



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD REMOTELY AT 7pm ON MONDAY 7th SEPTEMBER 2020

PRESENT: Councillors Paul Blatchford, Steve Davies, Paul Harding, Nick Manley (Chairman), Dawn Parry (Vice Chairman).
IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs Liz Shayler (Clerk) District Cllr Haverson and 2 members of the public.

Before the meeting opened Members of the public were invited to speak;

- (i) The project manager spoke in support of application 20/P/1690/RM and gave further background information on a draft construction management plan clarifying wheel washing.

The meeting was convened

54/20 To receive apologies for absence (agenda item 1)

Apologies were received from Cllr Wormald

55/20 To receive declarations of interest (agenda item 2)

No Committee Member declared an interest

56/20 To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on the 3rd August 2020 (agenda item 3).

Resolved – That the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on the 3rd August 2020 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous).

The minutes of the meetings will be signed by Cllr Manley as a correct record.

57/20 To note the response from North Somerset in relation to the letter of complaint in reference to the Wolverhill Road application 18/P/4735/OUT (agenda item 4)

The Committee were disappointed with North Somerset's response but felt that there were no Code of Conduct issues which could be brought against an individual District Councillor. They were mindful that a judicial review would cost taxpayers money and given North Somerset's policies are overridden by the Government's National Planning Policy Framework, when there is no 5-year supply, then it was doubtful that this decision could be overturned. The response was therefore noted.

58/20 To agree that as part of Banwell Parish Council declaring a Climate Emergency that Green Measures will be considered in relation to all planning applications (agenda item 5).

Resolved – That as part of Banwell Parish Council declaring a Climate Emergency, that Green Measures will be considered in relation to all planning applications.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous).

It was noted that they had not been considered in relation to this month's applications and in future would include working towards passive housing standards and solar panels regardless of the direction on all new builds.

59/20 To note and comment upon planning applications (agenda item 6)

(i) 20/P/1690/RM Land to South of William Daw Close, Banwell.

Reserved Matters application for approval of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping for the erection of 26no. dwellings pursuant to outline permission 18/P/3334/OUT (outline planning application for a residential development of up to 26no. dwellings and associated infrastructure with access for approval; appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for subsequent approval).

Standing orders were suspended to allow the project manager for this application to speak

Clarification was given to the rationale for two story properties on the Eastern Boundary which was due to a request from North Somerset.

Standing orders were reinstated

Resolved – To not support this planning application due to the positioning of two-storey properties on the eastern side of the development which will have an overbearing impact on the adjacent residents and properties on Greenfields Avenue.

However, if North Somerset is minded to approve then the following condition is requested; That taking into account the local highway network and the volume of material that may need to be removed / brought to site, it is requested that a construction management plan is submitted prior to the commencement of development on site. This should include but not be limited to a construction programme including phasing of works, HGV routing, provision for staff car parking, times of site operation, on-site contact information, volume of HGV movements throughout the day, highway safety measures such as wheel washing facilities and mitigation measures for any remedial works required

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous)

(ii) 20/P/1755/FUH Pennyard House, East Street, Banwell. BS29 6BW

Demolition of front conservatory and replace with a new porch; replacement of existing sliding aluminium framed windows with 'Heritage' style uPVC woodgrain casement windows; re-rendering of external elevations and erection of a 1.4m high boundary wall at the front of the property between Pennyard House and The Longhouse.

Resolved – To support this planning application.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous)

(iii) 20/P/1846/CQA Cedar Haven Haybow Hewish Weston-super-Mare BS24 6RB

Prior Approval for the conversion of a redundant milking parlour to 1no. dwelling with operational development comprising re-roofing of building; insertion of windows, doors and re-rendering of building

Resolved – To object to this planning application as the Committee cannot support a permanent dwelling on a site where the existing property only has temporary consent (whilst the existing resident is alive) because it is outside the settlement boundary in flood zone 3.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous)

(iv) 20/P/1872/FUH Haybow Cottage, Haybow Hewish, Weston-super-Mare. BS24 6RA

Proposed erection of a boundary wall and railings to replace existing fence

Resolved – To support this planning application.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous)

- (v) **20/P/1911/TRCA Oak Lodge, West Street, Banwell. BS29 6DB**
T1 - Eucalyptus – Fell

This application was noted.

- (vi) **20/P/1954/CQA Barn at Silvermoor Lane**

Prior Approval for the conversion of an existing agricultural building (Sui Generis Use) to 1no. dwelling (Use Class C3) with operational development consisting of recladding of building with timber boarding; insertion of front wall and insertion of new windows and doors

Resolved – To not support this planning application as it creates a new dwelling outside of the settlement boundary in flood zone 3. However, if North Somerset is minded to approve then the committee request that an agricultural tie be put on the dwelling.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous)

60/20 To discuss and agree a way forward in relation to the Government Consultations on the following (agenda item 7)

- (i) Changes to the current planning system
- (ii) Planning for the Future
- (iii) Transparency and Competition

The Committee decided to deal with all three consultations together. It was felt that the language used did not make the consultations accessible at a Parish Council level. The most important consultation was believed to be 'Planning for the Future'. It was felt there were very positive suggestions but that there were other suggestions that were of a concern. The Clerk had spoken to North Somerset as to whether they were intending in responding to any of the consultations.

Resolved: The Clerk to resend the 'Planning for the Future' Consultation to all Parish Councillors and ask them to provide answers to as many of the questions that they can by the 25th September. Cllr Manley to collate a Planning Committee response for consideration at the next meeting.

The resolution was correctly proposed and seconded (unanimous)

61/20 To note planning decisions – (agenda item 8)

- (i) **19/P/3061/FUL Gobbles Farm, Wolvershill Road, Banwell. BS29 6DQ**
Change of use of agricultural building (shed 5) to storage (Use Class B8). Erection of extension to building (shed 3) and change of use to Gym (Use Class D2). Erection of replacement storage building (shed 4) (Use Class B8). Use of land for external storage, container storage and HGV parking. Construction of farm track and widening of existing access onto Wolvershill Road. (Retrospective). **APPROVED**
- (ii) **20/P/1016/LDE West Hay Farm Summer Lane Banwell BS29 6LE.**
Certificate of lawful development for land that is in use for commercial storage B8 purposes. **REFUSED**
- (iii) **20/P/1242/FUH Little Orchard, Wolvershill Road, Banwell BS29 6LA.**
Proposed single story extension to the rear of the existing detached dwelling & associated adaptations. **APPROVED**
- (iv) **20/P/1282/FUH The Forge, Hillend, Weston-super-Mare BS24 8PQ**
Raise roof and extend to rear elevation to create first floor. Alteration to exterior including new doors and windows (Resubmission of application ref. 19/P/2179/FUH) **REFUSED**
- (v) **20/P/1290/NMA Mead Fields Parklands Phase 3A Land South of Churchland Way Wolvershill Road Banwell**
Non-material amendment to application 18/P/5209/RM to replacement of NA44 housetype with D1389 (Sunford), which is the same building but with a modified bay window size only to the ground floor. **APPROVED**

(vi) **20/P/1291/NMA Mead Fields Parklands Phase 3B Land South Of Churchland Way
Wolvershill Road Banwell**

Non-material amendment to application 19/P/2662/RM to replacement of NA44 housetype with D1389 (Sunford), which is the same building, but with a modified bay window size only to the ground floor. **APPROVED**

(vii) **20/P/1453/FUH 34 Knightcott Gardens Banwell BS29 6HD**

Erection of a two-storey side extension. **APPROVED**

(viii) **20/P/1516/FUH 4 Hillmer Rise Banwell BS29 6HX**

Retrospective application for the erection of a rear raised deck area. **APPROVED**

62/20 Date of the next meeting (agenda item 9)

21st September, 7:30pm Parish Council Meeting remotely <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/308292669>

5th October, 7pm Planning Meeting remotely <https://us04web.zoom.us/j/279564797>

The Chairman closed the meeting at 20:05

.....Chairman

.....Date

DRAFT

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Complicated

Lengthy

Politicised

2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]

Yes

3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]

Online. However, other formats must remain available and accessible for those with limited or no ICT access or skills

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]

The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change.

The design of new homes and places

Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas.

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Whilst we agree some elements of the local plans should be simplified these changes threaten to undermine local democracy, marginalise local councils and fail to achieve the kind of high quality places that the government says it is committed to delivering. The distinction between Growth/Renewal/protected areas seems simplistic, especially given the lack of detail.

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Nationally developed/imposed plans are good for the key national strategic issues including environment, safety and security and design standards but it is important locally defined areas can continue to consider and protect specific locally important issues and need to continue to be determined and enforced locally. Additionally, future changes should include enforcements and penalties for developers who 'land bank' and delay development.

7. (a) Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of "sustainable development", which would include consideration of environmental impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, providing a nationwide definition of 'sustainable development' is adopted allowing local communities more power to assess their own applications against.

(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

Requiring all parties to sign up to and agree a "Pre-Development Plan" that can be bespoke for each scheme. Concept of idea that Success is equally important to all parties"

8. (a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes. However, this is not the moment to 'up' the requirement. The post covid requirement might greatly differ from all our expectations up until this moment as our high streets and city centres change.

(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Assessing the requirements for the number of housing requires more than just a calculation based on existing numbers and affordability in an urban area.

9. (a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. This is a recipe for chaos. It could allow inappropriate development without the needed infrastructure and the local voice will not be heard.

- (b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. There is not enough detail to assess what this would mean in reality. Furthermore, three simple categories will cause major friction at their borders. In particular the Protected designation will appease the already privileged, drive up house prices and lock out locals.

- (c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, but decisions, and reasons behind decisions need to be fully transparent and made at a local level.

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30-month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes

13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes – it remains vitally important that communities are able to have their say on development.

(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

By simplifying Neighbourhood Plans. For Parish Councils Neighbourhood Plans can be a huge undertaking requiring a lot of time, money and resources and require a level of understanding far beyond their capabilities.

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, prevention or delay of build out of consented schemes, unless there is a real (non-commercial) reason for delay is part of the underlying problem. More commercial obligations on consented schemes could work.

15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify]

Limited architectural quality and poorly designed. Repetitive 'estate style' housing which can be found in every town all over the country, failing to reflect local architectural styles. Housing still being built to a basic design which first emerged decades ago and is failing to adapt and progress to the future challenges facing us. Many lack simple environmentally friendly planning standards and ignore sustainability criteria, encouraging residents to own a vehicle and drive.

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]

Energy efficiency of new buildings and a commitment to becoming carbon zero.

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Adding another body and requiring each body to have an officer for design and place making is adding several layers of bureaucracy to the process.

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure. There needs to be more detail provided as to what your proposal actually is before we can consider this.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, providing developments adhere to a locally pre-determined set of design criteria and specifications. However, this should be accompanied with planning changes allowing poorly designed development to be refused more easily than present.

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space / Don't know / Other – please specify]

More or better infrastructure.

22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. The proposals suggest payment on occupation, which means developers can withhold payment until properties are occupied and may require on local councils to pay for improvements upfront themselves.

(b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]

Locally. A nationally determined rate will not take into account local requirements.

(c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

If the infrastructure levy is to be determined by the overall value of the development it should capture more value.

(d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure. It depends on how the infrastructure levy is to be set. If it is set against the overall value of the development, and the local authority borrows against the forecast value only for the value to drop due to recession or other market forces, the local authority will then potentially be at a loss leading to implications for the services they provide for their citizens.

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes

24. (a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes

(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. All development puts a strain on local resources and infrastructure.

(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, seems a sensible requirement

(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, if a developer refuses to provide affordable housing because of the cost implications it will have on their infrastructure levy payment then their consent for development should be withdrawn.

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?
[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. This could result in local authorities taking investment away from the community which is being impacted by the development generating the levy payment.

(a) If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

n/a

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

None.