

# WOODBURY SALTERTON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

## Minutes special committee meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> August 2014 at Bridge Farm at 7.30pm

The meeting was called at short notice to discuss actions to be taken regarding planning application 14/1821/MOUT for a 60 dwelling housing estate on the field adjacent to Sages Lea.

Issued 10/8/14

Present	Geoff Jung. Frank Mulholland. David Rose. Priscilla Trenchard. Norman Gordon, Aran Brown, Ian Hunt	
Apologies	Keith Phillips, Stuart Honour, Diana Wackerbarth, Ben Jones	
Previous minutes	Not presented	
Agenda	Roughly as per emails from Geoff on 7th Aug 13.17 & 8 <sup>th</sup> Aug 8.39	
Glebe Field	<p>EDDC have confirmed that the Glebe Field has been Registered as a Community Asset.</p> <p>It was agreed that there was now need to look at the next step and formulate a scheme to provide the amenities that we would like. (This can be done after August is out of the way)</p> <p>There is no reason now that we cannot say that, in the opinion of the residents, the Glebe field is our preferred location for new amenity assets and not Sages Lea.</p>	
Hogsbrook	Discussion on the future of the issues at Hogsbrook Farm will be discussed at a later meeting when more facts will be available	
Planning Application Adjacent Sages Lea	The Planning Application had been submitted on the 25 <sup>th</sup> July and published on 5 <sup>th</sup> August. The closing date for comments/objections is the 29 <sup>th</sup> August although a letter dated 4 August sent to some residents by the EDDC stated 25 <sup>th</sup> August. The 29 <sup>th</sup> August was agreed at the meeting as our target date. It was noted with some dismay that the application had been submitted at the start of the holiday season when many villagers are away.	
Nature of the Application	The application gave the impression that access via Sages Les was the main intent (being an MOUT application) but advice from a Consultant was that it is actually an outline application for the development of 60	

	<p>Houses with all matters reserved but with a full application for granting of access. This means that, if access were granted, outline permission for the full development would be achieved. What would then follow would be a full application for detailed design and construction and this would not be denied although conditions may apply.</p> <p>It was suggested that a full construction programme could extend to over 6 years.</p> <p>It was noted that Highways Agency had opposed the planning application 3- 4 years ago for the 18 house extension to Sages Lea on the grounds of traffic and safety but had been overruled by EDDC for the need for affordable homes.</p>	
Appointment of a Consultant	<p>Mr Charlie Hopkins, the specialist consultant who had successfully campaigned in Feniton had been approached and had agreed to act on our behalf. An initial consultancy fee around £2500 had been suggested. It was explained to him that the pledged funds had not been collected yet but he agreed to proceed on this basis.</p> <p>A question was asked at the meeting on what the consultant would do that we could not do? It was accepted that he would have detailed knowledge of planning legislation and policy and was familiar with the workings of EDDC Planning. The nature of the contract with him was not raised at this stage.</p> <p>The nature and details of the work to be done by the Consultant needs to be reported back to the Committee who may notify villagers as appropriate.</p> <p>A formal contact letter will have to be sent to confirm the committees wish to engage his services.</p>	
Pledged Funds	<p>It was reported that a sum of about £8000 had been pledged.</p> <p>It was noted that, if the process goes to appeal then more funds would be needed. The maximum expected cost of an appeal would be in the region of £7500</p> <p>The question was raised of the responsibility that the Committee were taking with villagers pledged money. It was, however, believed that the Committee had a remit to accept private money by virtue of the Pledge invitation circulated in July which explained the reasons for the funds. It was now important to show transparency in the management of the funds and to report back to residents who have contributed to the funds.</p> <p>The Treasurer will ring fence the funds, separate from the WSRA normal account and to communicate with all Pledges to acknowledge the pledge and to ask for money</p>	

	<p>to be deposited in the selected bank account as soon as possible.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Treasurer, will also keep the residents who donated money informed on a regular basis on how the money is being spent and managed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Treasurer would keep the identity of the residents who donated confidential and not disclose names or amounts of money to anyone including other Committee members.</p> <p>It was also noted that, at the end of the whole campaign, if there were surplus funds in hand, this would be apportioned pro rata by the Treasurer as refunds. This would remain confidential.</p>	
Circulars to be distributed to all Villagers	<p>The content and style of two circulars were discussed in some detail. These had been compiled earlier during the week, circulated to the Committee and comments had been incorporated.</p> <p>The first circular was an urgent plea to all villagers to contribute to the fighting fund if they have not already done so.</p> <p>It all encouraged villagers to comment (objecting or accepting) on the Planning Application. It points out the urgency to respond before the deadline date of 29<sup>th</sup> August.</p> <p>A second circular (printed on the reverse) was a detailed guide for comment on the main issues. The issues were covered under headings of : Sustainability Traffic Design Location Other factors</p> <p>There were some small amendments agreed to this circular.</p> <p>Some discussion ensued on the guidance circular because there was a view that, although comprehensive, it was somewhat complex and some villagers may have difficulty in distilling the salient points for their response. An abridged addendum to this was tabled at the meeting which highlighted the main issues in 6 simple sentences. Due however to the urgent need to get information to villagers at least during this weekend, it was decided to proceed with just the two page/single sheet circular.</p> <p>Frank Mulholland suggested that we should send out regular, reminder-emails, right up to the 29th, containing such lists; to assist respondents and to ensure that a large number of comments are posted in response to the Planning Application.</p>	

	<p>An action was taken by Geoff Jung and Frank Mulholland to print the final versions as agreed and to distribute these as soon as possible.</p> <p>It was recognised that there may be a number of weeks before any decision is made by the EDDC</p> <p>Copies of the circulars and the draft addendum are attached below</p>	
Conclusion	The meeting ended at 9.00pm	
Next meeting	To be advised. Due to the requirements of running the campaign adhoc meeting may be held at short notice	

### **HANDS OFF WOODBURY SALTERTON.**

#### **Your village needs your help NOW.**

On the morning of the 5<sup>th</sup> August, a Planning Application, reference **14/1821/MOUT** was published on the East Devon District Council's planning website for permission

"To build 60 houses on land adjacent to Burnsall House Woodbury Salterton".

***Contractor's access to the site would be via the Village Rd and Sages Lea!***

#### **Planning Consultant Funding**

- In anticipation of fighting these proposals on your behalf the Resident's Association Committee wrote to you asking you to contribute to a fighting fund a few weeks ago.
- A big thank you to the many residents who have responded generously, but we are slightly short of our target. Now that our campaign has started, we need to ask those of you who have not yet pledged to do so if you possibly can, no matter how small an amount.
- We would also ask those residents who have pledged to now send their donations to our Treasurer. Cheques to be made payable to "Woodbury Salterton Residents Association"

So if you can please, please, please send your contributions to the Treasurer; email [wsra2013@gmail.com](mailto:wsra2013@gmail.com) or to Stuart Honour at Willow Brook, Village Rd Woodbury Salterton.

#### **Resident Responses to the Planning Application**

- You can also help by submitting a comment to EDDC Planning by either writing or accessing the reference on the EDDC Website by Friday 29<sup>th</sup> August.
- Copies of your concerns should also be sent to The Parish Clerk Mrs B Price Greenacre Couches Lane EX5 1HL. [clerk@woodbury.eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@woodbury.eastdevon.gov.uk)
- Also to the WSRA secretary Geoff Jung Rosewood Village Rd Woodbury Salterton EX5 1PR [geoffdebbie2@btinternet.com](mailto:geoffdebbie2@btinternet.com)
- A Parish Council meeting is planned for Monday 18<sup>th</sup> August to discuss this and other planning issues.
- The Services of Charlie Hopkins a very experienced planning consultant has been engaged by the Association.

**Action is required now!**

**A “help to respond” guide is overleaf**

**Guide to responding to Planning Application 14/1821/MOUT for up to 60 houses on the field adjacent to Sages Lea.**

If you have a computer you can go on line to: EDDC Planning. You will find clear instructions on how to comment on this application. You go to “new applications on line” and enter the above application reference and will find all you need to do. You will, however, have to register yourself as they must know who you are. This is fairly simple but you will need to generate your own password.

A good tip is to write a word document first off line and then copy and paste it into the comment column.

If you wish to write, which is entirely acceptable, it is to:

East Devon District Council, Planning, Knowle, Sidmouth EX10 8BL quoting the application reference. (If possible send a copy to Woodbury Parish Council and a copy to WSRA details on page 1 of this leaflet)

The following are some of the factors that may be considered Council Planning authority in relation to Planning Application 14/1821/MOUT

Sustainability.

All planning applications for new housing requires that residents have access to all amenities such as shopping, medical, schooling and work without the requirement of a private vehicle. This cannot be achieved in many rural villages such as here in Woodbury Salterton. The unsustainability of this village and the lack of safe pedestrian safety on Village Road was why Devon County Highways department recommended refusal for the recently built housing at Sages Lea. It was overruled by EDDC planning department because the justification of the urgent requirement for affordable housing was considered a higher priority. Without major works to the lanes with safe provision for pedestrians and cyclists further housing would create dangerous road conditions.

Traffic

- The proposal to make the present Sages Lea Estate the only access for construction and eventually the only access will cause dangerous traffic movements on Village Road (there are no or inadequate footpaths) and Sages Lea.(Car parking already an issue)
- The current lanes connecting the village to other areas are all single track without pavements. Any further traffic will only add to these dangerous roads which will prevent pedestrians and cyclists from using them. This potentially will encourage more people to use their cars.
- At School drop of and pick up times there is already dangerous traffic/parking congestion in Village Road. Without proper pavements, the extra traffic generated by initially construction traffic and then the additional traffic from 60 extra properties will add to the already dangerous situation with a major risk to small children.

Design

- The development will be entirely out of proportion and character of the village. The Estate will be approximately more than 47% of the housing stock for whole village! A small village attached to a large estate!
- It will be in contradiction to the Village Design Statement of 2002 which was to preserve the character of the village and only permit small infill housing of 5 – 6 homes. This document was accepted by the Council in their policies.
- The Design Statement also says development in open countryside should be resisted

- The additional 28 homes on the Sages Lea extension were in violation of the East Devon Villages Development Plan (revised in March 2014) which confirms the principal of a small number of infill housing.
- The East Devon Local Plan (now under revision for reassessment of housing numbers) states "In rural areas beyond our villages the policy approach is one of development constraint and countryside conservation. (clause15.19)

#### Location

- The field to be developed is prime agricultural land and should not be sacrificed.
- The field is liable to flooding and a large housing estate will exacerbate this, resulting in flooding further down Village Road.
- A village green proposed on the new development will not be in the right location outside the village boundary.
- The proposal submitted provides large areas of open spaces and a village green. This would require considerable cost for the upkeep which would be a cost of the ratepayers.

*(The Glebe field which has been identified by the Parish Council as the site for Village centre amenities such as a Village Green, School Play area, Car park, a site for a larger Village Community Hall and community shop has recently been successfully registered as a Village Community Asset.)*

- Any other factors that you may consider e.g. noise, light pollution etc.
  - If anyone needs advice or help in writing your submissions please contact a committee member who will gladly assist.
  - This email has been sent by the Committee of the WSRA.
- 

Not distributed

### **THE MAIN ISSUES FOR OBJECTION**

- THE VILLAGE IS NOT SUSTAINABLE ENOUGH TO ACCOMMODATE AN EXTRA 60 FAMILIES
- ACCESS VIA SAGES LEA INTO VILLAGE ROAD FOR COMMUTER, DELIVERY AND CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE AND DANGEROUS
- THE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE ENTIRELY OUT OF CHARACTER AND SPOIL THE VILLAGE FOR EVER
- VALUABLE AGRICULTURAL LAND SHOULD NOT BE SACRIFICED
- THERE WILL BE INCREASED RISK OF FLOODING AND MORE NOISE, LIGHT POLLUTION AND CAR EMISSIONS FROM MAYBE AN EXTRA 100 CARS FOR 60 FAMILIES
- OTHER SITES ARE AVAILABLE IN EAST DEVON AT MORE SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS AND SHOULD BE EXPLORED