



MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7th APRIL 2021 7:30PM by video link (Zoom)

On Government Advice over COVID-19, this meeting was held in exceptional circumstances via conference call.

PRESENT.

G Boyle (GB) Chair, L English (LE), A Hemmings (AH), C Phillips (CP), L Alford (LA), and R Dunning (RD 7:32pm)

In attendance: D Dunning (Clerk)

Public Participation

None.

2021/04/07 No 1. To Note Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr. Anscombe. No Ward Cllrs were present.

2021/04/07 No 2. Declarations of Interest

Cllr English declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 4e & 4H as she lives in the locality.

2021/04/07 No 3. To Confirm The Minutes Of The Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting on Wednesday 17th March 2021 were accepted as a correct record of the meeting and were duly signed by the Chair.

2021/04/07 No 4. AGENDA ITEMS

2021/04/07 4a To receive request from South Gloucestershire Council for a list of potential sites for S106 spend related to planning application P21/01865/O - Land Off Abson Road, Pucklechurch and agree response.

Reports noted. **Resolved** to respond to the Community Spaces team that Eagle Crescent, The Recreation ground and St Aldams are potential project locations.

2021/04/07 4b. To consider draft social media/press policy and agree any actions

Resolved to adopt policy subject to the following amendment under '5 attendance of media at council or committee meetings' with the addition of:

(a) all relevant council meetings are open to the public and press and comply with public bodies (admission to meetings) act 1960.

2021/04/07 4c. To consider draft investment policy and agree any actions.

Resolved to adopt investment policy.

2021/04/07 4d. To consider the implications of not extending the right to hold remote meetings under the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020

4di) To consider the council's ability to hold physical covid secure and compliant public meetings to ensure the safety of its staff, members and general public until such time as existing Covid restrictions no longer apply.

The parish council agreed the small meeting room in the village hall cannot be considered suitable as a covid compliant location for council meetings and alternative accommodation will be required. Subject to Governmental or statutory advice, **resolved** to suspend physical meetings from 7th May 2021 until after 21st June 2021.

4dii) To consider extending the enhanced delegation to the Proper Officer already in place until such time as existing Covid restrictions no longer apply.

Resolved to approve enhanced delegation to the Proper Officer to ensure the continuation of council business.

2021/04/07 4e. To consider growing public disquiet that residents raising concerns with South Gloucestershire Council over the disruptive building works at the trading estate are not receiving any responses and agree any actions.

At least four residents have now contacted the clerk with concerns. Of particular concern is the disenfranchisement of those residents without internet access who have written to raise issues with South Gloucestershire Council without response.

Resolved to write to the Enforcement team for clarification.

2021/03/017 4f. To receive latest crime report and agree any actions.

PCSO Figures for the last 12 months for Pucklechurch and immediate surrounding area:

34 Violence Against the person

26 Vehicle offences

5 Theft offences

12 Public Order offences

4 Sexual offences

1 Possession offensive weapon

6 drug offences

11 burglaries

12 Criminal Damage offences

There were a total of 263 Anti-Social Behaviour reports

17 arrests

Crime report **noted**. The bare statistics provide no usable information but the council acknowledges this was a likely consequence of cuts.

2021/04/07 4g. To receive call for evidence for local authority remote meetings and agree any actions.

Resolved to respond with agreed comments (Appendix 1)

2021/04/07 4h. Restoration of Rebekka's garden.

4hi) To consider developing plans and measures to restore the area in line with its original design and agree any actions.

It was noted no further correspondence has been received and a plaque has appeared on the gazebo.

Resolved to obtain quotations for proposals to restore the garden in line with original design.

4hii) To consider including litter picking of the site in the Maintenance contract.

Resolved to add litter picking this site to the maintenance contract.

2021/04/07 No 5 AGENDA ITEMS TO NOTE

None

2021/04/07 6. PLANNING

2021/04/07 6a Planning Applications

2021/04/07 6ai. P21/01865/O Land Off Abson Road Abson Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9SD (Adjacent parish).

Erection of 15no. Affordable Housing units (Outline) with all matters reserved (resubmission of P19/18252/O).

Resolved to object (Appendix 2)

2021/04/07 6aii. P21/02144/RVC Land South of Lyde Green Cattybrook Road Mangotsfield South Gloucestershire BS16 9NN (Adjacent parish).

Variation of conditions 6, 7 and 8 attached to planning permission PK17/1112/F to regularise the ecology strategies. Erection of 115 dwellings, associated infrastructure, construction of vehicular access, parking, landscaping, allotments and public open space.

No comments.

2021/04/07 6b Planning decisions

2021/04/07 6bi P21/00935/F 45 Parkfield Rank Parkfield Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9NP

Installation of 1 no front dormer. Approved with conditions. **Noted**

Item received after agenda issued.

2021/04/07 6bii 2021/04/07 6bii P21/01112/TCA 21 Parkfield Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9PN

Works to fell 14 no. Chamaecyparis lawsoniana trees situated within the Pucklechurch Conservation Area. No objections. **Noted**

2021/04/07 6c Planning Enforcement and other actions

2021/04/07 6ci COM/21/0204/OD Shortwood Travellers Site Shortwood Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9PQ

Construction of new temporary building. **Noted**

Item received after the agenda issued.

2020/07/04 6cii Planning Appeal Decision (Adjoining parish)- Land At The Rosary, Cattybrook Road North, Mangotsfield (P20/08205/O)

Dismissed. **Noted.**

2021/04/07 NO.7 REPORTS

2021/04/07 7a To receive pre-submitted reports from Councillors.

No reports.

2021/04/07 7b To receive report from District Councillor(s).

None.

2021/04/07 7c To receive report from the clerk.

- Commissioned headstone testing by H J Jefferies cost £332.00 plus vat for end of April.
- Issued rental invoice to cricket team.
- Allotment rental agreements issued and started offering vacant allotments to those on the waiting list.

Council agreed if those on waiting list do not respond to email and phone calls, the clerk should move to the next person on the waiting list.

- Posted traffic order PT.6865 - Henfield Road, Lyde Green - Prohibition of Driving and traffic order PT.6862 - Coxgrove Hill, Lyde Green - Prohibition of Driving to website and social media.
- To date 75 responses to play area questionnaire.
- Chair has completed corporate governance questionnaire for internal auditor as part of the end of year process.

2021/04/07 NO. 8. FINANCE**2021/13/17 8a To agree payment of contractual or other obligations.**Table 1 Payment for 7th April 2021

Payee	Description	Net	VAT	Amount Paid	Chq Number	Power
Ensign Print	Pucklechurch news Spring	£162.00	£0.00	£162.00	2980	LGA 1972 s142
G Boyle	HP ink subscription Oct - Mar 21 and postage	£48.50	£0.00			LGA 1972 s111
G Boyle	Paid from petty cash	-£37.46	£0.00	n/a	n/a	LGA 1972 s111
G Boyle	Amount owing			£11.04	2981	LGA 1972 s111
Total	n/a	£173.04	£0.00	£173.04		n/a

In accordance with its powers under section 137 of the Local Government Act 1972, approve expenditure which, in the opinion of the Council, is in the interests of the area of its inhabitants and will benefit them in a manner commensurate with expenditure detailed

Pucklechurch Twinning/Gardening club	Grant	£300.00	£0.00	£300.00	2982	LGA 1972 s137
		£300.00	£0.00	£300.00		

Resolved to approve payments.

Cheque nos:2980 &2982 approved and signed by Cllrs Dunning and Boyle.

Cheque no 2981 approved and signed by Cllrs Dunning and English

2021/04/07 9 Future agenda items.

Action tracker

Play area questionnaire

2021/04/07 10. To note date of the next meeting 21st April 2021

Meeting closed at 8.42pm

Signed:

Date: 21st April 2021

Appendix 1 2021/04/07 4g. To receive call for evidence for local authority remote meetings and agree any actions.

Questions

The government would like to gather evidence about the use of the arrangements that make express provision for local authorities to meet remotely or in hybrid format during the coronavirus pandemic, including the arrangements that existed for Scottish Authorities prior to the pandemic.

Q1. Generally speaking, how well do you feel the current remote meetings arrangements work?

- Very Well

Q2. Generally speaking, do you think local authorities in England should have the express ability to hold at least some meetings remotely on a permanent basis?

- Yes

Q3. What do you think are some of the benefits of the remote meetings arrangements? Please select all that apply.

- More accessible for local authority members
- Reduction in travel time for councillors
- Meetings more easily accessed by local residents
- Greater transparency for local authority meetings
- Documents (e.g. minutes, agendas, supporting papers) are more accessible to local residents and others online
- Easier to chair meetings in an orderly fashion
- A virtual format promotes greater equality in speaking time during meetings
- Other:
 - More inclusive allowing those with childcare or disabilities to easily attend.
 - Enables wider diversity of those considering becoming a councillor.
 - Cost savings
 - Allows assessable attendance from any location good for those who may be working away at the time of the meeting.
 - Allow councils to adopt more business type practices.

Q4. (For local authorities only) Have you seen a reduction in costs since implementing remote meetings in your authority?

- Yes

Q5. What do you think are some of the disadvantages of the remote meetings arrangements, and do you have any suggestions for how they could be mitigated/overcome? Please select all that apply.

- Meetings are less accessible for local authority members or local residents who have a poor-quality internet connection
- Others:
 - Excludes those with no internet

Q6. What do you think are some of the main advantages of holding face-to-face meetings, as opposed to remote meetings?

No comments

Q7. If permanent arrangements were to be made for local authorities in England, for which meetings do you think they should have the option to hold remote meetings?

- For all meetings

Q8. If permanent arrangements were to be made for local authorities in England, in which circumstances do you think local authorities should have the option to hold remote meetings?

- In any circumstances

Q9. Would you have any concerns if local authorities in England were given the power to decide for themselves which meetings, and in what circumstances, they have the option to hold remote meetings?

- No

Q10. If yes, do you have any suggestions for how your concerns could be mitigated/overcome?

No comment

Q11. In your view, would making express provision for English local authorities to meet remotely particularly benefit or disadvantage any individuals with protected characteristics e.g. those with disabilities or caring responsibilities?

- Yes

APPROVED MINUTES SIGNED VERSION HELD BY THE CLERK

Appendix 2 2021/04/07 6ai. P21/01865/O Land Off Abson Road Abson Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9SD (Adjacent parish).

Objection

PPC notes this is a resubmission of application P19/18252/O (albeit with some alterations) which was refused by SGC and then subsequently refused on appeal. PPC objected to that application and it finds no evidence within the re-submission that would overturn any of its previously documented objections: the proposed development site lies adjacent to, but outside of the agreed development boundary of Pucklechurch Village and sits wholly within the Bristol & Bath Green Belt. PPC believes that development of this site would be contrary to SGC Policies CS5, CS8, CS34, PSP11 and PSP7 and the NPPF.

On page 73 of the Design & Access statement the applicant says, 'Notwithstanding the above, we have engaged and consulted with the Parish Council/s prior to the submission of this application and they have not objected to this development proposal.' This is somewhat misleading. PPC would like to make clear that the applicant attended a council meeting under Public Participation and spoke for 5 minutes (17.2.2021). As the minutes of that meeting show, PPC made no comment as to whether or not it objected/supported the proposal. Indeed, the applicant was informed that "the council will publicly engage with the planning process to provide objective comments to submitted planning applications which are considered against the current local plan and associated policies." There being no resubmission at that point in time, no comment was made.

The planning appeal decision (APP/P0119/W/20/3257774) agreed with PPC's submission for the previous application and significantly the Inspector determined that the site does not lie within a village and as such would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and also that since it is not within a village it cannot be considered as limited infill. The re-submitted scheme is no different in this respect and would therefore conflict with the provisions of the NPPF and SGC Policy PSP7 - Development in the Green Belt which states that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and will not be acceptable unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm. PPC is of the opinion that the applicant has not demonstrated any special circumstance that would outweigh the harm that would be done to the Green Belt. New, permanent, buildings would be introduced where there are currently none and this would reduce the openness of the Green Belt. The NPPF requires that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and therefore the harm to its openness must be considered substantial.

PPC notes that the applicant is bringing this proposal forward as a limited affordable housing site within the Greenbelt, pursuant with paragraph 145 (f) of the NPPF. SGC's policies set out a strategy for the location of development including new residential development, which would include self-build units. To be clear SGC can demonstrate a 5-year land supply for housing (which means the presumption in favour of sustainable development is not a factor here) and delivery of the self-build requirement can be met through the local planning delivery process - the demand for self-build housing in South Gloucestershire is not a special circumstance. Similarly, there is no housing needs survey data for this area that supports the assertion that this application meets 'local community needs' and nevertheless the site has not been identified as, or approved of, as a rural exception site for development. This application therefore conflicts with SGC's Policy CS5 Location of development and also Policy CS34 Rural areas, which allows for the maintenance of the settlement boundaries defined on the Policies Map around rural settlements until they are reviewed.

In addition, the applicant suggests that Back Lane will provide suitable pedestrian and cycle access for residents at the site – PPC disagrees. There is currently no pedestrian access to and from Back Lane either from the site itself or indeed from The Moorings as shown. Access to the latter can only be gained across uneven scrub/grass/mud through informal breaks in a mature hedgerow. Although Back Lane is a designated PROW, it is not appropriate for wheelchair/pushchair/cycle use given its propensity to become overgrown and muddy: as an ancient green lane it has no paved surface or any lighting. This would be at odds with Policies CS8 of the Core Strategy and PSP11 of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan, which require that the occupiers of new developments are given a range of travel options that would be appropriate, accessible, convenient and attractive for all types of trips to and from the proposed site. The

nature of Back Lane is such, therefore that it will discourage the likelihood of it being seen as a practical route, especially in darkness and in adverse weather conditions which often mean it is neither safe or convenient for regular use by pedestrians or cyclists. The site is not ideally located in relation to the future occupiers having access to a range of travel options other than the private vehicle. For example, immediately outside of the proposed development site there is no safe paved pedestrian footpath access to any local facilities or to the nearest bus stop: the addition of such a footpath could not be physically accommodated along the Abson Road without widening the road or removing hedgerows.

Back Lane also forms both the historic parish boundary and the village development boundary: its mature hedge and tree-line provide a green screen in front of the residential areas of Pucklechurch Village within the landscape when viewed from the south and from the higher topographic viewpoints that surround it. The application makes no reference to SGC's Landscape Character Assessments which for the Pucklechurch Ridge & Boyd Valley states that "Due to the strong visual interrelationship between the character area and the Cotswold scarp, development which would be prominent from or interrupt views to the scarp should be resisted in order to preserve the natural beauty of the AONB and its setting." The applicant claims the site will have 'zero visual impacts to neighbouring properties' but this cannot be true. The site is extremely visible from the main road and from the unrelated properties, as well as the open landscape around it. In this respect no Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been supplied with regard to the views from the AONB as was recommended before.

The Transport Assessment for the site appears to be little more than a copy of a page from the Manual for Streets and not an assessment, whilst the speed survey appears to have been undertaken on one day, rather than over a 2-week period which would seem to be more appropriate as this was what was requested by SGC's transport officer for the previous application. The timings of the survey also clearly avoided peak periods of travel along this route and no methodology or explanation as to how the 100 sample speeds were selected or recorded for the survey has been provided. The visibility splays that have been provided are also less informative than those that were previously required – these should be provided as accurate topographical surveys shown at a scale of 1:200.

PPC notes that although this an outline application an indicative layout in terms of house and plot sizes has been supplied and would query whether this makes the best use of the land in terms of density of housing proposed. Also, areas of public open space have been demarcated but no indication has been provided as to how these meet the actual requirements of a site this size and population with regard to, for example, natural and semi-natural open space, outdoor sports facilities and provision for children and young people. Furthermore, there is no indication as what/who will own such provision, when these facilities will be made available and what/who will take responsibility for the long-term upkeep and maintenance and the cost of doing so.

As with the previous application no proper record of a public foul sewer along Abson Road has been supplied.