

# Keinton Mandeville Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of the above-named Parish Council held on  
**Tuesday 16 February 2021 at 7.30 p.m.** via zoom

Present: Tom Ireland TI, Trevor Ryder TR, Chris Lane CL, Scott Fischer SF, Kevan McHale KM, Richard Sutton RS.  
 In Attendance: Tony Capozzoli, TC Charlie Hull CH (District Councillors) 5 members of the public, Sue Graham (Clerk)

**Public Session**

**District Councillors**

TC: Area East Committee will resume meeting at the end of March

Other villages are interested in SIDs and would be open to sharing a device

CH: Several emails received in relation to application for 30 houses (Queen St / Church St). Parishioners were advised not to email all members of the Area East Committee, just the ward members Tony and Charlie.

Recycling was missed again in Barton Road. CH reported that this was being addressed.

Church St / Queen St application. Concern expressed that the ‘consultation’ led by the applicant at the pre application stage was insufficiently comprehensive and did not reflect residents’ concerns. It was becoming increasingly obvious to those against the development that a neighbourhood plan would assist. There were a number of people in the village who would be willing to help with producing a neighbourhood plan. The Chair noted that this had been considered previously and it would be an expensive exercise, but it could be revisited. He asked the District Councillors about the potential to revise alongside any local plan revisions. TC suggested that advice was sought from Tim Cook in relation to this.

**19/03528/FUL.** The Chestnuts – amended application.

Second house offers no benefit.

The driveway is too narrow – it is contrary to highways advice about visibility splays.

There is an amended sewage system proposed.

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Apologies</b> Receive apologies and consider acceptance of the reasons. Apologies were received from Helen Beal and Chris Calcutt
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Declarations of Business Interests</b> There were no declarations
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>Planning.</b> Consider the following applications and make recommendations to the planning officer:  <b>21/00201/HOU.</b> Champion House Barton Road Keinton Mandeville. Erection of a single storey rear extension. The application was considered, and comments made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed materials are in keeping.</li> <li>• Cannot be seen from the road.</li> <li>• Noted that the applicant has spoken to the immediate neighbours who have not expressed concern.</li> <li>• No objections</li> </ul> <p>Resolved: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend approval.</p> <p><b>19/03528/FUL.</b> The Chestnuts Queen Street Keinton Mandeville. Erection of 2 dwellings with associated access and parking, to replace the existing dwelling. Amended plans: The proposed house (to the south) has been reduced in size and moved away from the listed Dovecote. The application was considered, and comments made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plot remains overcrowded in spite of a small reduction to the size of the second property.</li> <li>• The plot is not suitable for two properties of this size and consequently lacks green space.</li> <li>• Two significantly smaller dwellings, or one dwelling and a single garage would be more acceptable.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was acknowledged that the PC recommended two smaller properties at the previous consultation stage, however the size of only one of the dwellings has subsequently been reduced.</li> <li>• The Parish Council's previous comments about use of blue lias have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The driveway is too narrow, especially for two properties and the visibility splays cannot be managed given that adjustment depends on walls of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• There is a lack of detail about the use of renewables.</li> </ul> <p>Resolved: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend refusal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overdeveloped, overcrowded plot remains in spite of amendments.</li> <li>• The access is inadequate and cannot be addressed – the splays are related to the neighbouring properties' walls.</li> <li>• There is insufficient green space.</li> </ul> <p>Materials are out of keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p><b>20/03449/HOU</b> 2 storey extension to front elevation, Mathias House, High Street, Keinton Mandeville. The applicant confirmed that the neighbours had been consulted at the pre submission stage - there were no concerns. Councillors considered the application and comments were made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is adequate space for this extension.</li> <li>• Design is attractive.</li> <li>• No objections</li> </ul> <p>Resolved: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend approval</p>
4.0	<p><b>Highways</b></p> <p>Measures to address illegal parking at shop – request for proposal to build out pavement to be included in SIS.</p> <p>This suggestion to build out the pavement and kerb to further differentiate between the parking area immediately outside the shop, and the double yellow non parking area was discussed. The aim would be to make it impractical to park in the double yellow lined area and thus discourage vehicles from parking in the area that significantly restricted visibility when exiting the Queen St / High St junction. This was acknowledged as a sensible suggestion and agreed that it should be forwarded to SCC with a request for this to be included in the SIS. It was noted that there would still be the potential for large vehicles to mount and park on the pavement.</p> <p>Agree locations to be submitted to SCC as potential sites for the SID.</p> <p>KM and CL and KM and TR had walked the village and identified a number of potential sites for the SID, including on High Street, Castle Street, Church Street, Barton Road and Queen Street. These were discussed including the potential need for new poles to be installed at a cost of £200. It was noted that consultation might be necessary before the poles were installed, however this was academic until the locations had been agreed. Further discussion took place about Queen St, particularly north of the junction with Chistles Lane. No suitable sites had been identified in this area – poles would encroach on the pavement and consequently introduce other issues. KM suggested that the SIDs needed to be considered as part of a bigger picture, including community SpeedWatch.</p> <p>Resolved: It was agreed to send the potential locations to the traffic engineers for in principle approval.</p>