

Hemyock Parish Council
Planning Meeting to discuss

Planning application 16/01772/MOUT. Outline for the erection of up to 40 dwellings (including affordable housing), public open space and associated infrastructure. Culmstock Road Hemyock Devon held at Healthy Living & Activities Centre, Hemyock at 7.30pm on 6th December 2016

Subject	Action
<p>1. Present Mrs H Stallard (Chair), Mr T Barton, Mr S Clist (Vice-Chair), Mr R Calcraft, Mr P Doble, Miss P Lawrence, Mr N Moon, Mr L Povah, Mr N Punnett, Councillor F Rosamond (District Councillor), Mrs D Evans (Parish Clerk), Tina Maryan, Planning Officer (MDDC), Simon Steele-Perkins (applicant) and members of the public. Apologies Ms J Pritchard (received and approved)</p>	
<p>2. Declarations of Interest/Dispensations The clerk declared that:- Mrs H Stallard & Mr N Punnett have a pecuniary interest as they are members of the Upper Culm Community Land Trust (UCCLT). The UCCLT has entered into discussions with the applicant reference the proposed affordable housing element of the application. However, they were granted a dispensation to speak but not vote on this matter at a meeting on 26th September 2016. Despite the above dispensation, in the interests of transparency and impartiality Mrs H Stallard passed the chairmanship on to Vice-Chair Mr S Clist for this meeting. Mr Moon had previously declared that he owned property in Castlepark, near to the proposed development site, but he believed this did not constitute a pecuniary interest. Mr T Barton declared that he had a pecuniary interest as he was a UCCLT member and he owned property abutting the proposed development. He requested a dispensation permitting him to speak (but not vote) on all matters regarding the Waddeton Park development. He considered that this was in the interests of persons living in the parish and that he had specialist knowledge of the proposed site. PROPOSAL: The dispensation request is granted to allow Mr T Barton to speak on matters reference Waddeton Park. This request to be valid until May 2019. PROPOSED: Mr N Moon SECONDED: Mr P Doble DECISION: passed. (all agreed). Mr S Clist and Mr N Punnett abstained from voting.</p>	
<p>3. Public Participation Members of the public were given the opportunity to express their views with regard to the proposed development. The following is a summary of comments made:-</p> <p>3.1 The roads around the village cannot cope with extra traffic. The recent flooding highlights the problems in the village. Drainage is poor. The development will add to these problems.</p> <p>3.2 The development is on higher ground than that of Castle Park, views and privacy will be lost. The school is at capacity and waiting times for an appointment at the doctors' surgery will increase.</p> <p>3.3 The village is in need of affordable housing, as demonstrated by the council's recent housing needs survey. Open market development is acceptable if it brings affordable homes. Most houses in Hemyock were built on green field sites.</p> <p>3.4 What will the impact be on the already overstretched infrastructure, not just in the village but along the valley? What guarantees are there that the number of houses will not increase from 40?</p> <p>3.5 The development will bring increased traffic to the village, impacting on the school and safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>3.6 The junction leading to the development will be in the middle of the voluntary one-way system that operates around the school, making the situation worse.</p> <p>3.7 The village is fine as it is and any development should be resisted.</p> <p>3.8 There are already 3 large coach-loads of children bussed to Uffculme School and back. Any increase in traffic will create further safety concerns.</p> <p>3.9 Residents of Castle Park report that the bank of St Margaret's Brook has eroded by 1 metre in 6 years - the site adjoining the bank is not suitable for development. The proposed footpath on edge of bank is not suitable; the bank cannot cope with this.</p> <p>3.10 Developing a site surrounding a cemetery is less than ideal.</p> <p>3.11 There is a real need for affordable housing in the village. Those not keen on further development in</p>	

<p>the village must reluctantly accept that it will provide desperately needed affordable housing.</p> <p>3.12 The application information uses old photographs which do not take into account the Griffin Close development. The pictures have been selected so that no traffic on the roads, giving a false impression of traffic volumes. Culmstock Road is already very busy.</p> <p>3.13 Is the approval of this application merely a formality?</p> <p>3.14 Hemyock is large enough, we must not lose its sense of community.</p> <p>3.15 The site will increase traffic movements within the village. No jobs are being created and residents will need to commute to work.</p> <p>3.16 Affordable housing is needed but why cannot other small villages take their share of housing? The roads in Hemyock are becoming dangerous for walkers, horseriders, cyclists, mobility scooter users etc.</p> <p>3.17 Hemyock is in an AONB and this should be protected. The development should be strongly opposed. A small development with a larger percentage of affordable homes would be acceptable.</p> <p>3.18 This site is outside of the settlement limit, why won't MDDC reject it? What is the point of a Local Plan if it does not prevent this sort of development?</p> <p>3.19 The sewerage system cannot cope with current demand. Houses at Longmead regularly have sewerage problems when there is heavy rainfall.</p> <p>3.20 Infrastructure should come first then houses.</p> <p>3.21 What about provision of nursing home type accommodation?</p> <p>3.22 The development impacts on views across the valley. Waddeton will not develop the site, they will sell it on. What guarantees/assurances are there that the eventual builder will build what we want? Why is there a long road looping around the site to build just 5 bungalows?— this seems odd. Perhaps it will pave the way for more houses?</p> <p>3.23 The land is 4 metres higher than Castlepark. Privacy and views are greatly affected. What about light pollution? No employment, therefore increase in traffic.</p> <p>3.24 The village is big enough. Others should take some of the pain of development.</p> <p>3.25 Councillor Rosamond explained that the district is focusing on the main towns to provide the majority of new housing. However, having refused a planning application, MDDC recently lost the same application at appeal. The Planning Inspectorate ruled that MDDC did not have a sufficient 5-year housing supply and this had led to developers putting in more speculative planning applications. MDDC hope to resolve its supply when the new Local Plan is finally adopted, hopefully later next year.</p> <p>3.26 Tina Maryan (MDDC Planning Officer) explained the process she will go through to decide the outcome of this application. She will publish details of her pre-application advice with the applicant on the MDDC website. She will consult with statutory consultees from Highways, DCC education authority, SW Water and AONB and will weigh up the harm v the benefits of the development.</p> <p>3.27 Do DCC keep a record of other developments that have received permission but have not yet been built? If not, how does analysis of school place numbers allow for potential developments already in the pipeline? Tina will clarify with DCC.</p> <p>3.28 The clerk read a brief summary of comments from the AONB planning officer.</p> <p>3.29 The clerk summarised that the council had previously opposed the concept of this development and had made suggestions of amendments and additions to the outline plan in the event that planning permission was granted by MDDC. The clerk read the response from Waddeton.</p> <p>3.30 The clerk confirmed that she had asked that the parish council be involved in the 106 agreement negotiations between MDDC and the applicant. The planning officer confirmed that it was usually only between MDDC and the applicant. Simon Steele-Perkins agreed that the parish council could be included any discussions.</p>	
<p>4. <u>Consider the application and agree comments</u></p> <p>The councillors made their own comments and debated the merits of the planning application. The following is a summary of comments made:-</p> <p>4.1 There is a need for affordable homes in the village.</p> <p>4.2 SWW has confirmed to council that the sewage system is able to cope with additional housing.</p> <p>4.3 How sustainable is this development if residents have to travel to work?</p> <p>4.4 The erosion of St Margaret's Brook is an issue. Access to both sides of the bank from the development site is essential.</p> <p>4.5 Simon Steele-Perkins was thanked for taking account of the parish's feedback.</p> <p>4.6 Access around the whole cemetery is needed to trim hedges etc.</p> <p>4.7 How does this development reduce greenhouse gases, conserve AONB, protect the landscape, affect</p>	

- light pollution and improve transport?
- 4.8 There is a belief that planning permission will be granted regardless and therefore the parish council should not miss an opportunity to gain community land.
- 4.9 The planning officer clarified that the bar is set higher for developments within an AONB. She will look at the supply of affordable housing v impact on AONB.
- 4.10 The amenity land tied into a 106 legal agreement would be a great benefit to the parish.
- 4.11 If Hemyock must have extra housing let's ensure there is some gain for the parish.
- 4.12 Is this the right site for development?
- 4.13 Perhaps the right-hand side by St Margaret's Brook should be left untouched and only the left-hand side developed?
- 4.14 Has the visual impact of this development been properly considered?

After a lengthy discussion the following was proposed:-

PROPOSAL: the council supports the plan without the light green site (see parameter plan) on the right-hand side being developed.

PROPOSED: Mr P Doble

SECONDED: Mr R Calcraft

The following amendments were proposed

PROPOSAL: the council supports the plan without the light green site (see parameter plan) on the right-hand side being developed *with up to 40 dwellings to be constructed on the on the left-hand side of the site.*

PROPOSED: Miss P Lawrence

SECONDED: Mr N Moon

PROPOSAL: the council supports the plan without the light green site (see parameter plan) on the right-hand side being developed with up to 40 dwellings to be constructed on the on the left-hand side of the site, *subject to consultee comments being satisfied in particular from Highways, SW Water ref sewerage, AONB and a 106 legal agreement to include the dark and light green areas (defined on the parameter plan) being transferred to the parish council together with a commuted sum for maintenance purposes.*

PROPOSED: Mr S Clist

SECONDED: Mr N Moon

DECISION: passed. All agreed with the amendments.

Mr Povah suggested an alternative proposal which would oppose the application due to the proposed development of the right-hand side of the site. This was noted but not taken forward at this time as it was a direct negative of the original proposal.

The final motion was then considered.

PROPOSAL: the council supports the plan without the light green site (see parameter plan) on the right-hand side being developed and up to 40 dwellings on the left-hand side of the site being developed. Subject to consultee comments being satisfied in particular from Highways, SW Water ref sewerage, AONB and a 106 legal agreement to include the dark and light green areas (defined on the parameter plan) being transferred to the parish council together with a commuted sum for maintenance purposes.

PROPOSED: Mr S Clist

SECONDED: Mr N Moon

DECISION: passed. All agreed.

Mr Povah's suggestion was not revisited as the above motion was passed.

5. Date of next Meeting Wednesday 7th December at 7.30pm, Forbes Lounge, Parish Hall

Meeting closed 10.20pm

Signed Dated