

PARISH OF ABBOTS LEIGH - NOTICE OF MEETING
Abbots Leigh Parish Council
Held at Abbots Leigh Village Hall on Monday 14th March 2022 at 7.30pm

MINUTES

Present: Cllrs Talbot-Ponsonby, Butler, Narracott, Stewart & J Smart (Clerk)
Apologies: Cllr Walker & Ward Cllr Davies

Public Participation

Mr Nick Cryer, Charlie Allen, Gonzalo Trujillo and Peter Allen, all residents of Church Road were present and spoke on behalf of many other residents of Church Road regarding the proposal for a Conservation Area. The proposal was causing unnecessary anxiety and upset in the village. A considerable number of residents of Church Road met last week to discuss the position. It seemed clear that the PC had an agenda to drive the CA forward. None of the Parish Councillor's lived in the area suggested for the CA. The approach to the CA was biased, misleading and unprofessional. Relevant information had now been sent to planning consultant, who considered the PC was abusing the process and have now taken legal advice and may take legal action against the PC. Mr Cryer asked if the PC received a resounding NO to the proposal, would it carry on. STP responded that if a majority of the responses received to the consultation were NO, the proposal would not be taken forward.

NC asked if the results would be published. STP advised the outcome would be on the website and circulated via WhatsApp and The Link.

STP said that he was uncomfortable with the fact that it was suggested that the parish Council was abusing the system and that there was a suggestion that there was a hidden agenda by people who do not live on Church Road to impose a conservation area. It is the duty of the Parish Council to look after the interests of the whole parish.

MS stated that Mr Cryer's suggestion that the PC had been acting improperly was very distressing. There had been a full and proper process.

PLEASE ALSO SEE ATTACHED EMAIL.

1. Declarations of Interest in items on the agenda

Cllr Narracott declared an interest in Planning Application 22/P/0296/FUH – Cherry Halt, Harris Lane, as a resident of Harris Lane.

2. Previous meeting held on 14th February 2022

The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 14th February 2022, previously circulated, were signed as a true record.
Action Clerk.

3. Matters arising

Treescape Project – MS had circulated a report on the project, and the final contribution from the Parish Council would be £75.00.

4. Planning

Applications:-

22/P/0296/FUH	Cherry Holt Harris Lane BS8 3QX	Erection of a front porch and rear dormer extension. Demolition of balcony at rear and chimney stack to be replaced by steel flue pipe. Object – detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties. Further increasing the size of the property that had already been extended.
22/P/0320/FUH	Oaklea Lodge Blackmoor Road BS8 3RH	Proposed conversion of existing detached garage to a residential annex. No objections in principle but request a condition that the residential annex could not be a separate dwelling in the future, or used for commercial purposes.
22/P/0340/FUL	Atcost Barn Glen Farm Sandy Lane	Conversion of existing barn (Sui generis use) to 1No. dwellinghouse (Use class C3). No objections, but Councillors thought drawings were unclear. Request an elevation drawing on the house side of the boundary wall facing the street.
21/P/3232/FUH	18 Church Road Abbots Leigh BS8 3QP	Proposed erection of a two storey side extension and attached garage: widening of existing vehicular access. AMENDED PLANS. No further comments.
22/P/0060/FUL	Leigh Farm 16 Church Road Abbots Leigh BS8 3QP	Redevelopment of the site to provide 2no. additional dwellings and alterations to the existing dwelling to create an eco-community. Works to existing dwelling to include partial demolition with erection of two storey extensions to south-east and north-east elevations to create extension to existing house, shared workspace, and annexe: alterations to windows and doors. No objections in principle but requested a condition that the properties could not be used for commercial purposes.

Approvals/Refusals/Withdrawn:-

21/P/2694/FUL	Cotham Park Rugby Club Beggar Bush Lane BS8 3TF	Erection of a first floor balcony/viewing area to existing clubhouse. Approved.
---------------	---	---

Other Planning Matters

5. Ward Councillor's Report

Ward Cllr Davies was not present at the meeting.

6. Conservation Area

The consultation would end on Monday 21st March.

7. Neighbourhood Plan

MS reported that the NP implementation group had met on 2nd March. The next meeting would be held in June.

8. North Somerset Local Plan 2038 – Preferred Options

MS reported that most issues with the NP were Pill issues. ALPC needed to agree with a 'Settlement Area' that would be similar to the 'Village Fence.' STP suggested that before the next meeting, Councillors should look at the plan and produce a recommendation. Green space would be protected. RN welcomed sections DP48, 58 & 59 regarding individual dwellings. RN was happy to compare to previous version. MS suggested holding an open meeting prior to the next PC meeting for residents to have their say. **Action All.**

9. Financial

Approval of Accounts for Payment – March 2022

Approval of the Accounts for Payment for March was proposed by STP, seconded by JB. Approved. **Action Clerk.**

Village Hall Flat – Expenditure to-date

The total cost of 2021 refurbishment to the end of March would be £11,944.51.

JB reported that the whole flat was now insulated, apart from the small room which was waiting for Sean Dorrington to install the Velux window.

STP – The PC now needed to know what the costs would be for finishing the flat in 2022-23. JB had asked Mick Dillon for this. RN stated that the PC needed to know what MD was proposing with regards to the installation of the kitchen and bathroom - specifications etc. How much more would it cost and when would it be finished.

Clerk to ask for future budget from MD. The PC needed to know what was under the floorboards prior to allowing stripped boards, as there could be a noise issue. There could also be an issue with ventilation for wood burner. MD to check with installer. **Action Clerk/MD/RN.**

10. Village Matters

- i. Police Report - Crime figures for January 2022 = Haberfield Hill – 1 x Violence & Sexual Offences; Dennyview Road – 1 x Burglary, 1 x Vehicle Crime; Manor Close – 2 x Violence & Sexual Offences.
- ii. Village Hall - See above. Last price increase for hiring the Village Hall was in 2017. STP write something to go into the Link and the booking section on the website to advise of price increases. No discounts for local groups (unless agreed). Hallmaster reconciliation for bookings and payments. STP was still chasing Sean Dorrington.
- iii. Former Skittle Alley - Nothing to report.
- iv. Traffic Issues & Footpaths - STP reported that the traffic counters were in place, but there had been a problem with the one at Dennyview Road, so this one would run for another week. STP to follow up air quality monitoring. Plan to replace the soakaway outside Leigh Warren, but this was on a long term list. STP had received complaints about the new clearway at Weir Lane and Manor Road. Thought the sign had been installed in the wrong place. The sign was also too large. STP thought this could be smaller and had now contacted NSC to request this. STP would respond to the complaints. **Action STP.**
- v. Verges - The Wildlife Group would like to erect a sign at Poundbatch verge – Paul Watkins (NSC) and STP would contact him. **Action STP.**
- vi. Playing Fields & Events - Clerk to apply for TEN for the Platinum Jubilee. **Action Clerk.**
- vii. Village Orderly - Nothing to report.
- viii. Abbots Pool - STP pushing to get the signage completed.
- ix. Civic Society - MS reported on the previous meeting, when the CS liked the fact that a traffic count was being carried out and liked the Treescape scheme. RN – proposal for DCC (CS also keen) idea to have an avenue outside the church (3 small cherry trees). Would let the PC know if this was to go ahead. **Action RN.**

11. Communications

Nothing to report.

12. Clerk's Report

Date for Annual Parish Meeting – Wednesday 11th May 2022 7.00pm for 7.30pm.

On 16 Mar 2022, at 14:08, Nick Cryer - Berkeley Place <nick@berkeleyplace.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Simon,

Thank you for your email dated 14th March (below) and the time you allowed myself, Charlie Allen, Gonzalo Trujillo, and Peter Allen, at the PCC meeting on Monday evening. We are long standing residents of Church Road.

We are sure the minutes will be accurately captured but, thought it useful to drop you a note as a record.

In response to the continued concerns and reservations which have been shared with you by phone and in writing to date, we thought it important that we took the time to share with you in person, the views of a significant wider group of Church Road residents, regarding the unnecessary agenda the PCC persists in driving in connection with introducing a Conservation Area. It is causing unnecessary upset, anxiety, and agitation within our village. Whilst the idea of maintaining the character of the village is well intended, creating a Conservation Area is not the approach the residents who are specifically affected, feel should be taken.

We made it clear to you that there is a very strong perception the PCC has a legacy agenda to introduce a Conservation Area, which has been inserted as an item in the Neighbourhood Plan by the PCC. We can find no evidence to support the Village residents having specifically requested a Conservation Area be considered. There are more than adequate planning controls already in place and, the government are trying to encourage less red tape and bureaucracy, not more. The point was also made that none of the PCC members live in the area the PCC has decided to try and designate as a Conservation Area.

We made it clear to you that our perception of the information you had circulated to date, and more recently to try and fix the misleading information previously circulated, is that it is biased, misleading and unprofessional. Making statements like *'enhancement for individual owners, of neighbouring dwellings and local surroundings, in some cases reflected in higher property prices'* for instance, has no substance whatsoever and cannot be evidenced. This has been confirmed some of the UK's leading property agents with whom we have consulted.

We made it clear to you that we have also consulted with leading planning consultants, who have seen the information you have been circulating and question, what formal process do you think you are following? They confirmed there are more than adequate existing planning controls in place, and that there is a standard process the Local Authority follows, in considering whether there is special architectural interest or character or, significant historic interest, with a legal process, and that it is not a Parish Council matter.

We made it clear to you that the perception is that you are abusing the process, and as such, certain individuals have taken initial legal advice on the matter.

During the discussion;

- You stated there would be a weighting factor applied between those residents in Church Road who are affected, and those who are outside Church Road, but you could not confirm what this would be or how it would be applied, until you had the results in, and that you would not share this.
- On numerous occasions you made reference to the process you are adopting being a Vote but, you also said it was a Survey, and you also said it was a Consultation.
- You stated you thought it likely, based on feedback you had received to date, that the results would indicate an overwhelming NO.
- You confirmed if this was the case, then the whole process should be dropped and the agenda removed from the Neighbourhood Plan, so it would not continue to be recycled.
- You stated you would publish results from your process but, you said you wouldn't distinguish between those residents in Church Road who are affected, and those outside Church Road.

As you can imagine, based on the above, we were not wholly comforted by the responses from the PCC during the meeting. We left feeling like you were making up the voting/survey/consultation process as you went along.

Nick Cryer