1/1/5

Appendix 1

23/P/0820/OUT

It is worth starting with the conclusions to the submission in regards to the previous application (22/P/2083/OUT) linked to the same plot of land which stated:

"One of our major concerns about this application is that this may not ultimately be a 3 dwelling proposal, but a route to future development across Locking's southern boundary and the Bury which would have long term irreversible impact on the village, parish, wildlife, and the surrounding area.

There is significant disapproval in relation to this proposal and many questions and concerns outwith of what has been presented today. These of course will be raised at the appropriate time but are not applicable as part of these current conversations.

Therefore, it is our collective view that the Parish Council are unable to make an informed decision based on the information within the application. Therefore, in the absence of clarity and detailed evidence the only option, in our opinion, is to Reject."

What were ultimately concluding remarks at the end of a detailed explanation as to why the Parish Council should reject the previous application (and presumably contributed to your unanimous decision to reject 22/P/2083/OUT) have now been proved to be more than just idle speculation.

This latest application has already extended the proposed dwellings by over 33%. Where does this stop?

Not only is the planning system clearly broken in allowing applications to pass through the system with insufficient information and by also allowing documentation (pertinent to decision making) to be loaded after consultation windows have been closed, but the fact that formal decisions are made based on partial information, and that legitimate planning concerns, and the voice of the Parish Council, are overridden by a single delegated officer feels incredibly unjust.

It feels pointless, wasting councillors time in reiterating the legitimate planning concerns that this proposal brings, both on the objections raised previously (under 22/P/2083/OUT) and within this new iteration, as the comments do speak for themselves.

It is however worth highlighting some key facts that are pertinent to both this latest application and the past:

- 1) The land in question lies outside of the village boundary.
- 2) The land required to facilitate the removal of foul waste from the proposed properties is not fully owned by the applicant. N.B. There are 3 other households who own the land, through which his plans are attempting to pass the sewerage waste.
- 3) The council are unable to evidence that they have a housing shortfall vs plan. On the contrary, the council have supplied the annual report from 2022 that details that they are in excess of target. The 2021 report also stated a surplus.
- 4) The documents on this plan are not complete and have attempted to utilise previous documents from the previous application but have neglected to update key documents (e.g. the drainage plan still only displays 3 dwellings and the proposed block plan now ignores the need for the required pumping station)

1 2 P/2/2023



- 5) The highways agency previous amended their previous recommendation of "Objection Contrary to policy DM24 Highway Safety" based on the submission of "Speed Check data" albeit after the consultation window had closed. There is an objection on this latest application that covers this in more detail, but the timing, and validity, of the speed check have been questioned. As we are all aware the Bury Road has been closed on multiple occasions over the past 12 months and around the time of this speed check, the water board were again doing significant engineering works and therefore it is questionable if the speed check was done during a period of time that was truly reflective of the road conditions.
- 6) This application is detailed in relation to 4 dwellings, but this ultimately amounts to 4 houses, 2 garages and a pumping station so 7 buildings in total. This is before any consideration is given to a need for a road network that needs to support Emergency vehicles or waste collection vehicles (driving forwards in and out of the site) or the need for additional recycling stores etc etc. given that the site is already constrained by the flood zone, environmental buffers, and a public right of way running through the middle of it that the Archaeological report states is "recommended to retain the PROW in its current form to preserve this historic element at this location", how can this be achieved without impacting on the Character and appearance of the local area?

What more can be said? The facts speak for themselves. The option available to you all is simple. Reject this application as you rejected the first.

W 1/2/2023

12

Appendix 2

Chairman's Report - 25 May 2023

Welcome Councillors, to this our first Full Parish Council meeting in this new period. We, as you are all aware, have been elected uncontested to represent our community for the next 4 years.

I wish to thank you all for volunteering to support your community and hope that others will step forward to fill the vacancies that we have here at Locking. Our community really needs people to represent our growing community across all areas and become involved in ensuring that we as a growing community are properly represented in our differing areas.

On behalf of Locking Parish Council, I would also like to record Council's thanks to two long serving members of Locking Parish Council, Mr John Keate and Mr Les Mason who have served our community for many years. Their contributions to our community will be sorely missed as they were both so knowledgeable and supportive in this our growing community.

As your newly elected Chairman, I consider that we are a forward-looking Council, and that we will ensure that our agreed objectives are achieved to the benefit of our growing community. Council is committed to improving our carpark at the Old Banwell Road, Playing Field, and that the Spinney must be upgraded to make it safe for all users.

Paul Jones

Chairman

Locking Parish Council

1 2/7/20B