

# MALBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of Parish Council Meeting

in private session

Date: 10 <sup>th</sup> November 2010		Venue & Time: Village Hall Annexe, 7.30pm	
<b>Present:</b> Cllr. Mrs Gill Boyce Cllr. Mrs Ann Kendall Cllr. Paul Pedrick Cllr. Roger Rendle Cllr. Mrs Ann Smallman Cllr Mike Taylor Cllr. Mr John Yeoman (in the Chair)		<b>In Attendance:</b> Mrs Debbie Ede (Clerk, Minute taker)	<b>Apologies:</b> Cllr Tony Lyle (who had conveyed his views to the meeting) Cllr Putt had declared a prejudicial interest and was absent from the meeting
Minute Ref	Minutes & Actions	Owner	Status
1	The meeting was held in private session to debate the outcome of 03/11/2010 and make a decision on: <u>PLANNING APPLICATION Ref. No. 33-46/2144/10/F; CHOLWELLS COURT</u> - Mixed tenure residential development comprising 10 open market and 7 affordable dwellings, associated landscaping, access and other works including creation of allotments - Land adjacent to Alston Nursery, Alston Gate, Malborough, Devon.		
2	Cllr Yeoman set out the <b>rationale</b> for the meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To make a decision on 2144 &amp;</li> <li>Safeguard our position on the 106 in the event of 2144 receiving the go-ahead</li> </ul>		
3	New recent <b>correspondence</b> included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nick Rowell - for</li> <li>Scott Rossiters emails showing responses from SWW and Hastoe and some suggested minute corrections (including the tabling of plans after 9<sup>th</sup> July meeting which Cllr Yeoman had already stated had not happened)</li> <li>Peter Smallman - against</li> <li>D Hemming - against</li> </ul> <b>Recent update:</b> Cllrs Yeoman and Kendall had met with Bob Summers - DCC highways to inspect the vehicular access and share the concerns over pedestrian safety. Mr Summers had done the initial appraisal (4 <sup>th</sup> Nov, posted on the website); where he said he required further information to make a decision, a larger turning circle/adoption at the entrance, with a 20m extension westwards.		
4	A full and frank <b>debate</b> then ensued as to the acceptability of the planning proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without the AH the site would not even be considered</li> <li>Do we need it given the Hastoes development</li> <li>If site allocations were guaranteed to local people ie: Malborough Parish, then might consider</li> <li>If this passed, what might come next - re. precedent</li> <li>Local people but how local</li> <li>Accepted as No 1 priority for SHDC - at the expense of all other policy considerations and guidelines</li> <li>On the village vote - 39 against, 3 for but a number abstained - fears of firing squad or done deal</li> <li>Should be 60% affordable but argued down because of no grant</li> <li>Sprat to catch a mackerel</li> <li>Better sites ie: not on skyline, also re access &amp; safety</li> <li>Dangerous access</li> <li>Under the wire through AH provision - no demonstrated need</li> <li>For - 'gives the young people a chance'</li> <li>In 'two minds'</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Reluctantly oppose’</li> <li>• Feel for the young people but they wont get the houses</li> <li>• Too many</li> <li>• Maybe in the future</li> <li>• Cant guarantee the people who want the houses will get them; development in Malborough is not bad per se</li> <li>• No guarantee that the open market homes will not become 2<sup>nd</sup> homes and we don’t need them</li> <li>• Village gave a very clear no</li> <li>• Wrong time/wrong density</li> <li>• Too much too soon</li> <li>• If 24 now what will be available for the next half generation in 10 years time</li> <li>• No one in the village has come forward apart from 3 at public meeting (incl. Nick Rowell) and a Cllr.</li> <li>• No one has stopped us in the street in support</li> <li>• Very little consultation</li> <li>• Still sewerage concerns</li> <li>• A little development every so often</li> <li>• Preferred original lower density option around village green</li> <li>• Car ports make site even more crowded</li> <li>• Access and safety issues wont ever go away</li> <li>• Pedestrians will take the shortest route and will cross the main road</li> <li>• For the size of village we are we have an adequate supply of AH</li> <li>• Should be an on-going development policy with affordable housing trickled in</li> </ul>		
5	<p><b>By MAJORITY decision the Parish Council OBJECT to this planning application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the wrong development in the wrong place at the wrong time</li> <li>• There is no, current, demonstrable need from the local people</li> <li>• The Hastoe development fulfills local need</li> <li>• There should be more consultation re future developments</li> <li>• The acceptability of Alston Gate hinges totally on AH provision</li> </ul>		
6	<p><b>Safeguarding the 106 Agreement</b></p> <p><b>Education;</b> £61k ok</p> <p><b>Landscaping:</b> Could end up with market houses paying a lot (the £10/week quoted is high) - Tor Homes should be asked to contribute as their hedges etc too.</p> <p><b>Open Spaces:</b> <u><a href="#">Allotments</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do we need the allotments - land area fulfills density requirement of planners given more houses now planned than original</li> <li>• Discussion as to how the value of the allotments @£15k and the opportunity cost of the land @ £15k means a £30k offset against the open spaces contribution</li> <li>• Allotments are a token gesture</li> <li>• If we (the parish) don’t want the allotments they will go to Management Cmtt and therefore cannot be counted against a 106 agreement - not a village benefit</li> <li>• All letting of allotments should be open, no priority to new development owners, open to all parishioners in Malborough</li> </ul>		

	<p>(and, post-meeting note: South Huish - given that they lie within their boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letting should be advertised in the Messenger</li> <li>• The allotments should be given to the Village in perpetuity with no right to move around retained land</li> <li>• The access to the field should be blocked off</li> <li>• The paths should be widened to comply with the 3m required by DCC</li> <li>• The access should be locked</li> <li>• Water needs to be provided</li> <li>• A communal shed needs to be provided</li> </ul> <p><b>£15k</b>          £15 needs to be ring fenced for spending within the Parish - Projects could include Wheelchair access to Pavilion, playground and Village Hall extension</p> <p><b>Great Lane</b>          Thought that the lane does not need an upgrade - or is it for the crossing? Not an extra village benefit.          However - thought we can use the £5.5k for any footpath within Malborough within a 15 year time scale.</p>		
7	<p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Yeoman and Clerk to draft letter of response to Malcolm Elliott to bring to 17/11/2010 Council Meeting               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To refute strongly IVA report statement of strong parish council support</li> <li>• Do not 'muddy the waters' re other sites or suitability of other design - we do not need the houses now</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cllr Yeoman &amp; Clerk to write holding email, informing SHDC of decision</li> </ul>		
	The meeting closed at 9.40pm		
	<b>Dates for the Diary</b>		
	Next Parish Council Meeting date Wednesday 17 <sup>th</sup> November 2010 at 7.45pm		

**Distribution List**

Cllr. Mrs Gill Boyce

Cllr. Mrs Ann Kendall

Cllr. Mr Tony Lyle

Cllr. Paul Pedrick

Cllr. Mr Edmund Putt

Cllr. Roger Rendle

Cllr. Mrs Ann Smallman

Cllr. Mike Taylor

Cllr. Mr John Yeoman (in the Chair)