

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF AN EXTRA ORDINARY INSTOW PARISH
COUNCIL HELD AT THE PARISH HALL, INSTOW ON
THURSDAY 14th DECEMBER 2017 AT 7.30 pm**

Present: - Councillor Moores (Chairman)
Councillors Mrs Clements, Crombie, Green, Mrs Hackett and McCrum
Mr M Isaac (Clerk)

In Attendance: 5 Parishioner/members of the public.

130 OPENING OF THE MEETING

The meeting was declared open by the Clerk.

131 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Johns and Vandersteen

132 COUNCILLORS DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest announced.

**133 APPLICATION 64068: RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR
ERECTION OF TEN DWELLINGS (OUTLINE PLANNING
PERMISSION 58606) AT THE PONY FIELD, LAND NORTH OF
MARINE PARADE, INSTOW**

The Clerk outlined the format of the meeting. The first part of the meeting would be open to Parishioners to express their views and ask questions on the Planning Application. The second part of the meeting would be a discussion and voting on recommendations by the Councillors only.

The Parishioners raised the following issues

- A) The Design and Access Statement states that the flooding in the field has occurred because the drains in Marine parade have been blocked. This is incorrect. The flooding occurs in two ways. The first is, the force of the water coming through the culvert, hitting the bank as it comes into the field. The second is the excess water that does not go down the culvert. At times so much water comes off the hills at the back of Instow that the culvert cannot take all the flow. The excess splashes into Barton Lane, floods the junction at the bottom of Barton Lane, flows across the road and then goes either onto Marine Parade and from there into the field or it flows across the entrance to the Marines Camp and into the field. The field is soft and boggy throughout the year. The proposed suds will not make it any less boggy. If there is a public open space it may attract people with young children. Unfenced shallow ponds will be a hazard for young children.

Last Sunday following heavy rain the fields were flooded and the junction at the crossroads, at the bottom of Barton Lane there was extensive flooding across the road.

(Photos were circulated). The design statement indicated that all had been resolved. The Environment Agency sequential test suggested that it had not been resolved and were not satisfied.

- B) The sewage problems were discussed at the Planning Committee meeting on July 13th 2016 and it was decided that SWW should be asked to provide indisputable proof that their system was capable of accepting these additional houses. According to the website for this application and for the original 58606 SWW has not supplied a report from an independent source. Developers should not start work until that report has been provided. Assurances should be also obtained from SWW that the pipe between the pump house and the sewage farm at Yelland was capable of taking the extra load. SWW Officers have been heard to say that the pipe does not have the required capacity. The people living in the chalets experience back up in their toilets and no test has been carried out by SWW. An FOI requests to NDC identified no reports
SWW comments on the application are No Objections
- C) It is proposed that the remainder of the field shall become a public open space. Where are visitors to this open space going to park? It is very likely that visitors will mostly be dog owners. Is it possible to add this open space to the areas NDC are considering for a PSPO?
- D) According to the Construction Management Plan work will start at 7am. According to your instructions to the developers, work should start at 8am. I am sure the chalet owners and residents of Lane End Close and Sycamore Drive would prefer 8am.
- E) The Highways Authority has said that the pavement should be widened to 2 m as far as the bridge. At the Planning Committee meeting it was suggested by the then developer that this was excessive and during the discussion that ensued it was agreed that a width of 1.5m would probably be acceptable to the HA. This discussion did not make it to the minutes. Chichester Developments have ignored the HA recommendation and widened the footpath for only a short distance. The footpath should be widened as far as possible. It is dangerous at its current width. It is impossible for two people to walk side by side and not safe for someone carrying a bag. It is likely that the residents of the new houses will have children who will be put at risk with the current width.
- F) A fence should be provided between the path that runs down in front of the chalets and the development field. One plan shows a hedge that finishes between Grey Dawn and Briaryfield. The notes indicate that the current post and wire fence may be retained for the length of the path or that it may be replaced by a post and mesh fence to a height of 1.35m. The owners would like a substantial fence erected on the western border of the site as the estate road will be used by persons wishing to go to the beach and unwilling to pay for parking. When they have parked on the estate road they will see that the shortest route to the beach is through the chalet gardens. The safety and security of the chalets will be seriously compromised. The situation may be aggravated by the developer's treatment of the area in front of that fence. At the exhibition in the chapel it was stated that it was simply an area where they could not build or construct anything. They had to leave it free so SWW could have access to the sewer pipe if it needed attention. The area would probably be left grassed over. It has since been stated by a Chichester Homes representative that it would be a roadway designed to allow a tarmacked or similar access to the sewer pipes for SWW equipment including heavy lorries. This will encourage those going to the beach to use that "road" as a means of access via the chalet gardens.

SWW has only used the field to access a burst main on one occasion. On many other occasions SWW has had to access the sewer pipe they have done so from the Tarka Trail through the chalet gardens.

- G) The Ministry of Defence has stated that a noise abatement screen was required. This has not had been included in the plans and the noise impact assessment was inadequate.
- E) The Police have requested alterations to the access road and stated that it should be adopted.

It was considered that there were many errors/omissions in the application and it should be returned by NDC for re-submission by Chichester Homes.

A Parishioner stated that the pump station could not cope; the 2 houses on the extreme right of the development would under the perpetual light of the Marine Camp; the access road was only 1 to 1 1/2 vehicles in width and the houses were 'modular' and not in keeping with other houses in Instow.

Councillor Moores stated that the foul water disposal, surface water disposal and flooding would be evaluated and incorporated in conditions. NDC had not yet received a satisfactory response from SWW.

The provision of a fence/hedge between the development site and the chalets to act as a bund to prevent flooding of the chalets was discussed.

RESOLVED:

- a) That NDC be requested not to determine the above application until conditions (c), (d) and (e) in the Planning Committee decision on 13/07/ 2016 relating to surface water disposal, foul water disposal and flooding are resolved with SW Water to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and Local Planning Authority.
- b) The Council considered that the provision of a noise abatement screen between the Royal Marine base and the development should be considered
- c) Concern was expressed at the narrow width of the estate access road (it was said that cars could not enter and leave the estate at the same time) and it was considered that the estate road should be adopted by DCC
- d) The need for the right of way for SW Water and for the road/track close to the boundary nearest the chalets was queried. SW Water does not have a right of way at present.
- e) The Council requested that it should be re-consulted when the above issues have been addressed.

134 APPLICATION 64041: RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF SIX DWELLINGS (OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 58626) AT LAND AT ANSTEY WAY, INSTOW

A Parishioner raised the following issues:

Concern regarding the ridge heights of the properties as they were not as suggested in line with the nearest properties either end Valeridge and Millbrook House.

The properties were modular and not in keeping with other properties in Instow

RESOLVED:

- a) The Parish Council considered that it was unable to make a decision on this application as the detailed plan provided was incorrect and confusing as it was designated Anstey Way but related to application 64068 Marine Parade.
- b) As a consequence, the Council did not have the details of proposed materials/external finish or elevations of the properties to be built on this site.
- c) The Council requests an extension to allow Councillors to see the correct drawings.

Chairman

The meeting ended at 9.15 p.m.

.