

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 16th December at 4.45 p.m. in the Village Hall Committee Room.

Present: Cllrs Frost, Garland (Chairman), Mason, Ostler, Pratt, two members of the public.

1. **Apologies** for absence – Cllr Turner had sent his apologies as he was at a police meeting.

Meeting adjourned for open forum

2. **Minutes** of the last Planning Committee meeting on 16th December were approved (proposed Cllr Pratt, seconded Cllr Mason).
3. **Declarations of interest:** Cllr Ostler declared an ‘other’ interest in item 4e as the owner of a nearly adjacent business premises, and Cllr Frost an ‘other’ interest as a Trustee of the school.

The Chairman moved that 15/2424/MOUT be considered after the other applications as it was likely to need more discussion.

4. The Planning Committee considered the following planning applications:
 - a) **16/0003/OUT Land At Bluebell Holt Lyme Road** Outline application for the erection of dwelling and garage with only access to be considered.
There was lengthy discussion about building just outside the BUAB versus the need for housing for local employment.
It was resolved unanimously to respond as follows:
“The Parish Council Planning Committee is unwilling to support an application outside the boundary despite the stated need for a family dwelling, because it is not an exception site. However, it draws EDDC’s attention to the stated purpose of the application” (proposed Cllr Pratt, seconded Cllr Mason).
 - b) **16/0049/FUL Fayre View Lime Kiln Lane** Construction of dormer window on south east facing roofslope of bungalow; construction of garage.
It was resolved unanimously to respond as follows:
“The Parish Council Planning Committee does not object to the application unless any neighbours object on overlooking grounds” (proposed Cllr Frost, seconded Cllr Ostler).
 - c) **16/0001/TRE Rhode Hill Lodge Rhode Lane** T1, Oak: Reduce height spread by approximately 2m to give balance to the building on the eastern side and maintain a balanced shape. Lift lower crown by removing 3 lowest branches. G1, Beech: Reduce height by 5-6m and lift 8 lower limbs.
It was resolved unanimously to respond as follows:
“The Parish Council Planning Committee cannot determine which trees are meant by the application, which is of poor quality, and asks the EDDC Tree Officer to visit the site and advise. The oak appears to be a beech (from the poor photos provided), and the beech G1 is not identified on the plan supplied, only a hedge” (proposed Cllr Mason, seconded Cllr Ostler).

- d) **16/0044/TRE Land adjacent Glebelands Uplyme** T14 and T23 - Ash - fell. T16 and T21 - Sycamore - fell.

It was resolved unanimously to respond as follows:

“The Parish Council Planning Committee objects to the application, given that no real justification is given for the work in the arboricultural report” (proposed Cllr Mason, seconded Cllr Pratt).

- e) **15/2424/MOUT Land Adjacent to Lyme Road (Adjoining Uplyme Village Hall) Uplyme** Construction of two storey school building : Amendments to application form (ownership certificates), additional drainage response, additional highways response, amended location plans (red line), amended access drawings and additional information relating to ownership of hedge on road side boundary.

The Chairman summarised what had happened at a working meeting to discuss the application on 21st January, in particular revised plans for car parking and traffic volumes. Two main actions proposed were a traffic management plan and overflow parking for staff. He then read out the revised response from DCC Highways submitted to EDDC, and a statement from Cllr Turner¹.

After lengthy discussion, it was resolved unanimously to respond as follows:

“The Parish Council Planning Committee objects to this application. It has profound concerns over the danger and congestion that may be caused by the single access on the B3165 to the site crossed by pedestrians. The currently unacceptable traffic situation in Pound Lane is proposed to be transferred to a busy main road, which is madness. Anything other than a double access (in and out) will almost inevitably cause a serious or fatal accident, for which the design of this application will be responsible. Either a way to construct the one way flow of traffic must be found, or the school must not be built” (proposed Cllr Pratt, seconded Cllr Mason).

The Council supports the need for a new school, but cannot support these dangerous access proposals.

5. **AOB:** none

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 6.40 p.m.

Signed:(Chairman) Date:

¹ “Following the meeting on 21st January, I strongly feel that a single in/out entrance to the school will cause problems on the B3165, causing traffic to back up past Cooks Mead roundabout and the chicane by the Talbot Arms; and also problems for people trying to get in and out of the filling station especially on the way to work in the morning. As members pointed out on 21st, the Council holds the School and the Trustees entirely responsible for managing the traffic to avoid such conflicts, and the safety of pedestrians crossing the access. As discussed at the meeting on 21st, members felt that a one way flow of traffic through the school site, with an exit onto the Masters Close slip road, is both vastly preferable, and necessary, despite the professed objections of DCC Highways to this. If measures are not taken, the concern is that a serious accident involving pedestrians will be almost inevitable. Comments made at the meeting that “the B3165 is not busy” are inaccurate and unhelpful – it is the traffic at school start and end times that is critical, not the average. I understand that a new traffic survey has been requested by Jeremy Upfield. If this is done, it must be at school start and end times when parents and school buses are using the road.”