

**STOKENHAM PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 3RD AUGUST 2017 IN THE
STOKENHAM PARISH HALL**

PRESENT:**COUNCILLORS:****P. SPENCE (in the Chair)****MRS P. DOUST****A. GOODMAN****J. GARDNER****R. JACKSON****L. COWLEY****J. ANSELL****W. FLETCHER-NEAL****MRS C. PEARCE****C. ROGERS****Also in attendance: Gill Claydon – Parish Clerk****APOLOGIES;****COUNCILLORS:****MRS T. DAYMENT****MRS S. ROWLAND****T. LYNN****DIST 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 given.

2. OPEN FORUM

Mr and Mrs Wilson were in attendance with regard to their planning application 2348/17/HHO Florence Cottages. Initially Devon Highways had and a planning consultant raised concerns but Cllr Brazil encouraged them to put an application in and Highways had since advised they were content. The reason was to try to provide off road parking and alleviate the problem in Torcross due to the layby now having no parking permit capacity. At certain times of the year they could park outside their property and as they had a long garden they felt they could incorporate this. This area of garden was not needed so they would cut in 3metres and still have 4 metres behind with the layby parking. Cllr Rogers expressed concern with regard to Linger Lodge the neighbour above but was advised they were in support. They were advised the land did not need reinforcing and the watercourse would remain as it was 5 metres past the layby provision.

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)**

- 1671/17/ful Change of use of part of field to domestic garden and erection of garden shed 5 Copperfield, Chillington – Due to local knowledge the Planning Officer was to be requested to consider the previous history on this location. When excavating site had an amount of soil removed and this was placed front of the houses at the bottom. Initially it was stated this was a flood plain and then the houses were sold with individual gardens going all the way down. Planning enforcement queried the change to gardens when this area had been open field but believed it was allowed as the use was agricultural and growing vegetables. This application now sought to place sheds and change to a domestic

garden. If such was approved the line along the village would move forward into the stream and push urbanization further and people might encroach on the stream and could cause flooding blockages. This would be a considerable extension which if permitted would impose on the next field. **Objection** as this area sits within the flood plain and could cause future problems by allowing structures, initially such as a shed, to be erected adding to flooding here and further along. Question was also raised as to the ownership and thus notification of this land application and its current change of use. The design and materials proposed were also not felt to be in keeping with the proposed garden shed use. If District Council was inclined to approve this application it was requested by parish council that the SUDS team at Devon County be specifically invited to comment. An environmental survey was also requested due to this being a wildlife corridor.

- 2348/17/HHO Householder application for off road parking area 6 Florence Cottages, Torcross – 3 – 10p.m. permit. No objection. Permeable surfacing was required due to problems in neighbouring areas with flooding and it was suggested that due consideration should be given to any engineering works required and whether a retaining wall was needed adjacent to this watercourse and main road.

Emma Wilson and husband left.

- 2380/17/FUL Erection of 4 detached dwellings, garages, access road and landscaping Land adjacent to the old abattoir, Torcross – A site visit was requested to be undertaken and the response submitted from Stokenham Parish Council was that they met with concerned local residents and visited the site.

OBJECTION to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. The development would have a **detrimental impact upon residential amenities**. The visual impact of the development would break the established building line that formed part of the iconic view southwest from the A379 and the Ley towards the village.
2. There would be significant **loss of privacy** for all of Florence Cottages, as the gardens of the two dwellings on the northern boundary (plots 3 and 4) would completely overlook the gardens, ground and first floor windows of the cottages below.
3. Proposed planting to mitigate this overlooking would result in **overshadowing and loss of light** from the south.
4. Parish Council shared the concerns raised by the Highway Authority (**who recommended refusal**) about the proposed site access via Tor Church Road, a narrow road with high walls and blind bends that were well used by walkers and formed part of the South West Coast Path. The extra traffic generated by the development would **compromise the safety of pedestrians and cyclists** who made extensive use of the road for amenity purposes.
5. **Flooding** was a major concern in this challenging topography. Surface water ran off Tor Church Road and followed the contours through the field entrance and directly across the site. At times of high rainfall, a wide river of running water bisected the site on its way to the stream at the northeast corner. This phenomenon was confirmed by Parish Councillors with first-hand local knowledge and **directly contradicted the applicant's assertion that there was no history of flooding** on the site.
6. The **bank** that dropped from the north of the site to the gardens of Florence Cottages up to 10m below was **inherently unstable**, and had been pinned, rodded, and netted along large sections of its length: despite this, there were regular landslips in periods of high rainfall as the surface water referred to in (5) made its way downhill via the most direct route. Residents had well-founded concerns, shared by Parish Council, that excavation work at the top of the bank, for foundations, landscaping, installation of sewage pipes and other services, and drainage works, would further destabilize an already precarious situation. Members of Parish Council observed water running off the bank into the gardens of Florence Cottages during a site visit on a dry day in the middle of August.

Torcross residents were realistic about the inevitability of development of the site. Their concerns could be partially addressed by the following steps:

7. Two dwellings would be more acceptable than four; they could then be set further back into the hill, alleviating the problems of overlooking, and designed with ridge heights that followed the established building line south-east from Linger Lodge, the better to conserve and enhance the natural environment within the AONB.

8. Parish council did not feel that the drainage solution proposed by the application was adequate for the challenges posed by the site topography. The existing ditch shown carrying the surface water from the site entrance to the proposed attenuation facility was regularly overtopped in periods of even moderate rainfall, causing overflow to run down the bank into the gardens of Florence Cottages. Water needed to be trapped further up the site, to the south, otherwise the entire risk that it would overwhelm the storage facility would be borne by the unfortunate residents below.

9. This inequitable balance of risks cannot be overemphasized. Parish Council urged the Planning Authority to visit the site, to see for themselves the degree to which the residents of Florence Cottages below were exposed to any adverse outcomes from the development, be it destabilisation of the bank, exacerbation of surface water run-off, or both.

10. Development of the site presented a unique opportunity to deliver benefits to the entire village by addressing the flooding at its source. This would require a much more comprehensive drainage proposal than tabled so far, and necessitate the establishment of a management committee, to ensure the on-going maintenance of the facility and offer indemnity to the affected properties.

5. CORRESPONDENCE AND REPORTS

Mention about Exercise Tiger tank on footpath – it was a Humber

- A resident had approached a councillor to seek information as to there was a washing machine next to the pub at the entrance to Helmers Estate and raise concern with regard to dogs barking at this property.
- A resident on the corner of Home Close had cut back some vegetation which had made a huge difference to visibility when leaving this close.
- Cllrs Cowley, Spence and the parish clerk met with a representative from Remus at Helmers Estate and had a very instructive meeting. The agent was extremely co-operative and accepted responsibility for three quarters of the bridge to the land perimeter. If works were required to such structures in the future Remus would invoice all residents under a system that parish council felt residents might not be aware of. All properties were joint owners in a company who employed Remus to maintain estate drains, the pond and paths plus vegetation. Remus had considered the matter under Health and Safety and did not think a ramp to the bridge was necessary their side so Helmers properties would have to pay additional if they wished such. If a grant was obtained there would be a long term agreement imposed on those installing such as to maintenance, insurance etc. The Remus representative advised that no current owner wanted to take up the directorship so effectively they had no control over liability of payments requested. Parish Council was responsible for their ramp section of the bridge and it was noted they should put money aside for future maintenance. Additional multiple dwelling developments in the parish should be encouraged to have written into their contract for sale/planning, as Helmers had, that each property owner should state they have a legally binding requirement to maintain any flood alleviation installed.
- Cllr Cowley and the clerk also considered the ransom strip on the path from Helmers to Orchard Way. Parish Council needed to carry out some maintenance on behalf of the church as agreed when the permissive path was allowed. It was agreed to cut down the main vegetation to ascertain what was underneath and then consider whether to plant with

further shrubs to maintain the barrier. The clearance would be actioned immediately to tidy up.

- Cathy Aubertin responded that the Torcross layby was now a short stay car park to allow quick turnaround of cars. Business users were being told they had to use the tank car park.

6. NEXT MEETING

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

Signed: Dated: 21st September 2017

Meeting Closed 9.10p.m.