

**ST CUTHBERT (OUT) PARISH COUNCIL : PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS**  
**ANNEX A 2020/2217/OTS – NEW HOUSE FARM.**

Application Ref No:	2020/2217/OTS
Address:	New House Farm, Haybridge Hill, Haybridge, Wells
Date of response:	103 December 2020

<b>1. Recommend Approval</b>			
Please explain the main grounds on which you consider the application should be approved:			
<b>2. Recommend Refusal of Permission</b>		<b>YES</b>	
Please explain below the main grounds on which you consider the application should be refused:			
<b>Material Considerations</b>	<b>Explanation Of Concerns</b>		
1. Overshadowing			
2. Overlooking, loss of privacy or overbearing nature of proposal	The homes in Elm Close have an <b>open view</b> onto the AONB that is already being encroached upon by other developments.. The proposed buildings would not only obscure these views but the trees proposed to soften the skyline would serve to hide the views even further. New residents would also be denied the privilege of such an open vista because of the positioning of houses on a slope.		
3. Design & appearance, impact on public visual amenity	The development would not “sit within an existing urbanized context” because Haybridge is not an urban area. The significance of the <b>Green Gap</b> has been recognised by the Inspector of the Planning Authority under the local plan. Local residents have already seen immense overdevelopment in the area (west of Wells in the parish’s North Ward) affecting the visual appearance of the landscape.		
4. Layout & density of building	The buildings were not well positioned for <b>photovoltaic panels</b> and therefore undermine the environmental credentials of the application. The site is not allocated in the Mendip District Council Local Plan Part 1 or draft version of Part 2 and the economic sustainability of the proposal is put forward in only generic terms, rather than site-specific, reducing its credibility.		
5. Effect on listed buildings and/or conservation areas			
6. Loss of trees			
7. Loss of ecological habitats	The mitigations for <b>protecting wildlife</b> , specifically bats and badgers, show that habitats will only be replaced after the construction, which is too late and unacceptable in terms of the destruction of valuable habitats (and already dislocated by other developments). The site constitutes a link of <b>Green Gap</b> land between the edge of the AONB and Haybridge that has been supported by Mendip District Council and forms an integral, cherished and protected part of the local environment. It is development into open countryside. The environmental sustainability of the application is therefore weakened further.		
8. Access, highways safety or traffic generation	The A371 at the top of Haybridge Hill represents a <b>traffic hotspot</b> . Speeding is a common occurrence, and the density of recent developments exacerbates this. The junction with the B3139 is a hazardous location already and its hazards are not adequately addressed by the position of site access. A Roundabout would be more appropriate. Furthermore, the <b>electric vehicle charge points</b> were either a) not located near social housing or b) at such a low capacity from garages that the slow trickle charge would discourage the use of electric vehicles		

9. Inadequate parking & servicing	The location of the development is not within 10minutes, or 1km, from the <b>nearest amenity</b> , located on Tucker Street, and therefore not only inaccessible but increasing the reliance on short car journeys. This undermines the application's claim to seek <b>reduced car usage</b> between Year 1 and Year 5 of the development, but additionally the developers have not submitted a clear plan as to how else they propose reducing car usage.
10. Noise, smells or disturbance from the scheme	It should be noted that residents in Haybridge, along Portway and on Elm Close have had <b>protracted building works</b> noise, traffic, disruption and disturbance for months, more so since the legitimate hours for construction were extended by the government. Another application south of Elm Close jeopardises this even further, with likely impact on wellbeing and stress levels.
11. Flood Risk	The location of <b>storm drains</b> on Haybridge Hill raised concerns that overflow or blockage would lead to flooding in Haybridge, and there are already concerns at county level regarding run-off and sewage. The existing pumping station at Haybridge is regularly blocked and overwhelmed with the demands of the various new developments nearby (alongside existing properties.) This has been confirmed by the Water and Sewage authority
12. Other reason – please explain	The Planning Committee, as well as many residents, have voiced concern over the burden on <b>local infrastructure and services</b> ; the social sustainability of the application is heavily questioned.
<p><b>3. Recommend that the decision be left to the Planning Officer following consultation responses.</b></p> <p><b>This should be referred to the Planning Board if the Planning Officer decision is against that of the Parish Council</b></p>	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 10px; display: inline-block;"> <p><b>No</b></p> </div>
<p>General Observations:</p> <p><b>The Planning Committee acknowledged that, for an outline application, the level of detail in their recommendations was considerable. However, it was felt that the developers had disregarded the Committee's feedback from the consultation in most aspects, as well as under-representing the level of public negativity to the development resulting from the public consultation.</b></p>	