

Batheaston Parish Council

Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee Extraordinary Meeting held in The Rhymes Pavilion on 12th December 2012 at 6- 00 pm

Present:- Cllrs. L Brass (Chair), P Blanking, P Burcombe, K Hawkins, D Lavington, G Riley, D Robins, V Pecchia,
V Trenchard .& M Townley (Clerk)

Apologies Full attendance

In attendance Cllrs J Beresford-Smith, S Fremantle, D Gledhill, G Batt, M Veal. G Ward
Ms C Bond, T Davies, A Giles, B Kallender, R Mimmack, A Pawley, D Reading, Mrs A Robins + 1 Other

P-594 Public Participation

Ms Bond Repeated her comments of 27 Nov, and has received much positive response. The Travel Plan will manage parking issues – as at the National Trust. The BPC should pursue additional parking spaces.

A Pawley Has been the immediate neighbour for 13 years and objects to this new “theatre”. There are only 34 parking spaces in this area – for residents - with too many pinch points. The Application does not consider the neighbours, and might have trespassed on his property.

Cllr Eardley. Queried that the Notice of this meeting was not posted on the notice board in time. So queried what right for such a meeting – advised that it is allowed under SO 17.

Cllr Lavington – A number of technicalities have not been addressed.
[Advised that advice obtained from ALCA]

P-595 Declarations of Interest

P Burcombe – Member of the BNVH Trust; D Lavington – Chair of “Encore” a major Hall user.

P-596 Standing Orders

On opening the Meeting the Chairman suspended
SO 4a - requiring 7 days’ notice for a Motion- and
SO 11a - With some exceptions forbids the reversal of a Resolution within 6 months.

P-597 Reviews on Replacement Church Hall Application

In seating order each Parish Councillor offered their views:-

VP - Read out a letter of objection at the author’s request. Agreed that we all want a new hall but the parking is already a problem and this proposal increases footprint by 63% and volume by 124%.

PBU – In favour of the development

VT – Supports the need for the Hall, but parking is too important to neglect.

PBI – In favour of the new Hall but parking is a problem and must be addressed especially for emergency vehicles. Too many people do not live near enough to the Hall, and traffic is increasing all the time..

KH – disappointed at the loss of parking , previous consultations advised that extra spaces are being pursued. Concerned that non-foot traffic cannot reach the Hall. There is NO public transport in Northend. This is the time to deal with the problem.

DG – Surprised to hear this all again.

DR – The Travel Plan is only aspirations, is not statutory and cannot compel compliance. Para 3.6 declares that there is NO parking demand, and does not offer any traffic survey. The section on cycling/walking is not enough, and warnings not enough for visitors who come too far. Para 2.3.1 that does allow under-25s to rent the hall conflicts with Charity Commission’s objectives. The BNVH Trust needs to take care.

DL – The Planning Officer has answered all queries sufficiently. Noise objections should be referred to the Licensing Authority – not Planning. The new Hall is NOT a theatre. Over 40 letters of support. This BPC is subject to the law and technicalities need careful consideration. The Village Appraisal (1997) wanted the Hall replaced and all investigated sites recommended the Church Hall site. The vision Plan (2009) had 50% support for the same site. The BNVH members are honest, hard-workers seriously working for the good of the Village. Patsy Townsend left her home for the hall’s replacement and B&NES has donated £75,000.

Why not support but with a condition that parking spaces are provided – 2 years to go before any building

GR – Fully supportive of Hall development.

SF – Not a PEC members but people cannot be told where to park

JBS – Parking is the only objection – the field is available.

LB – The Travel Plan in appendix 1 quotes that 53 people attended the 8 Dec Encore event with 21 cars used. At full capacity the new Hall will attract 48 cars on that ratio i.e 2 cars to every 5 attendees or 40%. The Travel Plan cannot reduce that number.

Proposed	K Hawkins	}	RESOLVED –	“For”	the Resolution VP, PBI, KH, DR, VT,
Seconded	V Pecchia	}	(PEC only)	“Against”	the Resolution DL. & GR (in his absence)
The Chairman did not exercise his vote					

1 To object to the Plans on the grounds of lack of parking provision for the normal purposes of the stated usage of the new hall, of the effects of traffic in Northend and the amenity of local residents from noise nuisance and disturbance at the close of events;

2 To consider that objection when provision has been made for adequate parking

The Clerk was instructed to advise the following Recommendation to the Planning Officer.

Recommendation to Planning Officer

12/04653/FUL + 12/04654/CA Batheaston New Village Hall (BNVH) School Lane Batheaston	Erection of new 1-storey building, including multi-use main hall, activity rooms, kitchen, toilets and stores, and associated works for accessible access, following demolition of existing Church Hall
<p>The Parish Council formally objects to these Applications for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The Parish Council is supportive of a Replacement Building with adequate parking – as advised in earlier consultations. 2 The proposed replacement building appears well designed with good acoustic and energy-saving features. 3 The proposed building is 63% larger in footprint and is said to accommodate 155 persons. 4 The parking policy T10 requires one off-street parking space for every 10 persons. 5 Fails to comply with transport policies T3, T5, T6, T15, Para D10, T24(7)(8) and T25 6 In earlier consultations it was proposed that additional parking would be provided inside the walling fronting onto School Lane. No such proposal in this Application 7 The Application’s “Green Travel Plan” does not offer the required additional parking spaces. 8. The Hall will enjoy good acoustics – but events run until midnight. Noise and disturbance on drop off and pick up not addressed? 9. Operating Policy. The aims of the Company, as approved by the Charity Commission, as ‘without distinction of age’. Para 2.3.1 contravenes this aim because it is “prohibiting “ under 25s” 10 The Green Travel Plan confers no powers of compliance or enforcement. Major functions will attract car-borne attendees. The site is difficult to reach on foot from the further parts of the Parish 	

Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 8th January 2013 in The Rhymes Pavilion – at 7-15 pm

Chairman..... Date.....