

Keinton Mandeville Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of the above-named Parish Council held on
Tuesday 23 March 2021 at 7.30 p.m. via zoom

Present: Tom Ireland TI, Trevor Ryder TR, Chris Lane CL, Chris Calcutt CC, Scott Fischer SF, Kevan McHale KM, Richard Sutton RS, Helen Beal HB,

In attendance: Tony Capozzoli TC (District Councillor) Charlie Hull District Councillor) Lee Wright, agent for 20/03412/FUL. Sue Graham (Clerk) 9 members of the public.

TI opened the meeting and explained the procedure that would be followed, he would invite each participant to speak in turn during public session, there would be no further public participation during the council session. Lee Wright was present from Wright Consult and would speak during public session to present the application; he would also clarify any questions / points raised.

Public session

District Councillors.

TC reported the following:

- Area meetings, including Area East were meeting on zoom and now working to schedule.
- The 'Stronger Somerset' consultation deadline was mid-April and Parish Councils were encouraged to respond.

CH reported the following:

- New playground equipment had been installed in the Charltons. The recreation ground also had changing facilities and football goals and was available for hire by local teams.

Public

Streetlight outside the school is still not working and could be problematic for anyone trying to access the defibrillator at night. This needs to be addressed by the Parish Council either by means of ensuring the light is fixed or that new lighting is provided.

Item 3 20/03412/FUL.

Lee Wright presented details about the application as follows:

- This was an application concerning a site behind existing development on Coombe Hill.
- The proposal was for 2 x 2 bed bungalows, 2x 3 bed bungalows and 5 x 4 bed bungalows with the 4th bedroom in the roof space.
- They would be built to meeting level 3 accessibility standard (in relation to access to and use of dwellings)
- The designs incorporated high level energy efficiency features including air source heat pumps, electric vehicle chargers, solar panels, and rainwater recycling. This exceeded building regulation requirements.
- Building materials were a mix of natural stone, block and render and timber.
- The site is situated close to the village centre with easy access to the shop, pub and school.
- Acknowledged that the village has seen a lot of development, but the applicant is looking to provide dwellings to meet the demand for those who wish to downsize, and accessible properties for which there is a demand.

Public comments Item 3 20/03412/FUL.

Resident of Barton Road

- The development would be directly behind her property and would overlook her property and garden, especially plot 5 which has several large patio doors across the elevation facing the rear of her house.
- Concern that the application would not cease once the 9 bungalows are built. The design lends itself to future development (two roads lead to nowhere in the current plan) it does not appear to be a cul de sac and there appears to be a future intention to build on the extremities.
- The increase in traffic that this will generate is a concern.
- The consensus in the caring profession for looking after the infirm is to keep them in their own homes and have live in carers, avoid the need to move.

Resident of Queen Street

- Initially appeared to be an exciting proposition - affordable housing suitable for retiring, or downsizing, Keinton residents which allow them to stay in the community they are used to. The other houses the developer has brought to market on Coombe Hill are good quality and adhere to the vernacular of the village.
- Disappointed to discover that the proposal was neither affordable nor in keeping with the village.
- Development appears to be part of a wider scheme.
- Aware that the Parish Council cannot comment on an application for a wider scheme. However, the submitted transport assessment is based on the 40+ dwellings and is not even aligned to the application.
- The bungalows are aimed at the retirement market, yet the transport statement is based on a working or mixed population (e.g. get to work buses)

- So, why submit a transport statement for a scheme we are being asked to believe does not exist? Why apply for only 9 bungalows and not the full scheme? Possibly to avoid the need to provide affordable housing or to establish a new building line? Might this application be a Trojan horse to erode objection to a future application by establishing that new building line and justifying in-fill of green space while also pointing to a previously agreed transport assessment?
- Urge the Parish Council is able to assess how affordable these bungalows would be for KM residents as suspected that there are few houses in KM that would allow a financial downsize to one of these bungalows.
- Main objection is the attempt at urbanising KM. Infill of this green site seriously undermines the character of the village and for this reason the PC should object.

Resident of Coombe Hill

- Agree with the above comments.
- The longer-term intention seems to be for more development on this site which will eventually reach the recent development on Barton Road.
- Not complaining about the developer and recognise that this is a business.
- Main concern is about the safety aspect. No footpath on Coombe Hill, the bungalows are being promoted as accessible and suitable for disabled occupiers. The other new builds on Coombe Hill have families living in them and children walk up Coombe Hill. This development would constitute a risk to public safety without footpaths / pavements.

Resident of Church Street

- Concurs with previous comments.
- An application for 9 bungalows is not in itself a big issue.
- The application is disingenuous and would form a stepping stone to much larger development
- This is taking up green space and is not in keeping with the character of the village.
- Urge the parish council to reject on the basis of this being a stepping stone to larger development.

Resident of Fayrefield

- This is a development on agricultural land which does not respect the linear pattern of the village.
- This pattern of development in this area to date has been to start with a small application and subsequently add to it, this allows the threshold for affordable housing to be avoided. So far 19 houses have been built in phases allowing this to be avoided.
- The current development of 10 homes has left a gap between plots 8 and 9 which lends itself to creation of an access road.
- There is a huge issue with the junction at the top of Coombe Hill, this is a bottleneck, and the addition of these houses will add to the traffic.
- The fact that the development is being promoted as disability friendly is spin which will open the potential for 30 houses.
- The local plan has set a housing target for Keinton Mandeville. We have already exceeded that target. This has to be set against the fact that the village has only 1 shop, 1 pub and a school and contrary to claims in the application there is no post office and no health centre. This would be to much of a strain on existing resources.

Resident of Church Street

- Keinton is suffering overdevelopment in part due to the inability of SSDC to meet its land supply requirement. In the last 5 years, 87 houses have been built or approved with applications pending for another 51.
- Potentially 138 new homes in a village that had 411 at the last census.
- Tony Capozzoli briefed the PC in January that South Somerset DC 5-year land supply is met. Therefore, appropriate weight should be given to Policy SS2 which has a presumption against building in rural settlements unless it:
 - Meets a local need, principally for affordable housing- This proposal doesn't provide any affordable housing and doesn't meet a formally recognised local housing need.
 - Delivers employment.
 - Delivers enhancements to community facilities or services.
- This development is being deliberately phased to avoid any such contribution or requirements. Carefully remaining below the threshold that would trigger an s106 contribution or a proportion of affordable homes. Consequently, we would see increased pressure on the school which is already at or near capacity as well as the well trailed traffic issues through village choke points.
- This development is not about benefitting KM it is about enriching the developers.
- Scale of the development is also inappropriate when the new SSDC Local Plan is in the final stages of adoption. NPPF Para 49 states that an application can be rejected as premature when both a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.
- Oppose on these grounds and urge District Councillors to reject it.

Resident of High Street (backing onto development)

- Concurs with comments above.
- There has been too much recent development in KM.
- The village cannot accommodate existing traffic, let alone more.
- These are luxury homes; the ordinary person would not be able to afford them. Bungalows have already been approved off Castle Street.
- First time buyer homes are required to allow young people to get on the housing ladder.

Resident of Fayrefield

- The cumulative effect of all this development cannot be accommodated.
- There needs to be a break, pause in development as it will not be sustainable.

R Sutton – landowner for this application:

- 8 social housing units were provided on the site in 2007. This can be perceived as phase 1 of the development and thus represents a significant percentage of development on this site.
- The Parish Council is required to consider the application for 9 bungalows, not to have a debate about whether there will be future development on the site.
- As far as provision of employment opportunities is concerned – there was no demand for industrial units proposed in previous developments.
- The alternative could have been to sell this site to a large national developer with no interest in appropriate design / need.
- Bungalows are needed, there are no bungalows on the Lakeview development. Provision of bungalows would create balance.
- 4 have been already sold pending planning approval, including to a disabled buyer. This demonstrates a demand / need.

Lee Wright wished to answer some of the comments made:

- Downsizing: the intention was not to imply that all of the properties are designed for downsizing, this applies to only two or three of the plots
- The designs address current problems in caring for an ageing population if people did not wish to adapt their own homes.
- Not only designed for wheelchair users but those with mobility issues
- Traffic statement – the inclusion of this document was for transparency looking at the suitability of the site for current and future development. The application tonight is for the current developer to build 9 bungalows.

Final comments from public

- The transport document reflects pre application discussions the applicant had with the planning department about the suitability of the site for 40 houses.
- The development will not follow the building line with Coombe Hill.
- Just because there may be a recognised demand for such housing does not mean it needs to be built in KM.

1.0	Apologies Receive apologies and consider acceptance of the reasons. There were no apologies.
2.0	<p>Declarations of Business Interests</p> <p>20/03412/FUL, 20/03642/HOU 20/03643/HOU 20/03644/HOU - RS 20/03412/FUL, 20/03642/HOU 20/03643/HOU 20/03644/HOU - TI 20/03412/FUL - KM 20/03412/FUL – HB</p>
3.0	<p>Planning. TR took the chair.</p> <p>Consider the following applications and make recommendations to the planning officer: 20/03412/FUL. Erection of 9 no. Bungalows (some with rooms in roof space) including Extension of Access Road approved under planning applications 18/01533/FUL & 19/00834/FUL Land North of The Old Coach House Coombe Hill Keinton Mandeville.</p> <p>The plans were considered, and comments made as follows: CC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application lacks affordable homes. • The issues with the road junction make it unsuitable. • The village is already over-developed. • Endorses the points raised in letter from local resident Amanda Williams. <p>CL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agent clearly presented the proposal this evening, this together with the recent site meeting have been helpful. • The adoption of ‘green’ principles is heartening and sets a precedent for future development. • However, the key issues with this application are identical to 20/03613/FUL. Land OS 8325 And OS 8333 Off Church Street and as such the PC response for this application should be consistent with that response.

- This proposed development is on green space, it is not integral to and represents an extension to the village, this represents intrusion into the landscape
- The CPRE document is well-written and reflects valid concerns about the development.
- Councillors have responsibility to take careful note of the local response. In his many, many years as a Councillor this application has attracted the second highest number of objections. There are 72 public comments on the SSDC planning website. Of these, 62 object to the application. Of the 10 who support the application, 5 do not live in the village and the Parish Council is not obliged to represent their views.
- Although the landowner has reminded the Parish Council that the application on the table is for 9 houses only, it is noted that the application comprises all the documents submitted for consideration. It is explicit in the planning application that the developer has had a pre-application discussion with the Council about developing the whole field with 40 houses, this causes concern about the potential for an even greater impact.
- This development would have a direct impact on infrastructure.
- The most serious concern is about traffic. Although Highways in their comments have said that there is a clear view onto Castle Street from the Coombe Hill junction, what has not been acknowledged is the fact the traffic, including large lorries, is approaching on the right-hand side of the road because of the parked cars. It is also noted that their comments have been made during lockdown when the traffic is significantly less than in normal circumstances. The Highways consultees need to recognise that their observations need to look beyond the immediate ingress / egress to a development and to the wider network.
- Working from home is being promoted in the application, but this would only be viable if the broadband could cope, and the sewage, and the drainage.
- The argument about meeting the demand for bungalows is not persuasive. An application for 7 bungalows has already been approved off Castle Street and there are three more bungalow approvals in the village.
- Public safety is an issue with no footpath – as per the comments made in public session by a resident of Coombe Hill.
- In summary it is not good for the village and our residents do not want it.

SF

- Although the potential for 31 homes has been mentioned, this consideration needs to focus on the 9 homes in the application.
- The traffic report has highlighted it is suitable for the location.
- The social housing argument is not valid. This need has been met by other developments and there are other possibilities for young people to join the housing ladder.
- The green energy features are positive.
- Good quality housing such as this is desirable and there is a need to approve some development to allow new people to come to the village.

TR

- PC must acknowledge that a significant number of residents have objected to this application.
- No issues with the quality or the design of the proposal
- The development would not be consistent with the linear pattern of the village, indeed in previous planning application appeals (Land to rear of Prospect House and Land to East of Manor Park) this was quoted as a reason for dismissal. The same principle applies with this proposal. The building line of the village must be protected – this development would extend the building line at a right angle to Coombe Hill and as such is out of character with the existing pattern of development.

Resolved, it was proposed and agreed to recommend **refusal** based on planning considerations associated with the comments made above. Vote: for:3, against: 1

TR and the clerk would prepare a response.

20/03644/HOU Proposed parking, 9 Coombe Hill Close Keinton Mandeville

The plans were considered and comments made as follows:

No objections.

Clarity was requested about the positioning of the charging points and provision of space required by building regulations, this was clarified by the landowner.

Resolved: It was proposed and agreed to recommend approval. Vote – For: 5 Abstention: 1

20/03643/HOU Proposed parking, 8 Coombe Hill Close Keinton Mandeville

The plans were considered and comments made as follows:

No objections as comments above.

Resolved: It was proposed and agreed to recommend approval. Vote – For: 5 Abstention: 1

20/03642/HOU Proposed insertion of rooflights and window 10 Coombe Hill Close Keinton Mandeville

The plans were considered and comments made as follows:

No objections.

Resolved: It was proposed and agreed to recommend approval. Vote – For: 5 Abstention: 1

Concern was raised that the 'proposed insertion' had already taken place prior to this application being considered and approved.

TI took the Chair

21/00202/FUL Champion House Barton Road Keinton Mandeville. Conversion and extension of an existing outbuilding to ancillary domestic use and change of use of land to garden. CL pointed out that he would not be declaring an interest as although he lived opposite, he could not see the area in question and had not been included on the SSDC neighbour list.

The plans were considered and comments made as follows:

No objections

Noted that it would have made sense for the change of use from agricultural land to garden to have been approved for all of the properties at the original determination stage.

Resolved: It was proposed and agreed to recommend approval. Vote – For: 6 Abstention: 1