



STOKE GIFFORD

PARISH COUNCIL

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

Tel: 01454 865202

Email: clerk@stokegifford.org.uk

Web: www.stokegifford.org.uk

STOKE GIFFORD PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION MEETING

Held on Tuesday, 27th February 2024

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 R Barber S Bandcroft, M Brown, K Cranney, N Das Gupta, A Hyde, K Marsden, P Richardson and A Shore.
Also in attendance was John Rendell (Clerk) and four residents.

		ACTIONS
1	Welcome and apologies for absence. The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore welcomed all present to the meeting. Apologies were received from Councillors Dave Addison and Jan Brunwin.	
2	To receive notification of any member's personal or prejudicial interest. Councillor Keiron Marsden declared an interest in agenda item 7d.	
3	To approve minutes of the last Planning & Transportation meeting dated 23rd January 2024. The minutes dated Tuesday 23 rd January 2024 were agreed as an accurate record proposed by Councillor Tony Hyde, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, unanimously carried.	
4	Public Session [Maximum 15 minutes, up to 3 minutes per person]. A local resident wanted to bring to the attention of the Committee that ex Councillor Brian Allinson has been admitted to hospital recently and is very unwell. All at Stoke Gifford Parish Council wish Brian and his family well. Following a recent consultation held by SGC on Concorde way junction, a local resident was enquiring as to whether the Parish have received any feedback. Following many	

	<p>contacts into SGC the resident is unable to receive any further information and was seeking assistance from a District Councillor from the Parish. The Clerk confirmed nothing has been received from SGC but is aware Councillor Dave Addison has been liaising with the resident assisting with passing on relevant details.</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore will look into the consultation documents and report back to the resident.</p> <p>The resident was also concerned that SGC had not directly consulted the Parish Council (other than generally publishing on the consultations page). Councillor Keith Cranney commented that the Town & Parish Council forum next week may be an opportunity to ask SGC to communicate more directly with local residents and the Parish Councils.</p> <p>Potholes continue to cause much concern to residents and members as the roads seem to be deteriorating through the Parish. The Parish Office have reported many potholes along the Kingsway, some of which have been repaired but many areas still require attention. The Clerk urged residents to continue reporting to SGC on the Report-It site. An area along Church Road towards Harry Stoke Road is particularly bad and the Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore will take a look in the coming days.</p> <p>A local resident mentioned that due to the parish boundary changes and the Housing development currently underway at Brooklands Park, the Parish may wish to investigate new Parish signage to be installed on the highway verges. ‘Welcome to Stoke Gifford Parish’ signage will help residents know the parish boundaries. The Clerk will liaise with District members and check the possibility of installing new signage. There may be the possibility to re-use a removed, redundant Stoke Gifford sign from the now Stoke Park & Cheswick area.</p>	<p>AS to liaise with JH</p> <p>AS to check area and arrange report to SGC.</p> <p>Clerk to investigate signage options.</p>
5	<p>Possible street naming in new Brooklands Park phases 6 & 7.</p> <p>The Parish Clerk has been asked by the SGC Street Naming Team if the Parish have any suggestions for street naming within the new Brookland Park site, phases 6 & 7.</p> <p>Two names to be put forward our ex-Councillor Brian Allinson and a local resident/ landowner Henry Golledge.</p>	
6	<p>Update on previous planning applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 102 Rock Lane – approved (SGPC no objection) ○ Land rear of 3 Farm Cottages – approved (SGPC objected) , although SGC’s response was that parking should be off-road as provided for most house in the area and not in the turnaround area) ○ Land at Harry Stoke (phases 6 & 7) – approved with added conditions (SGPC objected) ○ 7 Parsons Avenue – refused (SGPC objected), new application on today’s agenda 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aviva Centre - External Plant Compound & Acoustic Screen – approved (SGPC no objection) ○ 87 Bush Avenue - approved (SGPC no objection, but comment about non-standard kerb) 	
7	<p>Planning Applications</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>a) P24/00158/HH – 105 Kings Drive Stoke Gifford South Gloucestershire BS34 8RQ <i>Erection of single storey rear glazed canopy.</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion about how this new application compares to previous applications, Councillor Neel Das Gupta proposed no objection to this planning application, subject to a condition to ensure appropriate drainage is put in place and that the storm water from the large canopy is contained within the boundary of the applicant’s property and is not permitted to run onto the ground of adjacent properties, seconded by Councillor Keith Cranney, proposal carried.</p> <p>b) P24/00189/HH - 59 Smithcourt Drive Little Stoke South Gloucestershire BS34 8NB <i>Erection of two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion, Councillor Sue Bandcroft proposed no objection to this planning application, subject to the relevant requirements for a dropped kerb for the widened vehicular access/crossover being fulfilled. Whilst this may require a separate permission from Streetcare, we would like to see this added as a condition to any planning permission granted, seconded by Councillor Neel Das Gupta, proposal carried.</p> <p>c) P24/00209/HH - 14 Clover Leaze Little Stoke South Gloucestershire BS32 8YL <i>Erection of a single storey front extension to form study and porch. Erection of a single storey detached building to form garden and bike store.</i></p> <p>Following a short discussion, Councillor Richard Barber proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Keiron Marsden, proposal carried,</p> <p>d) P24/00187/F - Abbeywood Community School New Road Stoke Gifford South Gloucestershire BS34 8SF <i>Installation of temporary classroom and toilet blocks.</i></p> <p><i>Councillor Keiron Marsden declared an interest in this application and will not vote.</i></p> <p>Following discussion, Councillor Sue Bandcroft proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Tony Hyde, proposal carried.</p>	

e) P24/00290/F - Crest House Lime Kiln Close Stoke Gifford South Gloucestershire BS34 8ST

Refurbishment of existing office building to include external condensers and façade louvres to provide a new heating and cooling system for the building.

Following discussion, Councillor Tony Hyde proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, proposal carried.

f) P24/00378/F - Land to Rear Of 7 Parsons Avenue Stoke Gifford South Gloucestershire BS34 8PN

Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of 1no. dwelling with access, parking and associated works (resubmission of P23/03354/F)

Members were concerned about the lack of windows and poor outlook for the dwelling, which would be out of keeping. Councillor Andrew Shore commented on the shortage of private amenity space and adverse impacts arising for neighbouring dwellings (including storm water). Following discussion, Councillor Penny Richardson believes the previous objections made by the Parish still stands on the revised plans and proposed that we object to this application, seconded by Councillor Richard Barber, proposal carried.

Submitted objection wording –

“Stoke Gifford Parish Council object to this planning application for the following reasons:

1) The size of the plot appears too small to host both 7 Parsons Avenue as well as the proposed new dwelling. It would be excessive infilling leading to a cramped, discordant & contrived look & feel. The application will be contrary to policies CS1, PSP8 points (a), (b) & (c), PSP38 points 2 & 4 and paras. 8.19 & 8.20.

2) Inadequate residential amenity for the proposed new dwelling. The proposed new dwelling will have a very poor outlook, with insufficient windows and light. The application will be contrary to policies PSP38 point 2 and para.8.21 which explains that tandem development is generally unsatisfactory. This is the case with this proposal, with poor access to the proposed property at the rear and the bicycle storage for number 7 up against the front of the new dwelling, leading to adverse impacts on the residential amenity both for number 7 and for inhabitants of the proposed new dwelling. Contrary to PSP38 point 2 & para.8.21 (amongst other things). Furthermore, being set so far back from the street, it is questionable if the main entrance door will have a clear view from the street, as required by the Householder Design Guide SPD page 28 on security grounds. In regard to the proposed parking space, there is lack of clarity on how that space would be secured in future for future residents of the dwelling, given its location in the front garden of other dwellings.

3) It will have insufficient private amenity space. It is hard to see how the claimed 53.5m² or even 48.5m² can be achieved, when comparing the space against the internal gross area of 37m². The figures of 35m² and 20m² in the previous application documents appear more plausible but are insufficient. It will be contrary to policy PSP8 para. 4.10, PSP38 point 4 & paras. 8.17 & 8.20 and the minimum standards in PSP43.

4) It will likely cause adverse impacts to the residential amenity of neighbouring property of 248 North Road. Whilst there is already a structure there, the impact from an outbuilding/shed is materially different from that of a distinct dwelling, especially an enlarged structure and with a domestic waste & recycling storage area in a narrow, confined space right up against the rear boundary. As the applicant acknowledges, the 'Windows to Wall' test is also not met. It will be contrary to policy PSP8 (a) - (e) and paras. 4.9 & 4.10 and PSP38 point 2 and the Householder Design Guide SPD page 3.3(iv).

5) It will cause adverse impacts to the residents of number 7, due to proposed storm water infiltration onto the ground of number 7. The amount of water will be increased compared to now, due to the increased footprint, and it should not be permitted to flow or infiltrate into the ground of adjoining property (which will likely be in separate ownership in due course) potentially leading to waterlogging. The storm water from the new dwelling needs to be dispersed within its own curtilage (if, as & when it becomes its own residential unit) but this is unlikely to be possible with the limited space around the proposed new dwelling, the necessary provision of paved areas and with 248 North Road adjoining close by and with its ground sitting at a lower level. This proposal will be contrary to policy PSP8 including paras. 4.9 & 4.10 and PSP38 point 2 and para. 8.21.

6) In design terms, whilst the applicant argues the hipped roof design is in keeping with other extensions and that the development would be a continuation of the existing developments, a key point is that the proposal is for a distinct dwelling and it would be an incongruous, out-of-keeping 'back land' development addition within a residential garden. There are no nearby examples of a dwelling house being located in a rear garden. This application is very different to that of rear extensions to existing dwellings. It would be contrary to policy CS1.

7) The increased amount of dropped kerb resulting in the immediate area (together with likely increased visitor parking demand) will reduce the amount of on-street parking for visitors of the nearby properties (in an area where parking can already be problematic). Thus, contrary to PSP38 points 2 & 3.

In summary, this proposal would be an incongruous, out of keeping over development which will look cramped & contrived, won't have good amenity for the occupiers of the dwelling and will cause several harms to the residential amenity of adjacent dwellings. It is clearly too much and inappropriate for the space available and the context and constraints of the site. It is contrary to multiple planning policies and should be refused."

g) P24/00382/HH - 38 Chalcombe Close Little Stoke South Gloucestershire BS34 6EW
Erection of two storey side and single storey front extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Councillor Keith Cranney was concerned about how the construction would be carried out; Councillor Sue Bandcroft was concerned at the potential impact to the walkway used by school children. Following discussion Councillor Keith Cranney proposed no objection on the basis the work is carried out to the rear of the property, to avoid the green space and public highway at the front of the property, seconded by Councillor Richard Barber, proposal carried.

Submitted wording –

“Stoke Gifford Parish Council have no objection to this planning application, subject to the following conditions forming part of any permission –

- 1) That a construction management plan be put in place, requiring that deliveries be made to and the construction work be carried out from the rear of the property, to avoid the green amenity space and pedestrian walkway (used by school children) at the front from being impacted.*
- 2) Given the residential area, that there is a restriction on 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.”*

h) P23/03371/F - Land At 41 Bush Avenue Little Stoke Bristol South Gloucestershire BS34 8LY

Demolition of existing garage and conservatory. Erection of 1no. attached dwelling with parking and associated works.

Councillor Keiron Marsden commented on the improved aesthetics but felt that our previous objections still remain with the revised plans. Councillor Andrew Shore noted that the building still projects forward of the building line (albeit slightly less than the original plans) and still reduces the garden for 41 Bush Avenue to below the policy threshold (slightly worse than with the previous plans). Councillor Keith Cranney commented on the high volume of objections from local residents, particularly around highways safety concerns. Following discussion, Councillor Andrew Shore proposed objection to this application, re-stating our original objections with appropriate wording and policy references, seconded by Councillor Tony Hyde, proposal carried.

Submitted objection wording –

“Stoke Gifford Parish Council have reviewed and note the revised plans, with an improved aesthetic design.

However, we object to this latest planning application for the following reasons, largely unchanged from the original plans –

	<p>1) <i>Despite the changes, it will still sit forward of the building line along Bush Avenue and adversely affect the characteristically spacious & open nature of the area. It would thereby not be in-keeping with the surrounding area and would harm the street-scene and character of the area. It represents over development of the site, with excessive infilling leading to an overly dominant, cramped & contrived look & effect, in the context of the surrounding area. The application will be contrary to policies CS1 part 1, PSP8 and PSP38 point 1 & para. 8.15.</i></p> <p>2) <i>It will reduce and lead to insufficient private amenity space for the existing dwelling of 41 Bush Avenue, with a significant shortfall (of 52m² vs 70m² requirement). This represents a deterioration from the already significant sub-standard provision resulting from the previous plans (56m² vs 70m² requirement). It will be contrary to policy PSP8 para. 4.10, PSP38 point 4 & paras. 8.17 & 8.20 and the minimum standards in PSP43.</i></p> <p>3) <i>It will compromise highway safety for pedestrians and road users, due to the widened and additional vehicular accesses onto the highway (which has significant vehicular traffic & pedestrian volumes), especially being so close to a road junction and across a pavement which is used by school children amongst others. It will also affect visibility across the currently quite open corner of two roads. Thus, it would be contrary to policy PSP38 point 3. Numerous concerns about highways safety from other residents are noted, we question whether there has been adequate consideration and a full assessment by the highways officer.</i></p> <p>4) <i>The increased amount of dropped kerb resulting in the immediate area will reduce the amount of on-street parking for visitors of the nearby properties (in an area where parking is at times already problematic) and will encourage unsafe parking behaviour. Thus, contrary to PSP38 points 2 & 3.</i></p> <p><i>In summary, this proposed development will - at the proposed scale and in this location - cause harms to residential amenity & amenity space, visual amenity & character of the area and to highway safety. It is contrary to numerous planning policies and should therefore be refused. “</i></p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>Government/ Housing Secretary consultations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential changes to policy on brownfield development (closes 26/03/24) - Potential changes to Permitted Development Rights (closes 09/04/24) 	
<p>9</p>	<p>Traffic lights at Hambrook – case for potential reinstatement of restricted turns.</p> <p>Following discussion members are keen to make contact with SGC to write on behalf of the many residents affected by the M4 over-bridge closure to see if the turning restrictions on Hambrook lights can be lifted.</p> <p>Over 2,000 local residents have signed a petition wishing to remove the restrictions.</p>	<p>AS/JR to contact SGC.</p>

	<p>The restrictions have been in place (on trial) to reduce the nitrogen dioxide levels on the section of the ring road to meet legal limits.</p> <p>SGC have been gathering emissions data for a number of years now, but normal traffic levels were disrupted by the COVID lockdowns in 2020/21.</p> <p>The Chair and the Clerk will write to SGC, given the public feeling and the changed circumstances now vs when the restrictions were brought into (trial) effect. These include the increase in electric vehicles, a greater proportion of other vehicles now with stop-start technology, changes in the road network (e.g. the SGTL road), traffic pattern changes post-Covid and the M4 over-bridge closure resulting in lengthy diversion journeys with resulting emissions increases across a wider area.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>South Glos Council Road Safety information.</p> <p>The Clerk distributed a poster received from SGC from the South Gloucestershire Road Safety Team looking to share key information to help the community stay safe when close to or using the road networks.</p> <p>The posters have been added to the Parish website and on all notice boards in the parish.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Any other business relevant to this committee.</p> <p>Discussions were held between members regarding an update on the old redundant Stokes Youth Centre building.</p> <p>SGC ran a public consultation recently asking residents for thoughts and preferences for plans for the building and site. The roof to the building needs replacing and the current structure is not fit for purpose costing approx. £450k to put right.</p> <p>Councillor Sue Bandcroft has been informed the plot of land including garage blocks opposite the Scout hut is up for sale. Bromford Housing Association owns the land, and the Parish Council will be informed once anything materialises via the Planning authority.</p> <p>Councillor Andrew Shore referenced some recently published feedback from SGC, following a pop-up meeting and consultation which ended in December on the A4174 walking and cycling improvements.</p> <p>Councillor Mike Brown informed members the car parking bays have been repainted, after many years the lines were faded and not showing at all in places, so a good job completed.</p>	

12	Next Meeting – 19:00, Tuesday 26th March 2024	
13	CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS To resolve, by the nature of the sensitivity of items to exclude the press and public [Public Bodies Admissions to Meeting] None.	

The meeting closed at 21:00

Signed: _____

Date: _____

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