

## NOTES OF VILLAGE MEETING

### Lympstone Parish Council

Plan no 11/1293/MOUT, **11/1293/MOUT** Outline application including access arrangements and layout for mixed use development comprising residential development of 154 dwellings, business units, doctors surgery, shop/cafe, creche/nursery, community facilities together with associated open space and infrastructure, Land Nw Of Courtlands Cross, Courtlands Lane, **Exmouth** - Report of the Clerk

A Village meeting was held on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2011 attended by approximately 140 people. These included Parish Councillors, Councillors from Exmouth and the press.

The Chairman opened the meeting and handed over to Cllr Rob Longhurst, the Parish Council's Champion for planning applications. Cllr Longhurst, with a visual presentation, described the current application and the differences between this and the previous application submitted in June 2010.

There were three main differences:

- 1 the Care Home had been omitted and from this the houses were more spread out.
- 2 There was to be a pedestrian crossing at Courtlands Cross and a new vehicular access point about 100m to the north of this.
- 3 Summer Lane was to be made one-way in an easterly direction (up the hill), with some changes to Wotton Lane as it was thought that this might see an increase in vehicular movements. A S106 agreement would include £100K payment to DCC to carry out these works.

The previous application had been refused, with 10 reasons given:

- 1 & 2 That it was against current policy of building in open countryside and in the green wedge.
- 3 The effect on schooling in the area
- 4 – 6 related to increase in traffic
- 7 – 10 related to the failure to provide sufficient information.

Cllr Longhurst explained how the application contravened policies contained in the LDF and Lympstone Parish Plan and proposed legislation contained in the DEFRA White Paper “The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature”, which would indicate support for the Green Wedge to be preserved and The Localism Bill which would give more control and involvement of the local Community in such applications.

The area was not included in the SHLAA proposals for Lympstone or Exmouth, whereas the land at Goodmores Farm was included and this provided houses in Lympstone and Exmouth.

The Housing Needs Survey that was carried out in 2008 was now out of date. A new survey form would be distributed with the Lympstone Herald in July. This would give up to date information regarding Housing Needs for the Parish.

He thanked Don Mildenhall for reading and analysing the traffic sections of the accompanying documents. Don answered questions about this aspect, as far as he was able, from the information that had been supplied. Cllr Longhurst then invited questions and comments from the floor.

- A Town Councillor from Exmouth reported that, at the moment, Exmouth Town Councillors for the Halsdon Ward were unlikely to support the application.
- There were questions about the decision making and appeals process including suggestions as to how Lympstone might work with EDDC and Exmouth TC to support an appeal.
- There were many concerns about traffic movements in existing roads and changes to the road layouts.
- There was concern about the loss of prime agricultural land although it was pointed out that designations as such had been abolished.

Cllr Longhurst and others confirmed that individual letters or emails of objection were needed. A letter from a family or a petition would only count as one objection. Sample letters of objection were circulated. Volunteers would be under the railway bridge on Saturday 2<sup>nd</sup> July to assist anyone regarding an objection.

At the end of the meeting, the Chairman thanked Cllr Longhurst for his presentation, to loud applause, and asked for an indication of the feelings of those present. When asked formally to show their view, no one indicated any support for the scheme and the vast majority, if not everyone (it was difficult to judge) voted against the scheme.

If the Parish Council is so minded, Cllr Longhurst suggests that its objection might be in the following terms.

“We, the Lympstone Parish Council, refer to the above planning application which has been referred to us as Consultees.

The Application was presented to a Village Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2011, which was attended by over 140 people, including some from Exmouth. The application was fully discussed and this objection was unanimously supported. The Application was then considered formally at our Parish Council meeting on Monday 4<sup>th</sup> July. The Parish Council having considered the application do not support the plan and unanimously recommended **REFUSAL** by the Planning Committee of EDDC. We cite the following reasons: -

1. There is no fundamental difference between this application and that submitted in March 2010 and consequently our previous detailed objections still stand. (Attached) The removal of the Care Home is of no significance.
2. The road change to Courtlands Lane as proposed will merely increase the traffic along this restricted route as the shortest way to Lympstone Village and Lympstone Primary School thus making this dangerous route even more so. This was a core objection to the last proposal when only pedestrian and cycle access was proposed.
3. Additionally the Council believe that the Traffic Assessment used within the plan contains some key errors of information and a series of dubious presumptions and assumptions within the modelling.
4. The application in no way answers the EDDC reasons 1 & 2 for refusal in 2010 since it still clearly breaches EDDC Policy. These cover “Building in Open Countryside” and “Green Wedge”. Both these objections are in line with the adopted Village Plan.
5. The LDF Preferred Approach supports the retention of the Green Wedge (Appendix 1) and does not support this development.
6. Intended Government legislation such as DEFRA White Paper “The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature”, would indicate support for the Green Wedge to be preserved. Under The Localism Bill and Neighbourhood Plans the Parish Council, by authority within the Parish Plan, would seek to formally secure these rights when permitted.
7. Despite the claims of SLP there has been no Community Involvement in this latest application. Whilst they have been in contact with Exmouth they have not offered any consultation with Lympstone. The whole reason d’être for this application centres on Exmouth and not Lympstone.

Cllr Rob Longhurst

Champion for Planning applications – Lympstone Parish Council

**Email from S Shaw re Sustainable Communities Bill**

Dear Mr Le Riche of Lympstone Parish Council

An opportunity has come up regarding an proposal under the Sustainable Communities Act that would help Parish and Town Councils. I am writing to you to ask that your council please add their support to this proposal.

Leiston Town Council have drafted the proposal. It is all about why the campaign for the Sustainable Communities Act was originally started – ending ‘Ghost Town Britain’ and empowering local people. Leiston face a Tesco application and their proposal is generic and a very reasonable suggestion to amend planning policy and guidance in a way that would help locally elected decision makers.

In summary, the proposal is to require applicants of major developments to

- attend a meeting of the local Town or Parish Council, or of a duly called Town Meeting, to answer questions on the application for development; and
- fund the council or duly called town meeting to commission an independent report on the application and critique of any reports that the applicant has submitted in support of the application for development.

The rationale being that local elected representatives and local people should be making their decision on whether an application should go ahead based on the best evidence, and this would help ensure that evidence was available. I have pasted full proposal and rationale.

I would appreciate if you could let me know if your council supports this proposal as soon as possible. This is an urgent matter as Lesiton Town Council are trying to push for the Minister to give a response within a month as any later and it will not effect the application. A number of leading organisations of Local Works, the coalition that campaigned for the Sustainable Communities Act to become law, also support the proposal.

Yours sincerely  
Steve Shaw

---

Steve Shaw  
National Co-ordinator  
**Local Works** - promoting the Sustainable Communities Act  
a project of Unlock Democracy  
direct: 020 7239 9053 office: 020 7278 4443  
mobile: 07788 646 933  
websites: [www.localworks.org](http://www.localworks.org) and [www.unlockdemocracy.org.uk](http://www.unlockdemocracy.org.uk)  
address: Local Works, c/o Unlock Democracy,  
6 Cynthia St, London N1 9JF

**Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council**  
**Proposal Pursuant to the Sustainable Communities Acts 2007 and 2010**

### **Introduction/urgency**

This proposal is designed to apply to all large planning applications that the Town Council

thinks will have a significant impact on our town.

There is currently an application to which we would like this to apply – hence our request for an urgent decision. This application (from Tesco Ltd) arouses strong feelings in the Town. But there is one issue on which both the ‘antis’ and the ‘pros’ agree: it will have a significant impact on Leiston. Some say that will be a bad impact: others say it will be for the good.

We have to make up our minds on our response by reading the application, listening to both sides, assessing any other evidence we can gather and in the end using our judgement. This proposal is to help us get as much evidence as possible on which to base our final judgement.

### **The Resolution passed by the Town Council on 7th June 2011**

We ask the current Minister at the Department of Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark MP) to make the following planning policy/guidance to apply to large planning applications in the area of a Town or Parish Council

1. That any applicant or representatives of any applicant who submits such an application that will have a significant effect on an area must, if requested by the Town or Parish Council attend a meeting of

- (i) that Council to answer questions from elected councillors; and
- (ii) a Town Meeting, should one be duly called, to answer questions from all electors.

2. That any applicant who submits such an application that will have a significant effect on an area must, if requested by the Town or Parish Council, or a Town Meeting, pay for the Council or Meeting to get an independent assessment carried out as to how the proposed development will affect the sustainability of the local communities.

2A. That if we agree the above or either of the above that we communicate this to Suffolk Coastal District Council with the request that they delay determination of the Tesco application for a reasonable amount of time to enable us to act on this proposal and to get a decision from the Minister.

3. And if we agree 1 and 2 above, we seek the support of other Town and Parish Councils.

### **Rationale**

Re Proposal 1 above. The current application referred to above is about 10 inches thick running into thousands of pages with numerous specialist reports from consultants. Some of our councillors have read some of it; they will have many questions. As a Town Council we need them answered to enable us to make our best judgement. There is no way that this can be done by letter or email., It is reasonable, and indeed necessary to enable us to make the best judgment (whichever way that judgement goes), to seek the right, using the SCA, for us to require any such applicant to attend our meeting.

Re Proposal 2 above. The current applicant, to which we refer above, has spent

hundreds of thousands of pounds on this application. The consultants they have used do not come cheap! Inevitably their evidence supports the application: there is nothing wrong or improper in that. But there may be other views that 'other' consultants may take. Indeed, we need an alternative view, or even a 'critique', so we can make the best decision based on a fair weight of evidence from both sides. There is no way we can afford this amount of money. The current applicants have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds presenting their case; they will almost certainly have budgeted for an appeal if one should be necessary. They are going to significantly affect our town. It is reasonable that they pay what will be a far smaller amount (perhaps circa £25,000) to enable us to get evidence to carry out our quasi-legal duty regarding assessing this application. There is no way that we can afford to pay for this ourselves.

Re Proposal 2A above. This is a reasonable request to enable us to get more information and to involve our electors. We have checked with the Planning Officer – it is not against the law for this reasonable delay to be agreed – but it is more likely to be so if the process that we have requested is in place, as this would give the local planning authority a good reason to postpone their decision.

## FINANCE REPORT

### 1 Payments for approval

#### Payments for approval

1625	Optima Graphics Herald printing	247.00
1626	EDF Energy electricity toilets	31.95
1627	Scottish Power - Electricity Youth Club	99.45
1628	Mrs De la Rue - Flower beds	18.65
1629	Lympstone Village Hall room hire 27/6/11	16.55
1630	Mrs C Edworthy Wages June	180.00
1631	Mrs T Laney-Hubbard Wages June	111.00
1632	Mr A J Le Riche salary & expenses June	1,177.74

TOTAL 1,882.34

### 2 Financial Summary

Opening balance at 1st April 2011	3,697.95
Receipts	<u>18,456.28</u>
Total receipts	22,154.23
Transfer from dep ac	<u>0.00</u>
Total paid in to current ac	22,154.23
less, Payments	7,737.25
Net balance	14,416.98
Receipts not on statement:	-2,104.90
Unpresented cheques	6,255.37
Balance per Bank Statement 25th May 2011	18,567.45
Deposit Account	
Balance at 01/04/2101	10,145.68
Interest to May 2011	1.67
Transfer to current ac	0.00
Total	10,147.35

### 3 Budget monitoring report

This is attached

**4 Grants** These have not yet been advertised on the notice boards due to lack of space.