

The Planning & Environment Committee

MILBORNE PORT PARISH COUNCIL

The Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting
held via Zoom video conference on:
Tuesday 21st April 2020 @ 6:45pm

Present:

Councillors: Mr R. Tizzard (Chairman), Mr T. Carty, Mr R Lockey

In attendance:

Miss N Hetherington – Deputy Parish Clerk.

Public Question and Comment Time:

One member of the public present – no questions were asked or comments made.

Agenda Number:	Agenda Item:
1	<u>Apologies for Absence:</u> None received.
2	<u>Declarations of Interest:</u> Cllr Carty noted that he owns property near to the Solar Farm screening proposals. Cllr Tizzard noted that he has a business connection with Burrington Estates (Court Lane proposals – Agenda Item 8b) which relates to another property not in Milborne Port; he will not participate in the working party for the site.
3	<u>Adoption of previous committee minutes:</u> • Tuesday 17th March 2020 It was noted that the notes taken at the last meeting (17 th March) which was conducted via telephone conference were not formal minutes therefore cannot be formally adopted. It is the minutes from the meeting of 18 th February 2020 that required formal adoption. The minutes of 17th February were approved unanimously as an accurate record of the meeting.

Planning Applications:***Planning application 1***

a) Reference: **20/00620/LBC – Listed Building**

Address: **5 Lauder Court, Milborne Port, Sherborne, DT9 5EL**

Proposal: Replacement of 3 windows with black aluminium double glazing

Members voted unanimously to **support** this application.

b) Reference: **20/00619/HOU – Housing**

Address; **5 Lauder Court, Milborne Port, Sherborne, DT9 5EL**

Proposal: Replacement of 3 windows with black aluminium double glazing

Members voted unanimously to **support** this application.

Planning application 2

Address: **Gauntlet Cottage, 13 Sherborne Road, Milborne Port, Sherborne, DT9 5AT**

Proposal: Alterations to form a singular vehicular access/hardstanding

Members voted 2:1 in **support** of this application on the following conditions: (a) subject to County Highways confirmation that the proposed arrangements are acceptable on safety, highways and traffic standards; (b) strict limit on the use to one car only; (c) there should be no on-road parking; (d) Highways Department to be strongly encouraged to consider double yellow lines for this stretch of the road; (e) the application satisfied all requirements regarding heritage as the site is in a conservation area

Planning application 3

Reference: **19/02244/REM**

Address: **Land OS 7800 Wheathill Lane, Milborne Port, Sherborne**

Proposal: Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval for appearance, landscaping, layout & scale for the erection of 65 No. dwellings, community hub, public open space and associated works (reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 17/03985/OUT)

It was noted that MPPC appreciates the dialogue with Redcliffe and the changes that have been made to the plans in response to concerns raised by members.

Members voted unanimously to **support** in principle subject to the consideration of members' serious concerns outlined in the document

	entitled Reserved Matters RESPONSE REGARDING AMENDED PLANS FOR APPLICATION 19/02244/REM LAND OS 7800, WHEATHILL LANE which will be forwarded to the planning department and district councillor as part of the council's formal response. <i>(It is included at the bottom this document.)</i> Planning application 4 <i>(addition to the agenda)</i> Reference: 20/01113/LBC Address: 61 Newtown, Milborne Port, Sherborne Proposal: Upgrade of existing outbuilding to create a utility room with access from dwelling and creation of an additional off-road parking space. Members voted unanimously to support this application. Planning application 5 <i>(addition to the agenda)</i> Reference: 17/02835/S73A Address: Milborne Port Solar Farm, Old Bowden Way, Milborne Port, Sherborne Proposal: Application for a non-material amendment to planning application 17/02835/S73A for the substitution of approved landscape plan to reflect minor amendments to planting scheme. Members voted by a majority of 1 to support this application with the recommendation that the western side of the solar farm should also be screened. 2 members abstained.
5	<u>Committee Budget Update:</u> This had been circulated to members with the agenda and was noted. Cllr Carty reported he has signed up to Parish-Online (digital maps for local councils) and that the cost will be £192 in 3 months' time.
6	<u>Redcliffe & Station Road Updates:</u> Cllr. Carty reported that both of the Station Road proposals (20 & 30 houses) have been rejected by SSDC on the grounds of road safety, location, ecology, school capacity (for the 30); he will forward the full report to Cllr. Tizzard for his information.
7	<u>New Infrastructure Projects (S106 money) Updates:</u> SSDC have now made money available to pay for the surveys of the Springfield and Gainsborough sites and West Country Surveys will begin the work as soon as they are able to restart work. Cllr. Lockey is working with the Football Club and liaising with Queenthorne in order to discuss when work can commence at Springfield; in relation to the tennis court conversion areas, he is also in the process of checking the ground in order to assess the need for drainage work; in relation to the

	work on the changing rooms, he is liaising with Paul Heath who is working on the plans.
8	<u>Other Verbal Updates:</u> a) Working Parties Updates: A new Court Lane Working Party was set up with Cllrs. Carty & Lockey. b) Neighbourhood Plan Group: Cllr. Carty reported limited progress due to the inability to meet at the moment; there is a plan to put some information on the Meetings with 13 residents' groups have taken place and the views of approximately 250 people sought; views of a minimum of 300 respondents need to be gathered for the data to be considered statistically meaningful. This consultation process is now 'on hold' until the current crisis has passed. Cllr. Tizzard expressed his appreciation of the work that has been done; he advised that all residents should be made aware of all of the HEELA-identified and other sites that could be developed and that views should be sought from a broad spectrum of residents, possibly using social media or a letter drop as a means of seeking residents' views. Cllr. Tizzard would like to see questions posed relating to housing which reflect both potential advantages and disadvantages. Cllr Carty updated members on his meeting with Alex Cave from Origin 3 (who is working for Burrington Estates on the Court Lane site proposals) in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan; Cllr Carty confirmed with Alex Cave that MPPC is currently in the consultation/seeking evidence/reviewing sites phase. Other topics discussed were school capacity and the site at Golding's Lane. Alex Cave plans to set up a conference/Zoom call with members of the P&E and Neighbourhood Plan group this week or next; Nathalie Hetherington can participate in order to take notes. Date/time tba. c) Construction Management of Active Sites: Nothing to report. d) Highways Matters: Nothing to report.

End of formal meeting 20:15

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Chairman of the Council:
Councillor Austin Fletcher

Clerk of the Parish:
Mr Simon Pritchard



**MILBORNE PORT PARISH
RESPONSE
AMENDED**

Tel: (01963) 251268
(Tuesday & Wednesdays)

E-mail: clerk@milborneportpc.org.uk

COUNCIL

TOWN HALL
MILBORNE PORT
SHERBORNE
DORSET DT9 5DF

**REGARDING
PLANS FOR
APPLICATION**

19/02244/REM LAND OS 7800, WHEATHILL LANE

Opening comments.

- 1. Community Hub**
- 2. Parking**
- 3. Pavement.**

Additional Comments

OPENING COMMENTS

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon this application in its amended form.

Milborne Port Parish Council would like to state that it welcomes that the applicant has sought to confer with us regarding the application, and we hope that some of our comments have contributed to improvements to the plan. We would note that a number of the suggestions we have raised have not been included into the amendments. We are disappointed by this, as we believe that the application could be further improved by adoption of these suggestions. This response focuses upon the three most important of these.

We also make some additional comments on wider matters.

Given that a number of Statutory Consultees have either not yet made comments, or that the comments made require further amendments, we reserve the right to submit additional observations in the future should we believe these to be appropriate.

1. Community Hub

One of the key benefits of the application was the provision to the parish of a new Community Hub building. This was given significant positive weight in assessing the planning balance of the application. Moreover, given its anticipated use, amongst other potential functions, as the site of the relocated Village Library, its provision has gone a long way amongst residents of the Parish in assisting popular justification of the application. The Parish Council very much welcomes the constructive dialogue

Planning & Environment Committee - Milborne Port Parish Council – **21st April 2020**

Website: www.milborneport.org.uk

Email: office@milborneportpc.org.uk

Deputy Clerk: Nathalie Hetherington

Tel: 01963 251268

around this which has led to material changes to the layout of the building, windows, utilities and so forth.

However, we have made a number of further requests regarding the detail of that provision, in particular around the level of fit out of the building. The expectation at both a Parish Council level, and in the general mind of the residents of the village, was that the application would deliver a useful public building attuned to its anticipated function. With regard to its use as a Library, this expectation was important in discussions with Somerset County Council around the retention of a library in Milborne Port at all. It is now expected that the building will also be used as a display and exhibition area for content from the Village Museum. Both of these uses require the maximum amount of free wall space, both for display, but also to protect the books and exhibits from heat damage. We have requested that, as a result, the heating provision for the building would be underfloor, rather than wall mounted. More generally, we understand that, as the application currently stands, the building would be delivered in a 'shell and core' state. This would mean that the Parish would need to meet the cost of converting the building into a state where it could be actually used for the functions anticipated. Our preference, and indeed the general expectation of the Village, would be that the building be delivered in a state where it merely required final decoration and the installation of furniture. We would anticipate that the bathroom and kitchenette facilities that appeared in the draft layout drawings during consultation would be in situ, and that the walls would be fully plastered with all electrics and fixed lighting installed. Consistent with SSDC's policies regarding sustainability we have also suggested that, as a public building, consideration be given to its being provided with roof mounted solar panelling to make it an energy neutral (or indeed, energy exporting) installation. This is perhaps less pressing than the points in the previous two paragraphs, but we believe it could make an important statement within the village, and the wider South Somerset District around how progressive sustainability can be achieved with a little creativity and investment.

In discussion with the applicant, we have been led to understand that the reluctance to confirm these points is in part down to cost, and we fully understand the commercial considerations in this regard. We understand that providing the building fit for its purpose does not raise any viability issues for this development. However, within the wider context of the application as a whole, and given the importance of the Community Hub in the original assessment of the planning balance of development, we believe that a significant improvement to the merits of the application, and support for it amongst residents of the Parish, could be achieved by conceding these relatively minor amendments.

Request : That SSDC consult with the applicant in this regard, and, if necessary, make the provision of the Hub in a 'ready-for-use' state a condition of Reserved Matters approval.

2. Parking

We note the various adjustments to the parking arrangements within the site, and welcome these. We do note the Highways communication posted on 7 April, which merely states that amended plans have been submitted but does not comment upon whether these have gone far enough to satisfy Highways in general.

Most of the internal layout alterations submitted focused upon the (welcome) installation of speed restriction features, rather than the management of on-street parking within the site and the ability for larger vehicles to navigate the site with ease once the roads are filled with parked cars and vans. We look forward to Highways' comments in this regard.

Our main concern, however, relates to parking around the site, rather than within it. In particular, we are concerned with the existing residents parking on the west side of Station Rd. In the approval of the Outline Application (17/03985/OUT dated 30 July 2019), SSDC included an informative stating that the applicant would need to perform a study regarding the displacement of existing parking arrangements around the site. It stated that:

“It is expected that any detailed layout will accommodate suitable parking provision for any parking (including on-street parking) likely to be displaced from existing dwellings”

In December 2019, representatives of the Parish Council spoke with the applicant, and were advised that this study had indeed been performed (by a company called Pegasus) and that it was likely that the parking in front of the houses and cottages on the west side of Station Road, opposite the site, would no longer be possible. We were advised that we would be sent a copy of this study, but it seems this was overlooked in the run up to Christmas, and we have been unable to identify it within the various amended submissions.

We have some sympathy for the applicant in that the 30 July 2019 approval also included a Condition (No.3) stating that the application must follow the submitted draft access layout for the south west corner of the site, despite this being a not to scale plan. It is difficult to reconcile compliance with the informative, when the required parking displacement study demonstrates the need to provide for alternate parking arrangements for displaced vehicles, but the condition prevents the applicant from changing the layout submitted prior to the study being undertaken.

We would hope that common sense would prevail. To the extent that the vehicles currently parked on the west of Station Road need to be displaced, we would suggest that they be relocated to parking spots provided by the applicant on the east of Station Road next to the Market Square. We have prepared a somewhat stylised mark-up of existing plans showing how this might be done and shared this with the applicant (attached). This would clearly need to be reworked professionally, but we believe it sets out the principle clearly. We believe that the approach would have the added benefit of making the functional carriageway of Station Road more straight, thus further improving what is a currently a weak part of the village’s road system – a point which was again given weight in assessing the planning balance of the original application.

Request : That the parking displacement study required by the informative be published and that SSDC and the applicant confer to amend the planned layout of the south west corner of the site so as to provide parking on the east side of Station Road, notwithstanding the restrictions of condition No.3 in the 30 July 2019 Outline Approval.

3. Pavement

The pedestrian pavement arrangements along Station Road have for many years been poor. Perhaps the worst part of these is opposite the site on the west side of Station Road outside of the cottages and houses north of Cold Harbour. At this point the pavement is currently approximately 0.5m wide. One of the advantages of the application was the proposal to improve this pedestrian pavement. From the outset, Milborne Port Parish Council has stated that it would prefer for pavements throughout the village to be 2m wide. This ties with National Guidelines, but more importantly fits the basic human logic of being wide enough for two push chairs to pass one another. The original application was for the pavement on the west side of Station Road to be increased to 1.5m. Highways, whilst noting that this was narrower than National Guidelines, observed that it was better than existing arrangements and hence consented to the 1.5m width.

We note that the application, as is, continues with the 1.5m wide pavement on the west side of Station Road, but also includes a pavement on the opposite east side of Station Road. This was included in the original not-to-scale layout for the south west corner of the site, which Condition No.3 states should not be changed.

Again our suggestion is that common sense should prevail. We see no real need for a pedestrian pavement on the east side of Station Road at this point. It does not go anywhere (there is no pedestrian pavement on the east side of Station Road to the north or North Street to the south) and pedestrian access and throughput can be achieved by people walking across the Market Square, provided

appropriate access (steps/ramp) can be installed to accommodate the height differential. Further, our suggestion (see 'Parking' above) would be that the east side of Station Road would be the obvious location to provide parking for the vehicles displaced from the west side cottages and houses. In the absence of an unnecessary pavement on the east side of Station Road, we believe it would be relatively easy to achieve a full 2m wide pavement on the west side, consistent with National Guidelines.

Request : That SSDC work with the applicant to remove the seemingly unnecessary pavement on the east side of Station Road; replace with parking for local residents as above; ensure pedestrian access from the Market Square onto Station Road (potentially via the existing carriage way at the west end of Wheathill Lane which will cease to be used for vehicles); and extend the width of the pavement on the west side of Station Road to 2m.

Additional Observations

Access to Beaumont Cottage – We note and welcome the ongoing commitment to the continuation of road access for the residents of Beaumont Cottage to their property. We note the lime green indicator of this in the Access and Movement Strategy document that is included with the amended application. We would raise a concern that this is detailed as "Access to the Garage" rather than "Access to the Property" and request that the exact nature of the access be discussed with SSDC and the residents to ensure that all are in agreement, and that the necessary legal provision is put in place to effect the agreed arrangements.

Natural England – we note the observations of Natural England of 7 April 2020, and draw attention to their clarification that they have not commented upon whether or not licenses may be required for the management of protected species identified at the site. We would draw attention to the comment submitted by Austin Fletcher on 13 December 2019 regarding such licenses. Whilst this is a private comment, Austin is the Chairman of Milborne Port Parish Council. The approach taken by the applicant, particularly with the focus upon bat roosting, rather than bat foraging or migration, seems to be inconsistent with the observations made by Mr Fletcher. We are not experts in this area, but one of our legal obligations is to consider the ecological and environmental impact of the actions we take as a Council. Hence we would request that SSDC definitively determine whether licenses are required for the management of any impact from the development on protected species, in this case most notably Bechstein and Lesser Horseshoe bats, and that if this is the case, these licenses are sought and the terms of them complied with.

LLFA – we note the correspondence of 6 April 2020 from the LLFA which broadly welcomes the improvements made to the surface water management plans. However, we do note the ongoing specific concerns regarding the proposed underground storage facility. We also note the suggestion from the LLFA that on-site parking could be made with permeable paving, in a manner similar to the Market Square, and that this might improve the overall management of surface water further.

Highways – as noted above, Highways have at this stage noted the fact of the amendments to the application, but have not yet comments upon them.

Bazzleways and Osborne House complex – We note and welcome the relocation of the proposed houses and garages further away from the existing properties within these complexes. However, we would request that explicit clarification be made regarding what the anticipated practical access arrangements will be so that the existing properties can access, protect, and maintain their boundaries, and what the legal form will be to effect these arrangements.

Local Accessibility – We would ask that appropriate regulations be put in place ensuring priority access to persons with a local connection to the parish to the affordable housing within