

**STOKENHAM PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 3RD MARCH 2016 IN THE
STOKENHAM PARISH HALL**

PRESENT:**COUNCILLORS:****P. SPENCE****MRS C. PACK****L. COWLEY****J. GARDNER****MRS P. DOUST****A. GOODMAN****MS. S. BLADON****T. HOEKSMAN****MRS C. PEARCE****Also in attendance: Gill Claydon – Parish Clerk****APOLOGIES;****COUNCILLORS:****C. ROGERS****T. LYNN****MRS S. O'DWYER****J. ANSELL****CLLR BRAZIL****1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors were reminded of their responsibility to continually update their Notice of Registerable Interests and were invited to state whether they had a declarable interest in any matter to be discussed during this meeting. None.

2. OPEN FORUM

Clare Pawley was present to comment on the Prideaux House application and noted she was the only person to have written expressing comments and wondered whether this was the village respecting the owner's need to sell. Susan Jamieson (nee Hannaford) was present to listen to the debate on this application. Clare Pawley felt the scheme was deeply insulting to the area showing five houses set back with the one on the eastern end appearing to get no light at all and the introduction of the colour and design was appalling. Firstly in order benefit from a balcony they were set on the wrong side for the angle of sun. Also the properties proposed rose 10 feet to the point all of which included glass as sketched which would impose five pillars of light coming back down the A379 line across a Nature Reserve and AONB. With the expanse of glass on the house adjacent, which tended to be illuminated all the time, this proposal could pollute the night sky further. It was unbelievable how the four houses at the front were sited as those using them would be looking into each other rather than outwards. She felt that this was overdevelopment of the site as the properties stretched from the holiday barns to the Broadwater property fencing. She also did not think there was enough parking for the properties proposed as the garages would be used for alternative reasons due to the size. Also the colours and portholes were a shocking introduction in this sensitive SSSI, AONB and Nature Reserve area. She was also advised that potentially a sale had fallen through in Florence Cottages because people now favoured going inland due to recent flooding. It was noted that there did not tend to be flooding in front of Prideaux House if the ley was kept freed but a lot of water came down from behind from a stream by Greyhomes but if developed there could be installed a large hard area which would disperse excess water. Clare Pawley felt this was bad design for which she was worried about permeability over the whole area and its knock on effect on the Torcross community. She did acknowledge that Torcross would like to see a suitable development of this area though. She personally felt that everyone wanted to ensure that the vendor was dealt with fairly and encouraged development but

were not in favour of this proposal. A question was raised with regard to the historic importance of this site due to D Day history. This was not felt to be the case as preservation of Prideaux House was not necessary. It was formerly a coaching station even before Torcross Hotel was built in 1889. Prideaux House did not have any outstanding features for such consideration.

3. MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous planning committee had been approved at full council and no further meetings held since then.

4. PLANNING & PLANNING MATTERS

Parish Council Observations (Object – Neutral – Support)

- 0309/16/FUL Erection of industrial building containing 3 workshops Fairfield Meadow, Orchard Way, Chillington – Ratified no objection noted February full council.
- 0310/16/CAC Erection of industrial building containing 3 workshops Fairfield Meadow, Orchard Way, Chillington – Ratified no objection noted February full council.
- 0433/16/OPA Outline application with all matters reserved for demolition of existing and erection of 9 No. new dwellings Prideaux House A379 Kiln Lane to Torcross Point, Torcross. – Parish Council noted the detail contained within the application information in that the planning officer had stated District was not happy with this proposal as the ideas put forward were not suitable for this site. Those present did not feel that this application was realistic for the area as it did not fit nor blend with existing parish structures. The application stated that surface water would be directed to the main sewer. However it was noted that Torcross suffered from sewage back-up so this proposal needed to consider soakaways and meet the SUDS criteria. A statement within the application said this proposal was not within 20 metres of a watercourse and this appeared to not consider the juxtaposition of the Slapton Ley so it was felt that the information provided was inaccurate or badly researched. It was noted that the rear houses would be overlooking the lower properties and there would therefore be a loss of their visual and private amenity. There was a concern raised on the effect of such proposal on the SSSI/AONB and Nature Reserve as the design of this development was not felt appropriate for this context. Due meeting consideration was given to the District Officer concern, as stated within the application, as to why this area was not being used for commercial/tourism etc and that there was no reason for it to be used for housing.

Objection as the design, raised ridge height, layout, appearance and materials were out of keeping with this SSSI/Nature Reserve and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Concern was put forward with regard to the proposed connection into the main sewer in this locality and such intention to place 9 properties into this system could be problematic therefore due regard should be given to SUDS. This proposal also sat close to the Slapton Ley and should have raised consideration with regard to further run off into an area that already floods. The rear properties were felt by their height and high use of glass to overlook the proposed front properties causing them a loss of amenity whilst also presenting increased light pollution in this sensitive area and were against the District core development plan policy. Parish Council noted that redevelopment was inevitable and would accept a suitable redevelopment of this site if it were in keeping with community need and added value to the area.

Clare Pawley and Susan Jamieson left the meeting.

5. OPEN SPACES, SPORT AND RECREATION PLAN

The projects and proposals put forward from the working parking were tabled with a schedule of need and sorted into to suitability to enable such information to be used to create a draft broad

parish plan. These initial projects were considered further and then prioritized so that they could be costed for inclusion in the plan.

- Allotments - This would serve parish wide and a call for suitable sites should be made and a list of those interested in acquiring such collected.
- Benches - These could be provided through enquiries for memorial benches with a contribution towards ongoing maintenance.
- Defibrillator - Stokenham and Chillington have static ones and the 1st Responders carry mobile ones.
- Signage for Orchards – This would be provided through the Orchard Link partnership/grant.
- Drainage of Helmers Playing Field – All future projects on this land depend on this being carried out. The cost for drainage was estimated to be £20,000 - £30,000.
- Bio-sewage treatment for the Helmers Playing Field area – This could be carried out when drainage was addressed. Probably £15,000- £20,000.
- Provision of an underground gas tank for the hall heating – This was felt to meet the open space Section 106 criteria and the installation of such down to the hall committee.
- Car park improvement at entrance – This would only require road planings to fill the holes and therefore this would be incorporated into other works and removed from the list.
- Helmers playing field works to the car park – Did not meet the Section 106 criteria.
- Ramp to bridge on the Helmers way side – Area owned by the residents and maintained by a management group. Technically difficult to implement and down to landowners.
- Chillington Community Hall extension – Did not meet section 106 criteria.
- Chillington outside toilets – Ongoing maintenance and the onus of requirement to clean such facility when district were closing public toilets. This was not within the Section 106 criteria.
- Older and disabled children’s play equipment – Swings and a slide for the disabled at double width on the grass bank could be considered.
- Play equipment at Beesands – Consideration with regard to relocating the play equipment due to ongoing maintenance when shingle breaches the area.
- Benches Helmers – Provided by the Chillington Community Association on their verandah
- Benches Chillington Orchard – Needed along with improving the access at the Summerye Lane edge of the woodland by putting down woodchip to create a better footpath and entrance.
- Footpaths – Parish council could consider improving certain stretches. Provision of footpaths from any future developments to be highlighted when applicable.
- Helmers Way land – Project area could accommodate a few allotment gardens or plant trees.
- Graveyard Extension – Project to cover the whole parish. Obtain facts and figures.
- Benches for Butterfly Field – To consider need and maintenance works to enhance use of this area.
- Bus shelters – Not a priority and more for County Highways to implement.
- Beesands car park – The suitable field had been bought.
- Chillington provision of a Car Park – Could consider if suitable land was offered or identified.
- MUGA – Retained awaiting future consideration are drainage of the land.
- Drainage in Chillington – The location of this request within Chillington was not understood.
- Stokenham Village Green – Currently it was not felt that there were enough Section 106 funds available to cover market value purchase and enhancements needed to sustain this

open space boundary works but would be kept on the project list in case the land came forward.

- New Permissive paths – Would be negotiated by parish council if a route identified.
- Coastal paths – Funding for works covered by English Nature.

Projects put forward needed to cover a broad area across the parish:

- Torcross – Butterfly field
- Kernborough – Nothing identified
- Stokenham – Play equipment and adult exercise equipment/Trim trail.
- Kellaton – Nothing identified.
- Beesands – Moving play equipment.
- Beeson – Beeson Orchard
- Hallsands – Nothing identified
- Chillington – Drainage of Helmers playing field

6. CORRESPONDENCE AND REPORTS

- The Chairman outlined a concern raised with regard to length of recent meetings. Consideration was given to further committees but this was felt to dilute the amount of councillors contributing to decisions. Therefore he proposed keeping planning within the main meeting and he would do all he could to ensure meetings ran to time. He asked that all councillors bring relevant papers to meetings having read them before the meeting and been on line to look at planning applications. To be concise with reports, not comment on everything on the table unless there was information to add. If he as Chairman tried to push meetings along quickly he asked that councillors not be offended.
- Transfer of land at Chillington. Due to recent chasing by parish council with regard to the encroachment of land by the placing of a bench and also payment for the works to the gate and fence posts an email was received from parish council solicitors. This email now sought to increase the original estimate for works from £600 to £800 – as there were 15 points raised for this transaction to £1200 as they stated that their charges already amounted to £1400. Initially a quote was provided and instructions sent in June 2014. This quote was for £250 (1.5hrs work) and an expected quick transfer (30% discount making hourly rate of £164.50). Due to various staff changes at District this matter just sat until February 2015 when the clerk chased progress. There has then followed some dialogue with regard to the need to erect a fence, seek repair of the gate/posts and ascertain the colours outlined on the location map. These were addressed and in the last week or so the encroachment of land had been raised and District had agreed to pay for the gate/posts and write a letter to the neighbour who was encroaching. Apart from these points very little else had been done by the parish council solicitors. Should clarification be requested with regard to the increased charges, Yes.
- Cllr Gardner noted he had been invited by Dr Sarah Wollaston MP to attend a meeting in the next few days with regard to Slapton Line and coastal erosion.
- The Chairman noted he attended the Slapton Line Partnership Steering Group and that they had one more week of investigative works to complete. Thereafter the repair was to be progressed by the Environment Agency without delay. The central section of the promenade well had no void although either end there was but basically the main substance of the wall was still intact. They were already sheet piling the road and expected to finish by Easter with the Torcross car park cleared and open. In the wider sense the decision was taken to apply for funding to produce a Beach Management Plan. A firm of engineers was to produce such and then they would seek funding from Government or elsewhere for safeguarding the road for the next period of ‘holding the line’. There had been heated discussion but the Chairman had

managed to broker a firm commitment that the Beach Management Plan would contain all engineering solutions regardless of such designation criteria by the SSSI/English Nature etc as residents had intimated that previously solutions had been ruled out as not allowed under certain designations. A full consideration of all options would then ensure that this myth was scotched. All solutions could then be tested for cost benefit and then the agencies pick one. It would take a year for this review to be completed.

7. NEXT MEETING

Full Council would be held on the third Thursday in March and the next planning committee would be held on the first Thursday in April, if planning applications received could not wait until the following full council. All meetings to be held in the Wesley Smith Room at Stokenham Parish Hall commencing at 7.30p.m.

Signed: Dated: 17th March 2016

Meeting Closed 9.40p.m.