

## **MILBORNE PORT PARISH COUNCIL**

### **Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at 6.45pm at the Town Hall**

**Present:** Mr M Ritchie (Chair), Mr J Oldham, Mr R Tizzard, Mr T Campbell, Mr R Douglas, Mrs A Flynn and Mr C Laughton

**Also Present:** Emma Curtis – Parish Clerk

#### **Public Question Time**

There were 16 members of the public in attendance.

A man commenced Public Question Time by voicing concerns over communication and asked whether anything had proceeded with the parish magazine. Mr Oldham responded that discussions were ongoing and a meeting due to take place in March. Mr Laughton commented that he had recently seen a copy of the South Petherton magazine which was a good example.

Another gentleman commented that he felt the Parish Council were reluctant to take the Parish Plan survey at face value due to comments made by Mr Douglas at a recent meeting. Mr Douglas refuted this comment saying that he had a professional reputation to maintain and that he had simply been reporting the statistics from the survey which had only been completed by a minority of residents. The gentleman stated that from those that did respond, 72% were against further development in the village.

Another man mentioned that the Parish Council had been soliciting feedback from residents and queried what the point was if only a small percentage of the village responded to the survey. Mr Douglas stated that it was an attempt to engage with the village and that a response of 22% was not the majority of residents. The man responded that the Parish Council response to SSDC in January was at variance with the response of the survey. Mr Douglas responded that the Parish Council were trying to be pragmatic and that if the planning application was approved trying to be objective to gain the best out of a bad situation. The man responded that there was a degree of frustration within the Working Group as it was felt the response in January was not as clear as it could have been and that it had come across that the Parish Council were in favour of the development. He stated that he had spoken with Lee Walton, Planning Officer, who had confirmed he had taken the January response from the Parish Council as support for the development and that he had noted a change in tone between the November response and January response. He commented that he felt the tone of the Parish Council was unfortunate. Mr Oldham commented that he had engaged in conversation with the previous SSDC Planning Manager who had said that to be taken seriously the Parish Council should comment on planning Material Considerations. A man asked if another planning application for 65 dwellings was submitted, would the Parish Council support this if changes were made?

Mr Campbell stated he had also had a conversation with Lee Walton that day and that his conversation was at variance to the man in the public with Mr Walton commenting he felt the development would go ahead. Mr Campbell expressed that although the Parish Council were keen to get the best deal possible with the developers, this did not mean they support the development and it was a question of objectivity.

Mr Douglas commented that members of the public had more influence over the Area East Committee than the Parish Council commenting that it was a working party from Gainsborough who had managed to get that application sent to appeal.

A further man questioned Mr Douglas about his professional background, title and qualifications asking why he hadn't used his professional skills to find out why there was a limited response to the Parish Plan survey. Mr Douglas responded with details of his professional background and said he had done the best he could with the statistics received while trying to maintain objectivity. The man asked whether Mr Douglas had received a second opinion, Mr Douglas responded he had not and had no need to.

A gentleman said that he felt the Parish Council should make it clear that they would prefer no development at all. Mr Douglas said this was in the January response to SSDC. The gentleman responded that this did not come through and it had appeared the Councils view had softened.

Mr Tizzard stated that he had been tasked with drafting the response on behalf of the Parish Council and that he had drafted it with objectivity on behalf of the planning committee. He stated that as a chartered surveyor he was involved in property and had a good understanding of the reality of today's planning world. Mr Tizzard commented that he was not surprised to hear from a member of the working Group that Mr Walton accepted the principle of development on the land and that the lack of five-year land supply overrules the Local Plan. He stated that his personal view was that if a site was to be developed within the village then it was sensible to look for the most suitable and least harmful site and that he felt that regarding the site in question it was inevitable that some development would take place. He commented that the UK is in a housing crisis and that the government were tasked with increasing housing numbers throughout the country. He commented that he had intended the response to be objective and creative should development be granted on the site. There were community benefits which the site could offer and these had been referred to in the committees response.

A man asked Parish Councillors if they knew who owned the field adjacent to the proposed site as the response had asked for road access without ransom to support future development. Mr Laughton responded that one field was owned by Somerset County Council as it was used as the school football field. Mr Tizzard responded that none of the fields immediately adjacent were owned by the Tizzard family and that he thought the field adjoining may still be owned by a Mr Parker. The man asked why the Parish Council had responded in the manner that they had, and Mr Tizzard replied that he felt the man was doing the Parish Council a grave injustice as his slant on the response was not justified. He went on to state that SSDC had issued a paper suggesting a number of sites for future development within the village. SSDC had proposed both the Redcliffe Homes site and the land adjoining as one proposition. The Parish Council had asked that the combined sites be considered as two separate issues. He stated that if development were to happen on the site then the junction would require improvement and that it would seem prudent to improve the junction to a standard which would accommodate more houses in the future, should they happen. He concluded that none of this meant the Parish Council supported the development as proposed but that it had made objective suggestions to make the development, should it happen, more acceptable and to provide the most community benefits.

Mr Ritchie called time on Public Question Time at this point as it had overrun its 30-minute period.

- 1. Apologies for Absence:** None received.
- 2. Declarations of Interest:** Mr R Tizzard, agenda item 4 application no 17/04849/FUL Venn Farm, *brother is the landowner and applicant but that he had no personal*

*interest in the land or business*

3. **Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2018** were approved and signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

4. The following **Planning Applications** were considered:

**17/04849/FUL** Erection of a new agricultural building for the use as a milking parlour  
*Venn Farm, London Road*

**No Objections**

**18/00052/FUL** The erection of a single storey rear extension  
*4 Russell Place*

**No Objections**

5. The following **Planning Approvals** were noted:

**17/04653/FUL** Erection of a detached double garage (revised application)  
*Roofview, Station Road*

**17/04553/FUL** Alterations and the erection of two storey rear extension and balcony and erection of single storey link extension to dwelling. Conversion of garage to provide additional living accommodation. Erection of garage/studio building and a wood shed.

*Wick Cottage, Wick Road*

**17/04593/FUL** Internal alterations and change of use of building to 1 No.4 bedroom dwelling and 1 No. mixed use commercial/residential unit

*Post Office, High Street*

**17/04382/FUL** Carrying out internal and external alterations to include refurbishment of the old stables, old butlers accommodation, scullery and garage and the erection of an extension to form media/games room

*Ven House, London Road*

6. The following **Notification of Appeal Decision** was noted:

**17/00570/OUT** Outline application for the erection of 1 No. storey dwelling and garage

*112 Combe Hill – Appeal allowed subject to conditions*

**Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/R3325/W/17/3181937**

7. The date of the next Planning Committee meeting was confirmed as **Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018.**