

Minutes of the Meeting of Priston Parish Council

Held at 7 pm on Monday 10th March 2025 in the village hall

Present: Cllrs Guy Davies, John Lippiatt, Bruce Clarke, Peter Hopwood, Helen Burns, Jocelyn Nichols (Clerk), B&NES Councillor Matt McCabe and 3 parishioners

1. **Matters raised by parishioners:** The winding mechanism for the church clock has been removed to be fixed, so the clock will not be working for about three months.
2. **Apologies:** Cllr Nick Keppel-Palmer & B&NES Councillor Fiona Gourley
3. **Minutes:** The Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 20th January 2025 were approved and signed.
4. **Parish Councillor Vacancy:** One application has been received from Robert Davies. He explained his previous Councillor experience and was welcomed back as a Councillor after signing his acceptance form.
5. **Planning Application for Glamping Pods:** John explained the reasons for the application for 4 pods of 8 metres by 3.6 metres and 6 parking places. The farm needs to diversify to survive, and there is a need for accommodation for those attending events at Priston Mill to reduce the taxis coming in and out of the village, and also to provide accommodation for those attending pampering weekends with Milkhouse Therapies. The pods could also provide peaceful retreats. The only lighting will be low level with no overspill. The pub would also benefit and supports the application. Matt thought B&NES Highways would be in support of the scheme if it reduced traffic through the village.
John left the meeting while Councillors discussed the application, which they felt did not make the most of the reasons for the pods. Robert's report was discussed, and it was noted that John Whybrow, the closest neighbour, didn't have any reason to object to the pods.
It was agreed that Robert would draft our response in support of the application, with some conditions: that the land returns to agricultural land when the pods are removed, that the lighting is minimal and low level, that planting of hedges between and around pods would soften the looks and provide privacy. Also highlighting the overloaded sewage works.
6. **Actions from previous meeting:**
 - A) The dog mess situation has still not improved. Helen asked Matt if his parish support grant could be used to purchase bins, and he agreed it could. **Action: Clerk will find out the cost for 3 bins, and email Matt and Fiona about a possible grant. The bins will be placed on the bridleway, by the Glamping site and by Village Farm. Helen will speak to the landowners and Guy will empty the bridleway bin, John the glamping one and Bruce the Village Farm one.**
 - B) **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.**
 - C) **Action: Clerk to chase a response to the query about why the VDS was not included in the Glamping Application, as it should be in planning decisions.**
 - D) **Action: Clerk will remind B&NES again about unblocking the culvert at Conegre Dip, which they are investigating. John will ask the Bendalls if they can use their digger to clear some debris. Also the clerk will ask the flooding officer about the promised screen and stream improvements to**

Priston Lane.

7. **Chair's Report:** The Village Hall Committee are still considering what to do for VE day. In emergencies access to the hall will be needed. **Action: Clerk to email Peter Brooks asking for a key box to access the hall in emergencies, if we can store some emergency kit there and informing him that John Cameron will be the emergency co-ordinator.**
The Pows are selling a field by auction and Robert will be attending.
We will be invited to a public consultation by the developer planning 120 houses in Timsbury on the site of a former Tudor house.
The track by Holt House has been cleared.
The defibrillator cabinet at Willow Barn has been cleaned and new signs are awaited.
A successful tree planting event was held on Wilmington Farm, and a biodiversity update took place looking at ponds and dead hedges.
8. **Financial Report for the financial year 1st January 2025 to 1st March 2025:** The Parish Council had £8,858.33 in the bank on 1st January and on 1 March there was £7,366.87. Expenditure was £1,491.46, including purchasing 4 bleed kits. Expected balance at the end of March is at least £3,528.62 plus £2,477.42 CIL money.
9. **Planning issues:** Lighting issues at New Farm are ongoing, the lighting officer would like less than half a lux light spill into the hedge. Blind Lane shepherds huts lighting has been approved. Mead Cottage have received a certificate of lawfulness for their garage and extension, the Old Byre application has been approved, and 2 Hill View and Church Farm applications are still pending.
10. **Roads and Highways: Action: John will report the pot holes along the road to the Mill, and Helen will report the edge of Priston Lane on 'Fix my Street'.**
11. **Flooding:** We will discuss flooding with the Ward Councillors at the next meeting.
12. **To report on footpaths:** The Inglesbatch byway is being improved.
13. **To report on external meetings and agree attendance at future meetings:** Bruce and the clerk will attend Parish Liaison on 19 March at Keynsham recycling centre.
14. **Any other Business:** The report from our police officer was discussed.
15. **Date of next Meeting:** Monday 12th May 2025 (AGM) 7pm in the village hall. Annual Parish Meeting 15 March 2025 at noon in the village hall.

Signed:Date:

**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 **25/00720/FUL.....**
Glamping pods

LOCATION **Pressbarrow Farm, Priston**

DATE OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING: ...10 March 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	NO
A Listed Building?	YES	NO
Inside the Priston Housing Development Boundary?	YES	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
.Lippiatts, Pressbarrow cottage	Yes/No	Yes/No
Keppel-Palmers Holte House	Yes/ No	See Below.....	Yes /No
John Whybrow, Barnstables	Yes/ No	Yes /No
Keppel-Palmer(?), Westend	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	Not considered
PP CP6	84	Environmental Quality no enhancement High Quality Design Historic Environment Landscape Nature Conservation	1. 2. 3. 4.
PP D1	88	General Urban Design Principles [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 c d f g

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
VDS REC 1	31	Design features of new buildings	N/A
VDS REC 2	31	Maintain existing character	N/A
VDS REC 8	32	Avoid inappropriate changes to housing density & size	N/A
VDS REC 12	32	When development is allowed, improve the village infrastructure first	No consideration
PP D2	89	Local Character & Distinctiveness	
		Responds to local character, layout, building lines, Roofscapes, materials, building forms	a OK
		Improves area of poor design	a OK
		Responds to historic grain – building heights etc	b N/A
		Enhances natural features – landscape, views...	c OK
		Contributes to local social context	d No
		Respects local architectural styles, proportions	e Yes
		Reflects materials, colours, textures, boundary treatments	f N/A
			g OK
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	Urban Fabric	
		Provides continuity of street frontage	N/A 1
PP D.4	91	Streets & Spaces	
VDS REC 3	31	Provide provision for parking	Off road
VDS REC 13	32	Respect the village green spaces	Outside village boundary
PP D.5	91	Building Design	N/A
		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	
VDS REC 5	31	Ensure boundary materials are appropriate	
VDS REC 10	32	Design and locate outbuildings with consideration to their visual impact	
PP D.7	93	Infill & Backland Development	N/A
PP D.8	95	Lighting	
		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	
		Proposal includes lighting	

Policy	Page	Issue	Assessment
PP HE1	102	Historic Environment - Safeguarding Heritage Assets	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
PP NE2	108	Conserving & Enhancing Landscape & Landscape Character	
		1. Conserves/enhances landscape & local distinctiveness	a No
		2. Conserves/enhances important views	d No
		3. Avoids or mitigates adverse impact	Minor impact
		4. Includes Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment	Not included in plans
VDS REC 4	31	Retain existing vistas and landscaping	
		Minor impact	
VDS REC 11	32	Include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	
		Not included in plans	
PP NE2A	111	Landscape Setting of Settlements	
		Minor impact	
PP NE2B	112	Extension of Residential Curtilages in the Countryside	
		N/A	
PP NE3	115	Sites, Species & Habitats	
		3 Impact on features of the landscape	
		Green field will be lost	
		Harm to nature conservation minimised	a
		Compensatory provision	b
		Site lighting designed to avoid harm	d iii
		Lighting will be increased	
PP NE6	118	Trees & Woodland Conservation	
		N/A	
PP NE1	124	Development & Green Infrastructure	
		Does not enhance the Green Infrastructure	
PP CP8	126	Green Belt	
		Within Green Belt, reduces openness	
PP GB1	128	Visual Amenities of the Green Belt	
		Not enhanced	
PP GB2	128	Development in Green Belt Villages	
		Outside HDB	
PP GB3	129	Extensions & Alterations to Buildings in the Green Belt	
		N/A	
VDS REC 2	31	Maintain the existing character in changes to existing buildings	
VDS REC 9	32	Ensure new or altered properties blend well with the village	
VDS REC 10	32	Design and locate outbuildings with consideration to their visual impact	
		mainly out of sight, but impacts on openness	
PP PCS	131	Pollution & Nuisance	Potential increase to both
PP PCS2	132	Noise & vibration	Increased noise

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

6. Assessment of the Proposal:

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

7. Conclusion:

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

Support

- See below
-
-

Comments only

- See below

Object

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

Comments from Nick KP 5 March 2025

1. In principle no objection to what they are proposing however a few issues that we'd be keen to be taken into consideration in any consent.

2. There will be an increase in traffic in this part of the village - how can that be managed/mitigated?
3. We would want to see measures to curtail noise and light especially at night
4. Will dogs be allowed? If so it could be a lot. There needs to be some kind of containment so that there isn't disruption with the dogs that "live" here. In glamping areas I have seen there is an enclosed dog exercise area. If dogs are allowed maybe this is the perfect place for a poo bin.....
5. Drains - I wouldn't want the pods to contribute to more stress on the sewage system. Even if only partially occupied it is a lot more people - the equivalent of one or two extra houses.

Comments from Penny Rogers

1. I would be grateful if the parish council could consider my comments along with everyone else's when discussing this application on Monday:
2. I do not object to the principle since camping facilities are a traditional method of diversification for farmers.
3. I question the statement that there is no existing overnight accommodation in the village for guests at Priston Mill. There are several holiday cottages and airbnb rentals. I don't understand the point of the misleading statement.
4. The application states that there will be 'low level lighting'. There has been concern in the village about the recent increase in light pollution which is affecting our dark skies. Would it be possible to add a condition that all lighting is turned off at, say, 10pm? And this means all lighting on the site, e.g. fairy lights, solar powered lights etc. Nearly everyone has a torch on their phone and/or personal head torches so they can make their way around in the dark. It will help preserve the environment for wild life.
5. The planning application does not say anything useful about biodiversity. Would it be possible to request some native trees or hedging on or around the site to provide a net gain?

PPC Response to BANES planning

Priston Parish Council response to Planning Application 25/00720/FUL Pressbarrow Farm

Priston Parish Council **strongly supports** this Planning Application for Glamping Pods. We consider it to be a suitable diversification of the farming activity and helping ensure the survival of this farm. We also consider there will be little impact on the openness of the green belt. There are **three conditions** we would like to see applied, should the application be permitted.

Recommended Conditions:

1. Increase the site bio-diversity by adding hedging around and between the glamping pods.
2. Ensure all lighting is kept to a minimum with no floodlighting on the site.
3. When the pods reach the end of their useful life the land should be returned for agricultural use

Additional Comments:

The existing sewage treatment works may need improving before further development that adds to its load is permitted in the village. Discharge into Priston brook should not be permitted.

Justification for our decision:

Even though far fewer residents make their living on the land, farming is still the lifeblood of this rural community. The subject of this Application, Pressbarrow Farm, has involved four generations of the Lippiatt family and is an integral part of the village of Priston. The Parish Council wishes to see Pressbarrow Farm thrive and prosper.

There is an increasing awareness of the importance of food and the necessity of having food security in the face of pandemics and uncertain international conditions. Although the production of food has never been more important, equally the barriers facing farmers have never been greater in the form of rising costs and falling profit margins as well Government policy which is often inconsistent and unhelpful. Moreover, the Somerset landscapes that we all prize and which are admired the world over are largely the product of generations of small family farms. As a community, we should offer support to the farming community in their struggle to produce food and look after our land. This support extends to farmers' efforts to diversify and secure additional income streams so as to promote the viability of their businesses.

In the view of the Parish Council, there can be no question that the very special circumstances required by Para 153 of the NPPF to justify proposals which may cause some harm to the Green Belt are present in this case. On the one hand, the harm to the openness of the Green Belt is minimal. The quantum of development is small, entirely appropriate in a rural area, well designed, and with very limited visibility. Even so, the Applicant should ensure that lighting on the site causes minimum impact in this dark village and that there is a planting scheme (e.g. hedging) around the perimeter and between the pods to soften the impact and encourage biodiversity.

On the other hand, even apart from the contribution to the viability of Pressbarrow Farm itself, there are major benefits accruing from this proposal. Policy RE7 of the Local Plan supports new visitor accommodation, and in this case there is an evident need particularly from the guests of the large wedding venue at Priston Mill. There are only a few other sources of accommodation in Priston (e.g. a small number of Air BandB's and rental properties) and many guests wish to stay overnight or longer. At present, most guests find accommodation elsewhere, leading to a high volume of taxi traffic, which is undesirable on our narrow lanes. The Parish Council understands there is strong support for this proposal from the management at Priston Mill.

Other businesses in the village will also benefit. The Ring o'Bells Pub is a certain beneficiary particularly with the contribution to the viability of its restaurant. There is also a health and beauty business in the village which will benefit. Both these enterprises are supportive of this project.

If consent is granted to this Application, the Parish Council suggests that it is desirable to preclude the possibility that at some time in the future, the land may be deemed to be previously developed and possibly suitable for residential development.

A condition should be applied whereby the land reverts to agricultural use at some appropriate stage.

Concern over the adequacy of the sewage treatment by Wessex Water continues, this site proposes to use the existing village sewage facilities. 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 more 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.