

**Minutes of the Meeting of Frampton Cotterell Parish Council**

**6 June 2018**

**Held at the Brockridge Centre, Woodend Road, Frampton Cotterell**

**Present:** Councillors Mrs Williams, (*Chair*), Mrs Allan, Beecher, D. Hockey, P. Hockey, Mrs Stickland, Mrs Pennell, Susan Tubey (*Vice Chair*), Underhill, and Mrs Walters

**Also Present:** Naomi Bibi (*Clerk*)

**Apologies:** Cllrs Farbrother, Clark and Wells

**1217 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies from Clls Farbrother, Clark and Wells were noted.

**1218 Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair drew attention to the emergency exits and evacuation procedure.

**1219 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations**

Cllrs D and P Hockey declared that the participation of those Parish Councillors who are also members of South Gloucestershire District Council in both the debate and any subsequent vote on matters contained in the agenda would be on the basis that the views expressed were preliminary views taking account of the information currently available to the Parish Council. Parish Council members who are also District Councillors reserved their final views until they were in full possession of all relevant information both for and against.

**1220 Confirmation of Minutes – 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2018**

It was moved by Cllr Beecher and seconded by Cllr Underhill and **RESOLVED:** that the minutes be confirmed and signed subject to the following amendments to the minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> May 2018.

Min 1193 relating to Min 1177 should read *'a mixture of inside and outside any greenbelt development should be 'minor'*.

Min 1195 should note more items than only 2(b), and that the Standing Orders should also acknowledge diversity. The term 'model' should also be removed.

Min 1196 in the sentence "*Wales and 'senior' officers*", the "*and*" should not be in italics.

Min 1212 should conclude with "*noted*" and not "*referred to South Glos for consideration*".

Min 1214 the final resolution should read "*to extend her contract*" and not "*to extend contract*".

**1221 Questions / Comments from Members of the Public and Comments from the Website**

22 members of the public signed the public attendance sheet, all wishing to discuss planning application PT18/2215/O (6 Bell Road), as listed on the agenda.

All public present unanimously objected to the plans for the following reasons:

- An increased sense of vulnerability for elderly residents given the number of proposed dwellings and ergo increased number of residents.
- Existing properties would be overlooked by balconies looking directly onto existing gardens.
- The proposed height of the roofs is higher than that of existing roof heights.
- There is currently a 300-year-old boundary wall which is part of the grounds: this should not be demolished.
- The road would become a thoroughfare to many cars as there are 16 allocated parking spaces associated with the proposed development.
- The plans do not provide sufficient parking for the number of properties proposed.
- The site is over intensive, with traffic being on the doorstep of existing properties.
- There would be an increase in pollution / fumes / with fresh air lost.
- There would be an increase in noise pollution.
- Current residents would be subjected to light pollution due to security lights / lighting for and from new properties.
- The plans are architecturally not in keeping with and totally out of character with the rest of the buildings and environment.



- 1221 *cont*
- The site is in curtilage of a grade II listed church.
  - Under the new plans, current residents would lose natural daylight as new buildings would block light.
  - There are trees on site and these should be protected and not demolished.
  - Bell Road is lower than the level of the ground and there would therefore be dangers to the waterlines.
  - The road is one way because it used to be dangerous to its current residents with several people being knocked over. The increase in residents *and* traffic would therefore further increase this risk again and make the area hazardous and congested.
  - With the new development, flooding was raised as a major concern as with so much concrete, there would be insufficient drainage. (Residents reported flooding with raw sewage since the increase in property developments in the area in the last 18 months.)
  - Low water pressure was reported as already being a problem in the area, and additional properties / residents would merely put an increase on water supply and demand.

It was moved by Cllr Mrs Pennell and seconded by Cllr Beecher and **RESOLVED** unanimously to: object planning application PT18/2215/O (6 Bell Road) on the abovementioned grounds.

**ACTION:** The Clerk to post this list of objections, along with Westerleigh Parish Council's objections, to FCPC's website to highlight the strong, unified objection.

Cllr D. Hockey said that these plans need to be considered by Councillors at South Glos. and should be referred for a site visit. He advised the public to attend this site visit, but to organise one person in advance to act as spokesperson (as they would be given a total of only 3 minutes to speak).

#### 1222 Planning Applications

- The comments attached at Appendix 1 to be referred to SGC for consideration.

#### 1223 Planning Decisions

- The decisions made by South Glos. Council regarding planning affecting FCPC were noted.

#### 1224 Valuation Cost for Watermore Infant School

The imminent auction of the former Bockeridge School was discussed, along with the importance of one hundred and fifty years of history and the emotional ties that the school likely had to many of the village residents. Cllr Beecher also informed Council that the School's trust deed stipulates the site must forever be used for educational purposes, and that this trust survives even once transferred to a third party.

Two options were discussed:

1. Whether it would be possible to put in a bid for the Council to purchase the school building.
2. Whether an application could be submitted to Historic England for the building to be nationally listed, so as to afford protection from demolition by future developers.

It was **RESOLVED** unanimously by Council that: an application to Historic England be made as a priority to have the former Bockeridge School building listed nationally, with the possibility of having the application fast-tracked investigated, as well as looking into the option to purchase the old school building.

**ACTION:** The Clerk to liaise with Cllr Beecher and his wife Stella with regards to the application form (given extensive research already carried out on the school building by Cllr Beecher and his wife), and submit an application to Historic England.

**ACTION:** The Deputy Clerk to find out if funding is available should the Council wish to put in a bid to purchase the school building. (Looking at what funds are available / if another loan would be possible / whether the Bockeridge Centre could be re-mortgaged to allow for more funds / how quickly capital could be released.)

Cllr P. Hockey informed Council that there is a policy in place at South Glos. whereby Frampton should have been given first refusal on the purchase of the property.

**ACTION:** The Clerk to speak to Rebecca Toms, Head of Property Services at South Glos. to find out why FCPC were not given first refusal.

**ACTION:** The Clerk to report back to the next Full Council Meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2018.

*NB. Cllr P. Hockey informed Council that she is no longer a governor to Watermore Infant School and therefore no longer has pecuniary interests.*

*ACWILLIAMS*

**1225 Correspondence from BRPFMC Chairman to Report**

Cllr Mrs Pennell updated Council that she has been advising BRPFMC with regards to their utility costs against their rental income.

Cllr D. Hockey commented that it was clear from their correspondence to the Council that BRPFMC would cease to exist if the Council insisted on its current repayment plan.

It was agreed that more financial information was required from BRPFMC for the Council to suggest a more reasonable repayment plan.

**ACTION:** Cllr Mrs Pennell to speak to Tony Nelmes of BRPFMC to obtain a breakdown of their income and expenditure.

It was **RESOLVED** unanimously by Council to: follow the Deputy Clerk's recommendation (as per Agenda Item 9) for a letter to be sent to BRPFMC from the Council (to be written by the Deputy Clerk with the Chair's assistance).

**1226 Items Considered Urgent by the Chairman**

There were none.

**1227 Date of next Meeting – Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2018 at 7.30pm**

The Chair closed the meeting at 21:25

