

WINKLEIGH PARISH COUNCIL

Lower Itton, Spreyton, Devon EX17 5BB, 01837 89095, winkleighpcl@btconnect.com
www.winkleighpc.org.uk and Find us on Facebook

Question for the District Council

1. Has the Village Design Statement been adopted by the District Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance?

Questions for the District Council and the Parish Council

2. Policy H1. I can appreciate the reasoning behind the policy, but has the Parish Council or the District Council any suggestion to make which would enable “substantially larger” to be quantified? For example, would “40% larger than the original building” be appropriate?

Winkleigh Parish Council response - To make it applicable to the affordable properties and to put a limit on floor space, 40% larger than the original building would be appropriate

3. Policy E4. Would it be possible to define “small scale retail development” in more detail and specify to which Use Classes the policy would apply? I appreciate that the District Council made this point in its representations (ref: 84) but, with the benefits of its breadth of experience as a local planning authority, I would appreciate any further comments in order to make the policy more effective for development management purposes.

WPC Response - Small scale retail development to serve the day to day needs of the Parish rather than the needs of the wider catchment area.

4. Policy H4. Paragraph H9 refers to two large sites being granted planning permission for up to 125 dwellings in total. Please could a map be provided to show the location of the two sites and with reference numbers (or links) to enable me to read the plans and decision notices? Both paragraph H20 of the Plan and Policy H4 imply that, even though granted planning permission for up to 125 dwellings, the development might not proceed. What is the basis for those views? In its representation (ref: 65), the District Council suggested that the area of land with planning permission for housing should only be indicated broadly and not included on the Policies Map because this would infer a higher status such as an allocation. Given that the land already has planning permission, is it not remiss to exclude the land from the Policies Map, especially as the second part of Policy H4 specifically deals with it? Indeed, what are the reasons for not including the land within the development boundary?

WPC Response

The Parish Council chose to leave the sites outside the development boundary for the following reasons.

The sites currently outside the development boundary, with planning permission, are large sites, which in the context of the very rural local housing market will require sustained market demand to build out. The uncertainty this implies, coupled with the current economic downturn, means a speedy development of the sites is unlikely. It is possible permissions will lapse prior to implementation.

Mrs Melanie Bickell (Clerk/RFO), Cllr.turner@outlook.com (Chair), Cllr.findlay@outlook.com (Vice-Chair),
Cllr.Jacobs@outlook.com, Cllr.mercer@outlook.com, Cllr.Naylor@outlook.com, cldr.bayley@outlook.com,
cldr.a.hipkiss@outlook.com, cldr.s.hodgson@outlook.com

The sites with permission were only released in response to a shortfall in the 5-year land supply. Notwithstanding the site to the south of Townsend Farm was included in the Torridge District Council SHLA there are other sites close to the village that are better suited to the scale of development appropriate to a small community.

By leaving the sites with planning permission outside the development boundary the Parish Council is able to leave options open for the future should permissions lapse. Policy H4 also gives some measure of control over the context and design of future development.

Lastly, public consultation revealed local people were strongly opposed to large site development in the village. While accepting the need for additional housing, the local plan allocation to the north of the village, together with windfall sites were felt to offer sufficient development for the foreseeable future. The approach taken by the Neighbourhood Plan (Policy H4 and the retention of the local plan development boundary) recognises the strength of public feeling but does not discount the possibility of development. It also leaves open the potential for a full appraisal of all development sites in the future if development does not come forward.

Questions for the Parish Council

5. Policy H3: bullet 2. To which adjoining land are the links intended and is it suggested that the links should be vehicular?

WPC Response – to retain options for the future the layout should influence provision for pedestrian and cycling linkages to the village, playing fields, Kings Meadow and adjacent agricultural land

6. Policy E2: bullet 4. Is the conversion of traditional buildings for economic development intended to include buildings in the countryside, in addition to those within the development boundary?

WPC response – Traditional building suitable for conversion anywhere in the parish

7. Should the Employment Land (Policy E1) coloured blue on Appendix A be extended at the Beechlea Industrial Estate to include the site of planning permission 1/0890/2018/FULM as shown in the representation from Beechlea Holding Limited?

WPC Response – Yes

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure that a copy of this letter and any subsequent response are placed on both the Parish Council and Local Authority websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.