

## **DRAFT**

# **MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF DEVAUDEN COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

**Held on Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018 at Itton Village Hall**

### **Councillors present**

N Knowland (Chairman)  
J Rowlands  
J Williams  
K McElroy  
I Cavill  
M Powell  
A Cooke  
A Williams

### **In attendance:**

Members of the public listed at the back of these minutes

S Harries  
D Mitchell  
N. James (Clerk)

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting as part of the pre-application consultation to discuss the proposals to build 15 houses off Well Lane. In introducing Mr Harries and Mr Mitchell from the planning consultants and developers he invited them to outline their proposals for the development. Mr Harries explained that the decision for 15 houses to be developed on this site had been included in the 2013 LDP. Their application had to offer a consultation period which would last until 14 September. He outlined the main points regarding their proposals and explained that there was a small area of land adjoining the allotments for which currently there was no specific proposal and he would welcome the thoughts of local residents for what they might wish to be developed there. All those in attendance were asked to forward their ideas to DCC.

2. Following this introduction the Chair advised the meeting that DCC had discussed the initial proposals at an earlier meeting and advised the developer of their concerns regarding the increased traffic and the sewage waste capacity within the current treatment plant. Since then the Council had received advice from Welsh Water which confirmed that the treatment plant in Well Lane would be able to cope with the increased usage from this development. Following that the Chair offered the opportunity to all in attendance to raise questions/observations for the developer.

3. The following points were raised:

- a. LDP 2013 had been discredited and was no longer fit for purpose and consequently any recommendations in it were open to re-examination and the building of homes in the country where there was no employment and the impact on travelling/fuel pollution was increasingly being called into question. The developer acknowledged that some issues had been raised with the LDP but advised that MCC accepted the principle of 15 houses on this site including a proportion of social housing as stated in the LDP.
- b. The documentation in the pre-application was misleading as it omitted to include that there had been a number of previous applications to build on this site. The developer acknowledged this and agreed to amend the wording.
- c. There had been inadequate notification to local residents with a number in Well Lane receiving no letter of the proposals from the developer. The developer explained that although they covered the statutory requirement for notification and indeed in this case sent out more letters than usual, he acknowledged that not everyone who had an interest might have received one.
- d. Well Lane was used by many large agricultural vehicles as well as forestry and other commercial vehicles and the new development would create significant difficulties not only for their access but also to other road users through the development. Moreover, with many residents' cars parked outside the new houses some vehicles would have difficulty passing through. In addition some were concerned about the safety issues around the new entrance/exit from/to the B4293. The developer advised that their plans had been subjected to scrutiny by an independent transport consultant and met the legal requirements for road width and likely usage. He added that MCC highways officers would also have an opportunity to examine the proposals to determine their agreement to the adequacy. The road would only be adopted by MCC if it conformed to the legal requirements and standards. There was considerable discussion on this point and the developer was asked to ensure that he did everything possible to install traffic calming measures to meet the local concerns.
- e. Related to this last point there was concern that there was no safe pedestrian access in the new development. The developer advised that the road was too narrow for a pavement.
- f. The development would mean the ripping out of trees and hedges from the local environment which, for some, was an unacceptable intrusion from what was described as a commercial development.
- g. A Planning Policy Wales document issued a few years ago noted that there should be an employment survey undertaken where social housing was built. The developer advised that the requirement for social housing was made by MCC and the developer had not carried out any such survey.
- h. In answer to a question regarding S106 requirements the developer advised that it would be up to MCC to determine what they would request of the developer under this.

i. There was some discussion regarding the additional area below the allotments and whether there could be any improvements to the allotments like a water supply which would be relatively easy to provide.

j. The developer advised that he thought the site development should last about 18 months but they would endeavour to reduce the disruption to local residents as much as possible.

k. The developer confirmed that the ownership of the social housing would usually be passed to MCC or a housing association who would undertake the management of the houses.

4. The Chair thanked everyone for their views and advised them to pass these to MCC when the application was submitted.

#### LIST OF ATTENDEES

D MADDOCKS

H WILLIAMS

J SHALLIDAY

D SHALLIDAY

G HANCOCKS

C ALWAY

P KIRBY

J THOMAS

P MAGGS

F RICHARDS

O TUNSAIL

R MAY

L MISET

M MADGETT

G OWENS

K SCHRADER

I HICKMAN