on 25th June. The need for Affordable Housing if it could be reserved for local people within the village maybe fully identifiable 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.

Density

The development is proposing 43 houses on a 1.95 hectare site but under the Housing & Land Availability Assessment Dec 2014 the recommendation is that the housing element of any site should constitute 50-75% of the available site. If this is applied to the Says Lane site it would mean the land that is actually building footprint would be brought down to 1- 1.5 hectares giving a density of between 27-43 dwellings. Hence the proposed density for the

site is actually on the high side. Considering that the development is being brought into what they have deemed as a semi-rural setting with the existing houses being a single building line with a density of 13 properties per hectare the proposed figure of 43 is not an appropriate density for that location; the lower figure of 27 would be more realistic.

The 'Design and Access Statement' promotes the development as being reflective of the Lower Langford conservation area (the boundary of which lays 300mt to the NE and beyond any connectivity of build or view) in style, but while the proposed development reflects this style, it will in fact be situated in the midst of predominately 1950s styles which face in the main along the A38 on a single front building line. The idea of an inward looking development being integrated with the adjacent village infrastructure goes against the view that would be perceived by outside observers, i.e., back gardens facing houses opposite on the A38 (even if behind 1.5 Mt walls and hedge rows) an inward facing in depth development centred around itself, this is not the convention for social engagement, 'Face to Face'. The proposed access on to the A38 being marked by 'feature houses' one of which will have a height of 2.5 floors is more of a statement of privacy than open connectivity. (4.1.2 Layout)

Future development.

Adjacent to the development site and to the SE are open fields, bordered by the A368. Closed off cul-de-sacs in the layout of this development would give access to these open fields and future development potential. When the applicants representatives were challenged with this observation it was justified as "keeping the future options open". These "future options", which would utilise the proposed main access to the A38, should be judged now on all relevant planning criteria or face the severest restrictions should the current application be approved.

6. HIGHWAYS

There are serious concerns regarding the close proximity to one another of the two access points from Says Lane and the proposed development on to the A38. In addition they are only a very short distance from the junction at Budgens which is notorious for accidents many of which are unreported as they have not caused injury to people only vehicles; however the developer has only taken account of the reported accident statistics.

The Parish Council have evidence from their speed activated sign which when located between Budgens and the entrance to Says Lane recorded in 14 days 10,407 vehicles travelling at speeds of 46mph and above, and gives some insight into the huge amount of cars and HGV's that are using the road that will be outside those parameters (estimated general volume 1500 per hour outside of peak times).

The volume and speed of traffic through the village past this notorious and badly designed junction, Says Lane and the possible new access to the development is providing the conditions for a significant increase in reported accidents and injury to people. The increase that would occur from the cumulative effect of the influx of development proposals across the whole of North Somerset will exacerbate this significantly and we would urge North Somerset Council to look at the cumulative road infrastructure impact of this current unprecedented deluge of applications.

The visibility to the right is poor when emerging from Says Lane and is only slightly better from the proposed site; therefore the positioning of the crossing suggested by the developer must take this in to very careful consideration. It would be imperative that the crossing is light controlled and the speed of vehicles along that stretch of the road reduced to 30 mph as was recommended in the 2009 National Travel Survey.

The number of vehicle movements calculated by the applicants for the proposed site at peak times (8 trips) is highly questionable bearing in mind the level of out-commuting generated by this proposed development.

Account must be taken of the cumulative effect of this development, other major developments in the parish and surrounding villages and the impact of the new South Bristol link road all of which will lead to a significant increase in through traffic on the A38. The application must be considered in this context.

7. DRAINAGE/FLOODING

The lowest point of this well graded, open grassland site coincides with the A38 Bristol Road/Says Lane junction. The level of natural permeability cannot be maintained following development which, by its very nature, will comprise large impermeable areas creating accelerated run off.

Tests carried out by Engineers on behalf of the Applicant confirm that the sub soil has only low permeability. This compromises the sustainability of the proposed surface water system at times of heavy rainfall.

Roof water is to be directed to the SuDS system but it is recognised this may have to overflow into the road drainage. Road drains will flow by flat open ditches and French drains to a pond feature at the junction of A38 Bristol Road/Says Lane. It is proposed that driveways will be porous but with use it is inevitable these will also contribute to runoff from the development to the pond.

The capacity & attenuation period of the pond is therefore critical if flooding of the development & downstream onto the A38 and into Langford Brook is to be avoided. Any additional risk of impacting on Langford Brook especially as a result of this development must be prevented as a number of houses experienced water and sewage flooding in 2011/12.

North Somerset Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Feb 2014 identifies the top 15 communities in North Somerset which are considered to be most vulnerable to flooding from surface runoff, ordinary watercourses and groundwater. It identified the measures proposed to be taken in these communities to reduce flood risk, **subject to sufficient funding and resource availability.**

The top 15 communities in North Somerset considered being most vulnerable to flooding from surface runoff, ordinary watercourses and groundwater are:

Backwell, Long Ashton, **Churchill**, Nailsea, Claverham, Pill, Clevedon, (East) Portbury, Congresbury, Winscombe, Hutton, Wrington, **Langford**, Weston-super-Mare

This suggests that the conclusion of the applicant's Flood Risk report, namely "the site is not considered to be in a sensitive location to flood risk" is wholly erroneous.

A further concern relates to the regular maintenance needed for an open, non-self-cleansing, surface water system. The Applicant recognises that a North Somerset Council maintenance contract funded by the developer is unlikely. An arrangement funded by residents of the new houses looks inevitable even though these can be disputatious and achieve only poor results.

As well as providing an essential drainage function it is presumed the applicant expects the pond to be a feature of this development. No details exist of how the safety of children, pedestrians and the visibilities at the A38/Says Lane junction are to be met.

Details of the sewerage and sewage disposal burden created on the existing Wessex Water arrangements are still to be assessed.

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. The applicants mention the 28 minute cycle ride to Yatton station – yet fail to

mention the highly dangerous nature of the B3133 particularly with regard to pinch points on Stock Lane where HGVs regularly are obliged to cross the centre of the road. This is not in any way a safe cycle route. 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. 43 properties are likely to yield about 15 to 25 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.

Account should also be taken of the University of Bristol's application for development of 141 units at Pudding Pie Lane opposite Churchill Primary School which itself would generate primary pupil numbers of circa 70- 85 or more pupils and a further application for 31 dwellings adjacent to the University proposed site preparing a planning application, the pressure on the school simply cannot be met. 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.

The development plan makes a suggestion of a pedestrian crossing near the Says Lane junction to the A38 –a highly dangerous position for pupils to cross one of the busiest roads in the South West of England for the purposes of attending a school which will not even have places for them.

10. BIODIVERSITY, TREES, HEDGEROWS

The Parish Council consulted their Tree Wardens who have made the following recommendations should the application proceed.

1. That the trees identified as of value in the tree report should be retained and fully protected during proposed construction.
2. The hedgerows should be protected. If removal of the hedge adjacent to the A38 is approved a new native species rich hedge should be created along the full length, stepped back from the original line of the hedge.
3. Approval should be conditional on the planting of a range of new native standard trees within the development - some on the new 'green' and others along streets and in gardens throughout the development.

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.

At a recent meeting on 13th May called by the Parish Council to take villagers' views on 2 other proposed developments on Pudding Pie Lane (one of which by the University of Bristol has now been formally submitted) approximately 250 attended at the Primary School and overwhelmingly objected to those applications.

Most unfortunately, the applicants have shown scant regard for local opinion. They did not hold a public consultation before submitting their application and advised the Parish Council that they were not obliged to hold a public consultation. Late in the day and with only short notice, using flyers that did not advise residents that the application had already been submitted, they held a consultation at the Community School (an inconvenient location as opposed to the much more convenient location of the nearby Primary School). 80 residents attended and overwhelmingly expressed objections to the application.

In conclusion, there has been very poor and limited consultation with the residents who are overwhelmingly opposed to this proposal further demonstrating it is in no way community led.

13. CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF OTHER APPLICATIONS

Our 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.

***** Councillors Simon Glanfield and Alan Lovell returned to the meeting.**

ii) 15/P/1276/F – Mrs K Allsop, Wyndhurst Cottage, Langford Road, Langford, BS40 5HY. Porch extension.

RESOLVED: to recommend supporting application 15/P/1276/F. The proposed porch had no impact on the surrounding area as it was not visible to any other property or the street scene.

iii) 15/P/1344/F – Mr J Bryant, Stonewell Cottage, Front Street, Churchill, BS25 5NB. Erection of a detached bungalow with shared access to the west off Front Street and following the demolition of outbuilding. (Resubmission of 14/P/2459/F).

RESOLVED: to recommend supporting application 15/P/1344/F. The changes to the roof which would increase the height of the two dormers and amend the design of the roof were considered appropriate and an improvement to the dwelling.

Members were concerned that no condition had been placed on the planning approval of the previous application 14/P/2459/F restricting the sale of the new bungalow as a separate dwelling from the main residence. The Parish Council had asked for this condition and would urge the Planning Officer to include it this time as it was a restriction commonly placed on developments of this type. The demarcation of a boundary between the two buildings on the plans should also be removed as the bungalow was use by a family member within the curtilage of the main residence.

***** District Councillor Liz Wells left the meeting**

iv) 15/P/1485/NMA – University of Bristol, Stock Lane, Langford, BS40 5DU. Mon-material amendment to planning permission 15/P/0116/F (Erection of a single storey MRI and Theatre Unit) to allow an additional room for medical gas.

This application had been determined between when the agenda went out and the meeting.

15/16.047 To agree additional hours/work schedule of overtime for summer work as recommended by Open Spaces & Allotments Committee by the Parish.

RESOLVED: to agree that the Parish Orderly may have the additional hours to carry out the recommended summer work.

15/16.048 To consider & agree the recommendation by the Open Spaces & Allotment Committee to supply water into the allotment fields.

RESOLVED: to agree that that water was installed in the allotment fields using the earmarked reserve £2,000 and this year's budget.

15/16.049 Accounts.

To receive and confirm the payments for July 2015.

RESOLVED: The payments were agreed and signed with total expenditure of £9,810.03.

15/16.050 Clerk's Report

- i) The clerk asked members if they wished to meet with Bristol University, members asked the Clerk to ascertain the agenda and who would be attending.
- ii) The date of the next Finance and Personnel meeting was set at 17th August.
- iii) The Clerk had instructed Katrina Bartlett of John Hodge to undertake the extension of the lease negotiations.
- iv) Councillor Brenden Hill agreed to be a point of contact on the Clerks answer machine whilst she was away.
- v) The Clerk advised under her delegated expenditure powers she was to purchase 2 barrels for the enhancement of an area of Blackmoor; a resident had agreed to plant and maintain the barrels. She also wished to instruct the trimming back of the hedge in the burial ground by the gravedigger to allow space for an interment under her delegated powers..
- vi) A window in the Cricket Pavilion had been broken; the Clerk was to instruct its repair under the Cricket maintenance budget.
- vii) Councillor Simon Hegerty agreed to carryout Councillor Valerie Langley's Tower delivery.

15/16.051 Matters for Information

- i) Councillor Sue List asked other members if they would deliver the Village Show Schedule

in due course.

ii) Councillor Simon Hegerty urged all members to input on the Bristol Uni application it was a large application for the 4 members of the working group to do alone, it was important for everyone worked together on it. There was surprise expressed that a residents action group was not yet emerging as had happened in other villages.

iii) Councillor Bill Carruthers requested that the recent traffic surveys was an item on the next available agenda. The distribution of flyers was also briefly discussed.

iv) Councillor Simon Glanfield outlined a recent problem he had with youths outside his house to raise awareness; it had been circulated through the Neighbourhood Watch network.

v) Councillor David Hurst highlighted that problems of the type mentioned in (iv) needed consideration in the approach to the former surgery.

vi) Councillor Dev Clutterbuck raised an issue regarding trees on Windmill Hill.

vii) Councillor Alan Lovell as the nominated contact for the Neighbourhood Plan volunteers could contact had been working in the background on the drainage aspects of the Bristol Uni application through Wessex Water looking at the cumulative impacts on foul drainage and sewage systems.

Meeting closed 9.45 pm.

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....