



# STOKE GIFFORD

PARISH COUNCIL

Community Hall, Little Stoke Lane, Little Stoke, Bristol, BS34 6HR

Tel: 01454 865202

Email: [clerk@stokegifford.org.uk](mailto:clerk@stokegifford.org.uk)

Web: [www.stokegifford.org.uk](http://www.stokegifford.org.uk)

## STOKE GIFFORD PARISH COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION MEETING

Held on Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> October 2023

#### EMERGENCY PROCEDURE

*In the event of a fire all those present should leave the building calmly, breaking a fire alarm panel on the way out, and assemble on the far side of the car park at the assembly point.*

*Attendees are reminded to either switch off or make silent their mobile phones.*

#### PRESENT:

Cllrs D Addison, S Bandcroft, M Brown, K Cranney, N Da Gupta, A Hyde, K Marsden, A Shore.  
Also in attendance was John Rendell (Clerk) and nine residents.

		ACTIONS
1.	<b>Welcome and apologies for absence.</b> The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore welcomed all present to the meeting.  Apologies were received from Councillors Jan Brunwin, Richard Barber and Penny Richardson.	
2.	<b>To receive notification of any member's personal or prejudicial interest.</b> None.	
3.	<b>To approve minutes of the last Planning &amp; Transportation meeting dated 26<sup>th</sup> September 2023.</b> The minutes dated Tuesday 26 <sup>th</sup> September 2023 were agreed as an accurate record proposed by Councillor Dave Addison, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, unanimously carried.	
4.	<b>Public Session [Maximum 15 minutes, up to 3 minutes per person].</b> A local resident noticed graffiti has appeared on the Groundsmen's building and football dugouts over the weekend. The Clerk informed the resident this has been identified by the Grounds staff and Caretaker and between them it will be cleared in-house.	

	<p>A local resident also mentioned a large gathering took place at the Community Hall the previous weekend. Car park was at maximum capacity with vehicles also being parked along adjacent streets.</p> <p>The Parish Clerk informed the resident the bookings line had taken a hire from a Charitable Trust early evening on Sunday 22<sup>nd</sup> October for up to 100 guests. Due to the public interest in their particular event, they had many more people attend site to support and the rooms/ building was clear before 21:30 when the security company closed site. Due to the amount of footfall through the building the rooms needed an additional clean Monday morning which the event team has paid for.</p> <p>A Local resident queried the positioning of the boulders at Meade Park once the new car park extension will be in operation. The Parish Clerk informed the resident two boulders will block the pathway by Hatchet Road entrance to prevent unwanted vehicles from entering site, and the remaining boulders will be placed along the footpath within the park grounds next to the boulders already in place.</p> <p>A local resident asked Councillor Neel Das Gupta for an update from South Glos Council on latest queries from residents regarding the lack of painted road markings on New Road, as well as overgrown weeds and general condition of the roads and highways. Councillor Neel Das Gupta will update the resident.</p> <p>The local resident also queried potential building developments at Bristol Parkway and Woodlands Golf Club and was concerned on the knock-on effect spilling into neighbouring parishes and towns.</p>	<p>Neel Das Gupta</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Planning Applications</b></p> <p>Should planning permission be granted, SGPC would request the inclusion of a condition restricting the hours of working (and movement or delivery of machinery or building materials), during the period of construction, to 07:30 – 18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 – 13:00 Saturdays and with no working permitted on Sundays or Public Holidays.</p> <p>Due to the members of the public present to raise points regarding planning application (c) Land Rear of 3 Farm Cottages, at the Chair’s suggestion this item was considered prior to applications (a) and (b).</p> <p><b>a) P23/02714/HH – 78 Simmonds View</b>  <i>Erection of single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion, Councillor Dave Addison proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Tony Hyde, proposal carried.</p> <p><b>b) P23/02787/HH – 82 Bush Avenue</b>  <i>Demolition of detached garage. Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.</i></p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore provided a photograph and shared some points for consideration, in relation to the planning policies and Householder Design Guide SPD. Members were also concerned at how this application seems to seek to change and add to a previous, but not implemented Certificate of Lawfulness (CLP), affecting the</p>	

clarity of the CLP and the new proposals, and felt that the various extensions should all be considered together.

Following discussion Councillor Dave Addison proposed to object to this planning application, drawing upon Councillor Andrew Shore's work and raising our concerns about the inter-related applications, seconded by Councillor Keith Cranney, proposal carried.

- *The side extension is not subservient to the existing dwelling in scale & character. It is neither stepped back nor stepped down. This is contrary to the Householder Design Guide SPD sections 2.1 & 2.3. Furthermore, the side extension appears to be more than half of the existing front width, contrary to the Householder SPD section 2.3 on page 20. Thus, the extended dwelling will be overly dominant.*
  
- *The proposed side extension appears designed to maximise footprint, very close to the boundary, resulting in a contrived and overpowering addition to the building and street-scene. This is particularly so given the dwelling is on the outside of a curve in the road and is thus prominent. Instead, it should be built 'in-line' with parallel walls, as explained in the Householder SPD section 2.3, pages 20 & 24. Furthermore, a side extension built close to a boundary should have a plain wall and not have a side window - Householder Design Guide SPD page 18 refers.*
  
- *Whilst the proposed conversion of the existing hipped roof to a gable end roof may fall under permitted development, this permitted development does not extend to the proposed gable-end roof to the right hand side of the side extension. A gable end roof is not in keeping with the predominant hipped roof style in the locality and, in particular, with the side extension being closer to number 80 Bush Avenue, the gable-end roof will jar with the hipped roof style of number 80 and be visually dominant and incongruous. Householder SPD section 2.5 refers, amongst other policies. We consider that a hipped roof design should be retained on the side extension (as other extended dwellings in the area have done).*
  
- *The additional/extended rear dormer, as a result of this application, would seem to result in the dormer extending across much more than 50% of the roof plane. This is contrary to the Householder SPD section 2.5 page 34. Furthermore, the dormer does not appear to be set down sufficiently below the main ridge nor set sufficiently back from the roof sides, also contrary to the Householder SPD section 2.5 page 36. Thus the essentially full-width 3<sup>rd</sup> floor design (with what seems like a balcony on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor / in the roof) is likely to be oppressive and intrusive to the neighbouring properties. Householder SPD section 3.3 page 43 refers.*

*Overall, whilst the desire to build an extension to this dwelling is recognised and acceptable in principle, the detailed application – as currently proposed – would be*

*overbearing due to its scale, proportions, massing & design. It would appear contrived, be visually dominant, over-powering and discordant with the street scene (especially given its relatively prominent position on the outside of a bend in the road), it will tend to lead to a cramped terracing effect and will look and feel over-bearing to the neighbouring properties.*

*It would therefore be contrary to the Householder Design Guide SPD (in multiple respects) and contrary to policies CS1, PSP1 and PSP38.*

*Finally, it is disappointing, and we feel misleading to see that the claimed ‘existing’ elevations do not reflect the true current as-is situation. Whilst this may be due to a recent Certificate of Lawfulness, it is still misleading as the CLP application has not been implemented. Furthermore, the ‘proposed’ elevations (side and rear extensions aside) indicate that the applicant intends to build differently to what the CLP application indicates. In the circumstances and given the apparent intention to build all the elements as one project, we consider that the application should aggregate all the proposals (both permitted development, with changes, and the additional non-permitted elements) for consideration as a full planning application (and not seek to incrementally add to and change the CLP elements which haven’t been implemented).*

**c) P23/02862/F – Land Rear Of 3 Farm Cottages**

*Erection of 1no dwelling with access parking and associated works.*

Four local residents were in attendance and addressed Members regarding their concerns with and objections to this planning application. This included the loss of important car parking at the end of Stratton Close, extra parking demand from additional visiting cars, the cutting down of hedgerow/shrubbery in advance of the application and its disruption to wildlife, where refuse bins will go and noise from the existing property.

The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore briefly outlined the role of the Parish Council, as a statutory consultee, in providing comment on the planning application in relation to the prevailing planning policies and criteria, for South Glos Council to consider in determining the application.

Following discussion, Councillor Dave Addison proposed an objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Keiron Marsden, proposal carried.

*Stoke Gifford Parish Council object to this planning application due to its adverse impact upon the residential amenity for the neighbouring dwellings who will lose 2 parking spaces at the end of Stratton Close, where the new vehicular access is proposed, in an area where parking is already particularly problematic. It would therefore be contrary to policy PSP38 points 2 & 3. In addition, the new dwelling (despite providing 1 off-road parking space) is likely to attract an increase in visitor parking, putting additional strain onto the reduced parking spaces at the end of Stratton Close.*

	<p><b>d) P23/02904/HH – 105 Kings Drive</b>  <i>Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension and canopy (resubmission of P23/02351/HH)</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion, Councillor Dave Addison proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Tony Hyde, proposal carried.</p> <p><b>e) P23/02887/RVC – Rolls Royce Site</b>  <i>Variations of conditions 13 to alter the drainage strategy and 21 to alter the approved plans.</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion, Councillor Andrew Shore proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, proposal carried.</p> <p><b>f) P23/02744/ADV – Fox Den Road</b>  <i>Consent to display 1no internally illuminated static totem sign.</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion, Councillor Keith Cranney proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, proposal carried.</p> <p><b>g) P23/02844/NMA – Land Off Fox Den Road</b>  <i>Non-material amendment to planning permission P20/05916/F to revise the approved drawings.</i></p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore drew to Member’s attention that whilst our Parish Council views are not automatically sought for Non Material Amendment (NMA) applications, he had spotted this NMA application and felt on this occasion (due to the volume &amp; description of the proposed amendments) that we should review it.</p> <p>Councillor Dave Addison proposed the following comment: Stoke Gifford Parish Council have some concerns regarding the suitability of the cladding arrangement for the hotel/restaurant (reportedly to assist with buildability), in regard to its fire resistance &amp; containment properties. SGPC would like for this for this to be reviewed, seconded by Councillor Andrew Shore, proposal carried.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Update on previous planning applications.</b>  The Chair included previous planning applications in the documents and the decisions made by SGPC and SGC.</p> <p>Members noted the information provided.</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore highlighted one application:</p> <p>5 Rossall Avenue - subsequent to the Parish Council objections (to the revised proposals), the applicant has withdrawn the application.</p>	

7.	<p><b>Updates relevant to Transportation in the Parish (road/rail/bus)</b></p> <p>Councillor Keith Cranney mentioned to members South Glos Council plan for an upcoming consultation for a proposed 20mph speed limit on Bush Avenue, Smithcourt Drive &amp; Gipsy Patch Lane.</p> <p>The consultation will be open to the public between 13<sup>th</sup> November – 4<sup>th</sup> December 2023.</p> <p>Once formally received in the parish office the Clerk will present to Council.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Any other business relevant to this committee.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Recent meeting – East of Harry Stoke.</b></li> </ul> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore attended a recent, initial stakeholder meeting where representatives from Crest and Wain Homes were present. Councillor Keiron Marsden was also present, both representing the Parish Council. Despite most of the new dwellings being in Winterbourne Parish, nobody was present from Winterbourne PC. The next meeting is likely to be in April 2024 and members were keen for the Clerk to circulate meeting information, once received, to ensure SGPC continue to have a representation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Brooklands Park development.</b></li> </ul> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore informed members complaints have been put on social media regarding the condition of roads, parking, yellow lines and rat-running through the development which is unfair on local residents who have moved into the site. All members to consider the best way forward to getting these issues addressed.</p> <p>Councillor Dave Addison has received information that South Glos Council is about to run a public consultation on a plot of SGC land near to the Little Stoke Community Hall. They have initially sought the views of the local District Members. This site of the old Stokes Community Hall is being discussed and a consultation taking place to see what ideas there are for the vacant site/property. Councillor Addison urged members to gauge local residents’ opinion and come up with ideas for when the consultation process reaches the Parish Council.</p>	
9.	<p><b>CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS</b></p> <p>To resolve, by the nature of the sensitivity of items to exclude the press and public [Public Bodies Admissions to Meeting]</p> <p>None.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Next Meeting – 19:00, Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2023</b></p>	

The meeting closed at 21:15

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**A Shore (Chair)** On behalf of Stoke Gifford Parish Council