

Thurlestone Parish Council

<p>Minutes of the remote meeting of the Parish Council held on Monday 1st June 2020 via Zoom</p>
--

There was an open forum of 15 minutes at the beginning of the meeting to allow members of the public to ask questions or make comment regarding the work of the Council or other items which affect the Parish. The following points were raised:

Q. A resident of West Buckland opposed the suggested site for community housing in West Buckland. She considered that it would have a negative effect on neighbouring properties and on a wildlife rich site. The access would be difficult, pedestrian access is poor and SHDC had stated that it did not meet the NP or JLP development criteria. The development would be separate from the rest of the village and she was not sure why it was being presented if it is not financially viable.

Q. A statement was read out as follows (statement given to Clerk):

Just let's remember that the addition of some Community Housing was one of the main outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan supported by the vast majority of residents of the parish.

These are meant to , and will, provide a limited stock of housing for local working families most of which have grown up in the area, others working and living in the area for a minimum of five years, to build a secure future for their family.

The plan is partially aimed at re balancing the community to compensate for the influx of second and holiday homes which have greatly changed the mix of people which originally formed part of the attraction to move to the area, together with helping the schools and business to flourish in the future and provide local employment.

At least two of the families that have applied were from families going back for generations in the parish, one of which has moved away to advance their medical skills and now wishing to bring their skills home and work in their local NHS services.

Another generational family will need rehousing when their tenancy, kindly given by Evans Estates when the farmer died unexpectedly, has to be given up in less than two years so timing is crucial to them.

The controls for acceptance for the housing and any long term change of ownership mean they will only be available to families who meet the strict controls in the legislation . This will mean there will be a potential for children growing up in the parish now to have a realistic chance of a house in the future using the same criteria.

Of the two remaining options, the West Buckland site has major complications with road access combined with topographical challenges due to the steepness of the land. This is pointed out by the initial district council report and I would consider it unviable and too expensive to go ahead with.

The Bantham site on offer fits in with existing housing, minimum intrusion visually due to good landscaping unlike some of the new private expansion of the existing housing.

It would add to the village feel ,with working people and children taking part in real village activities, Bantham Life Saving Club etc, while growing up, working in the shop , pub and offering local services. In other words help put back the heart in the village.

The rolling funding from Government is uncertain to continue after the Covid situation so a prompt application is crucial with no more stalling and objections for personal reasons shown from some of

the population and a more embracing thought process taking over for the benefit of the whole community.

*My vote is for the Bantham site and a fast outcome please. Neil Girling
(A Blow In from 40 years ago)*

Q. Another resident agreed with the statement above and felt that the PC had prevaricated and now has the opportunity to make a difference for young people and the community.

A resident asked the following 3 questions:

Q. How will the PC assess the votes on the voting cards?

Q. What happened about the request for the PC to look into the allocation of moorings in Bantham?

Q. Indications are that numbers of visitors to Devon and Cornwall could be huge this summer and the large numbers are already causing problems – what planning is there to ensure that this does not cause problems for key things like access to emergency services, for example?

Q. A resident asked if it would have been more useful if the PC had asked those showing their preference of site on the voting form to put their name and the address of their main residence on the form because she considered that a vote from someone who lives in Bantham should carry more weight in talking about this site, for example.

A. Later on during the meeting, it was explained that anonymity is crucial and that it is immaterial whose views they are and where they live in the parish: this not a vote, we are canvassing views.

Q. A statement was read out from a resident of Bantham as follows:

We have already lost one very good site at West Buckland for the Community Housing due to comments from some people who have been able to move here and buy/inherit houses, but they don't seem to want young local people to have the chance of buying in this area too. I have lived in the parish for 60 plus years and my late husband and I were lucky that we got an Estate cottage 40 years ago, when our chance of buying in Kingsbridge fell through.

The proposed site in Bantham is right next to the Watch where I live. It's ideal for young families with facilities and the beach nearby. It carries on from our terrace of houses, so will not be an eye sore, or a blot on the landscape and a few extra cars will be nothing compared to the 100's we get every day in the Summer.

My siblings and our children have had the best life growing up here, and my children look forward to coming back with their children. They both moved away to further their careers in the NHS. My daughter would love to now move back here with her partner and young son rather than having to grow up in a city, but they cannot afford our local prices.

The need for this Community Housing is URGENT, to keep life in the parish going. The older generation won't be here for ever. We need new young life back in the villages. When my sister and I moved into two of the Watch Cottages in the 70's we were the only young couples in the village, we don't want to revert back to those times and turn it into a retirement village.

A resident asked the following 4 questions:

Q. A tree needs to be removed along the footpath between The Mead and the village (the footpath is owned by the hotel). Can the PC request that this be done asap please.

Q. The new consultation about dogs on beaches needs to be looked at as it is recommending a reduction in the times when dogs will be excluded from Bantham beach.

Q. The planning application for 6, Meadcombe has been approved by the Mead Management Co.
Q. The speaker said that he was confused about the community housing process and didn't think that the VV article was helpful.

Q. A resident supported previous statements in favour of having community housing in Bantham and agreed that the West Buckland site was not appropriate in terms of access. They made the comment that the housing design can be attractive and we should not assume that it will be otherwise.

It was not possible to respond to all questions at the meeting so they will be dealt with either at the July meeting or in the course of the month on the parish website.

The meeting convened.

Present: Councillors Rhymes (Chair), Munn, Mitchelmore, Hurrell, Crowther, Williams and Marshall

In Attendance: Helen Nathanson (Parish Clerk), District Councillors Long and Pearce and 28 members of the public

1. To receive apologies.

There were no apologies.

2. To receive any amendments necessary to Members' Registers of Interests.

There were no amendments.

3. To confirm the Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting on Monday 11th May 2020. The Minutes will be signed once the Coronavirus restrictions allow.

The minutes were confirmed as an accurate record with the addition of the following alteration:

Item 6 Amendment to the update on community housing, the first sentence should read: 'The Bantham Estate had been approached to ask if the field next to the allotments behind The Sloop was available and it is not.'

4. To consider any matters arising from the Minutes.

The following matters arose:

Item 8 The lane alongside the garage site to Court Park has been cleared and the PC thanked Paul Martin for carrying out the work.

Coronation Quay has now been closed for a further 6 months, though anecdotally it was reported that people are still able to use it.

DCC has inspected the coastal path between Thurlestone and Bantham and has not found any problems which they consider to be serious enough to warrant work.

Cyclists using the coast path is a matter of trespass and needs to be pursued by landowners.

Councillors discussed the possibility of installing better and larger signs – the Clerk will investigate whether we can pay for our own to be put up. She will also contact the NT to see if they can help.

5. To comment on the following planning applications:

**0857/20/HHO READVERTISEMENT (Revised Plans Received) Householder application for first floor extension
3 Edwards Close Thurlestone TQ7 3BP**

Thurlestone Parish Council objected to this application.

Councillors considered that the revised drawings do not address their grounds for objection. The ridge level of the proposed extension remains the same as that of the main dwelling and therefore not subordinate in scale and form (contrary to **NP Policy TP7.2.i**); the proposal does not protect neighbouring residential amenity as it will appear dominant and overbearing to the single-storey dwellings to the rear (contrary to **NP Policy TP1.1**); and fails to respect the original planning rationale upon which planning permission was originally permitted for the development of Edwards Close (55/0804/07/RM)(contrary to **NP Policy TP1.2**).

It should be noted that Appeal decision ref: APP/K1128/D/12/2175103 relating to no 11 Edwards and dated 2 July 2012 predates the Thurlestone Parish Neighbourhood Plan, made in July 2019, which is part of the statutory development plan of the area. The District's grounds for refusal of the appealed application (55/0092/12/F) were: (1) the position, scale and design of the proposed development does not respect the character of the site and its surroundings and the proposed extensions would be out of keeping with the distinctive character of the overall development at Edwards Close which lies within the AONB; and (2) the position, scale and design of the extensions in close proximity to adjacent properties would result in an unneighbourly form of development by reason of the bulk and dominance of the resulting building and loss of privacy to adjacent neighbours. Further, the present proposal can be distinguished from the appealed application as the proposed development is located within a shared courtyard and not on the periphery of the development. For all these reasons, Councillors considered that this proposal would set an unacceptable precedent for the area and strongly object to the application.

**1035/20/HHO Householder application for extension
Old Chapel, West Buckland**

Thurlestone Parish Council supported this application

Councillors considered that the proposed ground floor extension is clearly subordinate to the existing dwelling (**NP Policy TP7.2i**); that the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties provided the height of the western section of the southern boundary wall remains 'as is' (**NP Policy TP1.1**); that the style, scale and character of the proposal, mainly comprising alterations and renovation, is proportionate and appropriate to its location within the village, the South Devon AONB and setting of the adjoining West Buckland Conservation Area (**NP Policy TP1.2**). Councillors were, however, concerned about the potential for light pollution from artificial light, given the amount of fenestration on the south elevation, which is visible from key viewpoints within the South Devon AONB, notably, FP5 (**NP Policies TP1.4, TP1.5 and TP22.1**).

The following conditions are therefore requested: (1) to ensure that the western section of the southern boundary wall is not raised and accords with drawing no JTD 0215 02 202 Rev A so as to protect the amenity of the neighbouring property, Springhill, (2) to ensure the details of the metal frame and mesh used for the balustrade and the metal canopy are appropriate and in keeping with the building, and (3) to use light reducing film is used on the glazing on the south elevation to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light which would be harmful on local amenity, on the

intrinsically dark landscape, the natural environment and South Devon AONB (**NP Policies TP1.4 & TP1.5, DEV25 of the Joint Local Plan and Policies Plan/P1 and Plan/P2 of the AONB Management Plan**).

0735/20/HHO Householder application for proposed renovation and internal alterations to existing property with 2 storey rear extension. New single garage with annex flat above.

The Chase, Warren Road, Thurlestone

Thurlestone Parish Council objected to this application. Councillors considered that the proposed development will have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, contrary to **NP Policy TP1.1**, due to the main roof being raised to create a 3rd floor attic storey. This additional storey, which is designed to provide 2 additional bedrooms and bathroom, will appear overbearing and have a dominant impact on properties to the rear (Fiferail and Sea Point). It will also overlook and potentially cause loss of privacy to the adjacent property, Edens, and to Southerley, which is located at a lower level on Warren Road. There is no Design and Access Statement and little detail regarding the proposed ridge height, but it appears that the western portion of the roof is being raised by almost 2 metres. The new standalone replacement garage, with flat above, will also impact on the amenity of properties to the rear (Fiferail and Sea Point) due to the proposed ridge height. While the right to a view is not a material planning consideration, it should be noted that the ability of individual dwellings to enjoy the views of the coast is reflected in the siting of the existing properties and in private property covenants that seek to prevent development that could adversely affect the views of others. Councillors therefore felt that the proposal fails to comply with **NP Policy TP1.2** as it is neither proportionate nor appropriate in its location, in terms of the street scene generally and the South Devon AONB. The substantial amount of fenestration on the South elevation would also impact on light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, on the intrinsically dark landscape, the natural environment and South Devon AONB (contrary to **NP Policies TP1.4 & TP1.5, DEV25 of the Joint Local Plan and Policies Plan/P1 and Plan/P2 of the AONB Management Plan**).

Please also note: The revised plans 1341909 PP_14A, PP_12A and PP_10A uploaded on 29 May 2020 seem to be identical to the original drawings. The description of the proposal does not accurately reflect the proposed works, ie. to raise the main roof of the building to create a third storey level. The proposed site section plan 1341909 PP_10A for the South and East elevations shows the South and West elevations and PP_22 for the West and North elevations shows the East and North elevations. There is no Design and Access Statement and there is insufficient detail regarding the proposed ridge height of the main building and garage.

1081/20/HHO Householder application for installation of cladding to south and west elevations
5 Mead Lane, Thurlestone

Thurlestone Parish Council supported this application.

Councillors considered that this proposal for the installation of cladding to part of the building to cure a damp ingress problem will not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties (**NP Policy TP1.1**); that the design is proportionate and appropriate to its village location within the South Devon AONB and the building materials – white Cedrex wood effect cladding to be installed to part of the South and West elevations - is appropriate (**NP Policy TP1.2**); and that there will be no impact upon the character and quality of the natural environment and South Devon AONB (**NP Policies TP1.5 and TP22.1**).

**1085/20/HHO Householder application for alterations and extension to dwelling
20 Court Park Thurlestone TQ7 3LX**

Thurlestone Parish Council objected to this application.

While Councillors accepted that the property is in need of updating and improvement, they considered that the proposed alterations and extension to this dwelling amount to the overdevelopment of the site. They felt that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, to the extent that the proposed two-storey side extension would have a dominant and overbearing impact on 21 Court Park, with which it is in close proximity, and that the proposed decking on the south elevation is likely to cause loss of privacy to both 21 and 18 Court Park (contrary to **NP Policy TP1.1**); further, that the design of the proposed development, particularly the replacement garage located on the north elevation, in the front garden, is neither appropriate nor proportionate in its immediate location or street scene generally (contrary to **NP Policy TP1.2**). The side and garage extensions would also contravene **NP Policy TP7.2i**, as the proposed ridge level heights appear to be the same and not subordinate to that of the existing dwelling. There were also concerns about the usability of the garage and safe vehicular access, given the limited amount of space available at the front of the property and lack of on-site parking (contrary to **NP Policy TP1.7**).

1093/20/FUL Change of use, renovation and extension of existing redundant farm building to create multi-purpose community facility including co- working hub with surfboard shaping workshop and ancillary cafe; replacement of existing equine sand school area with new five-a-side 4G football pitch; construction of new skate bowl and children's adventure play facilities; creation of communal farm and proposed substantial landscape enhancement including construction of wildlife pond, planting of community orchard/tree nursery and wildflower meadow, associated landscape and ecological enhancement measures together with the upgrade and expansion of the existing car parking Application within consultation/publicity period

The Yard, Land At Sx 699 454 Aunemouth Cross To Bantham Cross Bantham Devon

Thurlestone Parish Council supported this application.

Councillors considered that this application for the neighbouring parish of Churchstow would help contribute to a more active, vibrant year-round community and provide opportunities for local employment in the area. Thurlestone parish is generally well served in terms of private recreational facilities (golf, tennis and sailing) but has little in the way of play and youth facilities that this proposal in the neighbouring parish would provide. Highway and AONB issues would, however, be important considerations, particularly any external lighting.

**1084/20/HHO Householder application for alterations and external works
11 Mead Lane, Thurlestone, TQ7 3PB**

Thurlestone Parish Council supported this application.

Councillors considered that the proposed development will not impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties (**NP Policy TP1.1**); and that the design of the proposed alterations (mainly internal) and external works, including new windows on the first floor north west elevation, are proportionate and appropriate in the location, subject to a condition regarding the details of the

refurbished balcony and new spiral staircase to the balcony on the south east elevation (**NP Policy TP1.2**).

**1280/20/VAR Application for removal of Condition 5 of planning permission 0433/20/HHO
Broadsands, Ilbert Rd, Thurlestone, TQ7 3NY**

Thurlestone Parish Council objected to this application.

This property occupies a prominent location on the southern boundary of the settlement and is visible from key viewpoints within the South Devon AONB, notably, the highly sensitive South West coast path. There is a substantial amount of additional glass being used on the South elevation of the dwelling and this condition is necessary in order to reduce the impacts of light pollution from artificial light to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the South Devon AONB.

- **NP Policy TP1.5** is a dark skies policy to ensure proposals are designed so as to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, on intrinsically dark landscapes and the natural environment;
- **Policy DEV25 of the Joint Local Plan** requires proposals within the setting of a protected landscape (AONB) to be designed to prevent impacts of light pollution from artificial light on intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation interests;
- **Policies Plan/P1 and Plan/P2 of the AONB Management Plan** (a material planning consideration) support development that is appropriate and proportionate to its setting within the AONB by seeking to avoid, minimize or as a last resort compensate, for harm to the special qualities and distinctive characteristics of the AONB; and
- The requirements of **paragraphs 55 and 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework** are satisfied.

This condition has been imposed and discharged by the District elsewhere in the parish and therefore, Councillors considered its removal would set an unacceptable precedent and strongly objected to the application.

**1370/20/HHO Householder application for replacement garage and summer bedroom (to supersede application 3430/19/HHO)
Yellow Sands Ilbert Road Thurlestone TQ7 3NY**

Thurlestone Parish Council supported this application.

Councillors considered that this proposal to replace the garage and summer bedroom is subordinate in scale and form to the existing dwelling (**NP Policy TP7.2i**); that the proposed works will not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity, given the size of the plot (**NP Policy TP1.1**); that the design is proportionate and appropriate to the location and also, the materials (**NP Policy TP1.2**), which is important given the prominent position of the building overlooking the golf course and the SW Coast Path beyond. However, conditions are requested to ensure: (1) the summer bedroom and garage shall only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and shall not form part of a separate unit of accommodation; and (2) the recommendations of the Ecology Consultancy's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Surveys of 2019 shall be implemented and adhered to.

**1414/20/HHO Householder application for front extension to dwelling with replacement balcony over
6 Meadcombe Road Thurlestone TQ7 3TB**

More time was needed to examine this application. Councillors agreed to make a decision by email before the closing date for comments on 26th June.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Crowther and the NP Committee for all their hard work looking at these applications.

6. To note the reports from District and County Councillors and to ask questions arising.

The reports were noted.

Councillor Pearce reminded people to respond to the consultation around dogs on beaches, which has only just been opened and details of which can be found on the SHDC and Parish websites.

Councillor Mitchelmore stated that he thought that the PC had been dictated to by SHDC about the location of community housing and he was not happy about it. He supported community housing but felt that the decision about where it should go should be taken by the parish. Councillor Pearce explained that all housing has to comply with planning policy, particularly in a sensitive area like this parish which is in the AONB and on the historic coastline. The SHDC report reflects this in recommending the site that best complies. Councillor Crowther also explained that the PC has been looking for suitable sites for four and a half years and that we have only the two, on which we are now consulting. She also reiterated that SHDC supports the Bantham site and does not support the West Buckland site.

7. To receive updates about Parish matters, including but not restricted to: Highways, Parish Hall, Trees and Litter Bins

Problems have been reported with parking on the road leading from the War memorial to the church car park. The lane is owned by Bantham Estate. Councillors recalled a previous agreement with a parking company whereby tickets and fines could be issued. This will be investigated.

Speeding has been a problem along the road from West Buckland to Bantham and the village speeding signs will now be put up as lockdown allows.

The road was recently cleaned between West Buckland and Bantham but was so ineffective as to be worthless. This needs to be reported to Highways.

The Parish Clerk had attended a County Focus Group which looked at the issues faced by town and parish councils during the pandemic. Many other parishes around the county are worried about the influx of visitors and consider that the problems are not yet over for the south west. Councillors considered whether they needed to look at this in more detail and form a Working Group to consider issues related to the number of people coming to the parish. It was decided against this but Councillor Munn volunteered to write to the local MP to ask for Government support around this issue.

The church wants to trim some trees which are overhanging the path and will need to seek appropriate permission and carry out the work at the right time.

Discussion was had about a tree which was taken down on the Yarmer Estate and then burned for a few days. The advice in such a case is to call the Fire Brigade.

8. To receive an update about the opening of the Thurlestone public toilets.

The toilets have had an attempted break-in and many people seem to have been using the area around the blocks as an outside toilet, which is becoming a health issue and may require hazardous waste clearance.

The Parish Clerk reported that Thurlestone still does not have a date from SHDC for being opened but councillors had seen cleaning teams there that day and the Ladies block was open at that time. The Clerk will investigate and continue to request that we have them open asap. If necessary, a specialist waste team will be contracted to clean up around the blocks.

9. To note the bank account balance of £22,392.71 to date 6th May 2020 and to approve the following payments:

Helen Nathanson	Parish Clerk pay	£287.28
	Stationery	£12.43
	Printing	£3.49
Nick Walker	Community Housing leaflets and posters	£125.00

The bank balance was noted and the payments listed above were approved. The following additional payments were also approved because they had been received just after the agenda was issued.

Paul Martin	£102.22
May invoice for Julian Lee – Grass Cutting	£320
Sue Crowther NP Committee expenses	£60.38
Additional total	£482.60

10. To note the date of the next Council Meeting which will be held remotely on Monday 6th July 2020 at 7.30pm.

This was noted and the meeting ended at 8.55pm.

Councillor Rhymes
Chairman