

## **MILBORNE PORT PARISH COUNCIL**

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

**Present:** Mr T Watts (Acting Chair), Mr R Lockey, Mr R Biss, Mrs A Flynn, Mr J Edmonds, Mr R Douglas and Mr C Laughton

**Also Present:** District Councillor Sarah Dyke  
Emma Curtis – Parish Clerk

Mr Watts agreed to be acting Chairman in the absence of both the Planning Committee Chairman and Parish Council Chairman. Mr Watts confirmed that the meeting was not a public meeting but a meeting of the Parish Council and therefore would adhere to the agenda and the 30-minute period allowed for Public Question Time. Mr Watts suggested that members of the public raise their comments and questions during public question time and they would be answered by Mr Beaver and Mr Craddy during their presentation.

Mr Chris Beaver introduced himself as Planning Consultant from Planning Sphere Limited and his colleague Luke Craddy Transport Consultant for Redcliffe Homes. Mr Beaver confirmed that Redcliffe Homes had the option to purchase the site along Station Road.

#### **Public Question Time**

There were twenty members of the public in attendance.

One gentleman asked whether an access assessment had been undertaken for the duration of building occurring on the site and if a highways assessment was available.

A lady questioned why the meeting was not a public meeting. Mr Watts commented that it had been felt by the Planning Chairman that it was not yet appropriate for a public meeting due to no application having yet been submitted, but that if he was Chairman it would have been a public meeting. Mr Watts stated that Redcliffe Homes would come back at a later date for an open public meeting and reiterated that at this point no planning application had been submitted.

A lady requested that the Redcliffe Homes representatives look at the traffic already parked along North Street proving that it was a one-way road already with the extra traffic caused by the proposed site. She also stated that Milborne Port had received its quota of housing up until 2020. Mr Watts commented that the South Somerset Local Plan only gave minimum figures, not maximum.

Another man mentioned that houses next to the site boundary had not received notification of the proposed planning application and that the proposed car park was just 20 feet from his house. He also mentioned that the housing target in the South Somerset Local Plan was 279 and that around 220 had already been built leaving 7 per year until 2028. Councillor Dyke intervened and said that the number stated was not actually a target but a figure to which another man responded it was an objectively assessed figure. Mr Douglas commented that any issues with these figures should be directed at South Somerset District Council who produced the plan and not the Parish Council.

A gentleman asked what consideration had been given to those people whose lives would be interfered with should the planning application be approved. He also questioned what research had been conducted about protected hedgerows and trees.

A further member of the public asked whether an infrastructure assessment had been undertaken to assess water, gas and electricity supplies. He also asked what transportation and highways assessments had been undertaken evaluating the impact onto the High Street.

Another member of the public asked what the height of the new dwellings would be adjacent to the current Bazzleways Homes.

Mr Edmonds commented he felt that the village needed a new grocery shop and industrial units.

- 1. Apologies for Absence:** Received from Mr M Ritchie and Mr J Oldham
- 2. Declarations of Interest:** None received.
- 3. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> May** were agreed and signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting by acting Chairman Mr Watts.
- 4. Presentation from Mr Chris Beaver, Planning Consultant, on behalf of Redcliffe Homes regarding proposed outline planning application for 65 dwellings on Station Road:** Mr Beaver confirmed he was presenting on behalf of Redcliffe Homes and that the company would be progressing and submitting a planning application to the SSDC Planning Department. Mr Beaver stated that baseline surveys had been conducted over the past nine months and these had formed the draft plans for the estimated 65 dwellings. He confirmed that the plans were not yet finalised and that Redcliffe will be open and transparent and listen to members of the public. Mr Beaver commented that once the application had been submitted to SSDC that all comments should be passed directly to SSDC. He mentioned that the development was a mixed ten-year housing scheme with a percentage of affordable homes and all homes would be no more than two storeys high.

Mr Caddy confirmed that a highways and transport assessment had been undertaken prior to the plans being prepared which considered the impact on the road network in Milborne Port. This assessment studied the context of the village and its facilities. Mr Caddy confirmed that in the plans there would be new access on to Station Road and that improvements would be made to the Wheathill Lane junction which is a substandard junction along with adjusted positioning of Wheathill Lane and an extended footway. Mr Caddy mentioned that a study had been undertaken considering the capacity at junctions and that the village was not experiencing any significant delay at junctions meaning this would not restrict potential for planning. Mr Douglas responded that the delay at junctions was hugely significant and that the assessment team should go back to the drawing board. Mr Caddy continued and said that the carriageway at the edge of Coldharbour did not need to be that wide and adjustments could be made.

In response to some questions asked during Public Question Time Mr Beaver confirmed that should planning permission be granted that a construction phase management plan would be agreed with SSDC. He also apologised that some houses appeared to have not received their leaflets but encouraged people to give their feedback to Redcliffe Homes. He commented that Redcliffe Homes were a responsible developer and transparent in their plans.

Regarding the amenity question raised, Mr Beaver stated that developers are required to consider these including overlooking existing properties and adhere to planning standards. He commented that there was no planning law entitling people to a "right to a view" and that an arboricultural assessment had been undertaken and root protection zones identified so there would be limited tree removal. To conclude, Mr Beaver confirmed that no homes would exceed two storeys.

Mr Watts asked Councillors to make ask questions and make comments and the following points were raised:

Mr Laughton asked how many people were in the team who had conducted the traffic survey as congestion was an issue now and would only be exacerbated with the new development. He suggested that the team come back and spend all day assessing the traffic flow throughout the village to get an accurate assessment.

Mr Lockey commented that saying there was no traffic delay was proof they had not done their homework. He said that that the new development would be extremely inappropriate for the increase in traffic it would bring and that this would have a huge impact on traffic at school drop off and pick up times. He commented that the safety of school children crossing the road was unsafe now, and would be made extremely worse. He agreed with Mr Laughton that junctions in the village already caused a significant delay. He questioned the proposed layout of Coldharbour stating that the delivery lorries to the Co-Op would not be able to reverse in to deliver. To conclude he commented that even if people were not entitled to a view, they were entitled to light. Mr Craddy responded to Mr Lockey that the increase in traffic would not exacerbate safety issues.

Mr Douglas questioned whether, in their professional opinion, if they thought the SCC Highways guidance was current best practice.

Mr Biss commented that he had concerns that no new utility supplies had been installed in the village despite the growth in housing developments. He also voiced concern about who would maintain open areas and trees in the proposed site. Mr Beaver commented that it would be likely a private management company would be responsible. Mr Laughton responded that the Bellway and Cavanna sites were run by management companies and that the parking there was awful and suggested Mr Beaver and Mr Craddy paid a visit to those sites.

Mrs Flynn stated that the road by the school was already narrow and single file due to the volume of traffic and congestion. She commented that there was only one shop in the village and the delivery lorry causes congestion more than once a day. Mrs Flynn mentioned that another housing development in the village had been turned down despite changes being made to the plans and that the village needed a varied housing mix and new shop.

Mr Edmonds stated that 65 houses on the proposed site was stupid and should be reduced to at least 30.

To conclude Mr Watts commented that with forty years on the Council he would really like to see a new shop in the village and if put on the proposed site this would alleviate lorry access and allow the road to be widened. Mr Watts stated that he felt

if this planning application was successful then the fields behind would more than likely be developed on a through road from each site would alleviate traffic issues on Wheathill Lane.

5. The following **Planning Approval** was noted:

**17/01517/FUL** Conversion of existing workshop garage to dwelling  
*Swatchford Cottage, Lower Kingsbury*

The following **Planning Refusal** was noted:

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

6. The date of the next Planning Committee Meeting was confirmed as **Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2017.**

DRAFT