



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, 28th January 2025

EMERGENCY PROCEDURE

In the eve 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, J Brunwin, K Cranney, N das Gupta, A Hyde, K Marsden, P Richardson and A Shore.

Also in attendance was John Rendell (Clerk) and seven members of the public.

1	Welcome and apologies for absence. The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore welcomed all present to the meeting. Apologies received from Councillor Richard Barber.	ACTIONS
2	To receive notification of any member's personal or prejudicial interest. Councillor Keith Cranney declared an interest in agenda item 10 due to being on the licencing committee so will not take part in the conversation.	
3	To approve minutes of the last Planning & Transportation meeting dated 26th November 2025. Councillor Keiron Marsden identified an action that required highlighting on agenda item three and four. The minutes dated Tuesday 26 th January 2024 were then agreed as an accurate record proposed by Councillor Penny Richardson, seconded by Councillor Keiron Marsden, unanimously carried. <i>Item 9 was discussed at this point on the agenda.</i>	

4	<p>Public Session [Maximum 15 minutes, up to 3 minutes per person].</p> <p>The Chair reminded all present that members of the public have three minutes per person and the public session will take a total of fifteen minutes. Any time extensions beyond this are only at the discretion of the Chair. The Chair asked members of the public and also committee members to be as concise and focussed on the topic as possible and reminded them to raise their questions & points through the Chair, so as to keep order and one conversation.</p> <p>A resident from Little Stoke is unhappy about the road layout through the north ward of the parish, highlighting recent works carried out on the Gipsy Patch Bridge, which has had a negative impact on traffic through Gipsy Patch Lane and in particular the various roads linked to the area on Hatchet Road, Bush Avenue, Smithcourt Drive, Station Road, the Kingsway and Gifford Crescent.</p> <p>The resident would like to discuss the matter with the Department responsible for the recent works to the bridge and the road network.</p> <p>Councillor Dave Addison explained to the resident the next Full Council meeting being ran by South Gloucestershire Council is scheduled for 12th February. All residents are welcome to attend and would need to register their wish to speak prior to the meeting. Councillor Addison encouraged the resident to attend the meeting as the highways/ road network falls under the remit of the district council.</p> <p>A resident from New Road is pleased that SGC have postponed their original proposal to install a parallel crossing linking Concorde Way and Brierley Furlong, across New Road, Stoke Gifford.</p> <p>The Concorde Way, New Road scheme aims to make Concorde Way a safer and more pleasant walking, wheeling, and cycling route to encourage more people to use it by delivering a new parallel crossing of New Road to improve connections to Concorde Way. The resident was keen to learn of any updates from SGC and hopes the proposal will not happen as its dangerous and will impact negatively on the residents and people using the pathway and road. The resident has received acknowledgment from SGC that an audit was conducted and passed for the proposal which concerned the resident from a health & safety perspective.</p> <p>District Councillors Dave Addison and Neel DasGupta have worked closely with the Chair of this committee during the last year and have listened to the members of public who objected to the proposal, along with Members of the local parish and passed on information to SGC officers which led to the proposal being postponed. Councillor Dave Addison will continue to consult with SGC officers and report back to this committee on plans for the scheme.</p> <p>In response to questions raised by a local resident, the Chair Councillor Andrew Shore advised that following contact with Crest, one of two non-working streetlamps flagged up in Brooklands Park is now working. The other lamp is not yet powered up, until the new apartment building beside it is completed in the coming weeks. The proposed road surfacing was delayed shortly before Christmas, as Wessex Water require some work on the drainage system which Renelec will complete for Crest ahead of the surfacing.</p>	
5	<p>Update on previous planning applications.</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore handed members a report on previous applications and briefly called out a few pertinent points of reflection from some of the recently</p>	

<p>concluded applications.</p> <p><u>Land Adjacent to Knightwood Farm – six new dwellings, variation of condition requested</u></p> <p>The effect was to change the previously approved plans, by adding a pedestrian-only access route, re-orienting one plot, adding cycle storage (all looking okay) plus other changes (below).</p> <p>SGPC objected (see points below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PV (solar panels) deleted on revised plans – it is not sustainable as a planning objection • Visitors parking spaces reduced from two to one, dimensions of other spaces unclear – standards only require one space, officer reported the parking spaces meet the dimensions needed • Reduced access road width – mixture of widths, case officer argued 5.5m down to 3.8m does not materially change thing. Widths vs some other new developments - some better, some similar • Side windows added to two plots – condition added for these windows to be obscure glazed • Plain render used on some front elevations, contrary to condition on original consent that all to be Old Farmhouse brick <p>SGC have granted approval (with some conditions on the windows and some clarifications re parking)</p> <p><u>Abbeywood Community School – extension to add classrooms</u></p> <p>SGPC raised concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding parents parking / pick-up provision – brushed off by officers, in my view being over-simplistic with their assumptions of students walking • Regarding trees (sharing concerns of tree officer) – tree officer concerns overcome by revisions <p>SGC have granted approval</p> <p><u>65 Kilby Road – rear canopy & free-standing gazebo</u></p> <p>SGPC raised no objection (though some individual member concern re gazebo)</p> <p>SGC issued a ‘split decision’ –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canopy – permission granted • Gazebo – permission refused, due to massing of this (together with garage) above fence-line, making it oppressive, overbearing & overshadowing to residents of one nearby property <p><u>109 Bush Avenue – single storey rear extension (PNH prior approval request of permitted dev rights)</u></p> <p>SGPC raised no objection, subject to similar materials being used</p> <p>SGC granted approval, saying use of similar materials was implicit in the permitted development rights</p>	
--	--

	<p><u>23 Samian Way – Change of use to Children’s residential home</u></p> <p>SGPC objected due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity (on both sides) to adjacent residential homes • High potential for noise and/or other disturbances, affecting residential amenity • Care level of just one member of staff inadequate for mitigating controls to be feasible, given the special needs and 8-16 age-range • No physical changes to the building to help alleviate noise issues • Outdoor amenity space insufficient in size and unsuitable for special needs of proposed residents <p>Applicant has withdrawn the application (before SGPC determined it)</p> <p><u>Grindlewald / 37 Rock Lane – erection of one dwelling</u></p> <p><u>Initial application:</u></p> <p>SGPC raised no objection (though some individual member concerns) Support from some residents, objections from others, on height</p> <p><u>Revised application:</u></p> <p>This reduced the building height, overcoming some local resident concerns SGPC raised no objection (though some individual member concerns, eg. around boundary wall height)</p> <p>SGC recommended refusal, citing dominant & overbearing impact upon 37 Rock Lane (due to its massing, height, and distance of the proposal) District Ward Member requested SGC Planning Committee to review it, with a visit to site. However, this was refused by the SGC Committee Chair, saying the officer recommendation “does not appear finely balanced”</p> <p>SGPC refused planning permission</p> <p>Applicant lodged appeal – essentially arguing (amongst other things) that the height was over-stated by case officer (1.4m higher than bungalow, not 1.9m higher), oblique angle between existing & new dwellings makes a difference, facing elevation will not be blank as has windows (albeit obscure glazed).</p> <p>Inspector concluded most of number 37’s outdoor areas and the main downstairs room would not lack acceptable outlook or be overly dominated by the proposed new house. Inspector concluded differently for the bedroom of number 37 (which is the closest room) but considered that, given it is a bedroom, this was less of an issue.</p> <p>Inspector’s decision – to allow the Appeal and Grant Permission (but with conditions added)</p> <p>A key factor seems to have been the Inspector’s view that windows in the elevation of the new dwelling, despite being obscure glazed, mean the elevation facing the bungalow is not blank (whereas SGC argued strongly that it was a blank or ‘mostly blank’ elevation, making it dominate the outlook of the bungalow). Also, that bedrooms are not clearly defined as primarily habitable rooms in SGC Technical Advice Note.</p> <p>But the Inspector added conditions, including additional information to be submitted to SGC on various things, including construction materials, landscaping and boundary wall surface and levels.</p>	
6	<p>Planning Applications</p> <p>Should planning permission be granted, the given the residential area, SGPC request</p>	

<p>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>The above condition request is added to the Parish submissions, where appropriate.</p> <p>a) P21/00996/RVC Land at Harry Stoke (Crest) <i>Variation of condition 41 attached to outline permission PT06/1001/O to amend wording regarding the electricity pylons.</i></p> <p>Following a lengthy discussion, Councillor Keiron Marsden proposed to object to this planning application and re-state previous comments made by the parish council, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, proposal unanimously carried.</p> <p>Comments submitted –</p> <p><i>Stoke Gifford Parish Council have reviewed the latest wording proposed to vary condition 41, together with the associated plan, following which we re-iterate our objections to this RVC planning application.</i></p> <p><i>Our objections centre around the following aspects –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Adverse impact on residential & visual amenity (despite the applicants claims to the contrary) from remaining power lines and associated pylon.</i> - <i>The proposal would essentially remove the condition placed on the outline planning consent by the government planning inspector, which was added by the inspector for good reason, that the lines, pylons etc are to be removed prior to residential occupation of the dwellings. It is hard to see a justification for deviating from an inspector's added condition.</i> - <i>The proposed 15m separation distance between HV apparatus and residential development would appear to be significantly at odds with the National Grid rule of thumb buffer distance, being 30m, as referenced by the applicant in a previous request to vary the condition. The rationale for 15m is unclear and causes concern on the grounds of health & safety.</i> - <i>Furthermore, we note a local resident's comment that the National Grid technical guidance is for a minimum distance of 30m for maintenance access.</i> - <i>Although the applicant has quoted a few examples of dwellings located less than 15m from existing electrical infrastructure, in regard to the first claimed example (at the southern end of Harry Stoke Road) the overhead power lines are actually significantly further away than 15metres. In regard to the other claimed precedents, there are many differences, factors & reasons which means these examples cannot be directly read across to this particular site and housing arrangement.</i> - <i>It is of note that the said power cables are to be undergrounded within phases 6 & 7 and to the east of the site, so why not also underground for phase 5 (which is what the inspector intended).</i> <p>b) P24/02961/NMA Land at Harry Stoke (Crest) <i>Amend building line of plots 112-114, re-align footpath/cycle way, increase size of bin store, erect cycle store.</i></p> <p>Following a brief discussion, Councillor Keiron Marsden proposed to object to this plan-</p>	
--	--

	<p>ning application, seconded by Councillor Sue Bandcroft, a vote was taken, 9 for 1 against, proposal carried.</p> <p>Comments submitted –</p> <p><u>Objection</u> - <i>Stoke Gifford Parish Council object to the proposed amendments.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the proposed changes to the bin & cycle stores look to be of little material consequence, the highway & parking changes are of concern.</i></p> <p><i>We consider that the reduction of 2 visitors parking spaces, compared to the approved plans, to be unacceptable due to the adverse impact upon residential amenity for the inhabitants and their visitors (especially given the parking provision is already below the usual standards).</i></p> <p><i>Also, it will leave a strange triangular slither of unusable land to the rear of the parking spaces, not making optimum use of land.</i></p> <p><i>The change to the footpath in the area also appears to be less desirable than the approved scheme and using reinforced grass to facilitate emergency vehicle turns seems unusual, bringing potential for adverse knock-on effects.</i></p> <p><i>In due course the initially unadopted roads within the application site and the already adopted highway off Maules Lane will all become adopted. It seems wrong and unnecessary to lose 2 parking spaces, make inefficient use of the available land and introduce the risk of issues from the reinforced grass. We feel an alternative way needs to be found to deal with the issue of the land ownership, whether that be a stopping up order or some other solution.</i></p> <p><i>We also question whether this is an appropriate NMA application (given the highway, footpath & parking changes) and feel it should instead be submitted as a revised planning application with full consultation.</i></p> <p>c) P25/00148/HH 78 Simmonds View Stoke Gifford South Gloucestershire BS34 8HL <i>Erection of single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation and reduction in size to existing out-building (resubmission of P23/02714/HH).</i></p> <p>Following a brief discussion, Councillor Keiron Marsden proposed no objection to this planning application, seconded by Councillor Dave Addison, unanimously carried.</p> <p>Comments submitted –</p> <p><i>Stoke Gifford Parish Council, noting the changed plans from the previous application, have no objection to this application.</i></p>	
--	--	--

7	<p>Government announcement of funding for potholes and the impact in South Gloucestershire.</p> <p>The Clerk has received confirmation from SGC the Government has announced additional funding to help address the backlog of pothole repairs. Locally, the additional funding will be managed by the West of England Combined Authority, who have confirmed that we will receive £2,486,093 for the next budget year (2025/26), starting in April. This is excellent news for our communities.</p> <p>The funding will be allocated based on our (I.E SGC's) already agreed priority system and will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurfacing schemes • Patching programmes • Pothole repairs • Other essential maintenance activities that enhance safety and extend the lifespan of the road network. <p>Members of the public and Councillors were reminded to report all potholes on the Report-It page on the South Gloucestershire Council website: Report a pothole, damaged road, footpath or cycleway BETA - South Gloucestershire Council</p> <p>Councillor Sue Bandcroft has recently been contacted by residents regarding a pothole that has been reported to Streetcare twice previously (report number: SGC248556-F2V6). It is a pothole on the North Road/Hatched Road mini roundabout. The resident(s) have complained about their cars being damaged as well. District Councillor Neel DasGupta will chase the Streetcare team.</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore will contact Leigh James to ask for a contact list that would help members.</p>	<p>NDG to chase Streetcare.</p>
8	<p>Stoke Gifford area – Phase 4C Waiting Restriction Review. Update.</p> <p>Background Funding has been sourced by SGC to conduct an area wide waiting restriction review for the Stoke Gifford Ward, and with the ward being quite a large area it has been decided to split the review into three phases, phase 4A,4B and 4C.</p> <p>Purpose of the Scheme The purpose of the scheme is to address the obstructive and inconsiderate parking on the identified roads and to amend existing waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The Clerk tabled the review document at the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore informed members that a handful of the parish councillors and the Clerk attended a meeting with SGC operatives a few months ago and were able to have an input in the scheme and express some concerns and suggest tweaks in certain areas proposed on the plans.</p> <p>Works are scheduled to take place imminently, subject to the conclusion of the public consultation (which ran from 5/12/24 – 3/1/25).</p>	

9	<p>Highway works at Gipsy Patch Lane (snagging works post the Cribbs Patchway metrobus extension).</p> <p><i>This item was discussed earlier on the agenda before item 4 public session.</i></p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore informed members that SGC Streetcare will be undertaking minor highway works on Gipsy Patch Lane and Hatchet Road from Monday 27th January for approximately two weeks. These snagging works are being undertaken as part of the Cribbs Patchway metrobus extension project and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of a redundant footpath across the northern verge near to 35 Gipsy Patch Lane. • Re-profiling the path next to the toucan crossing near to 30 Gipsy Patch Lane. • Installation of tactile paving in several locations. • Installation of coloured surface treatments and direction arrows in several locations to highlight pedestrian/cyclist routes. • Installation of high friction surfacing and alterations to junction markings. • Changes to damaged or out of date traffic signs. <p>The works are minor in nature, and SGC do not anticipate any significant disruption. Some of the works are weather dependent, so the dates could be subject to change.</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore has been chasing Richard Gillingham (SGC Highways) for the overdue audit the parish has been informed will be taking place on the road network in Stoke Gifford, and along Gipsy Patch Lane. The additional works that are taking place may be prior to the scheduled audit and the Chair will continue to link with SGC ensuring the audit will take place.</p>	AS/ Richard Gillingham.
10	<p>New Premises Licence Application – Stoke Gifford Convenience Store, Unit 1 Simmons View.</p> <p>SGC have received a New Premises Application and plan under the Licensing Act 2003 for the following:</p> <p>Reference – LI25/0573/PREMIS Stoke Gifford Convenience Store, Unit 1 Simmons View, Stoke Gifford BS34 8HR</p> <p>The consultation end date is 18th February 2025.</p> <p>The shopping unit is currently empty and was previously a newsagent and then latterly a school uniform embroidery retail shop. Councillor Keiron Marsden has been in contact with many residents near to the proposed unit and many would like to see a convenience store operating in the area. A few comments have been made regarding the limited parking spaces available but in the main a convenience store would be welcome by all catering for a forever growing population.</p>	

	<p>The general consensus among Members was that this is likely to be beneficial to the area, similar to what existed previously and for which planning consent is already in place, but with the licensing committee to review the sale of alcohol. It was agreed that any comments on the license request would be submitted by Members individually.</p>	
11	<p>Application for a Block Street Trader – to trade at University of West of England, Frenchay Campus.</p> <p><i>Councillor Penny Richardson declared an interest in this application and did not take part in the discussion.</i></p> <p>SGC have received an application for a Block Street Trader</p> <p>Reference - LI25/0172/STB UWE Bristol (Frenchay) to trade at University of West of England, Frenchay Campus, Coldharbour Lane, Stoke Gifford, South Gloucestershire, BS16 1QY</p> <p>The Chair, Councillor Andrew Shore informed members this application is outside of the Stoke Gifford parish boundary but could have an impact on the Parish (erg. regarding litter) given the close proximity. The Clerk will forward the details to Councillor Tony Hyde who sits on the Stoke Park & Cheswick parish council.</p> <p>Following discussion, the Chair proposed to submit an objection to this application on behalf of the Parish Council, due to insufficient details to enable proper consideration, seconded by Councillor Dave Addison, proposal unanimously carried. The Clerk will object to the application.</p>	<p>Clerk to send application to TH.</p> <p>Clerk to send objection online.</p>
12	<p>Any other business relevant to this committee.</p> <p>On-street Electric Vehicles Charging consultation from SGC (from 22nd Jan until 12th Feb)</p> <p>Councillors asked the Clerk to add this to the parish council website.</p> <p>SGC are consulting with the public to canvass the views of residents for on street Electric Vehicle charges. The sites are spread throughout the district and include the Stoke Gifford parish with two roadside charging spaces proposed on The Green, near to the war memorial.</p> <p>The charges are to provide reassurance to residents to help to give them the confidence to make the switch and know that they can charge their vehicle locally.</p> <p>Some Members felt the location proposed on The Green was not an appropriate location. Following a short discussion, it was agreed that Members would submit themselves to SGC any comments they have regarding the proposals.</p>	<p>Clerk to add to website.</p>

	<p>The consultation opened on 22nd January and can be found on the SGC website.</p> <p>The Clerk will also add to the parish council website.</p> <p>Brooklands Park Residents Association</p> <p>A local resident in attendance and Councillor Mike Brown informed members the structure of the group is changing, and there may be a different person in charge of linking the group with the Parish Council. Once the group meet and approve roles and responsibilities within the group Councillor Brown will update council.</p> <p>Vehicles parked overnight at Meade Park</p> <p>A motor vehicle has recently been involved in a road traffic accident and was left in a parking bay at Meade Park for a period of two weeks. Councillor Keiron Marsden wondered if members need to look at the policy to be able to remove the vehicle. As the vehicle had the necessary licences to be roadworthy the Police are unable to remove the vehicle, SGC are also unable to carry out the removal under their powers.</p> <p>The Clerk highlighted the following from the Parks & Open Spaces Policy: Permission from the Parish Council will be required for the following: parking overnight and/or longer term stay, between 9.30pm and 7am weekdays and between 9.30pm and 9am at weekends (Unless by prior arrangement).</p> <p>The Clerk believes this is not an issue and vehicles are rarely left on site overnight. The parish policy in place works well but would expect either the Police or SGC to act on any vehicles that are parked on site without prior consent.</p> <p>SGC placed a letter on the abandoned vehicle and the vehicle was removed two days later.</p> <p>Councillor Dave Addison confirmed the parish has no legal duty to remove abandoned vehicles and before they could be removed, they would need to store them in a nearby compound (at additional cost). Councillor Addison asked the Clerk to add to the next Full Council agenda in February.</p> <p>Community Litter picking group</p> <p>Councillors Penny Richardson and Sue Bandcroft have been looking into revamping the community litter picking group. The current group has a limited number of attendees, and the idea is that the new group can move around the parish and on a variety of times and days of the week allowing more parishioners across all wards to take part. The office has a contact at SGC where litter picking equipment can be sought and the Clerk asked the active Councillors to consult with officers on updating the policy, a poster being added to the website and notice boards, and the risk assessment.</p> <p>Councillor Penny Richardson will meet with Cath Slade and the Clerk.</p>	
--	--	--

13	Date of next meeting. 25 th February 2025 @ 19:00.	
14	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 21:08

Signed: _____

Date: _____

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