

SHIPHAM PARISH COUNCIL
(Incorporating Rowberrow and Star)

Chairman: Councillor I Shaw
01934 842114
24th August 2019

Clerk: Samantha Peake(Mrs)
21 Gloversfield
Shipham
Somerset
BS25 1SU
Tel: 01934 844612
Email: shiphamparishclerk@yahoo.co.uk

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Planning Meeting held on 22nd August 2019 in Shipham
Village Hall at 7.30 pm**

Present: Cllrs I,Shaw (In the Chair) S Leader, P Tratt, C Mltchel, H Andrews, and the clerk S Peake

Also Present: SDCllr L Methley, SCCllr N Taylor, Andrew Tregay and Mike Payne from the Agents and Mr and Mrs Notaro

Apologies: Cllrs A Read, K Hollis, C Riches, S Adams, K Chalk, N Bisdee and SDCllr P Fineran

There were about 60 parishioners present

1. Declarations of interest

There were none

2. Planning application:

44/19/000011/ACN: Erection of dwelling with associated garaging, access and landscaping at, Folly Lane, Shipham, Winscombe, Somerset for Mr Notaro.

The agents outlined the proposals to the meeting. The Chair outlined some potential problems with the proposal and opened the meeting to the parishioners. The following relevant points were made:

- Proposal is in AONB
- Materials out of keeping with existing buildings
- Access questionable as sightlines are inadequate
- Not appropriate scale (4 times as big as surrounding properties)
- No neighbourhood consultation
- Removes view of field
- Out of place in the community and in the AONB
- Larger than the original footprint of the buildings that were there
- Other developments have been refused being in the AONB
- Overhanging buildings and narrow lanes will cause access problems for the build
- Possible contamination of land not addressed
- Possible light impact in an area where there is no light
- No need for lay-by proposed
- Landscape view provided by plans does not reflect the most often used view
- Some discrepancies in the heritage statement

The agents made the following points:

- The building is partly sunk into the ground so will only be 1 and half stories limiting impact
- There is no reason that a contemporary design with different materials cannot work with existing buildings, historically that has been the case
- A construction management plan will have to be agreed with SDC
- The visual impact has been considered as part of the process
- Contamination will be addressed if the problem arises but Environmental Health have put some conditions on in any case
- The heritage statement was carried out by a qualified professional.

Cllr Andrews proposed to object to this proposal, seconded by Cllr Tratt and the council agreed to object on the following grounds:

- Contrary to policy D9 – the scale and nature of the development is not appropriate to the size...and identity of the existing community (it is over 4 times as big as surrounding neighbours) nor does it complement the existing built form of the settlement with totally different materials being used to existing buildings and elsewhere in the Mendip Hills
- Contrary to policy C02 – being outside the village development boundary it would be infill in the countryside and so should not physically extend the built form of the settlement. The scale and nature is not appropriate to the size, accessibility character and identity of the existing community and is not in accordance with policy D19
- Contrary to policy D19 - development proposals in the Mendip Hills AONB will only be supported where they conserve and enhance the natural beauty ...of the landscape in these areas. The form bulk and design of this proposal does not have proper regard to the context and nor does it protect and enhance the natural and historic features of the landscape as it is an exceptionally large building out of keeping with the settlement
- Contrary to policy T3a – It is not appropriate to the scale, size and existing character of the settlement and it does unacceptably harm the character and amenity of nearby properties due to the scale of the development and ,as stated above, it is not appropriate to the size, accessibility, character and physical identity of the settlement.
- Contrary to policy D25- it does not protect residential amenity due to the overbearing and visual dominance of the proposal
- Contrary to policy D24 as there is likely to be an increase in light pollution.
- Does not fulfil NPPF as it has an adverse impact on the AONB .
- The access is questionable as the sightlines are not adequate
- The contamination of land is well known in Shipham and this has not been addressed by the proposal.

The Parish council strongly recommend the Highways authority to do a site visit.

3. To discuss any action to take regarding Great Hills (photos and e-mails previously circulated)

Council resolved to contact enforcement regarding concerns about the development that appears to be carried out at this property.

The meeting was closed at 9.05 p.m.