

# **ST CUTHBERT (OUT) PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 23<sup>RD</sup> OCTOBER 2024**

**PRESENT:** Cllr Hathway; Cllr Hayden; Cllr Lunnon; Cllr Reeves; Cllr Zorab

**IN ATTENDANCE:** 2 members of the public, 2 representatives from Orme Architecture

## **01. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TO CONSIDER THE REASONS GIVEN**

Apologies received for Cllr Hoogesteger

**RESOLVED – TO ACCEPT REASONS GIVEN FOR ABSENCE**

## **02. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**02.01.** There were no declarations of interest

**02.02.** There were no requests for dispensation for disclosable pecuniary interests.

**02.03.** There were no requests for dispensation.

## **03. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items for exclusion.

## **04. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Members of the public agreed to speak as their application was discussed.

## **05. RECOMMENDATIONS OF ST CUTHBERT OUT PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY 02<sup>ND</sup> OCTOBER 2024.**

**RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved to accept the Minutes of the Planning Meeting of Wednesday 02<sup>nd</sup> October 2024.

## **06. DISCUSSION WITH HOLLY STEWART ON BEHALF OF ORME ARCHITECTURE REGARDING APPLICATION 2018/1780/FUL**

Discussion of 2018/1780/FUL continued, no concrete way forward was agreed.

## **07. APPLICATIONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

All planning applications can be viewed in detail from [www.mendip.gov.uk](http://www.mendip.gov.uk). Members of the Public are welcome to express their views at the Parish Council Planning Committee as well as direct to Mendip District Council.

No. & Officer	Detail	Dec. A/R/W
2024/1628/FUL  Jane Thomas	Creation of a lean-to on the main barn to be used for a classroom and parking spaces  Emborough Farm, Roemead Road, Binegar, Radstock.  <b>23/10/24 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL</b> <b>The design of the building is compatible with the local environment/surroundings</b>	
2024/1701/ REM  Jennifer Alvis	Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 2019/1381/OTS for the erection of 100no. dwellings, (including the provision of 40 affordable housing units), Public Open Space and associated works. Matters of access/appearance/landscaping/layout/scale to be determined.  Land South Of 17, Elm Close, Wells. <b>23/10/24 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL</b> <b>The Planning Committee has approved this application</b>	
2024/1762/HSE  Connor Chapman	Part Loft Conversion in existing house and extension to existing outbuilding.  4 New Buildings, Long Lane, Dinder, Wells. <b>23/10/24 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL</b> <b>The design of the building is compatible with the local environment/surroundings</b>	
2024/1780/ VRC  Kelly Pritchard	Removal of condition 5 (Caravan Occupancy Time Limit) on consent 104293/004 (Touring caravan site, including new toilet and shower block, alterations to existing entrance).  Haybridge Farm, Wells Holiday Park, Haybridge Hill, Haybridge, Wells. <b>23/10/24 RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL</b> <b>Due to the existing Condition in place, the Planning Committee feels it would be disadvantageous to the local area as the current status quo promotes tourism. By removing this Condition, the area would lose potential as a tourist asset. Replacing the availability of holiday destinations with permanent homes would also open the site up to additional development of permanent residences which is undesirable given the large developments that are either in progress or awaiting approval in St. Cuthbert (Out) Parish.</b>	

2023/1515/ OUT	Outline application with all matters reserved except for access, up to 47no. dwellings (including affordable housing), open space, ecological mitigation, and supporting infrastructure.	
Ed Winter	<p>Land At 353038 145483, Gypsy Lane, Wells.</p> <p><b>23/10/24 RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL</b></p> <p><b>a) Green Gap &amp; urban sprawl – the proposed development challenges the existence of the Green Gap, upheld by the Inspectorate, and would further allow for urban crawl into the parish’s rural countryside, 27 hectares of which has already been developed and a further 8.8ha subject to planning applications for large developments, all within a 1.2km radius of the site.</b></p> <p><b>b) Local Plan: The Planning Authority recently endorsed the Local Plan II. CP1 ignores that Haybridge is a separate hamlet from the primary settlement of Wells. CP4 requires a specifically identified local need but is not referenced in the Design &amp; Access Statement; there are allocated sites within Wells itself but this site is not allocated for development on the Local Plan adopted by Somerset Council.</b></p> <p><b>c) Visual impact: the development would have an irreversibly negative impact on the distinctive landscape character as well as within the setting of the AONB, 1.5km to the north. The elevated landscapes and rolling topography provide frequent distant and panoramic views, Gypsy Lane being one such landscape, and is visible when approaching from Glastonbury direction: it characterises the identity of the parish, the setting of Wells and the lower area of the Mendip Hills.</b></p> <p><b>d) ‘Stranded’ neighbourhood: without clear connectivity with a proposed development to the east, the site would be remote and isolated as a neighbourhood.</b></p> <p><b>e) Engulfing Elm Close: residents face dual applications both to the north and south of Elm Close, and furthermore, have lost the countryside to the east to development and risk losing their sense of community and the green space around their homes.</b></p> <p><b>Hedgerows cannot be seen as an isolated issue to a development – they offer corridors, foraging routes, habitats and shelter as part of a network: the reference that they are only relevant at site level and can be mitigated against as an isolated problem is increasingly a flawed solution. Residents are increasingly aware that a development-by-development approach to hedgerows is damaging, not long-term thinking and irresponsible.</b></p>	

**a) Access:** the existing junction from Gypsy Lane onto Elm Close B3139 does not cater for two way access and cannot be considered suitable or practical, as the only point of access to the development as well as existing traffic flow. The proposal would lead to potentially traffic coming from 4 different directions, with the potential for vehicles bottle-necking back onto the B3139.

**b) Safety:** the junction is also hazardous in vehicles, with evidential frequent speeding along the B3139, in both directions. Further, Gypsy Lane, for its width, has high traffic use both local traffic (tractors, horse movement boxes, delivery vans, residents in Burcott) and as a link between the A361 & A39. There is no footpath on either side of the road. Passing places are ad hoc and the walking route to schools and amenities via Burcott Lane has no footpath whatsoever.

**c) Traffic generation:** Gypsy lane is already a high-use route, with between 250-400 traffic movements per day observed by a resident. It is probable too that the development would attract commuters who travel (in cars) further afield, again within a burgeoning infrastructure around the City of Wells. It is believed that the traffic study accompanying the application was out of date and didn't take into account the 943 new dwellings in the North Ward, north west of the City of Wells. So far, no solutions to these issues have been forthcoming by the developer.

**a) public transport:** the development will inevitably become a car-based estate, as public transport provision is extremely limited, and between Wells & Wedmore.

**b) Active Travel:** Walking & cycling routes from the site along Burcott Lane to Wells is hazardous, footpathless until Burcott Road and at least a 30 minute walk. The local amenities on Burcott Road have no parking.

**Drainage / attenuation pond** – there were concerns that this would pose a safety risk, being in the southern open space most likely to be used as play area. A stepped bank would not reduce the hazards, despite the pond not always being full. This issue has still not been resolved by the developer and given our increasing levels of rainfall and wide topographical variations in this Parish, our area is very susceptible to flash flooding and pooling of water. Further reducing the capacity of the soil to act as a sink for rainwater risks exacerbating flooding on the roads surrounding Gypsy Lane.

	<p>a) <b>Affordable housing – residents asked whether the allocated 19 dwellings would be affordable to local, low-income workers.</b></p> <p>b) <b>Contaminated Land/Radon – there was inadequate supporting data to demonstrate how the potential for Radon would be identified for the &lt;1% homes exceeding action level.</b></p> <p>c) <b>Sewage provision – it was unclear how the development would deal with sewage, with the additional concern that the current sewage plant &amp; water treatment works is already at capacity.</b></p> <p>d) <b>Community facilities: there was no provision for existing local residents (facilities, meeting place etc). The nearest community building in the parish is 2.2km (Coxley) or 3.7km (Easton).</b></p>	
--	---	--

**07. TO NOTE PLANNING PERMISSION DECISIONS BY SOMERSET COUNCIL**

There were no comments regarding Decision Notices

**08. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> November 2024 at Coxley Memorial Hall (Back Room) at 7pm.