

Broadhembury Parish Council

BPC EXTRAORDINARY MEETING

Platform: ZOOM

1st FEBRUARY 2021 - 7.30pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Cllrs. B. Nelson (Chairman), Mrs E. Bradshaw (Deputy), V. Game, N. Howgill, C. Ledward, A. Powell, Mrs D. Rees, R. Dunford-Brown, Mrs J. Henderson (Clerk).

Also present were 4 BNCLT members, including landowner of proposed site and Cllr Philip Skinner (EDDC), plus 11 members of the public.

Apologies: Dan Wicks

AGENDA

- 1 Minutes of the last planning meeting** on the 18th December 2020 were signed correct. Proposed Cllr Bradshaw, seconded Cllr Howgill
- 2 Application for planning permission/listed building consent:**
Planning in Principle application: 21/0117/PIP
Location: Sunnyside, Broadhembury
Land Use: 4 dwellings
Type of Development: Affordable housing

The Chair took a moment to explain the workings of a PiP application and how a PC would have more influence than normal, being a community development. There will also be a second opportunity to hold a planning meeting on the detail and substantive issues. This would be required to take place within 3 years of PiP being granted.

Steve Chipperfield, Chair of BNCLT, was then invited by the Chair to outline the latter stages of events and thinking behind the lodging of a PiP with EDDC.

The Chair (BNCLT) explained that consultations were limited due to time constraints and swift action was essential in order to avoid the possibility of Commercial Developers moving in. A PiP only establishes a site might be considered suitable for a full planning application and allows the BNCLT much needed breathing space to consider other options. In consultation with EDDC, of various sites under consideration, Sunnyside was favoured. However, the BNCLT has not committed solely to this site. Should the PiP be approved, that would be the time for extensive consultations on how to drive things forward, with support and approval from the community.

A number of objections communicated to the BNCLT via email/letters, were acknowledged and assurances given that at the next BNCLT meeting (later this week) these would be addressed and individuals would be contacted with responses to points raised.

Lastly the Chair of BNCLT urged everyone not to discard the PiP out of hand, due to potential consequences outlined earlier and to allow the trustees to explore further options and consult with the community in due course.

Broadhembury Parish Council

The Chair (PC) thanked BNCLT and asked for any questions, with responses as follows:

If the PiP site were changed for another, then the application would have to be withdrawn and a new application submitted. PiP is not a blanket approval.

Of the various sites, the one chosen was favoured due to its proximity to services.

Broadhembury Estate is not in a position to offer an alternative site that meets the EDDC criteria, as everything else is in the Conservation area.

Having a fifth house as a Commercial property to help fund the other four, was considered but discounted as a last resort. Having gifted land at Sunnyside, offers leverage and equity to borrow.

If the PiP is passed, then the various legal protections would be sought to ensure the site is not exploited to the detriment of the village and its community.

Cllr Skinner (EDDC) commented on the technicalities of the question whether EDDC would approve a PiP, if BPC were not behind it. He said affordable housing is driven by the community, along with the PC and would therefore be rather odd for EDDC to be fighting against it. He pointed out the Housing Needs Survey would define and backup the requirements.

This application would reduce the risk of a commercial development in the village and allow three years to complete the technical papers of a full planning application.

The belief is this three year period would offer protection from other developers pursuing sites within the Parish, so long as there is proven activity.

Due to speed of application, more time for consultation was requested by some villagers.

The Chair proposed we adjourn without taking a vote He asked the applicants (BNCLT) to produce a written response to questions raised. This response would be considered when the meeting reconvened.

Meeting adjourned: 8.20pm

Broadhembury Parish Council

RECONVENED PC MEETING Platform: ZOOM 8th FEBRUARY 2021 - 7.30pm

PRESENT: Cllrs. B. Nelson (Chairman), Mrs E. Bradshaw (Deputy), V. Game, N. Howgill, D. Wicks, A. Powell, Mrs D. Rees, R. Dunford-Brown, Mrs J. Henderson (Clerk).

Also present were 4 BNCLT members, including landowner of proposed site and Cllr Philip Skinner (EDDC), plus 14 members of the public.

Apologies: Cllr C. Ledward

AGENDA

1 Minutes of the last meeting

To be continued for this 'Adjourned Extraordinary Meeting' and presented in combined format for approval at the next full PC meeting.

2 Application for planning permission/listed building consent:

Discussion of any supplementaries to BNCLT Q&A's and taking of the Vote.

Chair thanked the BNCLT for producing list of Q&A's (see attached) and went on to address additional questions he'd received from various parish members.

(Qi) Why did you ask the question of 'affordable housing need & why delay in publishing?'

(Ai) Previous Housing Needs Survey had expired and PC needed to take the initiative in order to meet the speculative requirement of affordable housing for locals. The new Housing Needs Survey results showed a need for 4 affordable houses, which was discussed, minuted and published on the website - 4th Nov. 2020.

(Apologies for delay in web publication of full Housing Needs Survey).

(Qii) Does the Drewe Estate own the CLT?

(Aii) No. The community owns the CLT (currently 100+ members). See BNCLT website for full rules and regs. once up and running.

(Qiii) How much has this cost so far?

(Aiii) PC received grants for legal work in setting up CLT (approx. £6k due to PC determination to protect unique architectural character/heritage of parish within legal framework).

(Qiv) Why the rush?

(Aiv) Planning in Principle is a new procedure with basic requirements ie: no plans, drawings, studies etc., and short time-scales, which in turn reduce costs for the applicant. The Chair had already negotiated an additional week with EDDC, giving BNCLT more time to address the community's questions, but a vote will be taken at the end of the meeting.

Broadhembury Parish Council

The Chair asked for any supplementaries:

(Qv) Had any Cllr and/or EDDC rep., physically checked the proposed site?

(Av) Not visited as a group due to pandemic and not legally required. However, the Chair had inspected the site.

(Qvi) Any other sites considered?

(Avi) Of the 21 sites originally considered, guidance from EDDC helped the BNCLT whittle this down to the only favourable site proposed today.

*(Qvii) Was EDDC informed of all sites and did they consider any other options of land. Has the Drewe Estate withdrawn their previous offer of land to the PC (PC Mins. Jan 2016) a site - *SHLAA 131 - for 3 affordable dwellings?*

(Avii) This site was rejected by the PC at the time, so not up for reconsideration.

(Qviii) If PiP granted, then site abandoned, what happens to PiP?

(Aviii) Being similar to an outline planning application, a PiP would have a time limit of 3 years and if abandoned/inaction by CLT, the PiP would expire.

(Qix) Previous Memorial Hall site was for more housing, so was this taken into consideration when filtering down possible sites?

(Aix) Yes was accounted for, but still came out bottom of the EDDC(**HELAA)/BNCLT criteria list. The combined criteria info. will be published by BNCLT in due course.

(Qx) To what extent do the CLT Trustees feel they represent the members?

(Ax) None of the Trustees know for sure. A new CLT survey has gone out, but results won't be known until Friday (12th). Inappropriate to make assumptions.

(Qxi) Can the PiP be paused or restarted?

(Axi) The concern is regarding a major developer coming in and doing something on a much larger scale. The PiP is a safeguard against this, and gives 3 years to explore options.

(Qxii) Why can't the PiP be withdrawn then resubmitted after the results of the consultation survey are known?

(Axii) CLT would not want to delay PiP due to how this would be perceived by the EDDC and may damage their working relationship. Due to the protection PiP offers, don't see the logic in taking this action.

(Statement 1) EDDC partially funded and helped set-up BNCLT, so surely any developer coming in within next 12 weeks would not be favoured by EDDC over CLT. Also expect results of CLT survey may be low in number due to lack of anonymity option.

Broadhembury Parish Council

(Statement 2) PiP has real implications for those living near the site, in terms of peace of mind, but also house price impact.

(Statement 3) If, as the CLT have said, there is no alternative to this proposed site and the PiP gets approved, the CLT will be applying for full planning. This is too short a notice, for something with such great implications to house-holders.

(Statement 4) Don't feel there is a choice, as can only consider this site.

(Qxiii) Is it not better for the CLT to withdraw the PiP for a couple of weeks, than have the PiP rejected by PC?

(Axiii) This option has been discussed. Probably haven't made clear, but with results from survey and what the CLT have listened to thus far, they intend to come up with options. So not just a take or leave it situation. Can't share options yet as info. not put together yet.

*(Qxiv) After 2016 plan was aborted no developer jumped in the (*SHLAA site) so why do the CLT think someone will jump in now?*

(Axiv) Developer threat is greater, as they would build more than the 4 needed. EDDC have invited landowners to register sites for potential development (**HELAA - done once every five years). A standing application will prevent others coming in. If CLT withdraw or EDDC turn it down, theoretically other landowners can then step in. CLT very fortunate in having a gifted site, as they don't have to offset the cost of purchasing land with a commercial build. This is a desirable parish for a developer hence the need for a CLT to safeguard parish interests.

(Qxv) Can the PiP application be altered/re-orientate?

(Axv) The PiP would require a separate application for any alteration of location of plot.

(Qxvi) Feel elevation of site is not suitable?

(Axvi) If not suitable, it will be rejected by EDDC.

THE VOTE:

The Chair invited Cllrs to discuss the Vote, allowing others at the meeting to remain present.

Cllr Game: Felt this had been rushed through and would prefer the PiP to be withdrawn. He could not be certain a positive vote would be in the interest of the community, due to lack of consultation of CLT members.

Cllr Howgill: Agrees there is a need for affordable housing and it's always going to be a tough decision as to where the site should be. Not enough transparency and openness due to speed of PiP and distrust of CLT with a lack of consultations with members and parish.

Broadhembury Parish Council

Cllr Bradshaw: Would like to see PiP delayed until CLT have website up with rules, regs, policies visible for all. They need to have a meeting with members first and a flow of information to members is required.

Cllr Rees: Agrees - lack of transparency. If voted through this would send a wrong message that the PC's prepared to act without being in possession of all information. Suggests vote adjourned and CLT provides missing info and carries out required consultations first.

Cllr Dunford-Brown: Also agrees - transparency and openness issues. Planning always contentious. Considers it harsh to vote through the PiP without proper consultations. Also thinks the CLT should be offered the opportunity to withdraw the PiP prior to a vote.

Cllr Powell: Didn't feel they had the community on board and this was essential. There are genuine concerns for those householders directly involved and CLT message not put across well enough.

Cllr Game: Asked if CLT could have additional day or two, in order to put to their members the option of withdrawing the PiP for now?

The Chair asked the BNCLT Chair if he would like to reconsider withdrawing the PiP, but he declined this option.

The Chair asked for Cllrs to vote.

VOTE:

IN FAVOUR:	None
AGAINST:	Cllr Game, Cllr Wicks, Cllr Dunford-Brown
ABSTAIN:	Cllr Rees, Cllr Bradshaw, Cllr Howgill

RESULT: Planning in Principle application: 21/0117/PIP not supported.

(As PC nominated Trustee for CLT, Cllr Powell did not take a vote, neither did the Chair.)

The Chair thanked everyone and brought the meeting to a close.

*SHLAA - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

**HELAA - Housing & Economic Availability Assessment

Meeting adjourned: 8.38pm