

Keinton Mandeville Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of the above-named Parish Council held on
Tuesday July 19th 2022. at Keinton Mandeville Village Hall at 8pm

Present: Tom Ireland Chair TI, Trevor Ryder Vice Chair TR, Chris Lane CL, Chris Calcutt CC, Gary Jennings GJ, Hayley Warrens HW, Ken White KW.

In attendance: Sue Graham Clerk, Dean Ruddle County Councillor, 71 members of the public.

Public session.

22/01720/OUT

The 'SHOCK' group spokesperson noted that Keinton Mandeville has a rural character, and a distinct linear pattern of development. This was the historic landscape. Past development proposals have been refused by SDC and the Inspectorate because they are inconsistent with this pattern of development. If this application is approved, this principle will be removed and in effect will open up other areas of the village for development.

Other issues raised

This is building on farmland and it is important to protect food production
If developed this will change the landscape, we will never get the greenfield back
Various concerns expressed that KM has been earmarked as a town.

Drainage concerns

Reference has been made in the documents to the potential for tapping into foul water drainage at Lakeview -this is not adequate or an option. There have been issues with flooding including raw sewage as the existing drainage system is not fit for purpose. Drainage issues will also impact on Charlton Adam
Increase in Council tax revenue from the many developments needs to be re invested in order to improve the infrastructure such as drainage.

Highways:

Traffic Survey contained in the LVA application: carried out in May 2021 when coming out of lock down therefore not a true reflection. Locally collected data confirms local experience that there is significantly more traffic than suggested by LVA
Damage to pavements in the village is caused by traffic mounting pavement (Castle Street / High Street) Another example of why additional traffic cannot be accommodated
Developer's assertion that somehow the development would contribute to traffic calming / improve the situation is ludicrous.
Bus services are limited – transport links are not as suggested in the LVA report
Junction at top of Queen Street – inadequate even without additional traffic generated by development of this size.
Plans indicate intention to change flow of traffic through the village by placing bollards at the current access to the village hall and creating new access to the village hall via the south east corner of the development. Concern that the developer referred to a bypass when addressing the village at a recent presentation. This would in effect shift the centre of the village to the west, and conveniently remove any assertions that the development would be remote from the centre of the village.

Noted that the CPRE response to the application makes number of good points and those present would endorse these.

Overdevelopment. Size of development is inappropriate for a village of this size. With recent developments added to planning applications pending decision there is the potential for 144 extra houses, a village the size of KM should expect only half of this. This number excludes the 120 proposed in the current development. The percentage increase cannot be accommodated.

Landscape

Impact on landscape is significant
The proposed development sits on prominent ground and would be visible from miles around - impacting on the surrounding areas including Kingweston, The Charltons, Kingsdon / Lytes Cary
Development will naturally grow over time and hence the impact would increase
This housing estate would be out of kilter with size and style of the rest of the village. The main settlement of the village at the moment covers 15 acres. This development site is 25 acres.

There are numerous examples of misrepresentation in the LVA documents including misrepresented growth of KM to date. The views / concerns of villagers are dismissed

Footpaths

Impact on footpaths (parish paths) is described as neutral – a footpath passing through a housing estate is significantly different and cannot be described as neutral.

SSSI is within 500m of this development, the village is lucky to have this. The wildlife is interesting and includes a variety of migratory birds. Light pollution from the development will be prominent and will impact on this site.

School

The school will become oversubscribed. The developers have talked about bussing children out of the village which is unrealistic. However, they are likely to pledge a sum of money for the creation of an extra classroom and claim the issue has been addressed. The process involved with securing an extra classroom is protracted, involves significant work on the part of the school itself, would not be guaranteed within a timescale and would not solve the problem, it is not as simple as having an extra classroom, there is no scope to extend the school and the communal spaces are not big enough to accommodate ongoing expansion. It is short sighted to suggest that simply pledging a sum of money would address this.

Queries about SSDC pre planning consultation, and 5 year land supply, and whether the lack of jobs and inadequate broadband were raised with Dean Ruddle

22/01947/HOU

Low level garage is becoming a house sized building with an office and ensuite.
 The frontage will extend above the existing wall and will be twice the height
 There will be reflective noise as the traffic noise will bounce off the higher wall.
 Gable end - materials: reconstituted stone, with white upvc windows
 It will be highly visible
 The current street scene features listed buildings
 It will create an oppressive and hemmed in environment

1.0	Apologies. Apologies were received and accepted from Tony Capozzoli
2.0	Declarations. There were no declarations.
3.0	<p>Planning. Consider the following applications and make representations to the planning officer 22/01720/OUT Outline planning application with some matters reserved except for access for a residential development of up to 120 dwellings (including policy level affordable housing) with associated public open space, community orchard, allotments and potential additional parking for the existing village hall, with details of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved. - Land South Of B3153 Keinton Mandeville Somerton Somerset TA11 6EF</p> <p>The plans were considered and comments were made as follows: There were 417 houses in the village in 2011. Since 2016 there have been approvals for 92 houses, with a further 52 in the planning system awaiting determination there is potential for 144 additional houses in the village, and this is <i>before</i> this application is determined. Proportionate development for Keinton Mandeville would be 40-50 houses. This is unsustainable and contravenes the planning principles adopted by SSDC. Despite making repeated references to ‘sustainable’ the application provides no evidence of sustainability. There are a number of errors / misrepresentation contained in the documents</p> <p>If approved this will be an urban housing estate. It is a speculative proposal by a remote company, which will be taken on by a mass developer with no interest in the well-being of our community, and as such the ‘promises’ will evaporate. The development is unjustifiable. Development of this site - agricultural land- will impact on food security, an increasingly important principle. Unsustainable: the proposed development is unsustainable and contributes to climate emergency Unnecessary. The village has had more than fair share of development Unsupportable – infrastructure cannot cope with further development, it is already beyond capacity This development would corrupt the character and built form of the village It is unwanted – none of the public present at the meeting have spoken in favour The outcome of this process will be our legacy - it future years it would represent a development attracting comments about who approved it and why it was ever allowed It will detract from landscape quality It will increase traffic Concern that people in the village believe that because of the location of this development, on the edge of the village, it will not affect them. It will affect the whole village, not least because the building materials will be transported in along Castle St for at least the next five years.</p> <p>This development would have enormous ramifications It is contrary to Planning Policy SS2 Development in Rural Settlements -it does not provide employment, doesn’t enhance community facilities, and there is no evidence it will meet housing need. It does not have the support of the local community.</p>

It is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 78: Housing development must be responsive to local need – this does not appear to be addressed in this application

It is contrary to the NPPF principle that development must be located where it enhances the rural community – this development would be to the detriment of the community.

Concern about the sustainability of proposed development and the environmental impact

Flooding –the use of impermeable materials is likely to result in flash flooding which will travel south

The applicant gives no consideration to climate change in the flood assessment. Reference is made to a broad-brush climate allowance, but no consideration is given to the influence of local microclimate/ topography on climate change-induced flooding locally.

The proposals in the nutrient assessment are contradictory, referring to the creation of wetland to mitigate.

Creation of wetland is not possible, in local area, due to absence of core environmental conditions, such as impermeable bedrock. The underlying strata is blue lias which is free-draining and will allow nutrients to permeate into watercourses. .

The transport assessment is inaccurate. It makes reference to the development promoting sustainable travel but does not detail how this would be achieved or acknowledge the lack of accessible public transport infrastructure servicing the village, enabling people to travel to their place of work etc without a car.

Mitigation of whole life carbon not mentioned, despite the development producing vast amounts of embodied carbon from construction to operational phase, which is not mitigated, in acknowledgment of the climate emergency and respective SCC and UK net zero targets.

The Design and Access Statement makes no reference to sustainable construction, such as the installation of solar panels or Air Source Heat Pumps to mitigate the operational carbon of the development

The SSSI is important. (It is noted that Natural England have been consulted –but there has been no response to date, this needs to be checked.) The proposed phosphate and flooding mitigation strategies associated with the development is likely to detrimentally affect SSSI by allowing pollutants to flow through soil and bedrock to the protected area.

SSDC have declared a climate emergency expressed a wish to be carbon neutral by 2030. A green area of this size will remove vital natural capital that is essential for absorbing carbon and the proposal seeks to remove it and produce vast amounts of whole life carbon as a result.

There are many misrepresentations in the submission documents, this skews the argument in favour of the developer as opposed to that of the village

The travel plan shows that this is a car park to car park development

In spite of some of the houses having 3.5 parking spaces allocated, the applicant's claim is that this will have little impact if not a traffic calming effect in the village.

The impact of the additional traffic would be significant, on Queen St to the A37, and on the High Street.

Residents' emotional well-being would be impacted.

Noted that a mix of 1-5 bedroom homes are planned. The population increase in South Somerset is lower than in Somerset as a whole and is highest in the 65+ age group. The proposed mix of houses is therefore inappropriate.

Impact on the landscape / view is not mentioned in the application

Drainage is a concern, particularly the reference to a pumping station directed to the top of Barton Road.

The lack of professionalism and apparent cynicism evident in the application is a concern, this may reflect the applicant's wider principles / approach to the development.

Scepticism expressed about the idea that the project is sustainable and also that any local issues that have been raised have been mitigated.

Concern that much of what is promised will not materialise as has been the case with other developments

The application demonstrates that the priority is building houses rather than protecting the local area

School: the school is full with no capacity to accommodate an extra classroom / additional space required

Numerous applications have been agreed / decisions pending (including the application in question) amounting to 264 additional houses, an increase of 63%, this is not acceptable for a village the size of Keinton Mandeville

Transport infrastructure to which the proposal refers does not exist

The village will not gain / benefit from this development, nor will services be improved.

The CPRE report deals well with the environmental issues. Residents have chosen to live in a rural community and we must fight to keep it that way

This is an outline application and as such 120 houses and access will be determined. Other issues such as sweeteners are irrelevant at this stage.

Footpaths (parish paths) will naturally be diminished as density increases, it is important to protect these

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

- Scale of proposal makes it unsustainable
- The density of the development makes it urban in nature
- A development of this size will contribute to the climate emergency as declared by SSDC
- There is a lack of evidence of local demand
- The infrastructure – sewage / drainage / roads and transport is inadequate
- Landscape impact (issues raised by CPRE)
- Negative / harmful impact on SSSI , including excess water from the development draining into it
- The associated increase in the population cannot be accommodated.

The Chair and Clerk would prepare a response to the planning officer.

Consider correspondence from SSDC: Consultation on Potential Leisure Planning Obligations for application 22/01720/OUT.

The spreadsheet from SSDC setting out proposed contributions was considered. The following suggestions were made with reference to uses of s106 contributions for leisure:

Tennis courts at Castle St playing fields would benefit from resurfacing

A play area near to development would be beneficial – possibly a cricket pitch which the village currently lacks

The village has an active and successful junior and senior netball club, but the teams cannot train in the village and have to travel to an indoor facility at Castle Cary. An indoor facility would be useful.

There is an empty ‘hub’ building at the Lakeview development and this could be usefully converted into a leisure facility

22/01947/HOU [Proposed replacement of previously approved garage/workshop/store \(ref:90/01466/FUL\) with double garage/annex. - Kent Lodge Queen Street Keinton Mandeville Somerton Somerset TA11 6EG](#)

The plans were considered and comments made as follows:

- The application appears to insinuate that this plan emulates the existing, this is not the case
- The existing house does not abut the road but the proposed does. The proposed would impinge on the street scene
- The proposed would be double height, it was previously single storey – the height extending above the boundary wall for the neighbours is a concern. There is no mention of pre application consultation with neighbours.
- The proposal is proportionate with a residential dwelling as opposed to a garage / workshop
- Concern about retrospective applications in the future and that the garage will be turned into open plan living accommodation
- No reference to sustainable construction – and insufficient information on materials that will be used - local materials / renewable technologies
- The windows on the back would be intrusive to neighbouring property
- This would be detrimental to residential amenity
- Noted the proposed property is gable end on, but there are existing cottages with similar orientation

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

- Scale. The proposed is too large and not a like for like replacement
- Materials used are not local nor sustainable contravening section c and d of Keinton Mandeville zero carbon policy, the NPPF paras: 14.154, 14.155, and local plan policy EQ1.
- Unacceptable Impact on street scene including the listed building opposite

It was noted that a single storey garage would be more acceptable notwithstanding other comments above