

## **Minutes of the Meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Committee on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> October 2019**

Present: Councillor Crowther (Chair), Councillor Williams, Chris White, Frith Chadwick, Richard Boughton

Apologies: Graham Gilbert

In Attendance: Helen Nathanson (Parish Clerk), District Councillors Long and Pearce, Parish Councillors Munn and Mitchelmore and 40 members of the public

1. The apologies were accepted.
2. The Minutes of the Thurlestone Parish Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Advisory Group on Tuesday 11 June 2019 were confirmed.
3. There were no matters arising from the Minutes.
4. It was noted that the Thurlestone Parish NP Advisory Group has been renamed the Thurlestone Parish NP Committee and that its Terms of Reference are available on the parish website.
5. To receive an update on the NP Community Led Housing initiative.

The Chair explained that, on account of objections received by the Bantham Estate by residents of West Buckland (WB), the former had proposed an alternative site for community housing, which was the site opposite Bantham Stores. At this stage there was no further information about what size the development site would be and whether or not it would only include the 6 houses for the community housing.

The potential reasons for supporting this site could be that this is a more sustainable location; there would be no overlooking of other houses; it can be coordinated with increased parking proposed for the village shop; and the houses could be below the crest of the field to minimise skyline impact.

The Chair explained that the West Buckland site was not being removed altogether but that the Bantham Estate does not want to upset local residents in West Buckland by offering a site for which there is not universal support. The landowner would like the communities to come together and agree what is acceptable.

By this stage in the community housing project the Parish Council had expected to be sharing the design plans with residents, having signed the Option Agreement with the landowner. This is now not the case and the Chair considered that it is causing unacceptable delays for the families involved.

6. To consider the location of the NP Community Led Housing.

Members of the public were then invited to ask questions and make comments on the above and the following matters were raised:

If the WB site is chosen will the landowner proceed with extending the car park opposite the shop anyway? Would residents therefore support development opposite the shop or on the corner in WB as preference?

If the landowner builds a car park opposite the shop, community housing at Bantham and then the proposed vineyard, there will be significant building work in a localised area around Aune Cross.

If they build at Bantham, how will this affect the roads particularly in the summer?

If the Bantham site were taken up and then the vineyard warehouse put in the corner, would this change the building line in Bantham and allow infill?

The Settlement Boundary is clearly defined and this site is outside that. It was never envisaged that there would be affordable housing in Bantham.

There is room for approximately 8 houses alongside the Sloop where the allotments are and the intention would be to relocate the allotments.

We don't have definitive information about how the Bantham site would be configured so it is difficult to make a decision.

It was noted that the North Upton site should be referred to as Buckland Park Farm.

Who sets the eventual market price of the houses? The Chair explained that the landowner is not involved in any part of the process after the Option Agreement has been signed and he would not therefore be involved in setting the price of or selling the homes.

Is it right that the landowner would be given the statutory amount of £10,000 per plot?

How can residents have a discussion at this stage when there is not enough information to make a comparison? We need to know how big the sites are before a decision can be made.

What has the Parish Council done to ensure that representatives of the different areas are invited to the meetings? How do we make sure that the message gets out to all residents?

Why does it have to be decided so quickly when we do not have all the information?

Was anyone from the Bantham Estate invited to attend the meeting? Yes but they could not attend at short notice.

The Bantham site would allow parking outside individual houses whereas in WB the parking would be on site but not adjacent to houses.

Parking and traffic issues apply equally to both sites.

The WB site as shown at the meeting was smaller than that previously agreed: why has it changed?

The new proposed site in WB seems far too small for the housing.

Where are the reports that have already been produced by SHDC?

Where are the objections from residents in WB? Are they in the public domain?

Who is controlling this process?

Bantham Lane is too dangerous for pedestrians so the Buckland Park Farm site does not allow for connections without a car.

If there was an evaluation of the Buckland Park site where is it and can we see it?

Why don't we just say no to Bantham?

Is the community's decision dictated by the planning authority's decision on the preferred site? Yes - the plans still have to go through the application process this may be a problem if it is not the authority's preferred site.

Is there a timescale on funding? Are we at risk of losing the funding or have we spent our allocation if WB does not happen? No – there has been very little work done yet on that site so not much money spent and there is no time limit on the community housing spending.

The Chair proposed that the Parish Council be asked to write to the Bantham Estate to give them 14 days in which to confirm whether or not there is a site available at WB on which the Option Agreement will be signed.

The date of the next quarterly meeting on Tuesday 10 December 2019 at 7.30pm was noted and the meeting closed at 9.14pm.

Councillor Crowther

Chair