

Clutton Parish Council

Saturday 7th February 2015, 10am in the Village Hall

Submissions from members of the public

1. A resident commented on the **layout** of the proposed Maynard Terrace and quoted the appeal inspectors comments that *'it should be possible in principle to accommodate 36 dwellings on the site without significantly harming the character and appearance of the area. Should the detailed submitted at Reserved Matters stage fail to demonstrate adequate regard for and sensitivity to the site's surroundings, the Council would be entitled to refuse permission'*. The submitted **design** and **layout** does not reflect the inspectors comments. This cheap-looking, urban design is inappropriate in this rural setting. The **Coal authority** have said that the available info fails to demonstrate whether or not the coal mining legacy affecting this site has been taken into consideration in the layout of the site, particularly with regards to the precise location of the mine entry and its associated zone of influence (20m radius from the mine entry) within the site. Building over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry raises significant safety and engineering risk and should wherever possible be avoided. The Coal authority has asked for Coal Mining Risk Assessments Report or similar. Therefore it is not possible to determine or assess the layout until the Coal authority has decided which areas of the site are 'Safe' to build due to surface coal, coal seams and the mine shaft. Apparently the surveyors this week have said that the mine shaft is only 40-50 ft deep, this is unlikely as there are mine workings from both Burchall's Colliery (1800's to 1921) 148ft deep and Greyfield pit (1833 to 1909) 900 ft deep that are close to Maynard Terrace so the mine entry identified by the Coal Authority could be connected with one of these. If it has filled up with water it is likely that the shaft would go down 40-50 ft until the water level.
2. A resident commented that he spoke out against the development at the previous stage. The site didn't meet necessary requirements to obtain planning permission yet the appeal was successful. He is disillusioned by the planning system and didn't feel that the people in official positions were working in the best interest of the residents. He thanked the Parish Council and felt they were doing a good job on behalf of the residents.
3. A resident stated that there were reasons for objecting to the design and appearance. The proposal does not respect the rhythm, balance and symmetry of the neighbouring terrace. As a resident of Maynard Terrace her own planning application for an alteration to the front of her house was refused as it did not respect the rhythm, balance and symmetry of the terrace. The materials are not sympathetic, there are no chimneys. It doesn't respect the building line with the new terrace straight onto the terrace with no front gardens. The layout could be improved by reversing the houses, respecting the existing building line with back gardens toward Maynard Terrace and leaving the hedge intact. Cars using the new development road, exiting onto Maynard Terrace will disturb the residents of no 17-21 Maynard Terrace as headlights will shine directly into their homes.
4. A resident spoke in support of the development as outline permission has already been given so now is the time to embrace the development. It was permitted when there was no plan in force and it was fought strongly by the Parish Council. This will happen so look on the positives as it will provide houses for young families and old people. The village is not picturesque and each estate in the village represents the houses of the time.
5. A resident said that he respected the views of the previous resident, but if houses are designed well they will age well. If they can't afford to do this development well then they shouldn't do it. Curo are not listening to comments that have been made previously. This development is contrary to the philosophy of Localism, it was

opposed by the Parish Council, turned down by committee three times, only to be overruled by a government inspector. The road side parking is inappropriate. The layout in the application does not show the surroundings and so it is not possible to assess it in relation to its surroundings. Parking Construction traffic on site B is not part of the development site will mean that the vehicles will have to drive through the protected ecological Zone. Experience from other sites cause concern that developers would rather pay fines than adhere to conditions applied on planning permission.

6. A resident commented that all other housing estates in the village are self contained cul-de-sacs – this one appears to create a circular race track for the young people in the village. There are a number of steps and steep slopes in the development which are not appropriate for the elderly or people with push chairs. The appeal inspector said of this development *'This is not to say that new housing must be delivered at any cost...if harm arising from the proposed development "significantly and demonstrably" outweighs the benefit, planning permission should be refused'* Curo should be asked to amend the plans to make it in-keeping with the village and this rural location.
7. A resident stated that Maynard Terrace is an undesignated heritage asset and its setting should be preserved and nearby development should be respect the character of the heritage asset. There needs to be a **Heritage review** and there has been no sign of one in the application
8. A resident stated that the village needs more bungalows, but it appears that that would not be viable. Low Houses/Bungalows would not dominate the terrace is these proposals do and the **scale** would be more appropriate to the surroundings. The roadside parking is in the wrong place. The current proposals will dominate the existing terrace as the houses are too far forward, not respecting the existing building line. The existing terrace will no longer be viewable from around the Parish.
9. A resident agreed with most of the points covered, but wanted it to be acknowledged that local democracy is hollow when the political monster is intent of destroying the countryside, and it is happening all over the country. Development sites are being allowed where there is not infrastructure and no opportunities for the new residents. There are still brownfield sites within the village that should be developed. The field was bought for opportunistic financial reasons and the development is all about finance and not about meeting local needs.
10. A resident stated that the proposals appear to be all about viability. She was resigned to the fact that the development would go ahead with the designs from the outline planning application. She could not believe it when she saw the urban designs within the reserved matters application. It will not look good.

Minutes of the meeting of the Council

Present: Councillors R. Naish (Chairperson), V. Adie, S. Dagger, J. Fletcher, I. Myatt, D. Phillips, S. Piddock, D Veale and D Worskett; Cllr. J. Sparks (District Councillor); Mrs H Richardson (Clerk); 73 members of the public.

Item

Action

18/15

Apologies, absences and declarations of interest

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs. Bailey, Starr, Mullins and Hillier. Cllrs. Naish and Piddock submitted requests for relief from the requirement to absent themselves from discussion of the matters relating to the planning applications for sites adjacent to Maynard Terrace and were granted dispensations for a period of 4 years, under section 33 of the Localism Act 2011. Cllr Dagger declared an interest in the proposals for Lower North End Farm.

19/15

The following planning applications were considered

a)14/05692/RES. Parcel 0006 Maynard Terrace: Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale)

It was reported that members of the planning working group had met and a summary of the issues raised at that meeting was circulated. It was also reported that representatives of the Parish Council had met with two senior officers from Curo and raised each of the issues identified by the working group. The overriding impression was that Curo believed that many of the problems raised could be fixed in engineering terms. It was noted that Curo had made it clear that the new urban design had not been driven by costs and indicated that the new design had been largely led by B&NES Urban designer. The Curo executives suggested that it would be possible to change some aspects of the design and specifications if permitted to do so by B&NES Urban designer.

The Parish Council had to deal with the legal process as it stands and that outline permission having been granted, the task at present was restricted to addressing the "reserved matters". However the inspector had made it clear that if an inappropriate design was presented that it can be refused.

It was recognised that there is a need for new housing to accommodate the young and the elderly and that the Parish Council has supported applications in the village that will help residents when proposed in the right place and designed in the right way.

The planning working group was recommending that the Parish Council object to this proposal as it was not compatible with 11 saved policies from the Local plan. As well as policies from the Core Strategy and NPPF.

Issues raised in the discussion which ensued included:

There is a need for housing for older people in particular that wish to downsize, but the proposals have not taken this into account.

There was a plan when the outline permission was granted, the previous local plan showed no requirement for development.

It was noted that the proposed junction change was still a contentious issue.

The layout does not respect the existing building line, and the position of the development creates a crowded appearance to the road which is a major design issue.

There is no provision for 1 bed homes and so residents will be penalised by

bedroom tax or within their benefits.

The process and design is all wrong.

28% of those wanted houses in Clutton want 1 bedroom homes. Car Parking will be a problem as 89% of Clutton residents own a car out of necessity and there are not enough parking spaces in the development. Curo have said in their application that they have observed in other areas of Clutton, people park on the pavements so the new residents can do the same. Just because there is a bad habit in the village, doesn't mean that it is acceptable.

All support has gone for the development as they have not delivered what was promised with regards to design. All Curo's credibility has gone.

The difference between the original plans and submitted plans is disingenuous. The Ward councillor reported that he had requested that this application be determined by committee as the outline application decision had been overturned and that there had been no core strategy in place at the time.

Curo had made the point at the meeting with representatives of the Parish Council that as a social landlord they are a not for profit organisation, all profits are put back into the company. In response to the request for 1 bedroom houses, they had explained they would be unable to turn a two bed house into two one bed units as they were only able to build 36 homes.

It was agreed with 8 votes in favour and 1 abstention that the Parish Council strongly object to the application citing incompatibility with many of the key "saved policies" and providing specific evidence of these incompatibilities.

b) 14/05831/FUL, Lower North End Farm, Lower Bristol Road: Construction of a fishing lake, car park, and access.

Councillor Steven Dagger left the room.

The planning working group recommended that the council should support this application with the condition that during construction the vehicles must use the Lower Bristol Road to the A37 and not come through the village. It is not good agricultural or grazing land. The landscape is not in its original state as there was a lot of earth moving by the engineers that built the railway. The proposal will require a lot of earth moving, but there don't appear to be any ecological considerations as it will be filled by natural run off and any breach would flow away from the village. The site is barely overlooked and it will bring more business to the village.

Other comments included:

Concern about the state of the road during construction and the removal of waste. The vehicles will be covered in mud and lower Bristol Road is a narrow stretch of road used by villagers.

The timings of the vehicles should be restricted to avoid the rush hour and that they should be asked to clean the road periodically.

The facility would be an asset for the village

Concern about the danger of turning out onto the A37 at the end of Lower Bristol Road and the high speeds of vehicles on the A37, compared to the cooks Hill turning.

It was agreed that the Parish Council support the application with conditions in relation to the access route, the times of access and cleaning the road. 7 in favour and 1 abstention

Close: The meeting ended at 11.05am