

WINKLEIGH PARISH COUNCIL EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday 14th July 2020 at 7.30pm held Remotely on Zoom

PRESENT: Cllr Findlay (Chair), Cllr Mercer, Cllr Bayley, Cllr Jacobs, Cllr Naylor, Melanie Bickell (Clerk)
Also Present: County Cllr Saywell, District Cllr Newton, Mr Nick Dean (Architect) plus 7 members of public

58.20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Bayley moved to approve the absence of Cllr Turner due to a prejudicial interest, seconded by Cllr Mercer, all in favour and **Resolved** (RR039/07/20). Cllr Hipkiss attempted to login to the meeting but had technical issues.
Cllr Hodgson unapproved absence

59.20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS

Cllr Bayley declared a personal interest in planning application 1/0113/2020/FUL due to proximity of his property to the development

60.20 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In response to questions from the public, Mr Nick Dean responded that 'Bring 2 Life Consulting Ltd' are the current developers. It is too early to state the price range of the properties throughout the development, and it will be a decision of whichever housing association gets involved as to whether they will offer shared ownership of the affordable properties

61.20 MINUTES

Cllr Mercer moved to approve the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held remotely on 24th June 2020 as a true and accurate record, seconded by Cllr Jacobs, all in favour and **Resolved** (RR40/07/20)

62.20 PLANNING MATTERS

62.1. 1/0113/2020/OUTM Great Well Park, Land North of Chulmleigh Road

Outline planning application with some matters reserved (Landscaping) for 74 no. dwellings

Under Chairs discretion, Mr Nick Dean provided the following comments to Councillors questions.

Biodiversity and local elements form an ecological point of view and a separate report has been submitted within the application on how biodiversity and ecology will be addressed. There is one section of the report which is still outstanding as survey work is still ongoing, this is an outline application and full detail will be submitted in the full application, for which there is currently no timescale.

Regarding investment in the public realm, I am following the guidelines set by my clients, the open space is in my control with the green space, trees and hedges proposed as part of the scheme. I have looked at keeping houses away from the adjoining hedges with the ecologist.

As this is an outline application, energy saving aspects, design and build ethics have been limited and these along with electric charging points will be considered and follow national guidelines in consultation with the developer when the full application is submitted.

Having play areas on site is a national planning requirement, which is not within my powers or position to ignore as is the community woodland, whereby the area in the District Council guidelines for this site is actually achieved albeit part at the top of the site and part at the bottom.

Winkleigh was chosen by TDC as a Local Centre for further housing. Admittedly the first draft of the Local Plan was for 55 dwellings on this site.

Regarding linkage, there is one place where a footpath from Kings Meadow estate feeds into the proposed development and we have carried any pedestrian route on from there within the site, so pedestrian movement alongside the A road is reduced or ideally given up, the entrance is now opposite the sports centre and I am anticipating negotiations with Highways for traffic calming measures on the A3124.

Cllr Mercer moved that WPC do not support this application because the number of housing units proposed (74) exceeds that in the TDC Local Plan (55) – and this has been achieved by increasing the housing density, by sacrificing the community woodland proposals and prioritising vehicular over non-vehicular movements across the

site -all of which detract from the proposal; the lack of connectivity to the rest of the village and adjoining facilities, such as the Playing fields, the low number of affordable housing units (19/74).

Specific comments based on Winkleigh Parish Neighbourhood Plan:

ENV1: Not clear how the proposal has utilised the local hedge survey supported by the PC to reflect the need to protect local hedgerows. Not clear how the plans deliver any net gain in biodiversity. The ecological survey dates from Feb 2019 and needs updating to reflect changes and environmental improvements made to the Biodiversity Area near the Sports centre. Nor does the report, because it is out of date, include the data on Bat activity collected by the Devon Bat project. A full survey on bat activity is required. There is a need, and potential, to achieve biodiversity "gain" with these proposals but this has been overlooked.

ENV4 - Not clear how local elements of design, or the Village Design Statement has been used in the plans.

ENV5 - No indication of any locally-sensitive design in the construction of the properties. No information given regarding investment in the "public realm," such as street furniture, public spaces to make the estate a pleasant, safe place to live.

ENV6 - No information on energy saving aspects of the build or how sustainability will be assured.

ENV7 - No reference to electric charging points.

H2 - No mention of storage or recycling facilities

H3 - No evident links to the adjacent playing fields and sports centre, and play zone. Lack of accessible open space within the design to benefit the community. Design Statement asserts that the community woodland has been removed due to the "parish view" that maintenance would be an issue. No such view exists. The developers should contact the Winkleigh Biodiversity Group to discuss this further. The creation of a new Play Area within the estate is superfluous as one exists across the road.

Traffic - Overall a strategic approach needs to be taken to manage speed on the A3124 and adjacent roads.

T1 - Cul de sacs, a feature of this proposal, should be avoided within the plans as they inhibit pedestrian movement within and across the site. Junction to access the site should be more sympathetic to pedestrians with surface detailing and other measures to inhibit traffic speed, and enable crossing of the A3124 by pedestrians. (as per the Hamilton \Baillie report)

T3 - Good there is a car park, but non-motorised movements need to be prioritised across the site.

T5 - No mention of need to reduce light pollution.

Seconded by Cllr Naylor, all in favour and **Resolved** (RR041/07/20)

63.20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

22nd July 2020 7.30pm via Zoom

Chair thanked Mr Dean and members of the public for their attendance

Cllr Jacobs thanked Cllr Mercer for his efforts which was echoed by Cllrs.

Chair closed the meeting at 8.22pm