

# **Churchill And Langford Residents Action Group (CALRAG)**

## **Response to modifications made to 19/P/2713/FUL in September 2020**

CALRAG has already made a response to the initial consultation and its overall objection and reasonings remain the same. CALRAG has examined all the modification documents and notes that they fail to adequately address the main issues of concern expressed by both residents and those submitted by professionals.

### **1. Highways and access**

- 1.1. The management of site-access, from A368 Dinghurst Road, remains entirely unacceptable as does the safeguarding for pedestrian access.
- 1.2. There remains no additional right-turning third lane to enable eastbound traffic to enter the site safely.
- 1.3. The various North Somerset Highways proposals have all been Ignored.
- 1.4. The site access from Skinners Lane would add extra congestion at a popular and already congested access point to the Mendip Hills AONB.

### **2. Storm Drainage.** Our informed representative visited the site on the days that the new geotechnical issues were explored in June. The following is his observations having observed the investigation.

- 2.1. The proposals remain totally inadequate.
- 2.2. It is of critical importance that none of the actual detailed geotechnical data, derived from the site in June, is made publicly available. We are offered only three summary numbers.
- 2.3. The subsoil conditions and depths on this site are, in fact, remarkably variable – as reflected in the very different half-drain times actually observed at different locations on site.
- 2.4. The five dwellings accessible from Skinners Lane are proposed to depend on individual soakaways unconnected to the main system. For the uphill dwellings, numbers 44 and 45, this is absurd because here, Carboniferous Limestone bedrock is much less than 1m below the surface. We need to see the actual data derived from these investigations in June 2020.
- 2.5. It is to be noted that the NSC Flood Risk Management Team (letter dated 9 September) makes similar points.

### **3. Ecology and natural environment**

- 3.1. This proposal poses profound ecological problems - and implementation would cause serious loss of local biodiversity – important both for bats and for many other species. It would further fragment these biodiverse, local ecosystems.
- 3.2. The applicant offers plant and animal diversity assessments which substantially underestimate the number of species actually encountered on this site. Lighting across this development would confuse and deter light-sensitive species of bats (and other animals).
- 3.3. Vague reference is made in the documentation to offsetting at another site. This is meaningless without clear, explicit reference, which is here avoided by invoking confidentiality.

**3.4.** It is important to note the recent (Sep 2020) and highly cautionary concerns of NSC Natural Environment Officer Lindi Rich – who, unlike us, has seen the (apparently inadequate) offsite mitigatory assessments.

#### **4. Landscape.**

**4.1.** The adverse effect will be profound on the local landscape at this popular and important Gateway to the immediately adjacent Mendip Hills AONB.

**4.2.** These landscape problems have been clearly stated in the response of the Mendip Hills AONB Partnership (letter dated 10 September).

**4.3.** This proposal for residential development is clearly incompatible with the provisions for AONBs within the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

**4.4.** Under the terms of the CROW Act 2000 (4.3 above), Local Authorities have a statutory duty (section 85) to maintain views into and out of AONBs. We might also note the rather similar duty imposed by the National Planning Policy Framework (Feb2019) para 172.

**4.5.** The views from Windmill Hill in Churchill will also be substantially affected by this application.

**4.6.** The more recent assertions offered by the applicants, concerning the inconspicuousness of the site within the landscape, simply fail to be supported by fact. Please note the observations by S106 project officer, Kevin Carlton (18 Sep) which explicitly counter the applicants' assertion.

#### **5. SUMMARY**

**5.1.** These modifications offer very little new actual evidence. The site remains totally unsuitable and would represent thoroughly bad planning from a number of perspectives.

**5.2.** Churchill and Langford villages have accepted as many houses as can be reasonably absorbed in order to comply with the requirement of a service village and with regard to green spaces and village boundaries:

5.2.1. Access to employment centres of Bristol and Weston-S-Mare will involve car journeys on roads that are already congested

5.2.2. Access to public transport involves a car journey and further adding to the offset double junction at Congresbury to access Yatton Station.

5.2.3. Churchill Academy is full and is anticipated to remain so even when Parkway School is open. Likewise Churchill Primary school

5.2.4. Please try and get yourself an appointment with your GP – very difficult.

5.2.5. There is no employment in Churchill so sustain the development that is already going up let alone any more.

5.2.6. People live in these villages because they enjoy the culture that village life offers. This should be respected just as other cultures are accepted and respected. Village life is very different and is indeed cost-effective as has been proved during the recent pandemic.

5.2.7. The application is contrary to North Somerset's Climate Change emergency.