

DRAFT MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF BOURTON PARISH COUNCIL

HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 3PM ON THURSDAY 7TH MARCH 2013

PRESENT: M Withers (Chairman), G Miller, P Williams, D Lawes, C Price, A Miller

APOLOGIES: S Firbank, L Jones, H Baker

ATTENDING: H Ransley (The Clerk), 11 members of the public

13.34 OPEN FORUM

Bourton Mill: MW declared that this would be an open agenda item.

13.35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cathy Price declared a personal interest in Bourton Mill (neighbour).

Geoff Miller declared an interest as a member of the Planning Committee.

13.35.1 Bourton Mill

MW declared this an open agenda item.

There were complaints from the floor that the Parish Council had not advertised this meeting as widely as it should have done and that there was a lack of notice to the public. MW responded that the usual notices had been put up on the notice board and website and that NDDC had only just issued the Planning Officers draft report.

A Cox said that he had phoned Sandra Deary to book a slot to speak at the NDDC Development Management Committee meeting on 12th March 2013. GM advised that anyone wanting to speak at this meeting should contact Sandra straightaway as it may not be possible to book a slot on the day. *(Sandra's telephone number is 01258 484 370)*

J Mann asked what the document was about and AS gave a summary. HR passed a spare copy J Mann.

MW said that with very few exceptions, the current set of documents was the same as the previous set. All the points had been discussed at a heated discussion last year. The Parish Council had distilled the information into a letter which was sent to John Hammond. There had since been a number of meetings with NDDC to get answers to the issues raised but there were still some outstanding issues. There had been a query over who owned the land and the application had been resubmitted.

GM said that the Development Management Committee would be looking to the Parish Council for guidance in coming to a decision. However, they will make their own decision which may not agree with the Parish Councils.

J Mann said that the Parish Council's recommendation should not be muddled between their own personal views and those of the residents. MW replied that all could give their opinion, that the Parish Council would listen to those opinions and would give a formal response to NDDC on behalf of the village.

AS highlighted the opening paragraph of the Consultations: Parish Council section on page 4 of the report which he thought implied that the Parish Council supported the application.

L Shepherd asked whether there were still outstanding issues. MW replied that NDDC thought they had resolved the issues and that the purpose of the meeting was to review the Planning Officers report to confirm what was still outstanding.

Dr Clarke said that the document stated there had been 38 letters of objection but that he himself had written 45 or 50 but that his concerns had not been answered.

J Mann asked what concerns hadn't been answered and MW replied that that was the purpose of the meeting.

The issues raised in the Parish Council's letter of 30th January 2013 to John Hammond were reviewed.

Number of Residential Units / Highways

DCC Highways report says that the infrastructure is acceptable subject to the installation of traffic measures.

L Shepherd queried the number of parking spaces per household. She had looked at the criteria for parking units per household on the dorsetforyou website and thought that this application fell short of NDDCs own policy.

The number of parking spaces is not clear on the plan. It is not known whether the spaces for the business units will be available to residents. Overspill parking would be on Bridge Street which is not acceptable and is considered dangerous.

Mrs Nathan said that the poor parking on Bridge Street delayed the Fire Brigade who were attempting to attend to a fire at her house in Kites Nest Lane. Tankers delivering oil hold up traffic.

A Sturt suggested that perhaps some of the area where the Village Hall was originally planned for could be used for overflow parking.

PW suggested using the 20 parking spaces from an earlier iteration of the plan.

All agreed that there was a need for more parking spaces.

Mrs Nathan said that the road infrastructure was inadequate to support the new development.

PW reiterated the widely held view that the road infrastructure surrounding the proposed development cannot support the development of 29 houses – a more appropriate number was 20-25 dwellings, as recommended by PFA Consulting in their April 2008 report.

A Sturt said that the applicant's traffic assessment was based on the site when the factory was active. This is a flawed approach. Steve Savage has not properly addressed the issues.

It was suggested that the Parish Council request that a new traffic assessment is carried out as no conclusions can be drawn from the current assessment. This should factor in traffic movement likely to be generated by the 6 business units as well as the private dwellings.

Concerns were raised over the safety issues regarding the junction of Kites Nest Lane onto Factory Hill. The house on the corner (unit 26) will reduce visibility and restrict the ability of emergency vehicles to turn into the Western Access Road. There are likely to be children walking between the houses and the play area.

The traffic splays at the Bridge Street/Main Road junction were discussed. These appeared to meet the necessary standards.

Dam/Lake

A Sturt raised the issue of the ownership of the dam. The third party must sign the Section 106 agreement.

A Sturt said that the removal of the affordable housing as well as the Village Hall may put in doubt the whole reason for approving the exception test.

Dr Clarke referred to his letter of July 2012 to the Parish Council regarding the Good Practice Guide. He referred to the 1917 breach and said that very severe flooding would cause this to happen again. Although Gasper Dam was eventually improved, it is still not up to scratch. He said that Garden Dam had leaks in it. The site is still in danger of being damaged by flood and he had received an email saying that the floor levels on the residential units would be raised.

It was generally agreed that there were still concerns about the Dam and flooding.

MW asked Dr Clarke whether the risk of severe damage would be alleviated if the improvements proposed were made. The latest drawings show the dam wall half a metre higher. Dr Clarke said that the higher the wall, the more damage.

It is not known whether all the upstream dam owners have been consulted.

A Sturt said that the developer should be required to provide a bond to ensure that funds would be available for future dam maintenance given the limited (renewable energy) income likely to be generated by the proposed Archimedes Screw.

Units 27 & 28

Dr Clarke said that the figures regarding the culvert were incorrect. It had not been stated where the water in the culvert came from. A Cox said that the culvert had flooded Bridge Street in 1985.

Professional opinions have been sought. It was requested that the Parish Council convey residents' continued concerns about dam safety to NDDC and to state that others have highlighted inaccuracies in the data that has been presented.

Dr Clarke confirmed that he will speak at the 12th March meeting.

MW said that the Council have to rely on expert opinion. A Sturt requested an independent review of the findings but the Planning Officers report states that this has already been done by Jeremy Benn Associates at the request of the Environment Agency. Dr Clarke said he thought that only the process had been reviewed rather than the base data.

Insurance

The evidence that had been provided regarding the availability of insurance was questioned. It is unknown whether this is current and affordable.

Sewers

This is being addressed through a recent planning application to provide a new pumping station at Kittymead.

Village Hall

It was thought that the percentage contribution to the new Village Hall should be based on the actual building costs rather than the previously estimated cost of £0.5m.

Resolution

That Bourton Parish Council respond to NDDC that there remain concerns about the proposed development and that Bourton Parish Council are therefore unable to recommend approval at this time.

Proposed by CP and seconded by AM. 5 voted in favour. GM had declared an interest as a member of the Development Committee and did not vote.

Chairman:

Date: