

THORNBURY TOWN COUNCIL

REPORT of the Meeting of the Town Development Committee
held on Tuesday 22 January 2019

Present: Cllr Maggie Tyrrell (Chairman)
Cllr Vincent Costello (*arrived during item 4*)
Cllr Clare Fardell (*arrived during item 4*)
Cllr Bob Griffin
Cllr Shirley Holloway
Cllr Clive Parkinson
Cllr Guy Rawlinson

Adrian Savery (Thornbury Chamber of Commerce)

Louise Powell (Town Clerk)
Wendy Sydenham (Administrator)

1. TO RECEIVE ANY APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Angela Symonds (out of Thornbury)

2. TO RECEIVE ANY MEMBER'S DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Clive Parkinson declared an interest in the Church Road planning application as a neighbour of the applicant and took no part in its discussion.

3. TO RECEIVE ANY REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were two members of the public present who wished to address the Committee. It was agreed that they would do so during the relevant agenda item.

4. TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION FROM A SENIOR MANAGER FROM STREET CARE, SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL, ON "DOING MORE TOGETHER"

The Chairman welcomed two senior representatives from Street Care, South Gloucestershire Council. They presented to the Committee on the new scheme "Doing More Together" through which Street Care aim to work with parish and town Councils to offer a range of services to improve local communities. At this stage they are looking to identify which services may be of interest to parish and town Councils and will be developing a pamphlet of these services with costs included.

(Cllr Vincent Costello and Cllr Clare Fardell arrived at the meeting.)

Cllr Clive Parkinson commented that he was concerned that this scheme would actually involve further services being cut and parish and town Councils having to pay to bring services back up to previous standards. The Street Care representatives acknowledged that they had finite resources and £3 million worth of cost efficiencies still needed to be made. The issues were discussed and the Committee stressed that although it was understood that resources should be targeted in the right areas, there were concerns about the cost to the Council in ensuring standards did not drop.

The subject of road maintenance and particularly pot holes was discussed in detail. Councillors stressed the bad state of many roads in the town. Members of the public were invited by the Chairman to address the Committee on this issue and the bad state of repair of both Rock Street and areas of Morton Way were highlighted. The Street Care representatives agreed to check whether these areas were on the programme of works and report back to the Clerk. It was noted that some of these works were affected by construction traffic and it may be that it was felt better to wait until constructions works were complete. There was discussion regarding the management of open spaces in new developments and concerns about whether these would be successfully managed long term.

The Chairman thanked the Street Care representatives for attending and confirmed that the Committee would be interested in seeing the pamphlet of services and costs in due course.

5. **TO CONSIDER ANY MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REPORT OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 DECEMBER 2018 NOT CONSIDERED ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA**

The report of the Town Development Committee meeting of 11 December 2018 had been circulated and was noted.

The Clerk circulated an email from the Developer TRO Engineer at South Gloucestershire Council regarding the road safety concerns around Whitebridge Gardens access. The email outlined proposals for speed limits and waiting restrictions and also plans to assess the signage and vegetation which it was hoped would address these concerns. It was noted that residents were meeting with the care home management to discuss concerns regarding parking. The Clerk confirmed that she would update the Committee as and when she heard more from South Gloucestershire Council and Cllr Maggie Tyrrell reported that she would inform South Gloucestershire Council about the meeting to discuss parking.

Cllr Maggie Tyrrell reported that she and Cllr Clare Fardell had attended the first day of the Public Inquiry into the Bovis Homes Ltd appeal and that public submissions were being heard on 1 February 2019. It was noted that the Public Inquiry is open for anyone to attend (10.00am-4.00pm each day at Turnberries) over the next four weeks. Cllr Maggie Tyrrell also reported that we were awaiting the outcome of the challenge to the Cleve Park appeal.

6. **TO CONSIDER COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION PT18/6450/O PARK FARM, BUTT LANE, THORNBURY (ERECTION OF 630 DWELLINGS)**

The Chairman invited a member of public to address the Committee regarding this application. The member of public raised concerns about the effect of the proposed development on road safety. The Morton Way/Butt Lane/Gloucester Road junction is already very busy and becoming more dangerous, and the proposed development would be accessed via the Gloucester Road which was already struggling to cope with increased traffic. Local services would be even more stretched, and this is before we know the full impact of the existing developments. The Chairman thanked the member of public for their comments.

The Committee discussed the application at length and the Chairman agreed to put together all comments and concerns in a response to South Gloucestershire Council. The following response was submitted:-

Thornbury Town Council objects to this application. It considers that the housing development proposed by Barwood Development Securities Ltd & The North West Thornbury Consortium would be detrimental to the town.

Town Council considers plans for this site ill-conceived and it is very concerned that the cohesive nature of the community will not be maintained due to the rapid increase in population that will come with the high number of speculative developments that are in the planning process. No attempt has been made to make a comprehensive assessment of the cumulative impact of all of the infrastructure needs arising from all the recently agreed planning applications, both within the town's development boundary and beyond it.

The site is outside the development boundary as defined in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy and the emerging Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) or Local Plan. It is understood that Thornbury is deemed to be a sustainable location for development in the emerging JSP but the number of dwellings proposed in this application would be in addition to the number considered as reasonable in that plan. The infrastructure to support this development is not in place and there are no coherent plans to address the pressure on schools, roads, health facilities, community facilities, etc.

The Town Council understands that South Gloucestershire Council can now demonstrate that it has a 5 year land supply as defined in the NPPF and therefore expects that other policies relevant to such a major development on the edge of Thornbury will now be given due weight.

The plan is totally unacceptable in design terms. The drainage problems on the site means that all the properties would sit higher in the landscape than is acceptable and the large number of 3 storey dwellings would lead to unacceptable urbanization of the landscape. The constraints of the site due to the flood risk means that all the properties are pushed into two small areas with no green spaces or play areas to alleviate the hard landscape. This creates an urban landscape in the rural setting and is unacceptable. Play areas are inadequate for such a large development.

There is little evidence that the ecology is being adequately protected. It is a matter of necessity to have all the open space around the edge of the development due to the flood risk but this would put additional pressure on the wildlife as people use the area more intensively. There would need to be more pro-active plans to protect the flora and fauna of the area than suggested in the ecology assessment, which seems to rely heavily on distance to protect species such as the otters, which is inadequate.

Access from the site to the town centre and other facilities is very poor, with an unacceptable walking distance of 1200m (by their own measurements). The opportunities for walking and cycling to all facilities in the town is hampered by these distances which will generate more use of the private car than is calculated in the company's travel plan. The traffic generated onto Butt Lane is unacceptable even at the levels anticipated by the developer. The additional highway works at the junction of Butt Lane and Gloucester Rd may allow traffic to flow onto that road more safely but there is no satisfactory assessment or solution to the amount of traffic than using Gloucester Rd and the wider highway network.

Parking in the town is already problematic so any benefit to the businesses of the town that might be generated from the new homes will be negated. It is likely that the lack of easy access will prevent new residents fully engaging in the life of the town, thereby having a detrimental effect on community cohesion.

The proposal for a bus route through the current Park Farm development site, even if it can be secured, is totally inadequate, given the scale of the proposed new development and will have very limited impact on traffic generation.

The traffic now accessing the town centre at The Plain is causing anxiety due to the narrowness of the road at this point and no plans have been considered to alleviate the problems generated by the current developments. This new proposal would put the road under even more pressure. The Town Council is concerned that this increase in traffic is already encouraging more use of unsuitable rural roads with the "rat run" effect at peak times causing danger on these minor roads.

The lack of employment opportunities in Thornbury will further increase pressure on the A38. Travel to work times are already increasing despite efforts to encourage more bus use. In fact buses simply get caught in the queues, making them unreliable and less likely to encourage more use. The effect of 630 more houses on this does not seem to have been assessed. The most likely scenario is that the development will put very large numbers of cars onto the junctions of Gloucester Rd and Grovesend Rd with the A38 at peak times. While junction improvements at these points may get traffic onto that road more quickly it will then simply add to the queues south into Bristol and north towards Gloucester with a particular problem at J14 of the M5, which is already at capacity.

The impact on health services, schools, policing, and other services has not been properly assessed. There is a need to assess the impact on these services of existing and developments with planning consent before considering more. The assertion that the original proposal to build a new primary school on the site is no longer necessary is questioned as South Gloucestershire officers have said that schools will reach capacity with the new developments already approved. Health services in the town are already under pressure with reported waits of 4-5 weeks to see a GP. The small area allocated for community use cannot provide the full range of facilities that would be needed by the number of new residents generated by such a large development.

There are several inaccuracies in the assessment of the town's facilities, most notably the assertion that there is still a hospital in the town. Should this application proceed, the assertions about the facilities available in the town should be tested further for inaccuracies.

7. TO DISCUSS THE ISSUE OF STREET AND PROPERTY NAMING IN THORNBURY

The Clerk reported that she had received confirmation from Churchill that they would rename "Alexandra Croft" to "Stokefield Mews" and new brochures would be printed. A member of the public addressed the Committee to highlight his concerns that the building was still named Alexandra Lodge and there were still inaccuracies in the brochure. He also requested that Council have more involvement with developers at the initial stages of developments so that it has more influence over issues such as naming. The Chairman thanked the member of public for their comments and confirmed that Council would always offer to work closely with developers but that usually these offers are not taken up and therefore it's ability to influence is very limited. The member of public also commented on the lack of a transport plan for Thornbury as this may strengthen our objections to planned developments. The Chairman thanked the member of public for their comments and confirmed that Council has repeatedly asked for a transport plan but this has not been forthcoming.

The issue of the naming of the Churchill development was discussed and it was agreed that the Clerk should reply to them thanking them for changing the name of the road into the development but asking them to reconsider changing the name of the whole development to Stokefield Court which would be more in line with other buildings in the town, e.g. Castle Court. It was also agreed that the Clerk should email South Gloucestershire Council regarding the Ainscough development to ensure that Council had an input into street naming.

8. TO DISCUSS BOXING DAY PARKING PROBLEMS

Emailed correspondence from a member of the public had been circulated regarding parking problems in the town on Boxing Day due to the hunt, in particular the use of disabled spaces and parking outside of marked spaces in the Rock Street car park. The issue was discussed and it was agreed that the Clerk should write to the hunt organisers asking them to ensure the situation does not arise again next year, for example, by providing adequate parking marshalls and organising adequate alternative parking with sufficient signage.

9. TO CONSIDER UNDERTAKING A SURVEY ABOUT REINSTATING THE PARKLAND WAY BUS STOP

Cllr Clive Parkinson reminded the Committee that at the meeting with bus companies in November it was agreed that Council would consider undertaking a survey on reinstating the Parkland Way bus stop. Cllr Clive Parkinson proposed that we undertake a survey of residents of the roads around that bus stop to establish their views, and that he would take the lead on this, working with the Clerk. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Maggie Tyrrell and unanimously agreed.

10. TO CONSIDER PLANNING AND LICENSING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered planning and licensing applications and agreed comments for submission to South Gloucestershire Council as detailed in the attached schedule.

11. TO NOTE THE SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATION DECISIONS MADE BY SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL

The schedule of planning application decisions (attached) had been circulated and was noted.

12. TO NOTE THE SCHEDULE OF PLANNING ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL

The schedule of planning enforcement complaints received by South Gloucestershire Council had been circulated and was noted.

The Clerk reported that she had received confirmation from a South Gloucestershire Council Planning Enforcement Officer that with regard to the enforcement complaint relating to the Old Fire Station, Thornbury (PT14/3838/F), an Investigation Officer had attended the site and measurements had been taken that confirmed that the height had been adjusted so that it was now in line with the approved plans.

13. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR THORNBURY

Cllr Clive Parkinson reported that at the last meeting the group were working on redrafting and finalising various sections of the plan as well as finalising the list of issues that was outside the remit of the group and would instead be considered by Council. The next step would be to make decisions on what would be included in the plan. The Clerk confirmed that the plan could not go out for consultation during purdah.

14. TO CONSIDER ANY OTHER CORRESPONDENCE, CONSULTATIONS OR URGENT BUSINESS

None.

THORNBURY TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS considered on 22 January 2019

DATE	REF NO	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	COMMENT	PLANNING DECISION
02.01.19	PT18/6450/O	Park Farm, Butt Lane, Thornbury	Erection of up to 630 dwellings (Class C3); up to 700sqm for Retail (Classes A1, A2, A3) and Community Hub (Class D1), network of open spaces, new roads, a sustainable travel link, parking areas, accesses and paths; and installation of services and drainage infrastructure (Outline) with access to be determined and all other matters reserved.	OBJECT – see Committee report for full response.	
03.01.19	PT18/6737/HED	Land Adjacent to Oldbury Lane, North of Thornbury	Removal of 3 no. 5m sections of hedgerow to facilitate the replacement of a waste main adjacent to Oldbury Road, north of Thornbury.	No objection, subject to the horticultural expert's comments and Council would expect that the reinstatement was to a high standard.	
07.01.19	PT18/6297/F	Milbury House, Whitehall Lane, Buckover	Conversion of barn to 1 no. dwelling with associated works.	No objection, subject to the Ecology Officer's approval.	
08.01.19	P19/0117/F	21 Church Road, Thornbury	Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.	No objection, subject to the protection of neighbours' residential amenities.	
09.01.19	PT18/6622/F	Park Farm, Butt Lane, Thornbury	Construction of temporary Haul Road serving Park Farm Phase 4, including temporary bridge crossing the Pickedmoor Brook and Permanent construction of link to Phase 4.	No objection.	

DATE	REF NO	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	COMMENT	PLANNING DECISION
10.01.19	PT18/5906/F	The Sycamores, Gloucester Road, Whitfield	Erection of single storey front extension to the garage to provide additional living accommodation.	No objection.	
10.01.19	P19/0328/RVC	Countrywide Farmer Ltd, Old Gloucester Road, Thornbury	Removal of condition 5 and variation of condition 8 (to remove the wording "as an agricultural merchants depot, without the prior consent of the council") attached to planning permission P87/2301.	No objection.	
10.01.19	PT18/5344/F	Ringtail Cottage, Butt Lane, Thornbury	Erection of two storey extension to form additional living accommodation and erection of front porch.	No objection.	

LICENSING APPLICATIONS considered on 22 January 2019

DATE	REF NO	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	COMMENT	PLANNING DECISION
04.01.19	LI19/0173/STS	Sizzlers, Thornbury Trading Estate, Cooper Road, Thornbury	Application for a Renewal Street Trading Consent in South Gloucester. Trading as "Sizzlers".	No objection.	

THORNBURY TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING DECISIONS notified at the meeting on 22 January 2019

REF NO	PROPOSAL	ADDRESS	TOWN COUNCIL COMMENT	DECISION
PT18/4592/F	Demolition of existing garage. Erection of 1 no. detached dwelling with associated works.	Cornercroft Barn, Hacket Lane, Thornbury	OBJECT - Council has concerns regarding over-development of the plot, impact on the ecology of the area, concerns that building near the culvert will increase the risk of flooding, and concerns about parking on the site.	Refusal.
PT18/4599/ADV	Display of 3 no. non-illuminated fascia signs.	Unit 22-24, Cooper Road, Thornbury	No objection.	Approve.
PT18/2669/F	Erection of 5 no. dwellings with access, parking, landscaping and associated works.	The Slad, Itchington, Thornbury	OBJECT - the revised plans are an improvement on previous plans but there is still concern that there is a lack of amenity space particularly in relation to plots 3 and 5 given that they are 3 bedroom dwellings. This therefore still constitutes over-development and is out of keeping with other properties in the vicinity. While the roof heights have been lowered slightly there is still no indication of their relationship to neighbouring properties and therefore whether plot 5 would have an overbearing effect on the neighbour.	Approve with conditions.

REF NO	PROPOSAL	ADDRESS	TOWN COUNCIL COMMENT	DECISION
PT18/4934/F	Change of use from offices (Use Class B1 (a)) to a tanning salon (Sui Generis) as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).	8 The Plain, Thornbury, BS35 2AG	No objection.	Approve with conditions.
PT18/5542/TCA	Works to trees as per the applicants proposed schedule of works (application form – section 5) submitted to South Gloucestershire Council on 27 November 2018. Trees situated in the Thornbury Conservation Area.	Coach House, High Street, Thornbury	No objection, subject to the Tree Officer's approval and Council is also concerned that there is no mention of a replacement tree for the tree that is being removed.	No objection.
PT18/4027/F	Partial demolition of existing dwelling. Erection of 2 no. dwellings with associated works.	1 Hawthorn Crescent, Thornbury, BS35 1ED	No objection.	Refusal.
PT18/3013/O	Conversion and extension of existing stable buildings to create 1 no. dwelling and 1 no. storage room (outline) with access and layout to be determined and all other matters reserved.	Land adjacent to The Lodge, Gloucester Road, Grovesend	OBJECT – Council has concerns due to the prominent position and therefore the impact on rural character and landscape, and also the proposed development is outside the development boundary.	Approve with conditions.
PT18/4729/F	Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of single storey rear and side extensions and alterations to existing outbuildings to form additional living accommodation.	Moor Farm, Kington, Thornbury	No objection, subject to suitable materials being used which are in keeping with the character of the building.	Approve with conditions.
PT18/5077/F	Demolition of existing extension and erection of first floor rear extension to form additional living accommodation. Installation of rear raised decking.	Park Acres, High Street, Thornbury	No objection.	Approve with conditions.

REF NO	PROPOSAL	ADDRESS	TOWN COUNCIL COMMENT	DECISION
PT18/5104/F	Erection of single storey rear/side extension to form additional living accommodation. Installation of 1 no. front dormer window.	8 Cleveland Close, Thornbury	No objection.	Approve with conditions.
PT18/5735/F	Erection of single storey rear and side extension to provide additional living accommodation.	82 Swallow Park, Thornbury	No objection.	Approve with conditions.
PT18/4678/F	Erection of a convenience store (Class A1).	Land off Morton Way/Badger Road, Thornbury	OBJECT - Council reiterates its previous objections. Furthermore, Council has concerns that there are discrepancies between different versions of the plans e.g. the width of the footpath by the hedge differs in different plans. The small amount of climbing planting suggested on the large wall will not help the overbearing nature of the wall. Council also has concerns about the type of materials used for the gate and the type of access.	Approve with conditions.