

BIGBURY PARISH COUNCIL (BPC).

MINUTES OF AN EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 26TH JANUARY 2017 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, ST. ANN'S CHAPEL, AT 7.30 PM

Present:	Cllr Bryan Carson - Chair	BC
	Cllr Beth Huntley	BH
	Cllr Rose Owen	RO
	Cllr Sharon Smith	SS
	Cllr George Rosevear – Vice chair	GR
 Acting Clerk:	 Cllr George Rosevear	 Members of the Public present 80
 1 / Apologies:	 Cllr Cathy Case	 CC

2 / **APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING WITH SOME MATTERS RESERVED:**
05/0570/15/0 – 4097/16/0 – Site Ref: SX663471

The full set of documents relating to the application had been displayed around the room for all Parishioners attending to view, prior to the meeting commencing. In addition, the main site plan(s) were also displayed throughout the meeting on screen for ease of reference.

Chair BC, in opening remarks, stated that the meeting was held specifically to allow the Parishioners' to voice their views in respect of the above outline planning application. He noted for the record that neither the SHDC case officer nor the applicant, both having been invited to the meeting, had attended.

He further commented that an application from the same applicant had twice been presented to SHDC Planning Department; and on the second occasion, when refused, went to Appeal and that Appeal was lost. The Inspector determined that there was a lack of safe pedestrian access to local facilities.

The new proposal contained a fresh access and splay from the proposed site to the B3392, together with, closing vehicular access off the B3392 to the C252 towards Bull Horn Cross and on to Ringmore and Challaborough, as well as Kingston, creating a pedestrian zone.

Chair BC then opened the meeting to parishioners for comments and opinions. During the course of the meeting there were 29 separate contributions from those present, of whom seven spoke more than once numbering 18 of the contributions.

In essence the comment was overwhelmingly expressing reservations and objections to the Application for all of the following reasons.

Whilst it was understood there was clear evidence of central government easing planning restrictions to satisfy the general shortage of housing nationally and that locally the District

Council had a shortfall in its five year land supply, no evidence had been produced, even for the limited scale, of demand for the level of “open market housing” contained in this application.

Furthermore, given that legislation had given additional Statutory bite to Neighbourhood Planning Groups (NHPG), this application was premature in the light of the Bigbury Parish Council NHPG not having completed its work, which includes a Housing Needs Survey. Given that the process is well under way, it is relevant, and should have the influence the NHP is intended to have over various matters, including future development.

Concern was also expressed that since much of the Parish fell within the AONB, insufficient weight might be given to the views of that Body.

It was clarified that since this was an outline application, several matters will be the subject of conditions, many more matters are characterised as “Reserved Matters”, since they will be dealt with if or when a full application is made.

It was also made clear that Devon County Council (DCC) Highways would be responsible for the infrastructure and engineering matters related to all Highway and Pedestrian issues. Therefore, it was expected that there would be a Section 106 Legal Agreement to cover not only the usual statutory contributions; but also contributions and considerations related to Road Safety and Pedestrian Safety.

Clear concern was expressed that the outline application had failed to properly or adequately address the Judgement given by the Inspector at Appeal. It was the overwhelming view from comment and parishioners’ reaction to the application that the situation would be far worse for those living in the immediate proximity of St Ann’s Chapel and those travelling to and from Bigbury Village, Bigbury on Sea and in particular those living in Ringmore, Challaborough and Kingston, both in terms of safety and convenience.

In terms of both safety and convenience it was felt the solution offered gave insufficient consideration to the probable increased journey times for those in the villages, bottle necks caused by commercial vehicles seeking unloading access to the Pickwick, as well as a lack of pedestrian pavements to encourage people to take the safe route across the B3392 between residences on Chapel Corner and the Pickwick to Holywell Stores and residences on the St Ann’s Chapel side of the B3392. Also, motorists travelling up the tidal road, or the Ashford Road, (i.e. Hilltop, Easton, Combe, Aveton Gifford, Kingsbridge, Salcombe etc.) to Kingston, Ringmore or Challaborough would have to make an awkward left turn by Holywell Stores, then a right turn across oncoming traffic, a potential cause of considerable congestion, especially in summer.

Allied to this was a very strong view that the position of the proposed pedestrianised area would simply encourage those travelling on the B3392, either way, and especially in the season, to drive faster through the area, significantly increasing the danger to pedestrians trying to cross the road in either direction. There appeared to be nothing in the plans to give adequate early warning or the means to slow traffic. It was understood that DCC

Highways Dept. were opposed to any coherent form of suitable traffic calming; although these are B and C class roads and not A roads.

There was also concern that the planned treatment around the cross roads would inhibit an ancient trade route, as well as have an adverse effect on the vicinity's Heritage assets. Essentially, the new road layout was out of character and keeping of St Ann's Chapel's "quirky" charm.

Several comments, to some degree, simply gave additional weight to the main comments made and summarised above. However, it was also important to record that several parishioners attending the meeting had had great difficulty or failed completely to gain access to the SHDC Planning section of their website, which has given greater emphasis to the meeting itself, as for some, it was their first opportunity to comprehensively view the outline planning application.

Although thought to be a good idea, there was likely to be insufficient time available to engage a professional independent planning consultant to advise and act on behalf of the Parish.

Chair BC brought the meeting to order. Based on the many and varied planning reasons that came out of the meeting and that have been summarised above the meeting was asked to vote on the following questions:

Those in favour of the Outline Planning Application: - 1 (A Parishioner acting as Devil's advocate).

Those against the Outline Planning Application: - 73.

Those abstaining from voting on the Outline Planning application: - 6.

In addition, all Parish Councillors present voted against the Outline Planning Application.

The BPC Councillors confirmed that the Parish's reasons for objecting to the application for outline planning consent would be forcefully put to the SHDC Planning Case Officer and subject to the progress of the outline planning application, further measures would be considered, including professional representation and any related costs considered and voted on by the BPC.

3/

ANY OTHER BUSINES:

INTRODUCTION OF CANDIDATES FOR THE FORTHCOMING SHDC

DISTRICT COUNCIL BY-ELECTION ARISING FROM THE RESIGNATION OF LINDSAY WARD.

Two of the candidates at the forthcoming by-election were present, BPC Cllr Beth Huntley and Cllr (North Huish) Jonathan Bell. They were both invited to give an informal introduction to themselves.

4 /

THERE BEING NO OTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 9. 15 P.M.

Signed.....

Cllr Bryan Carson - Chair