

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF HOLBETON PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON  
TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016 AT 7.30 PM IN  
HOLBETON VILLAGE HALL, HOLBETON**

Members in Attendance  
Cllr J Sherrell (Chairman)  
Cllr J Fuller (Vice-Chairman)  
Cllr H Baumer  
Cllr C Ackroyd  
Cllr D Knight  
Cllr J Pengelly  
Cllr M Reece  
Cllr T Craig  
Cllr P Hearn  
Cllr C Flower

Apologies  
Cllr Blackler  
PCSO A Potter

Other Attendees  
Clerk S Timothy  
C/Cllr R Hosking (Arrived at 8.20pm)  
D/Cllr K Baldry  
See end for other attendees

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7.40pm

**1.0 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2016 had been circulated and were approved. Cllr Baumer noted the date in item 1.0 should have read 19<sup>th</sup> October rather than 19<sup>th</sup> November.

**2.0 PLANNING MATTERS**

**2.1 Planning Application Updated – The Flete Estate**

- **Land North of Church Hill, Holbeton – Ref : 25/1720/15/0**
- **Land East of Vicarage Hill, Holbeton – Ref : 25/1721/15/0**

*The Chairman declared a disclosable pecuniary interest, and asked the Vice Chair, Cllr Fuller, to Chair the meeting for this item.*

Cllr Baumer declared an interest, due to his connection with the New Village Hall Project as Project Leader ; however in accordance with the Parish Council's Code of Conduct and having sought guidance, he confirmed he would be able to remain in the meeting forum, and would participate fully with a careful approach and open mind.

Cllr Fuller explained the format for this section of the meeting to those attending. The Parish Council would hear the views of those members of the public who wished to express them in an open forum, and would then have a private discussion in a separate room to summarise and make their final decision.

D/Cllr Baldry gave a summary of the planning process, advising that the Parish Council's views would be considered by the Planning Department ; it is the Planning Committee who make the final decision however. If the planning application is rejected by the Planning Committee, an appeal could be made by the Applicant. The Applicant, Mr A Mildmay White (AMW) was asked to summarise his application. He stated that he felt both planning applications should be considered together, as each supported the other. There are plans for affordable housing, currently set at 80% of the local market rate for shared ownership, and there are ongoing discussions to enable people with a village connection to be considered as a priority for these properties. The Flete Estate are hopeful that one of their charities could oversee this by use of a management committee in the village which could nominate individuals who would be eligible for these affordable homes. The Committee would consist of two members of his family, and three members of the Parish Council. He felt this would enable the village to have fair control over who would most benefit from the affordable housing. Cllr Flower asked AMW what had changed in this new updated application? AMW confirmed the changes had been driven by SHDC and English Heritage. Due to the AONB status of the village and the Grade I Listed Church. The application had taken these comments into account,

The Chair invited comments from the floor. These are summarised as follows :

- Regarding the Vicarage Hill development, access was a concern for new houses and Village Hall. Dangerous entry to the development at the brow of the hill. Road through Ford is narrow, and increased traffic volume for residents is a major concern.
- AMW was asked what would happen if the Village Hall Project did not go ahead ? AMW felt that there should not be 'what if's' and a positive attitude was required. He felt that the Village wanted a new Village Hall.
- A Parishioner pointed out that not everyone wanted a new Village Hall on the proposed site. AMW advised that this Planning Application including a new Village Hall, had been put forward taking into account the parishioners views over a 2-3 year period ; he was aware the school was getting smaller, the pubs were reducing in size and the shop is subsidised. If the new Village Hall plans were halted, he still felt there was a need for new housing to help the Village develop for the future, attracting new families and business to the Village.
- A resident pointed out that initially there had been a plan for access at the bottom of the hill, in relation to the Vicarage Hill development. This had been desirable as traffic would be more inclined to be directed away from Ford. Now that the access was only at the top of the hill, traffic may choose to enter/exit via Ford. Furthermore light pollution would be an issue for residents. Street lighting would need to be addressed. Savills confirmed that Detailed Planning Applications would be submitted at a later date to deal with issues such as street lighting. He confirmed that this planning application was

to secure outline planning consent, after which the developer would be responsible for planning what the houses would look like. AMW confirmed that it would not be a simple straight sale to a developer to do whatever they wanted with the site, there would be control over this, as there had been with Mason's Yard.

- It was noted from the floor, that the site was very much different to those new building developments located on the A379 who had direct vehicular access to the main road, not via narrow lanes.
- The gradient plans were raised as an issue as it was suggested that SHDC planners were unaware that the sites were situated on a hillside. Cllr Flower confirmed that the planners would visit the site as part of the planning process to view the aspect of the application, ie. gradient, access, drainage etc.
- Concerns were voiced with regards to the Church Hill site, that the surface water and drainage issue had not been considered thoroughly. This resident felt that flooding was a major risk within the village. The proposed use of a field drain does not cope currently in heavy rain, and with the added load from new housing, it was a great concern to the residents directly below the development who were aware that the this pipe also was damaged. A survey had been conducted. Savills advised that further exploratory work needed to be conducted at a cost in excess of £5k to investigate and that would be the next step if outline planning permission is granted. Regarding maintenance of the field drain, although it was not entirely on Flete land, as it was being used by Flete property, AMW confirmed that Flete would have some responsibility for the drain by prescription.
- Regarding the Vicarage Hill site, it was asked how much the houses would likely sell for, and whether there would be restrictions on second home ownership? It was confirmed by Savills that it was important to the Applicant that the character of the village did not change, and as an AONB, the development would not be disproportionate to the village, although clearly they were unable to estimate how much the properties would be worth.
- A comment was made from the floor that the Village needed to move on, in accordance with other villages in the area, developing for the future to keep the village alive.
- Another speaker from the village agreed that the village needed to keep moving forward, although it would be helpful to see drawings of how the Vicarage Hill development may look to help visualise it as has been done with the Church Hill site. Savills advised that whilst there was a footprint of the plans, there was no plan of how it might look, as this would be part of the next stage if Outline Planning Permission is granted.

Cllr Baldry summarised that whilst the subject of the new Village Hall maybe a side issue, the main concern was the housing developments. Drainage, light pollution and access appeared to be the main areas of discussion and concern.

In reaching that conclusion, the Councillors left the room to discuss their final decision in private. During their discussions it was **RESOLVED** that :

2.1.1 Church Hill Planning Application – It was proposed by Cllr Ackroyd and seconded by Cllr Flower that there would be **no objection** to the application **subject to** :

- The drainage issues and concerns being addressed fully

Also it should be **noted** that the Parish Council were concerned regarding the limited pedestrian access to the village from the development.

Other recommendations were :

- Public car parking should be maximised
- Thought be given to the practicality of the footpath access proposed for some of the houses on the development
- Conservation of hedges
- Consideration to the residents of Church Hill regarding their privacy and light pollution.

2.1.2 Vicarage Hill Planning Application – During the discussions, Cllr Ackroyd summarised that she felt the site was inappropriate and that a site for a new Village Hall would be better elsewhere. Cllr Baumer asserted that he felt a new Village Hall was important for the village ; and the site was ideal as it has close proximity the village community amenities such as the school, playpark and playing field. As a unanimous decision could not be reached, the Vice Chair asked Councillors to **vote**. The vote was recorded as :

- **4 in favour** (Cllrs Baumer, Reece, Flower, Craig)
- **5 against** (Cllrs Fuller, Ackroyd, Knight, Pengelly, Hearn)

In responding to this planning application it was proposed that the following notes should be made :

- Some Cllrs felt that the development was not a popular choice in the Parish Survey
- There were concerns regarding traffic increasing through Ford
- The access at the brow of the hill caused concerns about safety, and access at the bottom of the hill would have been preferred
- Concerns about flooding, as the site was situated on a hill
- Light pollution emanating from the housing development and the potential street lighting

## 2.2 **Householder application for single storey extensions to side and rear of the dwelling, alterations to external works and site boundary treatment – Goondiwindi, Battsborough Cross, PL8 1JS Ref : 3638/16/HHO**

The Chairman returned to the meeting. Mr S Casson attended the meeting to make his representations against the proposal, a copy of which is attached to the minutes. Whilst considering these concerns, the Chairman also advised that the Parish Council had recently rejected a previous application for this site in October. Cllr Ackroyd highlighted that this new application appeared to be larger than the previous one. During discussions it was **RESOLVED** that :

- The Parish Council would **not support** this planning proposal. This was proposed by Cllr Flower and seconded by Cllr Knight. The primary reason being over development of the site.

## 2.3 **Listed building consent for a single storey extension – 73 Ford, Holbeton, PL8 1LJ Ref :3783/16/LBC**

Having looked at the plans, the Parish Council **RESOLVED** unanimously to **support** the planning application on the grounds that it enhanced the current building.

## 3.0 **POLICE MATTERS**

PC Potter had attended earlier in the evening and confirmed that there had been no crimes that month.

## 4.0 **REPORTS FROM COUNTY, DISTRICT and OTHER REPRESENTATIVES**

Cllr Hosking highlighted recent news which included that DCC were currently planning budgets. There had been a £7m overspend in adult/children services, recovery of which may be via an increase in Council Tax next year. Other news included the second phase of Broadband which was to be rolled-out shortly, and that the Highways agency was being taken over by Scansca.

Following on from the last meeting, Cllr Hosking reported that the Locality Budget for Preschool had been granted and Cllr Baumer should receive confirmation of this via County Hall. A grant previously sought of £180 for the After School Club had, to date, not been claimed. The verges south of Brownswell that required cutting, as raised in the last meeting, were the responsibility DCC but there was no plan to cut them.

Regarding signage, Cllr Hosking was informed of a sign by the Lumberyard at the Ford Junction which was broken. There was also a sign at Mothecombe displaying the parking restrictions which was broken, which Cllr Hosking made a note of.

Cllr Hosking was asked about funding from the locality fund for a laptop for the Parish Clerk. Cllr Hosking confirmed it may be possible if surplus funds are available. It was discussed that possibly funding via the Transparency Fund.

During Cllr Baldry's update, he asked whether the Parish Council would like to meet next week with Cllr's Steer (Chair of Development Management Committee, SHDC) and Cllr Foss, as they had proposed, to discuss the Flete Estate planning proposal. The Parish Council confirmed that they were happy for Cllr Baldry to update those Councillors with the planning recommendations they had given tonight, although as they had now reached their decision, they did not feel a meeting would be helpful. Indeed, they were very dissatisfied that Cllr's Steer and Foss had not attended that evening, when their advice might have been helpful.

## 5. **MATTERS ARISING**

### 5.1 Production of a Parish Website

Cllr Knight confirmed she had met with Lance Howarth. He had already received the minutes for the last 6 months as requested and a copy of the Transparency Code. He had responded at length with suggestions for consideration, Cllr Fuller offered to circulate Mr Howarth's email to Cllrs to enable them to consider his comments.

### 5.2 State of the Parish Roads

Cllr Knight confirmed that there were still some abandoned signs but no further updates. It was noted that the handrail in Vicarage Hill was broken, and the Clerk should inform Cllr Baldry so that it could be fixed.

### 5.3 SHDC bin at Mothecombe Beach

The Clerk confirmed she had received a quote via Neil Greenhaigh of £250 for a new waste bin and £250 p.a. for it to be emptied. It was **RESOLVED** that purchase of a bin be approved, this was proposed by Cllr Flower and seconded by Cllr Ackroyd. It was agreed that the annual cost of emptying the bin be checked as last month Cllr Baldry had quoted £175. The Clerk would email Mr Greenhaigh again.

### 5.4 Defibrillator/CPR Training

Cllr Reece confirmed that the training session had been attended by 9 people; it had been

very beneficial and hopefully would attract more people from the community if the event was held again next year.

5.5 TAP funding

Cllr Ackroyd confirmed that the application form had been completed, ready for submission the following day. The grant for £1600 included maintenance around the village of branches, hedge trimming, rendering the water pump at Gibb and gate remedials. It was **RESOLVED** to go ahead with the proposal.

5.6 DCC funding (for Preschool)

See item 4.0 – forms had been submitted, and confirmation was being awaited from County Hall.

5.7 Highways Conference on 16<sup>th</sup> November at Buckfastleigh

Cllr Hearn confirmed he had attended the conference; during four break-out sessions he learnt that the A379 was an abnormal load road due to the bridges. He also learnt that when planning new building developments, planners mainly consider access onto the main road from the site and not the traffic levels on that road and whether they can cope with extra traffic.

5.8 New Village Hall – Community Reinvestment Project Fund

*Cllr Sherrell had a disclosable pecuniary interest and withdrew from the item. Vice Chairman Cllr Fuller acted as Chairman for this item.*

Cllr Baumer advised that he was looking for support from the Parish Council in an application for £49k funding which would help enable the project to move ahead to the Planning Application stage. Should a Planning Application be successful, it would then be possible to look at Lottery Funding to help move the project forward again. Initially architect drawings would be commissioned in liaison with hall users. A letter of support was required for the Project Fund application; Cllr Baldry had already given his support. There was an initial estimate of £1m for the project build of the Village Hall, approximately £430k of which would be raised from the sale of the site of the current Village Hall, with planning consent for 6 semi-detached dwellings. Cllr Ackroyd raised her concerns that they would be supporting a project which they had, in part, just rejected (see item 2.1.2). Cllr Baumer urged that this opportunity was reaching a deadline; there was only one opportunity per year to apply and the following year they will not be eligible. Unable to reach a unanimous verdict, a **vote** was proposed:

- Four Councillors were in favour of supporting the application
- Four Councillors were against the application including the Vice Chairman, who had the deciding vote and therefore the proposal to apply for funding was **rejected**

Cllr Baumer excused himself from the meeting.

5.9 Hedgecutting at Gibb

Cllr Reece confirmed that the hedge needed laying and the matter was ongoing.

## 6.0 **CORRESPONDENCE**

6.1 Dementia Friendly Parishes around the Yealm – Request for donation of £100

A request for a donation had been received, this was approved – proposed by Cllr Ackroyd and seconded by Cllr Fuller.

## 7.0 **FINANCIAL MATTERS**

7.1 South West Water - £13.99 due Ref: Allotments

7.2 Balance of Bank A/C on 4 November 2016 £13403.32 (Treasurers A/C) and £5000 (Business A/C)

7.3 VAT return for the year ended 31 March 2016 - £271.86 claimed

Cllrs approved the payment for SWW, this was proposed by Cllr Knight and seconded by Cllr Ackroyd.

## 8.0 **OPEN FORUM**

8.1 Locality Fund

Cllr Knight asked whether payment had been received for Sue Price's application for £100 to fund the hiring charges of the Reading Rooms for a period of 6 months for the Book Share project. The Clerk confirmed that she would check and update Cllr Knight (Post meeting note: a copy of the recent accounts has been forwarded to Cllr Knight)

8.2 Bird Flu

Cllr Reece confirmed that it was a government requirement to keep domestic poultry under cover to minimise the spread of the disease.

8.3 School Swimming Pool

Cllr Hearn advised that the school would be looking at ways to return the pool to the Community, as their asset to use and maintain.

8.4 Chair & Vice-Chair of Development Committee – Cllrs Steer and Foss

Cllr Hearn wished to record his disgust over the Cllrs non-attendance at that evenings meeting, and not providing their support to the Parish Council and community of Holbeton. It was reiterated that the Parish Council did not want to attend a meeting with them next week, as the decision had to be made that evening and it was pointless discussing matters again the next week.

8.5 Parish Clerk

The Chairman confirmed that the Parish Clerk had tendered her resignation, due to excessive workload whilst trying to undertake two employments. She felt the Parish Council needed someone able to work more than the 5 weekly hours contracted to her, to help take the Parish work forward for the future which she had tried to

do. He thanked her for her efforts, and confirmed that an advert should be put in the Holbeton News as soon as possible with a closing date of 6<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to enable a new candidate to be engaged asap.

8.6 Jo Battershill – Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme

Mr Battershill had approached the Chairman of the Parish Council for voluntary maintenance work within the Parish to enable him to undertake his Duke of Edinburgh Award. This had been approved, and he was planning to start work shortly.

**9.0 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS**

**10.0 DATE OF NEXT MEETING – Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at the Parish Reading Rooms**

**THE MEETING WAS CLOSED BY THE CHAIRMAN AT 10.47pm**

**SIGNED : ..... Councillor John Sherrell (Chairman) DATE: .....**

**Other Attendees CONT/...**

Stan Casson  
Hilary Casson  
Sonja Heard  
Diana Baumer  
S Marshall  
Anthony Mildmay White (Applicant – Flete Estate)  
Ben Wood (Savills)  
John Mildmay White  
Bob Glanville  
Gina Hay  
Dinah Weldon  
William Weldon  
Susan Price  
Graham Price  
Andrew Maitland  
Sally Maitland  
E Wyatt  
Ann Rayner  
Lynda Chapman  
Moran Chapman  
F Rayner  
Jessica Clarke  
Holly Rahder  
Nicky Cole  
Rik Knight  
Chris Bray  
G Hancox  
Peter Vaura  
L Zander  
Alison Hawes  
John Walters Symons  
Caroline Howarth  
T Petitt  
M West