

## KINGSTON SEYMOUR PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a planning meeting of Kingston Seymour Parish Council on Saturday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2015 at 10.15am in the skittle alley, Village Hall

### Present:

Councillors Mike Sewell (MS, chairman), Caroline Harris (CH), Pete Harris (PH), Mike Wallis (MW) and Ian Wariner (IW). Leonie Allday, Clerk.

### In attendance:

Paul and Daniel Kostyla, parishioners. Ian Ford, agent.

*Declarations of Interest under the Code of Local Government Conduct: None*

### 1. Apologies for absence

Councillors Paul Cox (PC) and Fred Malton (FM)

2. Planning Application No. 15/P/2429/CUPA: Prior approval of change of use from agricultural building and land to a dwellinghouse (Class C3) plus associated operational development comprising infill walls and replacement roof covering with zinc profile sheeting. At Agricultural building to east of Helliers, Lower Strode Road, Clevedon BS21 6UU. (Mr & Mrs J Buckingham, Clevedon)

A site visit had been held immediately prior to the meeting.

The Chairman invited Mr Paul Kostyla to address the Council with his concerns. These related to (i) the access arrangements, which he regarded as dangerous on account of the poor sightlines, (ii) the effect on his farm - the proposed dwelling, if approved, would fall within 400 metres of Seawall Farm, meaning that any future agricultural buildings he wished to erect would require full planning permission and could not be approved under permitted development rights. This would constitute a considerable additional burden. In addition he pointed out that the elevations were orientated incorrectly on the plans; he also had concerns about the water supply and drainage but accepted that these were not planning issues.

The Chairman then invited the agent to speak to the proposal. IF commented that in his view the application complied with the new permitted development regulations (GDPO 2015); he had also taken on board the Environment Agency's pre-application advice that due to the location of the building in an area of high flood risk a first floor safe refuge was needed.

The Chairman asked for councillors' views and in discussion the following points were made:

**Access** – The Parish Council noted that the Transport Policy Officer had stated that in his view provision for parking and turning was adequate and the access, “near to the apex of a bend on a narrow section of the highway” satisfactory on the basis that the proposed development would not generate significantly more traffic than the extant use. Councillors strongly disagreed and considered that this ignored two important factors:

- (i) The inevitability that in reality there would be a significant increase in the number of traffic movements. A two-car household could generate many movements a day.

- (ii) The fact that the access is on a dangerous and blind bend, with hedges that quickly grow high, especially in the summer months. A tractor or other agricultural vehicle exiting the site would probably be able to see a car or cyclist coming round the bend, a private car would not. By the same token, an agricultural vehicle entering or leaving the site at present is more easily seen than a private car would be.
- (iii) There is a considerable and increasing amount of traffic on this lane and the ever-increasing number of cyclists would be especially vulnerable if this development was to go ahead.

It was agreed that the Parish Council would request that the case officer asks the Transport Policy Officer to reconsider the access arrangements and specifically whether there might be a less hazardous alternative. It was further agreed to request that if prior approval was to be given on the basis of the existing access arrangements, a condition should be applied to require the owner of the site to keep the hedges very low, so that sightlines are as good as possible. The necessity for this was acknowledged in the Agent's Planning Statement, however it would mean that there would be little privacy for occupants of the proposed dwelling.

**Flood risk** –It was noted that the comments of the Environment Agency were in response to a request for a preliminary opinion only and probably a “desk study” and not one based on a visit to the actual site. As very small topographical variations can make a significant difference to flood risk the Parish Council was not convinced that the finished floor level of the proposed dwelling would be high enough to comply with the EA's requirements.

**Design** – Councillors considered that the design of the proposed dwelling was unsympathetic to the local vernacular, and that it would look more like an industrial unit than a private residence. There were no other dwellings in the vicinity of similar construction and it would necessarily be prominent in the landscape. Furthermore, in bright sunshine, there was a risk that the zinc sheeting roof could result in glare, increasing the hazards for drivers. A tiled roof would be preferred.

**Effect on nearby working farm** – It was agreed that the Council should ask for the additional burden to Mr Kostyla to be taken into consideration.

In summary, although councillors agreed that the application was sound in terms of planning policy, they did not feel able to support it. It was proposed (PH, seconded IW) and unanimously agreed that the Clerk should write explaining the Council's reasons for not supporting the proposal.

Action: Clerk

### 3. Quotation for cutting back overgrowth of vegetation obscuring crash barriers on shoulders of motorway bridge, Lampley Road

This was not discussed. (PC had informed the Chairman that he had arranged for North Somerset Council's “Green Team” to cut back the vegetation.)

*The meeting closed at 11.00am*