

Hawkesbury Parish Council



**Minutes of Hawkesbury Parish Council Meeting
Held on Monday 23rd April 2018 at 7.30pm
In the upstairs meeting room, Hawkesbury Parish Hall, High Street, Hawkesbury Upton**

Present:

Cllr Hope (Chair), Cllr Higgs, Cllr Powell, Cllr Musty, Cllr Stephens, Cllr Wareham and H Jones (Parish Clerk)

Apologies

Cllr Harding and Cllr Ruthven

Public Participation

11 Parishioners and Lone Star representative attended the meeting

Cllr Hope welcomed everyone

Action

1 To Take apologies for absence

Cllr Harding and Cllr Ruthven

2 To record declaration of interest from members in any item to be discussed

Cllr Musty-Park Street Development

Cllr Hope and Cllr Powell – Park Cottage planning application

3 To adjourn to allow Public Participation

PK18/1506/F – Granny Annexe and side/back extension-preserve existing cottage, change existing windows to oak. Family home for 6 people.

4 Councillors Items

4.1 Orange End phone kiosk-Cllr Stephens

£206.03 Councillors agreed to put aside to restore the phone kiosk, further discussions have taken place and additional panels need replacing 8 small and 13 large, increasing the costs to £246.36. A request was made for the PC to agree this new figure. The Clerk has not completed the audit but felt there would be sufficient funds to take into consideration the increased figure.

4.2 Guides planting wild flowers-Cllr Powell

Guides would like to plant wild flowers by the noticeboard/bus stop-as the flowers are low level no objection to the request.

4.3 Local Plan consultation ends 30th April – Cllr Hope

A reminder this consultation closed on Monday, Councillors give their comments to allow a response to be made to SGC, draft agreement by email.

5 5.1 Planning application received from South Gloucestershire Council-to be considered by Councillors-

PK18/1461/F	The Walled Garden High Street Hawkesbury Upton	Erection of 1no. dwelling with parking associated works (Re submission of PK17/1853/F)	Support the application (see the comments below)
<p>The Parish Councils previous comments remain; <i>The Parish Council agreed exceptionally to support the application despite the site being outside the Village Development Boundary. In reaching their decision the Council noted the application was for a single dwelling which had been sympathetically designed with careful consideration of its visual impact and in the context of existing housing in the immediate vicinity. They noted also that allowing the build would free up a local affordable home</i></p>			
PK18/1532/O	Land South of Park Street Hawkesbury Upton	21no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with access and Layout to be determined. All other matters reserved. (Re submission of PK17/2722/O)	Objection See below the comments sent to SGC
<p><u>Outline planning application for 21 no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with access and layout to be determined. All other matters reserved. (Re submission of PK17/2722/O) Land South Of Park Street Hawkesbury Upton Badminton South Gloucestershire GL9 1BA</u></p> <p>1. Hawkesbury Parish Council has considered this application, an amended re-application of the previous proposal for 27 houses. Details of the application beyond the site layout are largely unchanged, hence relevant comments from the previous application are restated for completeness. It should be noted though, that we (and many parishioners) have very strong concerns that the revised layout is significantly worse than that previously presented. Further, we</p>			

consider that the detail required for an outline planning submission is woefully inadequate to enable proper assessment of the full impact of the proposed development, particularly given that it is adjacent to the Hawkesbury Conservation Area. Finally, we were disappointed to note that some errors of fact relating to road and pavement width have only been partially corrected in this re-application, despite being clearly highlighted in our previous objection, hence assessments by Council Officials (and the applicant) continue to be based on flawed data.

2. On process, the Parish Council was surprised and disappointed to learn that this re-application will be considered in Committee on 3rd May, ahead of the expiry date for comments and giving no time for Council officials - or Lonestar - to take action based on those comments.

3. Hawkesbury Parish Council objects to the application for the following reasons:

Need

4. The case has not been made for a development of this scale in this location in the Village. The Parish Council is in no doubt of the need for additional housing in South Gloucestershire and indeed in the Village; it was the Parish Council which commissioned the village's Housing Needs Survey, the results from which continue to be misused by the applicant in order to justify speculative development. The applicant's Planning Statement makes much of the lack of a 5-year housing land supply within South Gloucestershire and uses the findings of the Housing Needs Survey to justify the provision of 7 affordable dwellings. However, it makes no attempt to identify or justify any broader need, or indeed identify any exceptional circumstances, for open-market housing on this scale or at this rate at a single site within the Village, which lies within the Cotswold AONB. Whilst the total number of units has been reduced, the re-application proposes a greater number of 5 bedroom properties, clearly aimed at increased profit rather than any village need. The Parish Council believes that the needs of the community (including for Affordable Housing) could be adequately met through smaller scale development in the Village, in line with the existing Parish Plan. Since the initial application and following several village meetings and a village-wide questionnaire, the Parish Council intends to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan, which will enable the needs of the village to be properly captured and acted upon, rather than development being led by speculative proposals such as this. Consideration of this application is premature to the Local Plan, which is currently being consulted, and our intention to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Access

5. Concerns have been raised previously with Lonestar, reiterated at the Public Consultation, that access along Park Street is inadequate to support this scale of development. Park Street is a narrow "no through road", being only 4m wide at its midpoint; less than the 4.1m width required by Manual for Streets for two cars to safely pass.

6. Park Street is already congested due to a lack of off-street parking for existing

homes. It is questionable whether the existing highway meets the technical requirements to support additional vehicular traffic and the Parish Council is in no doubt that a development of this size could be considered only if alternative access arrangements were established. Were access arrangements to be as proposed in the Planning Statement, the additional traffic would undoubtedly result in an unacceptable increase in congestion and would, in the Council's view, result in an intolerable increase in risk to pedestrians and other road users.

7. It is difficult to comprehend the statement in the report to the Development Control Committee that the impact of a doubling of the number of properties utilising Park Street for access would be 'relatively subtle'; in reality it would clearly be hugely significant.

8. There was some debate following the previous application about the width of the existing footway in Park Street. The applicant's Transport Assessment states that at its narrowest point the footway is 0.9m; the correct measurement is actually 0.75m (which has previously been reported to Council officials - with supporting photographic evidence).

9. The footpath width would need to be widened by 25cm to achieve the 1m width required, which would have a severe impact on the highway width, reducing it to 3.75m, not 3.9m as shown on the applicants drawing and statement.

10. South Gloucestershire's pre-application advice was that '*This access road is not acceptable for the scale of the development proposed*'. The Parish Council still sees no attempt to address that concern in the documents submitted, and can see no logic for SGC's Highways Department's agreement - which was flawed at initial application and remains flawed in this re-application. SGC's Highway's comments state that the:

"Transportation Development Control officer made no objection to the previous application after examining the information submitted by the applicant" and "Overall, therefore our position regarding this proposal remains unchanged".

11. The Parish Council struggles to understand why, given that Council Officials are aware of inaccuracies in the applicant's submission, they nevertheless continue to base their decision solely on those documents.

12. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and improvements can be undertaken that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. The reality is that in this case safe and suitable access simply cannot be achieved for all people because of the narrow middle section of Park Street constrained by the existing wall-to-wall width, which cannot be widened. There can be little doubt that all road users - but particularly pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders - would be at increased risk of injury as a result of the additional traffic, particularly during the construction phase.

13. Whilst clearly only a temporary issue (though it is unclear how long the build would take), several residents have raised concerns specifically with regard to the associated construction traffic, the ability of Park Street to accommodate that traffic and the impact on local residents' quality of life and residential amenity during construction. The reduction from 27 to 21 units is unlikely to markedly reduce that impact and as a no-through road the impact would undoubtedly be significant.

Location

14. The Planning Statement notes this development would be outside the Village Development Boundary and within the Cotswold AONB but it continues to trivialize the significance of preserving that part of the AONB which currently has development on 3 sides and which is adjacent to the Conservation Area; a small part of the Site, the northern-most section adjacent to Park Street, falls within the Conservation Area. The council believes that protection of this, and similar, pockets of land around the periphery of the village is key to sustaining the village character.

Scale of Development in AONB

15. The applicant's Planning Statement suggests that a development of 21 houses should not be considered a 'major development' in the context of the NPPF. It suggests that the 6.3% increase which would result from this development on Park Street can not be considered a major development, thereby effectively limiting the weight of argument associated with building in the AONB. The Statement notes, however, that the issue of whether or not this constitutes a 'major development' 'will be a matter for the relevant decision taker, taking into account the proposal in question and the local context'.

16. The Parish Council considers that the proposal would constitute a major development in the local context. Park Street, as a no through road, effectively forms an already constrained development within the village. The additional 21 houses could equally be considered in the context of the existing 21 houses in Park Street, representing an immediate 'local increase' of 100%. The Council accepts that such an interpretation would be overly simplistic, but it contends that dismissing the development as not being a major development simply on the basis that it constitutes only a 6.3% growth is similarly overly simplistic; the local context is fundamental. Whilst by many standards (quoted at length in the applicant's Planning Statement), 21 houses might be considered 'small scale', the fact is that this would represent the single largest new build development undertaken in the village in recent times. It is equally disappointing that despite SGC Planning Officer's advice to the Committee of the importance of context, he appears to base his advice (para 5.25) almost solely on a numerical analysis.

17. To add to the 8 examples cited in the report, it is worth noting Planning Inspectorate appeal no. APP/W1850/W/17/3172427, where an additional 29 houses proposed for the village of Cradley within the Malvern Hills AONB, and representing a 4% increase, was held to be a 'major' development. That ruling also asserted that whether or not a development is to be considered 'major' is to be regarded as a question of context.

18. Indeed SGC's Planning Officer goes on to suggest (para 5.26) that *"an increase of up to 30% in the size of a settlement would not be considered to conflict with the proportionate increase to rural settlements which policy CS5 alludes to being acceptable"*. As far as we are aware that figure has neither been tested nor consulted; by any measure it is grossly simplistic and fails to meet even a passing test of proportionality and common sense.

19. The decision as to whether or not this should be treated as a 'major development' comes down to the local context - not simple numbers. The Parish Council is in no doubt that by any reasonable measure it should be judged as a 'major development' and its impact on the AONB should be assessed in that context.

20. NPPF policy states that major developments within the AONB should be refused unless in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest; there are no exceptional circumstances in the case of this application at Park Street and it is not in the public interest.

21. Whilst this re-application is presented as an attempt to reduce the impact on the surrounding AONB by reducing the number of units and amending the layout, we consider it comprehensively fails to achieve that aim and in attempting to do so, proposes a significantly worse layout.

Layout

22. The most significant changes in the re-application are the reduction from 27 to 21 units and the fundamental change in proposed layout which is significantly worse by almost any measure than that previously proposed in an attempt, apparently, to soften the impact on the surrounding AONB. The Parish Council strongly supports the Conservation Officer's view - repeated here in full, that:

"Although the units have been reduced in number, what is now being proposed in my view is actually worse than the previous scheme, as following the removal of the central "village green", what is now being presented is just typical suburban cul-de-sac layout that would feature standard and repeated house-types arranged in a regimented layout. The considered collective character would be more monotonous repetition rather than creating an interesting sense of coherence or "place"."

23. He further adds:

"To ensure the setting of the locally listed buildings were preserved, a greater buffer was suggested to help retain a degree of the current rural setting the locally listed buildings currently enjoy. This was not addressed within the previous scheme but arguably the situation has got materially worse, as with the loss of the central square, there will be an increase in built form in the current backdrop to the locally listed buildings."

24. Several residents have raised strong concerns regarding the impact on residential amenity based on the very limited detail provided in the applicant's submissions, exacerbated by the revised layout where units have been relocated closer to existing dwellings. The density of affordable housing in

<p>particular, in the North West corner of the site, would have a very severe impact on the residential amenity of adjacent households, particularly 2 locally listed buildings on Park Street; one of the new units would be only 3m from one of those locally listed buildings.</p> <p>25. In sum, the revised layout appears to be a cynical attempt to address SGC's primary objection to the original application with respect to impact on the AONB, through a poor revision of the site layout which fails to address that fundamental concern and would have an even more detrimental impact on the site, Park Street and the village than the layout previously proposed.</p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>26. In summary, the Parish Council opposes the proposed development and considers that the needs of the community would be much more effectively addressed through smaller scale developments within and around the Village. A single development of the proposed scale and in the proposed location would have a detrimental impact on the character and well being of the village, would damage the AONB, would increase congestion and would increase risk to pedestrian and road user safety.</p>			
PK18/1506/F	Park Cottages Park Street Hawkesbury Upton	Demolition of existing garage. Erection of two storey rear and side extensions to provide additional accommodation and incorporate an annexe	No Objection to the restoration but scale is too large

6 Future Development – update and the way forward

Further investigation to the Neighbourhood plan-call a meeting with expressed interested parishioners. Speak to the representatives from Kingwood Parish Council and Nailsworth or guidance. 8-10 people are willing to help. Arrange a meeting for two weeks' time.

Thank you to Cllr Wareham for all his help.

7 CIL Monies-Councillors to discuss the possibility for CIL monies from SGC

This was discussed in full, reviewed the list drawn up previously. Agreed to add the Neighbourhood plan and Environmental work (The Pond).

8 Date of the Annual General Parish Council meeting will be held on Monday 14th May 2018 in the Methodist Hall, Back Street, Hawkesbury Upton at 7.30pm

Minutes Approved and signed as a true record.....14th May 2018