

THORNBURY TOWN COUNCIL

REPORT of the Meeting of the Town Development Committee held on 27th September 2016

Present:- Cllr. Maggie Tyrrell (Chairman)

Cllrs. Vincent Costello
 Guy Rawlinson
 Angela Symonds
 Helen Harrison
 Bob Griffin
 Clive Parkinson
 Shirley Holloway
 Clare Fardell

Clare Nelmes (Town Clerk)
 Sandra Richardson (Deputy Town Clerk)

1. TO RECEIVE ANY APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Adrian Savery (Thornbury Chamber of Commerce)
 Cllr Gail Whitehead

2. TO RECEIVE ANY MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None

3. TO RECEIVE ANY REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

4. TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION FROM AINSCOUGH STRATEGIC LAND ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND WEST OF GLOUCESTER ROAD

Rachael Ainscough (Ainscough Strategic Land), Nicola Lovell (RPS) and James Neville (Aecom) were welcomed to the meeting to provide a presentation on their application and to answer questions.

Rachael outlined the site, the policy context and the justification for development including the lack of a 5year housing land supply in South Gloucestershire.

The masterplan for the site envisaged a sustainable settlement, which detailed access arrangements, open space area, link to the neighbouring Post Farm development site and a design and layout orientated to capitalise on the views. It would include approx 180 homes including affordable housing with access from Gloucester Road. The developer is open to suggestions for how the open space could be managed and maintained. The development is likely to generate approx £1.5M of News Homes Bonus (NHB) and £1.2M of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to South Gloucestershire Council.

The main changes made to the application following earlier community engagement include:

- Enhanced green buffer to north of site and boundaries
- An opened up entrance onto the development site
- Reduced development on ridge and site high point
- Footpath enhancements
- More detail to drainage ponds and SUDs

The applicant is still discussing a number of issues with South Gloucestershire Council including:

- Road safety audit
- Pedestrian & cycle routes
- Emergency access to Butt Lane
- Transport assessment – which currently shows no/limited impact
- Gloucester Road/Butt Lane/Morton Way junction
- Modelling for Cleeve Park development
- Link through to Post Farm development

Drainage will be managed through onsite attenuation with no offsite run off. This should reduce flow through fields to improve drainage downstream, more efficiently than the current arrangements. It was anticipated that there would be no negative impact on ecology and archaeology. Existing features would be maintained and enhanced including hedgerows, green buffers and wildflower grassland. A management plan would need to be developed. It was recognised that the distance to the town centre and main town facilities would not be within the immediate vicinity of the development and that some are over 1.5km from the development site.

The chair opened up the meeting to public participation and questions.

Public participation

Roger Hall – representing Park Estate Residents Group asked whether the applicant had negotiated with SGC about a s106 agreement? Developer answered not yet but will keep town council informed on progress. He also raised concerns about the inadequacy of CIL contributions and ability of SGC to make infrastructure improvements in the town.

Concerns were also raised about increasing traffic and the impact of this. Will developer consider sustainable travel plans as part of the development?

There was also concern about flooding and new development worsening existing issues, particularly around Moreton Street and Duckhole and on the Gloucester Road by the proposed site entrance. Commented that affordable housing is not actually affordable for those living locally looking to get on the housing ladder. Nobody is in favour of this new development locally. When are SGC going to draw up a comprehensive and costed traffic management plan that takes into account the cumulative effect of new development on the town's highway infrastructure? Understands that Highways England have requested a delay to the consideration of this application pending work to assess the impact on the M5 and that Chris Rose from Highways DC has also queried the transport data. Concerns that the traffic model does not reflect local circumstances. Desire to see train and bus improvements, a park and ride and improved access to a new junction on the M5.

Another member of the public also raised concerns about the impact of the development on traffic, congestion, highway safety and the highway network.

David Dawkins, a local resident felt that this was a speculative development which lacked a proper masterplan for the site. He asked how the 35% of affordable housing would be provided and distributed around the site. He stated that Thornbury has already accepted enough new development to meet its housing needs and that it was unfair that we were being asked to accommodate even more to meet South Gloucestershire 5 year housing land supply issue. This level of development is beyond Thornbury's capacity to accommodate this growth and that this would increase pressure on local services and facilities. Concern was raised about transport congestion and capacity and the impact on roads of commuting into Bristol and outbound shopping.

Urges council to object to this application as it is not needed in Thornbury, local greenspaces and fields should be protected and that services are not within walking distance of the development site.

Keith Woosenam, a local resident commented that the consultation undertaken by the developer had been ineffective and there had been no assessment of Thornbury's needs. He felt that new residents would likely be commuters and the housing provided on site would be unlikely to solve current issues which was for more low cost housing for first time buyers and those downsizing. Condensed development and increasing density is an economic plan to make money for developers not a plan to meet Thornbury's needs. He called for a proper transport plan and study for the area. He stated that he drives through flood water every winter on that section of the Gloucester Road, retention ponds don't work and cause issues further downstream. The development does not consider and does not provide infrastructure to cope with the impact and increased pressure on local schools, health facilities and dentists.

Aaron Sims asked how approximate the 180 homes were, could this mean that when the reserved matters application goes in we could see significantly more. The developer responded by stating that this was unlikely to change as the site had been assessed on the density and design of 180 and any changes to this would involve significant work in redoing the assessments.

In answer to questions raised by members of the public the applicant gave the following responses.

The traffic modelling is based on data and assessments from an adjoining site application which has factored in growth. They have also been asked by SGC to factor in Cleeve Park development despite it not having planning permission yet.

The s106 is likely to include junction improvement to Butt Lane/Gloucester Road and Morton Way junction.

SGC are looking at the Tytherington Road junction and modelling of the J14 M5 with Highways England.

The proposed access to the development site can be provided with 120M of visibility in either direction, appropriate for the standard of road and there is enough room to incorporate a right hand turn lane.

The travel plan is currently being worked on and is likely to be a condition of permission and they are in discussion with Stagecoach about improving bus services in the Thornbury area.

It is SGC that recommends a SUD's system of drainage that takes account of existing issues and new build.

The Chair thanked the public for their contribution and closed public participation and moved to councillor debate.

Councillor debate

Cllr Clive Parkinson endorsed the comments made by the public and asked that they be reflected in town council's response to the application. He asked the developer where the evidence was that this development was needed and what impact it would have on Thornbury and highlighted the issues with car parking, facilities for young people, Armstrong Hall and other community buildings and health facilities and schools. He also commented upon the highways access which he felt was dangerous and exasperate existing issues at this blackspot, with the junction, speed, flooding and a bend. In response the developer stated that the development would have an impact, but the detail of the application was not known at this outline stage, which would determine the level of the impact. They have not consulted with other authorities and organisations about the impact as this was SGC's responsibility.

Cllr Clare Fardell commented that the 5 year land supply issue was not Thornbury's fault and it was a deliberate ploy by developers to gain planning permission for sites and then managing the build rate so that it was impossible to build enough for the area to catch up. She also raised the point that the effect of this new development is a large percentage increase in the population of Thornbury. She also commented upon the lack of affordable housing in the area, that new housing is no longer affordable, especially in high price areas like Thornbury.

Cllr Shirley Holloway thanked the public for their eloquent representations and reiterated the council's position that enough was enough in terms of new development in Thornbury. She was particularly concerned about the impact of all the developments on flooding, and the poor access to this site on the bend. She raised the issue that there was no provision for a bus stop in the vicinity of the development and suggested that they also speak to Severnside transport as well as Stagecoach as local bus operators.

Cllr Bob Griffin was sceptical about adequate bus service provision to serve this site.

Cllr Vincent Costello stated that this council has no powers and that SGC is caught between a rock and a hard place as this is part of a national problem and that he personally was pessimistic about the future.

Cllr Guy Rawlinson criticised the lack of an overall strategic plan for all developments in this area. He felt that there was no coordination to ensure that they all work together to tackle issues. He was also concerned about the management and maintenance of open spaces on the site. What plans are there for the Gloucester Road junction with the A38?

Following a question from the Clerk, the developer confirmed that the junction into the development would be bi-directional and will not be a left in left out junction as stated in the covering letter which was confirmed as being incorrect. Modelling suggests that the road and junctions will operate within capacity.

The chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and moved onto consider the council's response to the application.

5. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING PLANNING & LICENSING APPLICATIONS:

a. **PT16/4774/O Land West of Gloucester Road**

Erection of 180 dwellings on 8.00 hectares of land with public open space, drainage, associated works and access. Outline application with access for consideration, all other matters reserved.

Following the discussion at the meeting it was agreed that the council OBJECTS to this application on the following grounds and that the Clerk draft a suitable response to South Gloucestershire Council in consultation with the committee chair.

Outside the development boundary and Core Strategy

Speculative and unplanned development would lead to a significant % increase in the population of Thornbury without the necessary strategic planning to integrate it into the community and provide the necessary infrastructure.

Extends the boundary of the town and pushes the development area out, increasing the distance to services and facilities to an unsustainable distance, increasing the pressures on carparking in town centre as well as other local infrastructure and services.

Lack of employment opportunities within the town for new residents placing outbound commuting pressure on local highway network.

Impact of increased traffic on local highway network increasing congestion, causing pressure at key junctions and increasing road safety risk. Lack of public transport, walking or cycling facilities and connecting services to mitigate for this.

Insufficient information particularly on highway access and impact to make an informed decision on the application. Question the reliability of the transport modelling which was undertaken for a different development site and the accuracy of model inputs which reflect local circumstances.

Lack of consultation with developers or SGC about infrastructure, facilities, community need and s106.

The response would also reiterate and reflect the concerns raised by residents at the meeting.

b. **PT16/4856/PNGR Hackett Stables, Hackett Lane**

Prior notification of a change of use from Agricultural Building to 1 no. residential dwelling (Class C3) as defined in the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).

Councillors considered this application and OBJECT on the grounds of it being outside the development boundary, insufficient car parking, drainage concerns and failure to comply with agricultural use.

c. **PT16/4847/TCA Selwood, 22 Gloucester Road**

Works to crown reduce 1 no. Oak tree to a height of 10 metres and leave a radial spread of 2.5 metres on the South side situated in the Thornbury Conservation Area.

Councillors considered this application and made NO OBJECTIONS subject to tree officer advice

d. **PT16/5001/F 12 Brookmead**

Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Councillors considered this application and made NO OBJECTIONS subject to maintaining the amenity of neighbouring properties and a suitable party wall agreement

e. **PT16/4950/RVC 22-27 Cooper Road**

Variation of Condition of PT15/0995/F (added by PT16/4489/NMA) to substitute approved drawings P001, P002 and P003 for revised drawings T001, T002 and T003.

Councillors considered this application and made NO OBJECTIONS

f. **PT16/5139/TCA 19 Pullins Green**

Works to fell 1 no. tree situated in the Thornbury Conservation Area.

Councillors considered this application and made NO OBJECTIONS subject to tree officer advice

g. **PT16/5135/F 3 Siband Way**

Demolition of existing extension. Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Councillors considered this application and made NO OBJECTIONS

h. Premises Licence for Bryant & Co, 3 The Plain, Thornbury

Due to the lack of available information about this application from South Gloucestershire Council, Councillors were unable to consider this application.

i. Premises Licence for Heritage in Thornbury, 24 High Street, Thornbury

Due to the lack of available information about this application from South Gloucestershire Council, Councillors were unable to consider this application.

j. **PT16/4648/ADV First Floor, 29A High Street**

Revised plans for display of 1 no. non-illuminated fascia sign, 1 non-illuminated hanging sign

Councillors considered this revised application and made NO OBJECTIONS

6. THE SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATION DECISIONS MADE BY SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL

The schedule of planning application decisions made by South Gloucestershire Council were received and noted.

7. TO CONSIDER A CONSULTATION RUN BY BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL ON THE FUTURE OF SUPPORTED BUS SERVICES AFFECTING THE 77 ROUTE SERVICING THORNBURY

The consultation information was considered and it was AGREED to respond to the consultation objecting to any withdrawal of support to the 77 service which is an essential link between Thornbury and Southmead Hospital, Parkway Station and employment in the north fringe and city centre. Thornbury is currently experiencing significant additional new housing and this service is one of the few public transport options available to local residents who need to access health services, employment and transport connections in Bristol. We urge Bristol City Council to work with South Gloucestershire Council to ensure that this service is maintained and extended to meet the increase in population in Thornbury. We would also request that the town council are informed or consulted about any further future cross boundary bus service changes affecting Thornbury and the outcome of this review.

8. TO CONSIDER SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL'S A38 CORRIDOR CYCLING FEASIBILITY STUDY

The brief circulated by South Gloucestershire Council for the A38 Corridor Cycling Feasibility Study was discussed.

It was AGREED that the council should write to SGC to outline its support for the study, stating the importance of providing a cycling link connecting Thornbury to the A38 via Alveston Hill. Cllrs also request to be involved in the process and kept informed of progress and the outcome.

9. TO CONSIDER THE FEASIBILITY OF THORNBURY UNDERTAKING A NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Clerks report was considered and an update provided following a training session attended by the Clerk and Cllr Parkinson.

It was AGREED to arrange a free consultation with the training provider to consider the best course of action for town council.

The Clerk was also asked to clarify advice from South Gloucestershire Council on the NDP process, whether the area had to identify development sites within an NDP and the level of support available from the council to deliver it.

10. TO CONSIDER ANY OTHER CORRESPONDENCE OR URGENT BUSINESS

a. *Letter from GC(member of public) concerning signage for Hot Nails*

It was AGREED to refer the matter to South Gloucestershire Council Planning Enforcement as no planning permission had been received for the signage and it was in the conservation area and that GC be informed of our actions.