

## **Minutes of the Meeting of Priston Parish Council**

### **Held at 7 pm on Monday 20th January 2025 in the village hall**

**Present:** Cllrs Guy Davies, John Lippiatt, Bruce Clarke, Peter Hopwood, Nick Keppel-Palmer, Jocelyn Nichols (Clerk), B&NES Councillor Matt McCabe and 10 parishioners

1. **Matters raised by parishioners:** Please speak loudly so all can hear.
2. **Apologies:** Cllr Helen Burns, B&NES Councillor Fiona Gourley
3. **Minutes:** The Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 11th November 2024 were approved and signed, after removing the action to arrange a meeting of dog owners.
4. **Actions from previous meeting:**
  - A) The issues caused by increased shooting around the village were discussed. Peter has spoken to Stuart Pow, who will raise our concerns about shooting over Mill Lane at Potters break, and parking sensibly with Andrew Bendall.
  - B) The dog mess situation has still not improved. **Action: Helen and Guy will organise 3 bins, to be financed using our CIL money.**
  - C) The defibrillator box in lower Priston has glue residue from missing signs. **Action: Helen and Bruce will purchase new aluminium signs to smarten it up.**
  - D) **Action: In the summer Guy will re-instate the window panels and provide shelves in the telephone box, which will become a children's library.**
  - E) Peter and Helen have worked on an active Emergency Plan using the B&NES template. John Cameron has agreed to be the Emergency Co-Ordinator, as he has a background in incident management. We now need a team for certain roles. **Action: Peter and Helen will introduce our updated plan at the Annual Parish Meeting, and ask for volunteers to offer their skills for the different roles.** The clerk will be notetaker for the co-ordinator. Some purchases will be made from CIL money – approx. £1,000.
  - F) **Action: Clerk to again chase a response to the query about why the VDS is not included as it should be in planning decisions.**
  - G) There has been no response from Mill Cottage who's outbuilding appears to be lived in. **Action: Clerk and Chair to write again to Mill Cottage to check it is a granny flat, not a separate dwelling.**
  - H) **Action: Clerk to purchase a bleed kit and check it fits in the defibrillator box.**
  - I) **Action: Clerk will remind B&NES again about unblocking the culvert at Conegre Dip, which they are investigating.**
  - J) **Action: Storage of The Link since 1977 in the Village Hall loft will be discussed at their meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January, and boxes will be purchased if agreed.**
5. **Chair's Report:** Items moved to AOB.
6. **Financial Report for the financial year 1st October 2024 to 1<sup>st</sup> January 2025:** The Parish Council had £10,261.60 in the bank on 1<sup>st</sup> November and on 1 January there was £8,858.33. Expenditure was £1,403.27, including the annual meeting hire cost of the village hall. Expected balance at the end of March is at least £3,553.62 plus £2,835.22 CIL money. As our administration costs are at least £7,500, and the precept under £8,000, it was agreed we need to increase our precept by about 12%

to £8,768, to work towards at least 6 months carry forward, as recommended by our auditor.

- 7. Planning issues, including housing development in Timsbury:** Bruce has emailed the enforcement officer again about the lighting issues at New Farm, there is now a new lighting specification. A reply is also awaited for the Blind Lane shepherds huts lighting. Mead Cottage application is pending consideration, as is the Old Byre.

There is a proposal for 120 new homes in Timsbury and the developer has asked for opinions.

**Action: Nick will draft and circulate a letter expressing our concerns about the increased load on the existing infrastructure.**
- 8. Planning application for conversion of garage to dwelling at 2 Hill View:** Guy is the architect for this plan, so he explained the drawings and the reason for the application, which is to allow the elderly resident to stay in the village. The external envelope will not change, except that there will be new windows, and patio doors replace the garage door. It will be a minor second dwelling for family use which will not be able to be sold as a separate house. After questions from neighbours Guy left the room while the plans were discussed. Peter has completed our planning checklist, and will add to the comments we submit to B&NES including neighbours concerns about parking, planting or fencing to soften the appearance, and sewerage use increase. We will request that a condition is included that the dwelling remains part of the property and for family use.
- 9. Planning application for 2 houses at Church Farm:** The history of previous applications was discussed, and Guy explained that he was the architect, and also planning to purchase the land and build a house for himself, and another to sell. He described the planned changes to the previous successful application for 2 houses. They are 2 storey instead of one storey with a mezzanine, to reduce the footprint, and have moved further away from the other houses, and been designed to be built using less carbon. The current access way will be removed, and large areas of concrete will become garden, adding 500 square metres of biodiversity to the site compared to the previous design. The increased height is level with Bramble Barn on one house, and slightly lower on the other. There will be solar power, rainwater harvesting, over specified insulation, air source heat pumps and controlled heat recovery. The sewage use increase is being reviewed with a possible on site installation. The flood issues will be addressed by redirecting water flow at the top of the field as well as extending the current wall to protect nearby houses.

Guy left the room to allow neighbours to express their concerns and plans to be discussed. There is concern about the size of the first floor windows which look out to a neighbour's house about 18 metres away. The new design is preferred by neighbours and councillors to the previous one. It was agreed that Bruce's comments will be submitted to B&NES, asking that previous conditions remain, and expressing our concern about flooding, and our preference for sorting the flooding issue before it reaches the houses. We will also request that boundary planting reduces the impact of windows overlooking current dwellings.
- 10. Roads and Highways:** The recent fly tipping in Priston Lane has been reported to 'Fix my Street'. Kevin Bishop is B&NES Fly Tipping officer, and he is investigating the greengrocer van tipping incidents.
- 11. To report on footpaths:** The improvements to the track at Woodlodge have held up well in the wet winter weather, and additional hardcore has helped on our busiest footpaths and bridleways. Helen

has reminded Eddie Proctor at B&NES about clearing the track by the cricket pitch.

12. **To report on external meetings and agree attendance at future meetings:** Village Hall AGM is 29 January 7-8pm, Bathavon Forum is 24 February online.
13. **Any other Business:** Guy has agreed to be our Village Hall Rep – proposed by Bruce and seconded by Peter. He will raise the upcoming VE80 day in May, for which we have a budget, at the Village Hall AGM.
14. **Date of next Meeting:** Monday 10th March 2025 7pm in the village hall. Annual Parish Meeting 15 March 2025 at noon in the village hall.

Signed: .....Date: .....

JN 21/1/25

BC

**PRISTON PARISH COUNCIL – PLANNING APPLICATION  
CHECKLIST**

**Completed 21.01.2025**

Created to align with the Bath & North East Somerset *Core Strategy* (July 2014), and *Placemaking Plan* (July 2017), and to include the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents: *Priston Village Design Statement* (2018), and “*Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt*” (2008).

**APPLICATION** **24/04624/FUL**

**LOCATION** **2 Hill View, Priston**

**DATE OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING:** **20.01.2024**

**1. Introduction:**

**Issues that shall be considered:**

The degree of compliance with all relevant BANES Local Plan Policies made up of the Core Strategy, the Placemaking Plan and the Priston Village Design Statement.

Traffic and highway safety issues.

The degradation of the amenity of near neighbours, including:

Loss of light, loss of privacy, impact on access, noise pollution  
and light pollution.

The design and the materials of the proposal.

Storm water and foul drainage.

Crime and/or Disorder impact.

**Issues that shall not be considered:**

Any effect on the value of the property.

Possible future development not included in the proposal.

The morals or motives of the applicant.

**2. Summary:**

In the Green Belt? **YES**

A Listed Building? **NO**

Inside the Priston Housing Development Boundary? **YES**

**3. Proposal:**

Explained by: **PPC Planning Spokesman**

**4. Consultation of Neighbours :**  
Reported by the PPC Planning Spokesman

Neighbour	Content	Reservation(s)	Objection
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No

**5. Judge compliance with the following Planning Policies:**

The BANES Placemaking Plan (July 2017) Volume 1. Policies shown: [PP...]

Priston Village Design Statement, adopted as SPD October 2018. Recommendations shown: [VDS REC...]

Listed Building consent issues

(Further discussion of Green Belt policies can be found in: BANES *Existing Dwellings in the Greenbelt*, Supplementary Planning Document, as adopted Oct 2008, although this is in need of updating.)

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
VDS 6.3	28	Code of Practice for Developers	<b>No prior contact</b>
PP CP6	84	<b>Environmental Quality</b> High Quality Design Historic Environment Landscape Nature Conservation	1. 2. 3. 4.
		<b>Modification to existing building with only minor changes to exterior</b>	
PP D1	88	<b>General Urban Design Principals</b> [large scale developments] Safe, varied and attractive Enrich character & local distinctiveness Streets and spaces Landscape structure & settlement characteristics Buildings & spaces flexible & adaptable Energy efficient	a <b>n/a</b> b <b>n/a</b> c <b>n/a</b> d <b>n/a</b> f <b>n/a</b> g <b>n/a</b>

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
VDS REC 1	31	Design features of new buildings	n/a
VDS REC 2	31	Maintain existing character	YES
VDS REC 8	32	Avoid inappropriate changes to housing density & size Increase to housing density.	
VDS REC 12	32	When development is allowed, improve the village infrastructure first. No change proposed.	
PP D2	89	<b>Local Character &amp; Distinctiveness</b> Modification to existing building with only minor changes to exterior.	
		Responds to local character, layout, building lines,	a
		Roofscapes, materials, building forms	a
		Improves area of poor design	b
		Responds to historic grain – building heights etc	c
		Enhances natural features – landscape, views...	d
		Contributes to local social context	e
		Respects local architectural styles, proportions	f
		Reflects materials, colours, textures, boundary treatments	g
VDS REC 1	31	Design features of all new buildings should respect their immediate surroundings	N/A
VDS REC 9	32	Ensure new or altered properties blend well with the village.	N/A
PP D.3	90	<b>Urban Fabric.</b> No change	
		Provides continuity of street frontage.	1
PP D.4	91	<b>Streets &amp; Spaces.</b> No change	
VDS REC 3	31	Provide provision for parking	
VDS REC 13	32	Respect the village green spaces	
PP D.5	91	<b>Building Design.</b> No Change	
		Well designed building facades	a
		Extensions must compliment host building )	
		Good modern, innovative design supported )	
		Historic styles as appropriate )	c
		Buildings to provide wildlife habitats	d
VDS REC 2	31	Maintain the existing character in changes to existing buildings No Change	
VDS REC 5	31	Ensure boundary materials are appropriate No Change	
VDS REC 10	32	Design and locate outbuildings with consideration to their visual impact No Change	
PP D.7	93	<b>Infill &amp; Backland Development</b> N/A	

<b>PP D.8</b>	95	<b>Lighting</b> Not specified.	
		1. Not give rise to unacceptable illumination	a
		Impact on residential amenity or local ecology	b
		2. Protect darkness of rivers, ecological corridors	
<b>VDS REC 6</b>	31	External lighting should be minimal	Not specified.
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<b>PP HE1</b>	102	<b>Historic Environment -Safeguarding Heritage Assets</b>	N/A
		1-7 Impact on a heritage asset	
		8 Listed buildings	b
		Conservation Area (not Priston village)	c
		Archaeology	d
		Non-designated heritage assets	g
<b>PP NE2</b>	108	<b>Conserving &amp; Enhancing Landscape &amp; Landscape Character</b>	N/A
		1. Conserves/enhances landscape & local distinctiveness	a
		Conserves/enhances important views	d
		2. Avoids or mitigates adverse impact	
		3. Includes Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment	
<b>VDS REC 4</b>	31	Retain existing vistas and landscaping	YES
<b>VDS REC 11</b>	32	Include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	NO
<b>PP NE2A</b>	111	<b>Landscape Setting of Settlements</b>	
<b>VDS REC 4</b>	31	Retain existing vistas and landscaping	YES
<b>PP NE2B</b>	112	<b>Extension of Residential Curtilages in the Countryside</b>	NO
<b>PP NE3</b>	115	<b>Sites, Species &amp; Habitats</b>	
		3 Impact on features of the landscape	N/A
		4. Harm to nature conservation minimised	a N/A
		Compensatory provision	b N/A
		Site lighting designed to avoid harm	d iii Not specified
<b>PP NE6</b>	118	<b>Trees &amp; Woodland Conservation</b>	N/A
<b>PP NE1</b>	124	<b>Development &amp; Green Infrastructure</b>	N/A
<b>PP CP8</b>	126	<b>Green Belt</b>	YES
<b>PP GB1</b>	128	<b>Visual Amenities of the Green Belt</b>	No change
<b>PP GB2</b>	128	<b>Development in Green Belt Village</b>	Additional dwelling
<b>PP GB3</b>	129	<b>Extensions &amp; Alterations to Buildings in the Green Belt</b>	YES

<b>VDS REC 2</b>	31	Maintain the existing character in changes to existing buildings.	<b>YES</b>
<b>VDS REC 9</b>	32	Ensure new or altered properties blend well with the village	<b>YES</b>
<b>VDS REC 10</b>	32	Design and locate outbuildings with consideration to their visual impact	<b>No change.</b>
<b>PP PCS</b>	131	<b>Pollution &amp; Nuisance</b>	<b>Minor addition to traffic</b>
<b>PP PCS2</b>	132	<b>Noise &amp; vibration</b>	<b>Minimal addition to noise</b>
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<b>PP PCS6</b>	135	<b>Unstable Land</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP PCS7A</b>	137	<b>Foul Sewage Infrastructure</b>	
<b>VDS REC 7</b>	31	Surface water runoff should be controlled	<b>No change</b>
<b>PP CP9</b>	141	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RA4</b>	143	<b>Rural Exceptions Sites</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RE1</b>	193	<b>Employment Uses in the Countryside</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RE2</b>	194	<b>Agricultural development</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RE3</b>	195	<b>Farm Diversification</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RE4</b>	196	<b>Essential Dwellings for Rural Workers</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RE5</b>	197	<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>PP RE6</b>	198	<b>Re-Use of Rural Building</b>	<b>Satisfies criteria of local plan.</b>
<b>PP ST1</b>	215	<b>Promoting Sustainable Travel</b>	<b>N/A</b>
		Reduce adverse impact of all forms of travel on natural and built environment	
<b>PP ST5</b>	219	<b>Traffic Management Proposals</b>	<b>N/A</b>
		Ensure improvements for pedestrians, cyclists	3
		Improve air quality	6
		Respect local distinctiveness and not detract from the quality of the historic environment	7
<b>VDS REC 15</b>	32	Enhance road safety	
<b>PP ST7</b>	223	<b>Transport Requirements for Managing Development</b>	
			<b>No change</b>
		Safe and convenient access	1b
		Suitable vehicle access	1c
		Parking	4



	Appropriate level	4a
	No increase of on-street parking in the vicinity of the site affecting highway safety and/or residential amenity	4b
<b>VDS REC 3</b>	31	Provide provision for parking <b>As existing (see comments).</b>

## 6. Assessment of the Proposal:

Is the scale, height, massing, degree of extension acceptable?	<b>YES</b>
Are the design and materials satisfactory?	<b>YES</b>
Is the character of the landscape enhanced?	<b>NO</b>
Are the drainage arrangements satisfactory: Storm water	<b>YES</b>
Are the parking arrangements satisfactory?	<b>NO</b>
Are the traffic implications satisfactory?	<b>YES</b>
Is the effect of cumulative extensions in the vicinity acceptable?	<b>YES</b>
Is the amenity of neighbours preserved?	<b>YES</b>
Is the Crime and Disorder impact acceptable?	<b>YES</b>

## 7. Conclusion:

### COMMENTS ONLY

1. The primary intended use is to accommodate an elderly relative. It was noted that there is a lack of suitable alternative accommodation in Priston for elderly residents with mobility issues.
2. This is infill per **PP GB2** (p.128) but not a newbuild, and with only minimal changes to the existing external envelope.
3. **VDS REC 3:** It is a concern that this additional development may render the existing on-site parking space inadequate, in an area of the village where on-street parking is already a problem.
4. This will result in a small increase in the load entering the existing, heavily overloaded, waste-water infrastructure of the village.
5. External lighting has not been specified but it should be a condition that this should be kept to a minimum, in line with the community's wish to keep Priston a 'dark skies' village.
6. The property must remain part of 2 Hill View and the plot may not be split to allow a separate sale in future.

**PRISTON PARISH COUNCIL – PLANNING APPLICATION  
CHECKLIST  
2019 edition.**

Created to align with the Bath & North East Somerset *Core Strategy* (July 2014), and *Placemaking Plan* (July 2017), and to include the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents: *Priston Village Design Statement* (2018), and “*Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt*” (2008).

**APPLICATION** 24/04498/FUL

**LOCATION** ...Church Farm, Priston

**DATE OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING:** .....20 January 2025

**1. Introduction:**

**Issues that shall be considered:**

The degree of compliance with all relevant BANES Local Plan Policies made up of the Core Strategy, the Placemaking Plan and the Priston Village Design Statement.

Traffic and highway safety issues.

The degradation of the amenity of near neighbours, including:

Loss of light, loss of privacy, impact on access, noise pollution  
and light pollution.

The design and the materials of the proposal.

Storm water and foul drainage.

Crime and/or Disorder impact.

**Issues that shall not be considered:**

Any effect on the value of the property.

Possible future development not included in the proposal.

The morals or motives of the applicant.

**2. Summary:**

In the Green Belt?	YES	<del>NO</del>
A Listed Building?	<del>YES</del>	NO
Inside the Priston Housing Development Boundary?	<del>YES</del>	NO

**3. Proposal:**

Explained by: PPC Planning Spokesman The Applicant

**4. Consultation of Neighbours :**  
Reported by the PPC Planning Spokesman

Neighbour	Content	Reservation(s)	Objection
<del>.G Davies.....</del>	<del>Yes/No</del>	<del>...None.....</del>	<del>Yes/No</del>
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No
.....	Yes/No	.....	Yes/No

**5. Judge compliance with the following Planning Policies:**

The BANES Placemaking Plan (July 2017) Volume 1. Policies shown: [PP...]

Priston Village Design Statement, adopted as SPD October 2018. Recommendations shown: [VDS REC...]

Listed Building consent issues

(Further discussion of Green Belt policies can be found in: BANES *Existing Dwellings in the Greenbelt*, Supplementary Planning Document, as adopted Oct 2008, although this is in need of updating.)

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
VDS 6.3	28	Code of Practice for Developers	<b>No prior contact</b>
PP CP6	84	<b>Environmental Quality</b> High Quality Design Historic Environment Landscape Nature Conservation <b>Generally Compliant</b>	1. 2. 3. 4.
PP D1	88	<b>General Urban Design Principals</b> [large scale developments] Safe, varied and attractive Enrich character & local distinctiveness Streets and spaces Landscape structure & settlement characteristics Buildings & spaces flexible & adaptable Energy efficient	a <b>N/A</b> b <b>N/A</b> c <b>N/A</b> d <b>N/A</b> f <b>N/A</b> g <b>N/A</b>

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
VDS REC 1	31	Design features of new buildings	Generally compliant
VDS REC 2	31	Maintain existing character	Generally compliant
VDS REC 8	32	Avoid inappropriate changes to housing density & size	Some conflict on height Existing 'Orchard' 6.7m, new proposals 8.3m high
VDS REC 12	32	When development is allowed, improve the village infrastructure first	No change proposed
PP D2	89	<b>Local Character &amp; Distinctiveness</b>	
		Responds to local character, layout, building lines, Roofscapes, materials, building forms	a Yes a OK
		Improves area of poor design	b OK
		Responds to historic grain – building heights etc	c NO
		Enhances natural features – landscape, views...	d Yes
		Contributes to local social context	e N/A
		Respects local architectural styles, proportions	f Yes
		Reflects materials, colours, textures, boundary treatments	g Yes
VDS REC 1	31	Design features of all new buildings should respect their immediate surroundings	Generally compliant
VDS REC 9	32	Ensure new or altered properties blend well with the village	Generally compliant
PP D.3	90	<b>Urban Fabric</b>	
		Provides continuity of street frontage	1 Yes
PP D.4	91	<b>Streets &amp; Spaces</b>	
VDS REC 3	31	Provide provision for parking	Yes
VDS REC 13	32	Respect the village green spaces	Yes
PP D.5	91	<b>Building Design</b>	
		Well designed building facades	a Yes
		<del>Extensions must compliment host building</del>	
		Good modern, innovative design supported	OK
		Historic styles as appropriate	c
		Buildings to provide wildlife habitats	d No
<del>VDS REC 2</del>	<del>31</del>	<del>Maintain the existing character in changes to existing buildings</del>	
VDS REC 5	31	Ensure boundary materials are appropriate	Yes
VDS REC 10	32	Design and locate outbuildings with consideration to their visual impact	Yes
PP D.7	93	<b>Infill &amp; Backland Development</b>	
		Outside Housing Development Boundary	
PP D.8	95	<b>Lighting</b>	None specified
		1. Not give rise to unacceptable illumination	a
		Impact on residential amenity or local ecology	b
		2. Protect darkness of rivers, ecological corridors	
VDS REC 6	31	External lighting should be minimal	None specified

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
PP HE1	102	<b>Historic Environment - Safeguarding Heritage Assets</b>	
		1-7 Impact on a heritage asset	Minimal
		8 Listed buildings	b Minimal
		<del>Conservation Area (not Priston village)</del>	<del>e</del>
		<del>Archaeology</del>	<del>d</del>
		<del>Non-designated heritage assets</del>	<del>g</del>
PP NE2	108	<b>Conserving &amp; Enhancing Landscape &amp; Landscape Character</b>	
		1. Conserves/enhances landscape & local distinctiveness	a N/A
		Conserves/enhances important views	d. No
		2. Avoids or mitigates adverse impact	Yes
		3. Includes Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment	Yes
VDS REC 4	31	Retain existing vistas and landscaping	No
VDS REC 11	32	Include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Yes
PP NE2A	111	<b>Landscape Setting of Settlements</b>	
VDS REC 4	31	Retain existing vistas and landscaping	No
PP NE2B	112	<b>Extension of Residential Curtilages in the Countryside</b>	
		<b>Conflict with green belt</b>	
PP NE3	115	<b>Sites, Species &amp; Habitats</b>	
		3 Impact on features of the landscape	Minimal
		4 Harm to nature conservation minimised	a Yes
		Compensatory provision	b None
		Site lighting designed to avoid harm	d iii None specified
<del>PP NE6</del>	<del>118</del>	<del><b>Trees &amp; Woodland Conservation</b></del>	
<del>PP NE1</del>	<del>124</del>	<del><b>Development &amp; Green Infrastructure</b></del>	
PP CP8	126	<b>Green Belt</b>	
		<b>Development lies in green belt</b>	
PP GB1	128	<b>Visual Amenities of the Green Belt</b>	No impact
PP GB2	128	<b>Development in Green Belt Villages</b>	Yes
PP GB3	129	<b>Extensions &amp; Alterations to Buildings in the Green Belt</b>	
<del>VDS REC 2</del>	<del>31</del>	<del>Maintain the existing character in changes to existing buildings</del>	
VDS REC 9	32	Ensure new or altered properties blend well with the village	Yes
VDS REC 10	32	Design and locate outbuildings with consideration to their visual impact	Complies
PP PCS	131	<b>Pollution &amp; Nuisance</b>	Minimal impact
PP PCS2	132	<b>Noise &amp; vibration</b>	N/A

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
<del>PP PCS6</del>	<del>135</del>	<del>Unstable Land</del>	
PP PCS7A	137	Foul Sewage Infrastructure	
VDS REC 7	31	Surface water runoff should be controlled	No provision
<del>PP CP9</del>	<del>141</del>	<del>Affordable Housing</del>	
<del>PP RA4</del>	<del>143</del>	<del>Rural Exceptions Sites</del>	
<del>PP RE1</del>	<del>193</del>	<del>Employment Uses in the Countryside</del>	
<del>PP RE2</del>	<del>194</del>	<del>Agricultural development</del>	
<del>PP RE3</del>	<del>195</del>	<del>Farm Diversification</del>	
<del>PP RE4</del>	<del>196</del>	<del>Essential Dwellings for Rural Workers</del>	
<del>PP RE5</del>	<del>197</del>	<del>Agricultural Land</del>	
<del>PP RE6</del>	<del>198</del>	<del>Re-Use of Rural Building</del>	
PP ST1	215	Promoting Sustainable Travel	N/A
		Reduce adverse impact of all forms of travel on natural and built environment	
PP ST5	219	Traffic Management Proposals	
		Ensure improvements for pedestrians, cyclists	3 Minimal
		Improve air quality	6 No
		Respect local distinctiveness and not detract from the quality of the historic environment	7 N/A
VDS REC 15	32	Enhance road safety	Yes
PP ST7	223	Transport Requirements for Managing Development	
		Safe and convenient access	1b
		Suitable vehicle access	1c
		Parking	4
		Appropriate level	4a
		No increase of on-street parking in the vicinity of the site affecting highway safety and/or residential amenity	4b
		Condition already stipulated by Highways	
VDS REC 3	31	Provide provision for parking	Yes

## 6. Assessment of the Proposal:

Is the scale, height, massing, degree of extension acceptable?	YES
Are the design and materials satisfactory?	YES
Is the character of the landscape enhanced?	YES
Are the drainage arrangements satisfactory:	NO
Storm water	NO
Are the parking arrangements satisfactory?	YES
Are the traffic implications satisfactory?	YES
Is the effect of cumulative extensions in the vicinity acceptable?	YES
Is the amenity of neighbours preserved?	NO
Is the Crime and Disorder impact acceptable?	YES

## 7. Conclusion:

SUPPORT	COMMENTS ONLY	OBJECT
---------	---------------	--------

### Support

- if so, what aspects are supported and on what policy grounds?

### Comments only

*Priston Parish Council recognise that there is an existing approved planning application (21/03682FUL) for this site although it is outside the housing development boundary and within the green belt.*

*As this is a new application and the boundary of the site has been altered to increase the area for development we are unsure if the existing approval can simply transfer to this application, or if there is a need to consider all the previously raised comments and objections. With that in mind, if this proposal is to include all aspects of the development of the site Priston Parish Council continues to object to the development in principle since we do not consider it to be previously developed land. Our reasoning was included in our responses to the previous applications. There were also concerns from planning officers over drainage and foul sewer connection whilst residents expressed concern over, amongst other things, access.*

*We understand that as the boundary for the site has altered this now requires a full new application*

*If the position that this is previously developed land and can therefore be developed is retained we would like the following comments on the application to be considered and issues addressed.*



COMMENTS on application 24/04498/FUL Church Farm Priston

**Comment 1:** *There were a large number of conditions to be attached to application 21/03682/FUL and we expect all of these to apply to the current application. They must all be addressed before permission to build is permitted.*

**Comment 2:** *We consider this design to be superior to that already approved as the apparent density is reduced by making the houses higher. Also positioning the houses to the north of the site reduces their impact and increases the green space between the existing houses and the proposed new dwellings..*

**Comment 3:** *A condition of the development **must** be to provide suitable flood water drainage. The previous application's conditions in this respect are not strong enough and it is imperative that flood protection is assured before new development can commence.*

*In particular we do not agree with removal of the bund protecting The Orchard (house) and The Milking Parlour (house) from the flood drainage from the fields to the west.*

*It has been suggested that recontouring the field to the west of the site and changing the ditches may provide a way to stop the flood water from the field entering the site, we consider this proposal should be investigated.*

*The attached photograph shows floodwater over the area to the south of the site taken before the barns were removed. There **must** be provision to cope with this type of flooding event and not cause damage or danger to these existing properties and the proposed new houses.*



*General view of flooding around Church Farm barns*



**Comment 4:** *External lighting should be minimal, restricted to downlights and motion sensor activated lights.*

*We have major concerns are over the external lighting which is not specified and do not wish to see external lighting with any similarity to that granted for Walnut Tree House where over 100 external lights were approved. The lighting should be minimal and to the north side of the houses allowing safe entry and exit. All should be PIR/motion sensor activated.*

**Comment 5:** *The extension to the site footprint with land to the east and north is considered acceptable.*

**Comment 6:** *There is no indication for the location of the air sourced heat pumps. These should be sited away from the neighbours so as not to create a local noise issue.*

**Comment 7:** *The new proposed houses have large glazed areas facing towards the neighbouring properties. This will create a situation where the neighbours will be overlooked by the new houses, and overlook the new houses. This should be reduced as much as possible and there should be a requirement relating to the planting of hedging on the boundaries where overlooking can occur.*

**Comment 8:** *There should be provision of adequate sewage treatment by Wessex Water, or alternative means, before any further development is permitted in Priston. The village had approximately 40-45 houses put on the new mains drainage when the sewage works was constructed in the early 1950's. We think at the same time as Hill View houses were built. At that time it was customary to allow for at least a 50% increase in demand when building such a facility, so to be generous up to 70 properties were catered for.*

*There are now around 86 houses in the village using this infrastructure and there has been little or no change to the waste treatment facility. This proposal adds yet another property to that burden. We continue to see problems with the overloading of the works, discharge into the brook and flooding occasions are becoming more often.*

*Perhaps B&NES can withhold planning permission until Wessex Water provide a solution or at least a response.*

-

**Object**

- if so, which aspects are objected to and on what policy grounds?