KEYNSHAM TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Monday 5th October 2026 at 7.00 pm in The Space, Market Walk, Keynsham.

PRESENT: D Brassington, D Cooper, C Davis, C Fricker and A Wait (late).

IN ATTENDANCE: Dawn Drury (Town Clerk)

56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

RESOLVED:
To receive and accept apologies from Cllrs Alex Beaumont and D Biddleston.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

RESOLVED:
To note there were none.

58. DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

59. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Monday 7th September 2026 (previously circulated) be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

60. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were nine members of the public present.

61. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE BY MEMBERS

There were none.

62. SITE VISITS

There were none.

Cllr Wait arrived.

63. CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

With permission of the Councillors present item 8.2 **26/03453/OUT Devonport House, Durley Park** - Outline planning application for up to 55 dwellings and associated infrastructure including access improvements, with all matters reserved except for access, on the agenda was brought forward.

A verbal presentation was given by the Developers Planning Agent that gave information in respect of this Outline Application as follows:

The introduction included the site forming part of the regulation 19 sites within the Local Plan. Issues in respect of access and egress at the junction of Durley Park and Durley Hill were mentioned together with acknowledgement of what factors would be required to mitigate these issues including enhancement to local bus stops, modification of the junction together with improvement to access to the town centre and its facilities.

The Agent has gone through a pre-app process with B&NES Council and residents and the main interest in the site has been around the junction onto Durley Hill. The Developer appreciates that the current access is not ideal, but they have put forward a detailed package of measures in their application in respect of the access. The Applicant has expressed a willingness in principal to mitigation and improvement works on the junction, including improvement of bus stops and improvement to them. They would also like the issue of access and highways to be considered in the context of reduced traffic movements compared to the ongoing lawful use of the site. A transport statement that will be submitted with the full application estimates that there will be a 50% reduction in traffic movements in the peak morning and peak evening periods and a 30% reduction in movements through during the course of a day.

Also, an important factor at that junction is that there have been no reported accidents in the last five years and in the last ten years there have been only two reported slight accidents. This is clearly an argument that the development would not have a risk to safety or an adverse impact on the transport network so we think that the test set out in national policy and local policy are met.

To sum up we want to deliver 55 much needed homes on this site with a variety of sizes and variety of tenures and we think that there are no barriers to get this produced within the plan period. We think that this is a good fit for Keynsham in the context of strategic development at Hicks Gate as well. So, we respectfully ask the Town Council to support the application.

Residents were invited to speak as follows:-

Tom Roberts

In respect of the mitigating factors mentioned by the Agent I could not see anywhere within the reports submitted the possibility of a contribution towards a pedestrian crossing and nothing about the junction itself.

Also, there was reference to appendix X which is the delineation of the visibility splays but I could not find this or any diagram within the report.

The access road is Durley Park itself which is a private lane up to the site. The junction is where Durley Park meeting Durley Hill and is parallel to Durley Lane with 2 metres between them and Old Bristol Road (that rat run due to the gap in the ring road) directly opposite. What we have in effect there is a five path crossroads and at the moment there is not traffic management at all with users taking chances. There is no ordering of traffic flow at all.

It is anticipated that traffic numbers will increase due to large development proposed at Hicks Gate and possibly with the amendments to be made to the A4 bypass, particularly at times of rush hour. I ask the Council to oppose the application because it is back to front. This is an outline application detailing layout, scale and design with the housing plans reserved for later and are only illustrative. The only one matter that the Developer asks to have improved in detail now is the access, and access is what the B&NES Council's Officers doubt. In March, seen within the documents a Senior Planning Officer said that the road safety issues at the junction relating to the interaction with Durley Lane would need to be reviewed, that review has never been done. In June, Highways Officers advised that the access road can never be constructed to an adoptable Highways Standard. The Officer concluded that to quote "concern remains for the development to be served by a safe and suitable access". The Developers have quoted that no changes are proposed to the existing junction with the A4175 (Durley Hill). At the pinch point it is only just large enough for one car to pass through, there is nothing that can be done to rectify this as the land drops away. The heart of the problem has been kicked into the long grass as a concern and we as residents all attended the information day that was our overriding priority concern. We were given absolutely no plans and had to talk through our concerns with the Developers. We were told that there were talks happening in the background but this was not forthcoming and we had to go through the consultation process, reacting to a proposal blind about the fundamental issue of the safety at the access.

Sightlines at the junction are not mentioned at all, appendix X is missing, and the only access point stops at the mouth of Durley Park. Even the Council's own Draft Local Plan which proposes this site for development states it requires safe vehicular access. They have already flagged this. The site is proposed for a high proportion of social housing which means that there will be young families, children, elderly that do not actually have use of cars all having to use this one junction seven days a week, at different times of the day, a junction that will be

new to them, their visitors and those delivering parcels to them. The Officers themselves in the report state that the residents' movements will be very different from the linear flow of office workers arriving in the morning and leaving at the end of the day. If the access road can never be adopted who maintains it keeps it safe and stops people from parking on it if the actual estate does not provide any parking.

The Developers consultation report records a call for a full safety audit at the junction and access road. No such audit has been produced. We recognise that Keynsham needs homes and there are developments that are at a level where they allow for better facilities that this proposal. This is a marooned site that actually would reach its best potential as office space.

Safe access really must come first and not what is actually to be built. Officers have suggested exploring an access onto Durley Hill from the west of the development site. So they may see this as the potential solution. It would be interesting to know if this has been explored.

Note: There are no visual plans for such an access as it needs to be explored.

A request was made by the resident that the Town Council request that an independent safety audit be undertaken in respect of the proposed access and junction.

The Developer confirms that they had been requesting a proper dialogue with the Highways and Planning Officers since the pre-application commenced. We are hoping that now the outline application has been submitted we can have that dialogue. We are quite willing to consider improvement that may need to be made to the junction.

The accidents that are occurring are regular near misses and minor bumps but that still leaves debris at the scene.

RESPONSE FROM THE AGENT.

We were hoping through the pre-process to get a steer from the Highways Authority on what might be a preferred solution. So as part of our application we have not put any proposal forward on land outside our ownership, so we are hoping that it comes out through the consultation process and the determination of the application. There are no firm measures that have been submitted but we have expressed a willingness to look at such measures proportionally.

We will look into the matter of Appendix X, this should be within the Transport Report.

Professor David Nutt

We object to the current outline planning submission re the Devonport House site on these grounds.

1. The planned vehicular access via Durley Park is wholly unsuitable for a development of 50+ homes plus businesses

Specifically

a. The current road is single lane and the proposal of having a couple of passing places will be inadequate for the inevitable expansion of car and van numbers.

b. The removal of the dedicated footpath separate from the road will endanger pedestrians and deter walking so conflict with current active travel requirements.

c. Entrance into, and especially exit from, Durley Park onto Durley Hill is dangerous because of the poor line of sight visibility. Given the isolated location of the development will likely require each home to have at least one car the chances of serious vehicle accidents are very high. You should be aware there was serious crash just a few weeks ago at this junction.

d. If the current Highway plan for a two-way cycle lane on the Durley Park side of Durley Hill is enacted then the risks to cyclists will be significant: motor vehicles will have to enter deep across the cycle lane in order to see if they can safely exit Durley Park.

e. The current plans for traffic flow in Durley Park involve refuge places to allow vehicles to pass oncoming vehicles including rubbish collection lorries. The planned refuges are barely wide enough for cars to pass a lorry and would not allow vans or other lorries to pass without risk of harm to the protected trees. Moreover, vehicles passing each other would encroach on the "pseudo-footpath" so limit pedestrian movements and potentially put them at risk of harm. To quote from the Highway Officers report " *it is clear that this site access route could never be constructed to an adoptable highway standard". P94 of Document-C58F2F2BFBFA311C236AD786942B6BB0.pdf*

f. An increase in traffic flow into and out of Durley Park will make pedestrian's crossing Durley Hill to and from the bus stop towards Bristol even more dangerous than it is today, and likely impossible for old people, those in wheelchairs and parents with children in pushchairs. Given 45% of the new dwellings must be affordable homes there will be a significant increase in the number of people with these needs.

2. Our second major objection is that this development seems unnecessary given the massive expansion of housing planned for BANES residents at the Hick's Gate development which dwarfs what will be gained on the Devonport House site. The Hick's Gate residents will have much better access to Keynsham from the proposed new bus transport hub at Hick's Gate and if they choose to use the cycle lanes on Durley Hill they will rarely encounter any vehicles endangering their path when exiting Durley Park.

Taken together we think the current proposals are not well thought through and likely to lead to significant risks to drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. We recommend the Council reject the proposals until these issues have been properly addressed, and all solutions approved by Highway and Traffic experts.

James Sollars

Firstly, what do they propose to do about the added traffic that will be using Durley Park when exiting onto Durley Hill?

Secondly, what do they propose to do to help with added traffic movements in Durley Park as there will be upwards of at least 55 more vehicles with the likelihood of 100+ as most homes now own 2 vehicles and the probability of bicycles, pushchairs and scooters etc?

Thirdly, as more vehicular traffic will be entering and exiting onto Durley Hill such as deliveries etc, will there be an upgrade to make it safer to exit Durley Park and Durley lane with a traffic calming scheme, if so, what would this mean regarding queues of vehicles that may accumulate outside our property, as we already get fumes into our house and garden from cars and heavy traffic, including buses.

Fourthly, will there be better and safer access to bus stops and more buses for those that need to use them and better and safer ways for parents and children to be able to cross Durley Hill safely?

At present the speed limit signs are a bit ambiguous to say the least and I feel that proper speed restricting schemes should be implemented as a priority, I have on many occasions been in the front garden of my property where some vehicles have been in well excess of the speed limit.

I would like to finish by asking the developers representative a final question, did your company buy Kew Cottage?

Nigel Ottley

I have a couple of comments that I would like to make in regard to the major road safety problem arising from this proposal.

Durley Hill is considered to have a gradient around 10 to 15 %, moderate to steep, the top end being the steep bit. An ordinary bicycle freewheeling down a hill can easily reach 25 to 45 mph. The braking distance at 20 mph is 20 to 60 feet on dry roads and the perception and reaction delay adds 37 feet at 10 mph (bicycle NSW). At 25 mph on a 10% gradient this distance increases to 300 feet. This suggests that when a freewheeling bicycle is outside Durley Cottage and a car pops out of Durley Park the chances are that it will not stop in time to avoid a collision or possibly end up in the road. The length dramatically increases in the wet or in the dark.

For two months around September the conker trees drop leaves, conkers and shells onto the road in quantities that make the road conditions worse for two wheeled vehicles especially bicycles. If the road was adopted there would be a council cost to clear it to make it safe. If the road was not adopted then the new house owners would have to pay. They would already have a monthly grounds upkeep bill and the full repair and maintenance cost of the road would have to be part of that. The cost of the upkeep of the road could be enormous.

It is also very obvious that the proposal has no regard to B&NES Draft Local Plan 2025 which suggests amongst other things 'development is likely to be restricted to two storeys' and to include '1000sqm of class E' space.

63.1 26/03453/OUT Devonport House, Durley Park

Outline planning application for up to 55 dwellings and associated infrastructure including access improvements, with all matters reserved except for access.

Having listened to the Developers Agent's presentation, residents (from the Durley Park area) comments and the views of Keynsham Town Councillors, the planning and development Committee resolved the following:

It was RESOLVED that Keynsham Town Council Planning and Development Committee formally objects to planning application 26/03453/OUT and requests that B&NES Council REFUSE the application unless and until the applicant has demonstrated, through robust and independently verified technical evidence, that a safe, suitable, accessible and deliverable access solution can be provided for the proposed development.

The Committee further requests that no approval be granted on the basis of unspecified future mitigation or a willingness by the applicant to consider improvements. Any required highway, pedestrian, cycling, crossing and public transport improvements must be clearly identified, technically assessed, legally secured, funded and demonstrably deliverable.

The Committee specifically requests that an independent highway safety audit be undertaken before the application is determined, including a full assessment of the Durley Park/Durley Hill junction, visibility, pedestrian and cyclist safety, cumulative traffic impacts and the interaction with Durley Lane and surrounding highway infrastructure.

Until those matters have been satisfactorily resolved and the necessary mitigation has been demonstrated to be deliverable, the Town Council considers that the proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would provide a safe and suitable access and should therefore be refused.

The Committee therefore considers that the application is premature and inadequately evidenced in respect of its access arrangements and is therefore contrary to Policy ST7

of Bath and North East Somerset adopted Placemaking Plan 2017 and Local Plan (Core Strategy) Partial Update Jan 2023.

63.2 26/03406/AR Esso Service Station Bath Road

Display of 1 no internally illuminated static D6 digital sign

RESOLVED:
To SUPPORT the application - There are no planning reasons to object to this application: - Keynsham Town Council consider that the proposal is in accordance with Bath and North East Somerset Council Policies D1 – D6 of Bath and North East Somerset adopted Placemaking Plan 2017 and Local Plan (Core Strategy) Partial Update Jan 2023.

63.3 26/03294/CDCOU 53 High Street

Prior Approval request for (Class MA) a proposed change of use of upper floors from financial services Use Class E(c)(i)) to 5no. self-contained flats (Use Class C3).

RESOLVED:
To SUPPORT the Change of Use application with the restriction of 4no. flats and not 5no. flats - There are no planning reasons to object to this application: - Keynsham Town Council consider that the proposal is in accordance with Bath and North East Somerset Council Policies D1 – D6 of Bath and North East Somerset adopted Placemaking Plan 2017 and Local Plan (Core Strategy) Partial Update Jan 2023.

63.4 26/03292/FUL 53 High Street

Installation of 6no. conservation rooflights and erection of bike store and 5no. Sheffield stands.

RESOLVED:
To OBJECT the application on the following grounds-

The planning proposal for conversion of the upper floors to accommodate five flats will constitute an overdevelopment within the building. Keynsham Town Council opposes to the proposal for a fifth flat in the attic and considers the installation of the 6no. conservation rooflights as inappropriate and contrary to policy D1b of the Bath and North East Somerset adopted Placemaking Plan 2017 and Local Plan (Core Strategy) Partial Update Jan 2023.

63.5 26/03433/FUL 5 Westfield Close

Erection of single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory.

RESOLVED:
To SUPPORT the application - There are no planning reasons to object to this application: - Keynsham Town Council consider that the proposal is in accordance with Bath and North East Somerset Council Policies D1 – D6 of Bath and North East Somerset adopted Placemaking Plan 2017 and Local Plan (Core Strategy) Partial Update Jan 2023.

TREEWORKS

63.6 26/03366/TPO Ground Floor Offices, Wessex House, Pixash Lane
Poplar T5 – fell. Poplar T6 – fell. Poplar T7 – fell.
Poplar T8 – fell.

RESOLVED:
Noted with comments – Keynsham Town Council will be guided by Bath and North East Somerset Council's Arboricultural Officer's decision.

64. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY B&NES COUNCIL

RESOLVED:
That the planning applications determined by B&NES Council be received and noted.

65. ITEM FOR INFORMATION

SPEED LIMIT – NOTICE OF MAKING. 26-033 Durley Hill (attached)

RESOLVED:
To receive and note the notice of making 30mph speed limit on the approach to the mini roundabout at the Durley Hill, Bristol Road and Old Bristol Road junction, to a point approximately 70m south of Hicks Gate roundabout.

66. LIST OF OUTSTANDING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED:
That the information be received and noted.

67. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED:
That the next scheduled meeting of this Committee will be held in ***The Space, Market Walk, Keynsham on Monday 26th October 2026 at 7.00 p.m.***

The meeting finished at 8.14 p.m.

Signed: (CHAIR) ..... Date: 26.10.26