

## Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee Held on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020 virtually via “Zoom” Software

**Consulted:** Cllrs. Anne Curtis (Chair), James Sumner (JS), Paul Caddick (PC), Marion Reeve (MRV), John Graham (JG), Marcus Fry (MF), Alan Davies (AD).

Cllr Matthew Riddle (MR) (SGC), Graham Smith (Clerk)

### 1. Apologies accepted for absence

None

### 2. Public Participation

Four Members of Public were present virtually and actively participated in the meeting. One person logged on without introducing or participating.

(AC) permitted each participant five minutes maximum to address the committee but requested that public do not repeat issues that have already been raised.

Public Participants agreed that small business enterprises in the community should be encouraged but raised concerns that Forty Acre Lane is a single track, no through road with no turning spaces. Although in the application it is stated that it is 5m wide (Wills & Co, Design & Access Statement dated 28.4.20, P15 Item 70), it falls to as little as 3.8m in places which makes passing oncoming vehicles difficult and sometimes dangerous. The projected increase to 139 vehicles a day would exacerbate this, putting pedestrians and cyclists at increased risk. There are currently only a few places where parking in the lane is safe and have already seen an increase in cars & pedestrians visiting the field to look at the Alpaca's. Once the parking places are occupied (whether that is on the Lane or in the proposed development) people are parking dangerously.

Currently, turning right into the lane from the A38 means that vehicles pull into the middle of the road, with traffic passing on both sides, waiting to move across oncoming traffic. The speed limit is 40mph but unfortunately this is often exceeded. A concern is that queuing vehicles in the middle of the main A38 is a recipe for disaster. Drivers travelling from Thornbury are also distracted by the Alpaca's and not paying attention to the junction. Likewise, exiting the lane onto the A38 is becoming a problem.

The original planning for the hay barn (PT18/4983/F) showed the entrance to the barn some 10m further up the lane than its current situation, now directly opposite a neighbour's property, creating a dangerous bottle-neck and eroding privacy.

As a “Tourist Attraction” it will attract people from outside the locality who are not aware of the limitations of the lane. On a busy summer day when south bound M5 traffic is diverted onto the A38 people will be looking for somewhere to stop and use toilet facilities. What happens when cars pulling caravans decide to pull in, when it may also be a day on which the motocross is taking place. Residents request South Glos. Council take all these types of scenarios into account.

Residents feel that although they approve of the idea of a rural based family attraction it is in the wrong location both for the inconvenience for local residents such as noise levels from those enjoying the facility and that it could, through popularity expand naturally increasing resident concerns of the aforementioned issues over time. The area is also being used for parking by allotment holders and having additional parking space within the new facility will also encourage the allotment holders to park there reducing the facility for the attraction users hence creating even more over spill.

When the applicant received planning permission for the hay barn (PT18/4983/F) one of the conditions attached to it was that the original field entrance, on the corner of Forty Acre Lane and the A38, should be removed and a hedge planted, this has not yet been complied with.

**3. Declaration of Interests**

(AC) stated that the family of the applicant for P20/07483/F was known to her socially but had no financial interest or otherwise in the application.

**4. Minutes from Previous meeting**

**P20001 Resolved:** The Planning Minutes of 16<sup>th</sup> March are accepted as accurate by the committee.

**5. Planning Applications**

<a href="#">P20/06620/O</a>	Alveston House Hotel, Denmead And Highways	Demolition of existing buildings and and erection of 22no dwellings (Outline) with access, layout and landscaping to be considered, all other matters reserved.
<a href="#">P20/07483/F</a>	Land And Part Of Building North Of Forty Acre Lane	Installation of shop front, 2 no. storage tanks, hardstanding to form vehicular parking areas and a bike storage rack to facilitate a change of use of land and part of a building from agriculture to a mixed use craft space, shop and cafe with outdoor seating area (sui generis) as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).
<a href="#">P20/06112/F</a>	Land At 18 Greenhill Down Alveston	Erection of a 1 no. detached dwelling with new access and associated works

**Land And Part Of Building North Of Forty Acre Lane**

(AC) stated with regard to P20/07483/F that the A38 too busy, junction too dangerous if an additional influx of vehicles were to arise, South Gloucestershire Council should consider restricting oversized vehicles and applying restrictions to the opening times when the road was busy. She did not consider that the lower part was too narrow for two cars to pass, although (MRV) is worried about the width of the lane in conjunction with the requirement for a facility for cyclists. (JG) is particularly worried with regard to the safety of children crossing the road to the facility from Greenhill Road and back. (PC) expressed why the intention of developing an attraction was not raised when permission was requested for the barn. He also feels it is not the correct location. (MF) expressed concern with the increase of pedestrian use at an exceptionally busy road. (MR) recommended that the Parish council flag up the concerns to the traffic officer so a full investigation and risk assessment could be commissioned. (AD) stated that the Parish Council already has a sub-group relating to excessive and irresponsible parking on Greenhill particularly at school pick up and drop off times and having an additional parking facility over the road will encourage parents to use this and therefore creating more parents and children crossing the road to school which in turn will increase the risk of an accident. (MF) recommended that a transport study be commissioned by SGC.

**P20002 Resolved:** The Parish Council Planning Committee object to P20/07483/F until safety concerns are appropriately addressed.

Although the Planning Committee in principal would encourage new business that creates jobs and provides an educational resource whilst improving the quality of life for residents in the parish it does have concerns relating to the planning application as it stands. Councillors agreed that the A38 is too busy a junction and too dangerous if an additional influx of vehicles were to arise. Councillors are worried about the width of the lane regarding the nature of the vehicles that would be using the lane in conjunction with the requirement for a facility for cyclists who have not been considered. SGC should consider restricting access to certain vehicles at specific times. There is particular concern for the safety of children as the Parish Council already has a sub-group relating to excessive and irresponsible parking on Greenhill particularly at school pick up and drop off times and having an additional parking facility over the road will encourage parents to use this and therefore creating more parents and children to cross the A38 to school which in turn will increase the risk of an accident. With the increase of vehicular and pedestrian use at an exceptionally busy

road councillors recommended that these concerns be flagged up with the traffic officer so a full investigation, traffic study and risk assessment could be commissioned taking into account periods of heavy use.

#### Alveston House Hotel, Denmead And Highways

(AC) stated the view that the Owners of the Alveston House Hotel purchased the land and property with the sole view to make use of the land and to demolish the Hotel building. (MR) had attempted three times to get the building listed and that it was agreed that the building holds local significance but so much has changed to the building over time that it does not meet the criteria for listing. (MF) stated that concerns remain relating to inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and any relevant development plan policies. Whether or not the proposed development would make adequate provision for affordable housing and whether or not the proposed development would make adequate provision for public open space. (PC) raised his concerns relating to the deteriorating heritage within Alveston. (JG) raised his concerns that if the site was not developed the hotel shell would become dilapidated (AC) agreed as the return on the owner's investment can only be achieved by land development and that the planning proposals meets the concerns expressed with regard to traffic issues and parking. (MRV) remained concerned that losing the hotel would diminish the facilities within Alveston regarding accommodation, restaurants and weddings but felt that the current application is in keeping with the area. (AD) added that the demolition of the Hotel is not acceptable and needs to be retained. (AD) proposed that the Planning committee object to the current application. Councillors considered that there was a disproportionate amount of housing for an application within the greenbelt and the density too high. The question was raised as to whether there was a consideration for affordable housing to which it was agreed that 33% provision should be made. (PC) seconded the proposal and two other councillors voted for the proposal and three against.

**P20003 Resolved:** The Parish Council Planning Committee object to P20/06620/O on the basis that they consider the application inappropriate development regarding density of housing and further extensive infilling destroying the village character. Concerns are raised over the fact that the proposed development does not make adequate provision of 35% for affordable housing and that adequate provision be included for public open space. Councillors have concerns relating to losing the local heritage building which would have further negative impact upon the character of the village. Councillors urge the developer to retain the hotel building to accommodate the affordable housing percentage of the proposal whilst compromising with retaining a building that is so important to the integrity of the village of Alveston.

#### Land At 18 Greenhill Down Alveston

**P20004 Resolved:** The Parish Council Planning Committee object to P20/06112/F over safety fears that the development will prevent clear visibility for oncoming vehicles coming around the corner and vehicles exiting the proposed parking area.

## 6. Planning Permissions Granted

<a href="#">P20/04503/F</a>	34 Down Road Alveston	Creation of vehicular access onto the B4461 (Down Road). Installation of 1m high access gates and formation of vehicular parking area.
<a href="#">P20/04463/F</a>	16 Rosewood Avenue Alveston	Erection of single storey side extension and partial garage conversion to provide additional living accommodation.
<a href="#">P20/03610/F</a>	33 Davids Lane Alveston	Alterations to existing front and rear dormers to form pitched roof dormers. Installation of additional rear dormer and erection of single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. Alterations to rear windows.
<a href="#">P20/03715/F</a>	47 Courville Close Alveston South Gloucestershire BS35 3RR	Erection of a rear conservatory.

**7. Planning Permissions Refused**

<a href="#">P20/03514/F</a>	Land Adjacent To Rosemary Cottage Shellards Lane Alveston	Change of Use from agricultural to residential amenity land (Class C3) as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).
<a href="#">P20/01621/F</a>	Lawnes Farm Forty Acre Lane Alveston	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 1no replacement dwelling and associated works.

**8. Applications Withdrawn**

None

**9. Notice of appeal (Secretary of State)**

None

**10. Representation at Planning Meetings.**

None

**11. Appeal decisions**

None

**12. Enforcement Investigation.**

None

**13. Licence Application**

None

**14. Circulated Schedule**

None

**15. Matters the Chair Considers Urgent**

None

Meeting Closed 21.10PM

**The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be advised as soon as further information becomes available.**