BIGBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the monthly meeting of Bigbury Parish Council held on MONDAY August 17h 2020 at 7:45pm.

In accordance with Government advice and DALC guidance this meeting was held via video link (Zoom)

PRESENT: Cllrs: E Huntley (EH) (Chair), G Rosevear (GR), S Smith (SS), C Case (CC) (joined meeting after items 4.0 a), V Scott (VS), S Watts (SW), Dis. Cllr. B Taylor (BT), Clerk I. Bramble, (IB) and five other members of the public.

1.0 Declaration of Interest

BH declared an interest in 2342/20/ ref. item 4e; GR ref. item 4a; SS, ref. item 4d; CC declared an interest in items, 4b and 4c. No further declarations of interest were received at this point.

2.0 Apologies for absence:

 Cnty. Cllr. R Gilbert, Cllr K Holland

3.0 Burgh Island signage request:

The owner of the Island wishes to erect a sign on the slipway onto the Island indicating that unauthorised vehicles are not allowed onto the Island. VS commented that the slipway itself is not owned by the Island and that the wording of the sign should reflect that. VS suggested a wording for the signage which the owner will be asked to agree to.

4.0 Planning related matters

1. 2078/20/FUL, Bigbury Court Farm:

A site visit by Councillors had taken place and the council was broadly supportive of this development which will become the farmhouse for Bigbury Court Farm. However the council felt that that proposed external cladding should be in natural timber, to which the applicant agreed. On that basis VS proposed support, seconded by GR and supported by SS, SW and BH.

1. 2211/20/HHO, Avonmouth Shantee:

A site visit by council members had taken place. VS summarised in detail the application and expressed concern about the new ridge height not being specifically shown on the proposal’s plans and also a threat of light pollution from external lighting, both of which issues were discussed fully. VS proposed support seconded by GR but with the parish council asking should be subject to ridge height being specifically identified on the development plans and that a condition be applied that any external lighting should be subject to approval by SHDC, with the parish council being given the opportunity to comment on such proposals. SS, SW and BH supported these propsals and CC abstained.

1. 2069/20/HHO. Seaspray, Warren Road, BoS:

A site visit by councillors had taken place, a result of which was concern about the removal of the roof of the existing property, currently at two different heights, to be replaced by a single height roof to allow accommodation which does not presently exist and for which the new ridge height of the proposed development had not been shown on the plans. Consequently the council believed it could not offer support with such an important dimension omitted from the plans, which are the documents upon which judgements and decisions must be made. VS was very concerned about the scale and massing of the development, particularly as the ridge height to which the gable would would be built had not been specified on the plans and that the full height, extensively glazed gable extension at the front would bring the development much closer to its neighbouring property and would in turn result in an unneighbourly, over domineering structure, with considerable overlooking of neighbours to the front, with particular concern about the proposed balconies and also with light pollution from the extensive, full height glazing considered to be an issue. A member of the public also spoke against the development, voicing the concerns of the parish about ridge height, overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbours and light pollution.

SW proposed objection on the grounds of over dominance, overlooking, light pollution and contrary to adopted Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan policy BP7-General Design Principles for new development criteria (ii),(vi) and (viii) and the design principles set out in Appendix 9: Bigbury on Sea Village Study and aslo contrary to Joint Local Plan policies SPT1,SPT2,DEV2,Dev10 and DEV25.

GR seconded the proposal, VS objected, SS objected CC abstained, BH abstained. Council decision was to object for all above reasons.

1. 2107/20/ARM, Higher Easton Farm:

VS summarised the application, referring specifically to the Design and Access (D&A) statement, submitted with then outline planning application and the very broad parameters for key dimensions shown within it and expressed concern about the proposed ridge height considerably exceeding those scale parameters, particularly in respect of the development’s siting in an isolated and elevated position in the AONB. However some councillors observed that the development was for a working farmhouse for which considerable space for business use in addition to family accommodation would be needed and that its proposed scale and massing was comparable with other significant farmhouses in the parish in the parish.

CC proposed support, seconded by SS. GR supported, VS abstained, SW abstained, BH objected. Council decision therefore was for support.

1. 2342/20/CLF; Korniloff, Warren Road:

VS summarised the proposal with specific reference to the fact that the residential accommodation referred to is ancilliary to the purpose and function of Korniloff as a residential home, that access to that residential accommodation was not independent of the home and could only be through the home itself and therefore on planning grounds the proposal could not be supported. VS proposed objection, GR seconded, SS objected, SW objected and BH abstained.

1. 3450/19/ARM; St Annes Chapel:

VS summarised the application; believed the proposed number of homes, 9, was acceptable but questioned whether the development met the housing needs of the parish for affordable and 2 and 3 bedroomed houses, not the 4 and 5 bedroom homes included in the proposal. There was acceptance of a S106 financial commitment for off site affordable homes, given this proposal is for fewer than 10 homes.

It was felt that the design and layout of the development and its larger properties improved upon the smaller properties of the original layout of the outline proposal of 2019 but that the roof pitches of 40 degrees was too great, especially for the 4 and 5 bedroom homes in the location of the Pickwick Inn end of the development and that these homes would domineer and overlook neighbouring properties. The need for mature trees with their likelihood of obscuring the views of properties across the road and that the turning head shown, with the removal of richly bio-diverse Devon banks were all felt to be undesirable and unnecessary.

Reference was made to the Bigbury on Sea Neighbourhood Plan (NP) requirement for off street carparking spaces in a parish of narrow country lanes and already insufficient off street and on street parking in a parish with almost no public transport available and high car ownership rates. The NP justifies more off street parking including 3 car parking spaces for 3 bedroomed homes and that the proposal did not match this. Also there is a wish to restrict street lighting in the interests of reducing light pollution. There is also a need for on street electric charging points for the car parking spaces which do not immediately adjoin dwellings they serve, as well as in private homes as per Joint Local Plan requirements. A recommendation for a zebra crossing and bus layby was made.

A question was raised about the need for an archeological survey of the site before building commences but CC indicated that one had taken place before the original outline application was made. Historic England would comment on this aspect. BH questioned why pitched roofed garages were needed as opposed to car ports and flat roofed structures, and also that the larger homes, if they were to be built should be at the far end of the development rather than close to the Pickwick Inn where their height and steeply pitched rooves would give a crowded and darkening aspect to that part of the village. VS also commented that car ports should not subsequently be converted into garages.

SS added to the questioning of the need for 4 and 5 bedroomed homes and that a need in the parish was for more smaller properties into which owners of larger properties could downsize thus releasing larger homes into the market.

VS proposed objection for the reasons above; BH seconded; SW objected; SS objected; GR objected; CC abstained.

5.0) Any other Business: CC observed that large static caravans being moved into the parish ahd caused considerable congestion and blocking of roads in the parish and that it would be appropriate to write to Park Dean to ask for better delivery times I the future.

The meeting closed at 9:45pm.

The next meeting is to be held on **WEDNESDAY September 9th at 7:30pm**

Signed………………………………………………………………………………. Bigbury Parish Council