

MARLDON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a PUBLIC MEETING to discuss HOUSING OPTIONS organised by Marldon Parish Council and held on Wednesday 3rd February 2010 at 7.30pm in the Village Hall

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cllrs: Pennington, Benney, Palk, Mrs Cox,

ALSO PRESENT: Ms Bridget Green, of the Forward Planning Team of South Hams District Council; Clerk to the Council: David Eeles; and 110 members of the public

The Chairman of the meeting, Parish Council Chairman Cllr Pennington, began by thanking all those who had helped by distributing leaflets for the meeting- Cllrs Danby, Clarke, and Joinson; Messrs Carnell, Gould and Tucker. He then introduced the guest, Bridget Green, of the South Hams District Council Forward Planning Unit, who had come to consult the public primarily about the two new sites that have been proposed at SHDC's Dec. 17th meeting, for further consideration, namely on the Ipplepen Road at the Glendinning depot, and land south of Brockhurst Park, as well three sites that have been proposed as a result of the Princes' Trust enquiry, namely a reconfigured site at Vicarage Road/ Five lanes, Westerland Green and land West of Love Lane at Butterlake. He went on to sketch the background to these proposals, which emanated from the S.W Regional Strategy, a Bristol-based quango which he expected a future Conservative government to abolish. They had said that they wanted 400 houses to be found in the 16 parishes that had a shop and a school, despite the fact that there were other villages which did want more housing. He reiterated that Marldon had already expanded faster than any other S. Hams village in the last 10 years, with 102 extra houses, a 12.3% growth rate. All the proposed sites were outside the development area defined by the Parish with SHDC in the statutory Local Plan, which would be superceded by the Local Development Framework when this is agreed. The Chairman said the three sites selected by the Princes Trust from the original 10 had already been rejected by both the Council and at the public meeting, for reasons given at length in the letters sent to SHDC and the Prince's Trust. There was a deadline on February 10th for responses to the extra two sites. It was then aimed to publish the LDF document in the first week of March after which there would be a formal consultation period of 6 weeks, after which the matter would go for examination by the Inspector.

Mr Holloway, the owner of a business sited in a quarry in Kiln Road, said that he would have been very willing to sell his land for housing and relocate elsewhere in the area, an option that would provide a solution to this problem as the houses would not be conspicuous in the quarry and this area was in fact already in the existing development area. He couldn't understand why he had not been approached when his was a brown-field site that would not impinge nearly as much as the greenfield sites that had been chosen. Ms Green said that there had been a call for sites, and that if he wished he could apply for planning permission

on his site. Mr Holloway also suggested that land near his premises and owned by the Council under the management of Trustees could also be considered and would have the same advantages as his land had.

Mr Tar said he was a local farmer who farmed one of the identified sites, at Butterlake, and he had not been approached and would have been against this use of valuable farmland that would also breach one of the stated criteria, that there should be no coalescence with neighbouring settlements, as this would bring Marldon closer to Compton. It also breached the sustainability criteria that the houses should be near to the shops and schools, as these were on the extremity of the village as well as providing possible aesthetic objections to modern houses besides the historical heart of the village. Later questions on this site evinced that the land was in fact owned by the National Trust, although it was not inalienable land but the National Trust had a policy of not commenting on proposed development of their sites until plans actually put forward.

Several Brockhurst Park residents said that the proposed site South of the existing housing also breached the sustainability criteria, was on the extremity of the village and would pose serious access problems where the roads were already very busy. In any case the land in question was owned by the residents who would be most unlikely to wish to sell it. In reply to questions Ms Green said Compulsory Purchase Orders were not planned to be used in this exercise and that the new proposals had come from the local community.

The Chairman said that the area with the greatest demand for new housing was in the vicinity of Totnes, which included Marldon, although he later said that he had established that only 6 families had actually asked housing associations to be located in Marldon.

Regarding Westerland Green the Chairman gave a brief outline of Midas' previous attempts to develop this site, which had included plans to block off the top of Moorview. He reiterated the results of the traffic survey he had asked for which had shown a great increase in traffic movements along the Totnes Road, a feature which would affect several of the proposed sites including Vicarage Road.

On the Vicarage Road site it was noted that this land was leased on a 60 year lease to the Torbay Coast and Countryside Trust as land of outstanding landscape value, and its development would also breach the coagulation criteria by narrowing the green belt between Marldon and Paignton, as well as making it difficult to object to Torbay developing its sites on the other side of the ring road.

On the Glendinning site it was noted that this site would involve expensive new sewage works and would also be difficult to provide good access on to an already narrow and congested Ipplepen Road.

The mix of housing was discussed and the Chairman said that although it was SHDC's policy to have 60% of all new homes in the affordable category it was proving difficult to maintain this with existing developments in the current financial circumstances.

RESOLUTIONS:

The following resolutions were **CARRIED** by the meeting:

1. That the Westerland Green proposal (RA23/ original site 2) be rejected as a suitable site for housing development. Proposed: Mr Self Seconded: Mr Bagget. In favour: 104; Against 4; Abstained: 2
2. That the Butterlake proposal (RA24/ original site 10) be rejected as a suitable site for housing development. Proposed: Mr Tar Seconded: Mr Carnell. In favour: 109; Against 0; Abstained: 1
3. That the Vicarage Road proposal (RA25/ original site 1) be rejected as a suitable site for housing development. Proposed: Mr J. Smith Seconded: Mr Mc Adam. In favour: 92; Against 4; Abstained: 14
4. That the land South of Brockhurst Park proposal (site 12) be rejected as a suitable site for housing development. Proposed: Mr Letcher Seconded: Mr Porter. In favour: 106; Against 0; Abstained: 4
5. That the Glendinnings proposal (site 11) be **accepted** as a suitable site for housing development. Proposed: Mr Chidlow Seconded: . In favour: 45; Against 13; Abstained: 13
6. That the brownfield quarry site in Kiln Road where there is currently a garage be proposed for housing development. Proposed: Mr Tarr Seconded: Ms Tucker. In favour: 52; Against 6; Abstained: 12

The Chairman concluded by thanking all those present for coming and Bridget Green for giving up her spare time to attend.

Meeting closed at 9.30 pm