

# Keinton Mandeville Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of the above-named Parish Council held on  
**Tuesday 2 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, Dean Ruddle DR (County Councillor) Sue Graham (Clerk) members of the public.

The chairman 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. Matt Green from Orme architects was present and would speak at the end of public comments to clarify any questions / points raised. The clerk outlined the rules regarding recording of meetings.

## Public session

District Councillor. TC reported the following:

- Planning application 20/03361/FUL. Erection of a Building for the storage of animal feed, materials and machinery required to maintain the paddock. Land At Bushmills House had been approved with conditions
- Plans for 'Stronger Somerset' continued
- He was personally concerned about the number of planning applications that were being accepted by SSDC when there was no prospect of them being determined within the required period (due to the ongoing phosphates issue.)

## County Councillor:

Dean Ruddle reported the following:

- There would be no county elections this year
- The next elections will be for a shadow authority and then a unitary authority or alternative
- At the latest SCC meeting additional funding was allocated to adult care, children's care and CAB.
- Consultation would be starting about reopening Somerton Station.
- S106 money cannot be reassigned to other projects.

## Members of the public – general.

Query about whether there were plans for speed signs on Barton Road. The SIS and community speedwatch plans were noted, the PC was waiting for the SIS to be consulted on.

The streetlight immediately outside the school (no 2) and opposite the defibrillator was out. There were obvious issues associated with this.

## Members of the public re planning application 20/03613/FUL

Resident of The Old Barn:

- As raised in the CPRE submission, the proposed development does not respect the listed status of this property. The property is listed because of its status as a former agricultural building and it should be set in an agricultural context.
- Shortcomings of the village infrastructure to accommodate this development
- There are inaccuracies throughout the application, including with the geography of the site, and some existing aspects (such as the Old Barn gate) do not feature. The site survey was not properly carried out and results are conflicting. By extension, the data throughout cannot be relied upon, and for this reason alone should be rejected.

Resident of Queen St:

The strength of feeling prompted by this threat to a valued green space is evident through the volume of feedback on the planning portal. Application is undermined by

- 23 households back onto this plot and suffer a loss of amenity
- 2 Grade II listed properties lose their setting
- An existing bungalow is lost

All for the provision of 30 dwellings. The loss of amenity is profound.

- Lavenders, the only other bungalow in Church Street will be directly overlooked by a two-storey house. Indeed, because of the elevated position of this plot, even the lower 2-storey barn style will overlook existing houses.
- Sycamore, located adjacent to the proposed exit will have an elevated road within feet of their house.
- Damage to the fabric of our community is keenly felt in residents' comments.
- Almost every objection mentions the parlous state of the road and sewage infrastructure.
- Chris Ridewood who farms Newlands reports how, in 2019, upgraded drains were laid taking surface water from the Lakeview site. These same drains will be used to take surface water from the proposed site as the field will no longer act as a natural buffer to protect existing housing. This new drain vents into an 'Open Ditch' which cannot cope with existing demand; resulting in Common Lane resembling a river that flows for 400m through and beyond the railway bridge. His fields now flood regularly impacting his livelihood.
- Impact on the natural and delicate balances between housing, farming and the wild populations of Keinton: several residents report the diversity of wildlife that lives, hunts or traverse this green space. Bee Orchids grow; owls hunt, badgers reside on the boundary. This is a cherished local space deserving of our protection.
- Contrary to the claims of the applicant, who have misrepresented the public consultation by excluding concerns raised where they fell outside their narrow questions, this proposal does not enjoy the general support of the community.

Given the housing land supply exceeds 6 years and SSSC reports 1,065 empty properties in their area, there is clearly no pressing housing need and full weight can, and should, be given to Planning Policy, notably policies covering:

- Sustainable Development; and
- Development in Rural Settlements.

Keinton has had its fair share of housing in the past. It is ready to engage positively in defining our vision including new housing, sustainable over decades but the violation of our green spaces must stop.

#### Resident of Queen St

- Reiterated the points already raised.
- The site is elevated so this increases the impact of the development for those living nearby
- The strength of feeling about this application is unprecedented
- The public consultation was academic - members of the public felt they had not had the opportunity to express their views - the questions on the feedback form were limited and those who had expressed their own views either on the form or via the parish council had not been acknowledged by the developers despite assurances to the contrary.

Resident of Queen St, owner of land to the north of the proposed development site.

- He worked hard to make this field wildlife friendly – this would be lost with the development of the proposed site. His field would effectively be an island in the middle of a large housing area.
- The site would be elevated 2 metres higher than his land and this would increase the impact.
- The impact of the additional traffic would exacerbate the existing pressure on the village roads.

#### Resident of Brook Cottage - Queen St.

- Has lived in the village for 35 years. There have been many changes, facilities have been lost (pub, bank, post office etc.) but the village has grown significantly and we now have more people and fewer facilities.
- There will be an impact on roads, environment, plants and wildlife.
- The pinch point at the top of Queen St is dangerous and cannot accommodate more traffic.
- The traffic at the time of building would also impact significantly on the street.
- There is no need to demolish a perfectly good bungalow for access.
- The impact on those behind the site will be shocking
- The consultation was ineffective - comments made by others reiterated
- Previous s106 promises have not materialised
- The assumption that this is going to happen regardless of public opinion is upsetting

#### Resident of The Homestead (listed farmhouse backing onto proposed development site)

- The assumption by the developers that this will be granted is deeply concerning and undemocratic, if the views of the electorate are not taken into account it would be worthy of an enquiry.
- The development would also impact on neighbouring villages' gas, sewage, roads, school.

- As had been said earlier there are plenty of empty homes in South Somerset and no need for more in Keinton Mandeville.

#### Resident of the Old Rectory

- The foul drainage and surface water at the corner of Church Street / Queen Street / Common Lane is problematic, regularly overflowing and flooding. It has impacted negatively on the ecology of the pond at the Old Rectory.
- Concern about drainage in fields behind the rectory - these cannot accommodate more
- Concern over increasing loss of green space in the village

#### Resident of Church Street.

- There is sufficient housing supply in South Somerset. But even if there wasn't, the village has experienced at least 17.5% growth with no comparable increase in infrastructure or amenities.
- The development proposes no new employment, all residents of the new development would have to travel for work, the bus route is mentioned but the fact that it is a poor service is omitted. The suggestions for cycling / walking to work are ridiculous
- There are irregularities and errors in the application
- This proposal cannot be presented as an extension of Lakeview which was a brownfield site.
- The development would severely overlook properties on Church Street and Queen Street.
- There is regular flooding on Queen St with increasing frequency – the elevated plot will exacerbate this, the application even acknowledges that the SE corner is likely to flood.
- Environmental and wildlife issues have been dismissed with reference to measures to control / override.
- The road safety and traffic issues that would be generated will contribute to an accident waiting to happen.

#### Resident Queen St / Common Lane.

- Traffic issues at both top and bottom of Queen St will be exacerbated with additional cars from 30 properties. The corner of Church St / Queen St / Common Lane is also a dangerous blind junction
- South Somerset Cycle route passes across the development access. This is not mentioned in the application
- Water and drainage issues will be exacerbated – this currently flows down the road instead of the drains, it is getting progressively worse in spite of the new drain installed as part of Lakeview. This will result in erosion of and damage to roads.
- There will be an impact on Charlton Adam with additional sewage directed to the pumping station.

#### Resident of Church St.

- The Lakeview site attracted relatively few objections compared to this application.
- This application risks changing the character of the village
- The public right of way which originally ran alongside the former Lakeview Quarry and field will run through a housing estate if this application is approved
- This development would represent a loss of green space and character of the village
- There is strain on the gas supply, Wales and West Utilities are reviewing the situation following significant loss of pressure last week. They were unaware of approved / proposed housing developments in the village.
- The requirement for a pre school is questionable. The education authority appears to be relying on development to fund this need. There has already been £75k from other s106 funding allocated to preschool, in addition there is CIL from other developments. (DR noted that CIL was complicated and in any event the amount paid to the village would only be 15%)
- There is no identifiable local need making this development viable. With no need for housing, fulfilling this would rely on a preschool for which there doesn't appear to be evidence of need.
- RS and CC noted that the preschool provision would replace the facility at Barton held at the village hall which was not fit for purpose. There was a longstanding need for the preschool to be situated on the school site. However, it was accepted that this was not a reason to approve a housing development.

#### Resident of Queen St

- Reiterates concerns re democratic process - this had been presented as a fait accompli by the developers.
- Frustrating that this is being 'sold' as an extension of Lakeview which is a brownfield site. This proposal is development of green space that runs through the village.

- Reiterate issues with elevated site, flooding
- There is a need for smaller affordable homes but these do not feature
- Concerns that water engineers were reported to have conducted flow testing at 1am on Church St when flow would have obviously been slow.

Resident Common Lane

Strongly oppose, reiterate points made so far, especially in relation to flooding

Helen Beal. It is necessary for SSDC to start listening to local people.

Matt Green from Orme Architects answered some of the issues that had been raised:

- Lack of democracy. Concerning that this is perceived. No representative from Orme would have presented this application as a 'fait accompli'
- Site has been accepted as one suitable for development by planning policy, and for 43 houses. This development is for 30 houses which is lower density and presumably preferable
- KM has been upgraded to a village and as such allocated a target of 60 houses
- Pre application consultation was difficult given the lockdown restrictions on meetings
- Drainage issues are being worked on by drainage consultants – these are experts
- Ecology – this has been reviewed by the county ecologist, the presence for example of great crested newts does not mean it cannot be developed
- Access – the developers would be looking to reduce the impact on neighbouring dwellings
- Design – some of the design aspects that have been criticised are subjective. These would be high quality dwellings.
- Gas supply - would not be required air heat pumps would be used and this would minimise energy use.
- Affordable Homes – the developer is looking into a discounted homes scheme

Comments were made by members of the public that the proposed mitigations were inadequate, this development would destroy the green space in the village. The argument that this site is likely to be developed regardless is not a good reason to approve this application.

The HELA plan identifies *potential* development sites which have been submitted by landowners / developers. They remain subject to planning approval. This application can be rejected in spite of the target for 60 houses in the next 10 years. This application is premature and would distort this plan.

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Apologies.</b> Apologies were received and accepted from Charlie Hull
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Declarations of Business Interests.</b> Trevor Ryder: 20/03613/FUL. Chris Calcutt 20/03613/FUL. Kevan McHale 20/03613/FUL. Helen Beal 20/03613/FUL. Chris Lane 21/00391/HOU.
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting 2 February and 16 February 2021</b> Resolved: The minutes were agreed as a true and correct record of the meetings held
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Matters arising from the minutes not covered by items on this agenda.</b> There were no matters arising.
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Planning.</b> Consider the following applications and make recommendations to the planning officer: <b>20/03613/FUL.</b> Land OS 8325 And OS 8333 Off Church Street and Land Adjoining Primary School at Chistles Lane Keinton Mandeville. The erection of 30 No. dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated access, parking and landscaping together with the erection of a purpose-built Preschool Building (Use Class E). The plans were considered and comments made as follows: CL: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the Lakeview Quarry application was presented to the PC it was advised that this development would be preferable to the alternative – deep quarrying. Similarly, a less desirable alternative has been reported this evening by the applicant. This is disappointing and not a reason to approve the current application</li> <li>• There have been 200+ objections to this application (and one supporting it.) District Councillors are urged to acknowledge this. This is a huge percentage of the electorate, and importantly all are residents of the village.</li> </ul>

- There are no benefits to the development. It would bring more pressure on infrastructure which cannot be accommodated, including traffic and congestion. Whether this is incremental or not it is not desirable.
- The CPRE submission is excellent and points well made – the village must relate to its surrounding countryside, this application does not respect the surroundings/ character of the village.
- Of the 200 responses on the SSDC website, none refer to the need for a preschool (noted that responses include residents who work in that sector and those who have preschool age children)
- There is no submission from the Headteacher of the primary school supporting it
- Supports the desire for a village preschool but there will be other ways of achieving this; it is not a reason to support the application
- The PC has a responsibility to consider the legacy of this for future generations, therefore recommend that the PC recommends refusal.

RS:

- Not opposed to development – noted that he was the lone Councillor who supported Lakeview, but that was a different site. This is greenfield, not brownfield.
- There are too many houses on the site
- The access is not good – it would have been better to extend the final stage of the Lakeview development with a few larger houses, accessed through the Lakeview site
- Acknowledge there is a need for a preschool and given the cost it needs to be related to a development

SF

Reiterated points already made -

- Infrastructure is inadequate
- Cannot accommodate a further 60+ vehicles
- Acknowledge Lakeview has been well developed, and not opposed to development per se but this is not a greenfield site
- Over 200 residents are opposed to this and we need to listen to those objections

TI

- SSDC currently have a 5-year housing supply and as such the former planning policy applies
- It is unclear at the moment whether the allocated 60 dwellings for KM date from 2016/2018/2020 -the process has been arbitrary. Regardless of this, existing development and approvals have already increased the number of dwellings in the village by 25%. Further development needs to be delayed to allow these to settle in.
- Accessing this development will be via one of three unsatisfactory routes – top of Queen St onto B3153 – the problems with this junction are well rehearsed; Common Lane onto A37 via a junction with poor visibility; via Charlton Adam accessing A37 from a blind bend. It is unhelpful that County Highways do not seem to acknowledge issues beyond the immediate access road.
- Noted SSDC Heritage Officer has objected to this application. Concerns in relation to listed buildings is valid
- The overlaid sewage system needs to be acknowledged
- The fact that the land is elevated is important – the positioning of this development will impact so many existing properties
- The application has attracted an unprecedented level of interest and objection and the PC must reflect this in its recommendations.

Resolved: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend **refusal** for the following reasons:

Highways

Listed buildings / heritage

Flooding

Sewers

Housing need

	<p>Local amenity Renewable energy Landscape Character of village – does not respect distinctive linear pattern with inserts of green space TI would prepare a response referencing the relevant planning policies and reflecting comments made this evening. 21/00391/HOU. Proposed Dormer Loft Conversion Longacre Barton Road Keinton Mandeville. The plans were considered and comments made as follows: No objections from neighbouring properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Windows are located to the west and do not impact on neighbours</li> <li>• Noted that if works are completed at the same time as those on Champion House there will be an impact for Barton Road.</li> <li>• No objections</li> </ul> <p>It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend approval. <i>Tony Capozzoli and Dean Ruddle left the meeting</i></p>																													
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Determination of Planning.</b> No notices had been received.																													
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Other planning matters.</b> There were no other matters																													
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Environment Champion Update.</b> TR reported that the great tree giveaway would take place on 27 <sup>th</sup> March in front of Copperfields, Queen Street. This would be advertised on social media and the PC website.																													
<b>7.0</b>	<p><b>Finance and Payments (RFO – Clerk)</b> Resolved: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to approve the following payments: <b>Payments</b></p> <table> <tr> <td>Salaries February 2021 +overtime</td> <td>£307.34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEST Pensions Direct Debit</td> <td>£23.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HMRC</td> <td>£12.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Postage and stationery reimburse clerk</td> <td>£18.73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Village Hall</td> <td>£1500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Playing Field</td> <td>£1500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PCC</td> <td>£1200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SALC planning training</td> <td>£25.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reimburse C Lane, gift for J Light for website work</td> <td>£44.99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SSDC Playground inspections</td> <td>£127.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SSDC Parish Ranger</td> <td>£346.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Microsoft Office 365 subscription reimburse clerk</td> <td>£59.99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bullguard Internet Security subscription reimburse clerk</td> <td>£39.99</td> </tr> </table>	Salaries February 2021 +overtime	£307.34	NEST Pensions Direct Debit	£23.80	HMRC	£12.60	Postage and stationery reimburse clerk	£18.73	Grants		Village Hall	£1500	Playing Field	£1500	PCC	£1200	SALC planning training	£25.00	Reimburse C Lane, gift for J Light for website work	£44.99	SSDC Playground inspections	£127.20	SSDC Parish Ranger	£346.32	Microsoft Office 365 subscription reimburse clerk	£59.99	Bullguard Internet Security subscription reimburse clerk	£39.99	
Salaries February 2021 +overtime	£307.34																													
NEST Pensions Direct Debit	£23.80																													
HMRC	£12.60																													
Postage and stationery reimburse clerk	£18.73																													
Grants																														
Village Hall	£1500																													
Playing Field	£1500																													
PCC	£1200																													
SALC planning training	£25.00																													
Reimburse C Lane, gift for J Light for website work	£44.99																													
SSDC Playground inspections	£127.20																													
SSDC Parish Ranger	£346.32																													
Microsoft Office 365 subscription reimburse clerk	£59.99																													
Bullguard Internet Security subscription reimburse clerk	£39.99																													
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Receipts.</b> There were no receipts																													
<b>7.2</b>	<p><b>Review of Accounts.</b> Presentation of summary of accounts, bank reconciliation and budget to be considered, agreed, and signed by Councillors. The clerk reported that the bank statements had not been received and the bank reconciliation would be completed at a later date. The accounts for month 11 2020-21 were reviewed. The balance at the end of January was £40601.55 Payments in February totalled £798.93 and receipts were £nil. The balance was £39803.62.</p>																													
<b>7.4</b>	<p><b>Grant requests.</b> Receive the following grant requests Tennis club. The grant request for the fence was considered with reference to the purposes of the grant, benefit to the village and village residents, and the PC grant budget. There were 38 households who were members of the tennis club, a fairly small proportion of the village. However, the tennis court was a valuable leisure facility and should be well maintained. It was proposed and unanimously agreed to provide a grant of £500 from the 2021-22 budget.</p>																													
<b>8.0</b>	<p><b>Highways.</b> Update / Items to report. The Highways officer had confirmed that the drains were due for jetting Dean Ruddle had circulated correspondence indicating that there would be 20mph lights in the vicinity of school</p>																													

	SIS – the proposal for a pavement build-out had been submitted. The PC had agreed for consultation to proceed and confirmation of this was awaited from the County Council.
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Parish Paths.</b> Update / items to report. RS had discussed relocating the public right of way marker sign (High Street to Combe Lane) with the farmer. An appropriate location had been agreed and RS would install it. Parish paths were in a poor state at the moment following the wet weather
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Happy Tracks / Skatepark</b> Kate Ridewood reported that the park had been very well used during lockdown, however there had been some problematic anti social behaviour recently including climbing on the MUGA fence, swearing, littering, and dangerous driving on the village hall lane. This had been reported to the police and they had attended. The recent graffiti on the skatepark had been painted over.
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Maintenance.</b> Consider and agree requirements
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Gas Supply Pressure</b> – recent and ongoing issues on the village. Update from Wales and West Utilities. KM reported that there had been a problem with low gas pressure in Church Street and Queen Street, down to 6 mb. It was possible that the supply pipe was too small with gas demand in the village growing. Wales and West utilities had been unaware of housing developments in the village and were reviewing the situation.
<b>12.0</b>	<b>Broadband Provision in Keinton Mandeville</b> – update. There was nothing further to report
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Village Hall Report.</b> CC reported the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hall foyer had been redecorated.</li> <li>• The Treasurer wished to thank the PC for the grant.</li> </ul> Reference was made to the s106 agreement for Lakeview and the fact that a significant sum had been allocated to fund improvements at the village hall. There were also allocations for the playing field.
<b>14.0</b>	<b>Correspondence. Receive the following correspondence and agree any actions arising:</b> Preparing for the possible return of face-to-face meetings - NALC Advice. Advice had been received that legislation would not allow for remote meetings from May. It would therefore be necessary to complete a risk assessment for in person meetings (Chris Calcutt had helpfully provided this) and to consider bringing forward any items of parish council business to the April meeting. The Annual Parish Meeting could be held remotely during April.
<b>15.0</b>	<b>Correspondence. Circulation.</b> The following correspondence had been circulated by email during February SCC corona Virus advice / updates, SWP briefings, SSDC corona virus advice / updates, SCC - one million vaccinated in Somerset, Somerset prepared newsletter, SALC - Save the Oaks link, SCC data wish list survey results, SSDC Members Briefing – planning, EPC2-21 - Model Design Code - NALC Consultation, requests for planning application 20/03613/FUL to be heard by Area East, Mental Health Self-Care – SALC event, SCC unsung heroes of the pandemic, CPRE AGM,
<b>16.0</b>	<b>PR.</b> Items for inclusion in the April edition of the Parish Magazine, the website and social media sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Councillor Vacancy</li> <li>• Great Tree Giveaway</li> <li>• Location of dog bins</li> </ul>
<b>17.0</b>	<b>Future agenda Items.</b> Quotes for bigger litter and dog bins Fill parish council vacancy by co-option
<b>18.0</b>	<b>Any other reports.</b> There had been no requests for a bi election to fill the PC vacancy. This post could therefore be filled by co-option.
<b>19.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting.</b> 6 April 2021