

**Hemyock Parish Council**

**Meeting to consider Planning Application 16/00918/MOUT**

**Held in Forbes Lounge, Parish Hall, Hemyock at 7.30pm on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

Subject	Action
<p><b>1. <u>Present</u></b>                      Mr S Clist (Chair), Mr R Calcraft, Mr P Doble, Miss P Lawrence, Mr N Moon, Mr L Povah, Mrs H Stallard, Mrs D Evans (Parish Clerk) and members of the public.  <b>Apologies:</b> Mr T Barton, Ms J Pritchard and Mr N Punnett were excluded from the meeting due to their pecuniary interest as members of the Upper Culm Community Land Trust (UCCLT), a joint applicant on this planning application.</p>	
<p><b>2. <u>Declarations of Interest</u></b>                      No interests were declared.                      Dispensations – Mrs H Stallard, a UCCLT member, requested a dispensation permitting her to speak at this meeting but not to vote on the matter. She considered this was in the interests of persons living in the parish. The clerk outlined the current advice received from the Monitoring Officer at MDDC and the process for the dispensation. The council considered her request. Some concerns were expressed reference conflict of interest and undue influence on the decision making process.  <b>PROPOSAL:</b> The dispensation request is granted to allow Mrs H Stallard to speak at the meeting but not vote on the matter.  <b>PROPOSED:</b> Mr N Moon  <b>SECONDED:</b> Miss P Lawrence  <b>DECISION:</b> passed. 3 in favour, 3 against. The chairman had the casting vote and voted for the proposal.</p>	
<p><b>3. <u>Public Participation</u></b>                      The following comments were made:-</p> <p>3.1 The village does not want any more houses. There is already too much traffic and too many commuters.</p> <p>3.2 It is already a struggle to get doctor’s appointment in the village.</p> <p>3.3 Why doesn’t the UCCLT purchase other houses in the village that are for sale instead of building on green fields?</p> <p>3.4 The village needs more affordable open market houses.</p> <p>3.5 Is there a demand for more open market houses? Many in the village remain unsold.</p> <p>3.6 MDDC’s local plan policy states that the number of open market houses in a development should only be enough to subsidise the affordable homes and lower than the number of affordable.</p> <p>3.7 Can the village sewer cope? Isn’t it already struggling?</p> <p>3.8 Is there capacity at the school?</p> <p>3.9 There are other brown field sites in the village that should be considered before any development on a green field site.</p> <p>3.10 West of England Developments, the joint applicant, is shown as having gone into liquidation at Companies House. During the meeting the clerk checked online with Companies House and it was clarified that the applicant, West of England Development Taunton No 2 Ltd, is registered with Companies House.</p> <p>3.11 It was suggested that the council must have been aware that Griffin Close was phase 1 of 2.</p> <p>3.12 DCC has made comment that it requires additional information reference flooding and surface water.</p> <p>3.13 Access at the school is already a known problem. Accessing the development from Logan Way will increase this problem further, putting children’s lives at risk. Why can’t the site be accessed from Griffin Close or elsewhere?</p> <p>3.14 Mrs H Stallard reported that the UCCLT met with MDDC January 2013 and proposed 25 affordable homes and 14 open market houses. At that time MDDC informed the UCCLT that it could only submit an application for 12 affordable homes. A few months later it informed</p>	

<p>the UCCLT it could submit a planning application for all 25 affordable homes but by then the government funding had closed and the opportunity was lost. A recent leaflet drop to over 700 homes in the parish revealed 31 expressions of interest in affordable homes.</p>	
<p><b>4. <u>Planning Application 16/00918/MOUT</u></b>                  The councillors considered the application. Concerns raised included:- access, green field site, construction traffic, no jobs created by development, surface water issues, no visual impact assessment, lack of car parking spaces, sustainability, broadband, school, Doctors, no consultation with South West Water reference sewer capability and the ration of affordable housing to open market.  <b>PROPOSAL:</b> The application is not supported for the following reasons:- the development is outside of the village settlement limit; there are already issues with access to school, there would be an increase in traffic, increasing the danger to children accessing the play area; it is on a green field site; construction traffic is a concern; no jobs are created and carbon emissions are increased; public transport is limited to the No 20 bus which does not provide a service to and from Taunton for normal working hours; local roads are narrow and winding; access to medical services will come under increased pressure; consultation with South West Water is vital as it is believed that the sewer cannot cope with further development and the ratio of open market to affordable contravenes local planning policy.  <b>PROPOSED:</b> Mr N Moon  <b>SECONDED:</b> Mr R Calcraft  <b>DECISION:</b> passed (5 in favour). Mr S Clist abstained from the vote.                   Mr Stephen Major was thanked for his impartial expert planning advice.</p>	
<p><b>5. <u>Date of next full council meeting</u></b> Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August at 7.30pm, Forbes Lounge, Parish Hall</p>	

Meeting closed 9.10pm

Signed ..... Dated .....