

## WEMBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Councillors	<b>R Rowland</b>	<b>Chairman</b>
	<b>J Bennett</b>	
	<b>A Cammack</b>	
	<b>M Doody</b>	
	<b>D Drought</b>	
	<b>P Filby</b>	<b>Vice Chairman</b>
	<b>J Gibbons</b>	
	<b>J Hart</b>	<b>County Councillor</b>
	<b>R Newnham</b>	
	<b>D Packer</b>	
	<b>J Squire</b>	<b>District Councillor</b>
	<b>J Stansell</b>	
Clerk	<b>R Fairclough</b>	

**Minutes of the Wembury Parish Council meeting held at the War Memorial Hall, Wembury, on Monday 22 August 2011.**

### **11-097 OPENING THE MEETING**

The Chairman, Cllr Rowland opened the meeting at 7.32 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially Mr Kibble-White and Mr Matthews from Taylor Wimpey who would be speaking later in the meeting.

Cllrs Bennett, Cammack, Doody, Drought, Filby, Gibbons, Newnham, Squire and Stansell were present.

25 members of the public, Adam King, Wembury Tree Warden, Isaac Kibble-White and David Matthews from Taylor Wimpey were also present.

### **11-098 APOLOGIES**

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Hart and Packer.

### **11-099 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

None.

### **11-100 THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL WAS SUSPENDED FOR THE PUBLIC TO MAKE OBSERVATIONS OR TO PUT QUESTIONS**

**The Chairman suspended the business of the Council and opened this session to the public at 7.33 pm.**

#### **i) Taylor Wimpey - Development Proposals for Land off Leyford Close, Wembury Isaac Kibble-White Land Manager and David Matthews Planning Director**

**Isaac Kibble-White** thanked the Chairman for being given an opportunity to speak to the Parish Council and members of the community.

He then went through the history of the land adjacent to Leyford Close, Wembury and explained why it had not been selected for development as part of the DPD process along with the Knighton Hill site.

However, he suggested that there was another option for development in Wembury other than the Knighton Hill site and that was the land adjacent to Leyford Close.

He displayed and explained the site on a large plan and said that lots of information had been submitted to South Hams during the DPD process, which was available to view on their website.

Development on this land would have less visual impact, better benefits for the community and was a better position to develop within the village as a whole than the Knighton Hill site. It could contribute to the community, has good links to the school and recreational facilities and would have a positive impact on the village. Taylor Wimpey would deliver standard housing and would employ local trades. This development site is 3.64 acres and could accommodate up to 50 houses. However, this number of houses is not set in stone and Taylor Wimpey was attending the meeting to collaborate with the Wembury community, to work with the local people, Parish Council or working group, to deliver what they want from the site.

**David Matthews** said that he was surprised that this site was not approved as part of the DPD process. Consequently, the proposal now put forward is only a notional scheme and he has no preconceived ideas for the site. The housing market is slow at the moment but there is a demand for family houses. There would be many benefits to the Wembury Parish and he would like the local community to take pride in the final development.

A lengthy discussion then developed with the following key points being made. South Hams DC would welcome comments from the Parish Council and under the Localism Bill it could be possible for the two sites to be approved, which would mean an additional 80 houses in Wembury.

This would generate traffic problems that would have to be addressed and a highway assessment would have to be carried out. Various traffic initiatives were available, from a contribution to improve the bus service and road system to other green initiatives. It was said that most people would still use their cars and without work to the road system, congestion would occur. Access through Leyford Close would also be difficult with many parked cars in the Close.

Additional houses would create more people who would make more use of the local shops and businesses, the bus service and the school, which would enable the village to be more sustainable.

**David Pinder, Amenity Society**, believes that Cavanna Homes will fight for their right to develop Knighton Hill, as an allocation has been approved in the DPD and this scheme would have to be additional to the Knighton Hill scheme, not instead of it. This site has been through two reviews by a planning inspector and it was not put into the DPD. David said that to build on this site would undermine the planning process and therefore this development is not acceptable. If this site went through then the local authority influence would be eroded even further and he questioned what other sites would be built on within the Parish. Wembury is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and if this site went ahead, it would become increasingly more difficult to protect the landscape.

**Tony Romang** also reiterated that the site had been discounted by the Princes Trust investigation and only Knighton Hill had been accepted for development. The community did not want the Knighton Hill development and only because it is being forced on the community is it being reluctantly accepted. However, two sites are not acceptable.

**Cllr Drought** said that he represented the Parish Council at both the Princes Trust review and the Inspectors DPD review and the Parish Council was of the opinion that only two

sites were suitable for housing. A few houses possibly behind the Odd Wheel pub and a single row of cottages at Knighton Hill. However, he had continually reiterated that the Parish Council considers Wembury to be fully developed with no scope or requirement for large developments.

The debate continued and the following comments were made.

If 80 houses were built in Wembury then the sewerage treatment plant would need upgrading. David Matthews said that SW Water were due to upgrade the Wembury sewerage system by 2015 and agreed that they would have to contribute to such an upgrade. David went on to say that if Taylor Wimpey say they will provide 50% affordable housing then that is what they will do, unlike other developers who reduce the percentage of affordable houses. He felt that rural communities have to evolve to be sustainable and as Wembury has an older population, this development would breathe new life into the community and support the school, bus service and local facilities. However, he has no preconceived plans for the site and if there was no desire for such a development then the company would spend its money elsewhere.

It was suggested that perhaps Taylor Wimpey should wait a few years until the Knighton Hill scheme has been assessed and its affect on the Wembury community is known, before discussing the site development again.

**The Chairman** thanked Isaac and David for their presentation and lively discussion. At this point, they both left the meeting.

#### **ii) Members of the Public**

**Tony Romang** said that several tyres from South Barton Farm appeared to have been dumped in Brownhills Lane and asked if they could be removed.

**David Pinder** He said that the Amenity Society was concerned about the planning application 58/1831/11/F to site a caravan at The Stables, Ford Road, Wembury. The society have been trying for some time to get an ugly wall clad and the area cleared, which is part of a previous planning order. The caravan is supposed to be used when the barn is converted, but there is nothing to say that such a development will be forthcoming. Consequently, he felt that this planning application should only be approved subject to previous planning orders being complied with and evidence that the barn conversion will start soon.

**Terry Clark** explained the extension proposals in planning application 58/2037/11/F, 72 Church Road, Wembury and how the extension affects his property. He has written to South Hams DC objecting to the extension proposals in its current form and wishes the Parish Council to consider his comments when discussing this planning application.

**The Chairman closed this open session at 8.37 pm and resumed Parish Council business.**

#### **11-101 TO RECEIVE THE MONTHLY PLANNING REPORT AT ANNEX A TO THESE MINUTES**

The Chairman went through the planning report shown in Annex A of the Agenda.

**RESOLVED: To accept the Planning Report with resolutions as detailed in ANNEX A of these minutes.**

**11-102 EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION**

None.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 8.46 pm.

Roy Fairclough  
Clerk