**SHILLINGSTONE PARISH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT**

**7.00 PM ON THURSDAY 9th JANUARY 2020 IN THE PORTMAN HALL SHILLINGSTONE**

**PRESENT:** Councillors M Webberley (Chairman), L Gasson (Vice-Chairman), T Kennard, P Aaron, P Acton, R McNamara, Clerk D Green; in addition, there were 23 members of the public in attendance.

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Received from Cllrs K Ridout, R White and County Councilor P Batstone.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** None

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS:**

**i) 2/2019/1429/FUL - White Pit Farm, White Pit, Shillingstone, Blandford Forum Dorset**

The Chairman outlined the background to the application. He noted that there had been two previous informal meetings with members of the Parish Council and that this planning application was the scheme outlined at the November meeting, which involved a new construction in place of Block A and a new terrace in the centre of the development, some 19 dwellings in total. He noted that this application presented was for a smaller number of dwellings originally proposed to Dorset planners, and for smaller dwellings.

A number of concerns were raised in relation to the suitability of White Pit Lane as the only access route. It was said that this was a narrow lane, with no passing places and would not be able to cope with the additional number of vehicle movements that the scheme proposed. The Chairman did say that this was an issue that should have been brought up at the time of drafting the original plan. A resident raised the equivalence with the Hine Town Lane development proposal which the council had rejected a few years earlier, and pointed out that the proposed White Pit access was itself inconsistent with Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan which states that “*Development that would noticeably detract from the rural character of the lanes and tracks around the village and into the countryside will not be supported”.* The Chairman did say that whilst the Neighbourhood Plan may contain potentially contradictory policies, it had been prepared on the basis of community consultation, had been inspected and had been agreed by referendum.

Cllr Gasson felt that the parking issue was a central problem, there being insufficient spaces for the whole development, it was noted that car provision at 28 was less than 2 per dwelling and the additional 10 spaces for visitors etc. were likely to be wholly inadequate. The view was expressed that occupiers and their visitors were likely to park on White Pit Plane, thereby creating a potential hazard.

The location of the pedestrian path to the north west of the site was questioned. It was felt that this was a path to nowhere, with no evidence of any link to the existing village.

A resident questioned the actual size of the site, and stated that in his estimation is was some 14% larger than shown on the plans. It was generally felt that 19 dwellings were an overdevelopment of the site, and that a smaller number of dwellings would in fact be preferable. Cllrs Gasson and Acton were concerned that scheme may expand in terms of the number of dwellings as happened with the Augustan Avenue development. In relation to Block A of the development, the Chairman explained that the developers were seeking to rebuild rather than convert existing buildings and that this did have an additional cost. Residents also raised concerns in connection with the height of the Block A rebuild, which in their view was clearly intended to be higher than the present stable block that it will replace. A concern was also raised regarding the necessity for the construction of a sub-station on the site and the fact that the location of this was not specified.

There were many concerns expressed that much of the key information in the Viability Report had been redacted and it was very difficult to gauge the costs of rebuilding rather than conversion and the necessity for 19 dwellings rather than 16. A related concern was raised regarding the extent to which the development would include ‘affordable’ or social market rented housing; there being no requirement for the developers to make 40% of the dwellings available on this basis.; it was not clear from any of the planning documents that commitment was being given to any level of housing on these terms.

**Members of the council OBJECTED to the development of the basis of several key criteria:**

* Effect of the development on the rural character of White Pit Lane
* Site Access including the safety concerns regarding traffic volume
* Inadequate parking provision within the site leading overspill parking on White Pit Lane
* A general feeling of over-development in view of the proposed number of dwellings
* Concerns regarding the height of Block A and the height of the new build properties generally
* The lack of clarity in relation to affordable housing provision

**ii) 2/2019/1722/FUL – Hollies, Blandford Road Shillingstone DT11 0SF**

The Chairman explained that the scope of this development, for 3 dwellings, was clearly outlined in Policy 12 of the Neighbourhood Plan. He noted that access in this proposal would be via Hine Town Lane, rather than the suggestion of the Neighbourhood Plan, that an ‘appropriate’ access route would be onto Blandford Road. The Chairman said that while access onto Blandford Road might have been the preferred solution, this is not what is actually proposed, with interested landowners being unable to agree to a basis on which that access to Blandford Road would be permitted.

Some residents of Honeysuckle Gardens raised concerns in relation to a possible loss of privacy in terms of being overlooked, however the view was expressed that this would be minimal and there would be a green hedge between the new development and Honeysuckle Gardens. A resident drew parallels between this proposal and a decision made by Shillingstone Parish Council objecting to an earlier plan for a greater number of dwellings on Hine Town Lane, but the Chairman pointed out that the access point onto Hine Town Lane for this development would be at one of its widest points in the lane, the number of dwellings was fewer and likely traffic impact much lower.

**The council voted unanimously to SUPPORT the application.** There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.00 p.m.

**David Green, Parish Clerk**

**Signed Chairman: Date:**