

BUCKFASTLEIGH TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Environment and Transport Committee Meeting held on 6th June 2018.

Present: Councillors Janet Jones (Chair), Pam Barrett, Huw Cox, Ron Fox, Andy Stokes and Judith Hart (Town Clerk).

In attendance: 1 member of the public in relation to planning application no. 0253/18.

Part I (Open to the Public)

18/26. Questions raised by the public:

The Chair brought forward Agenda Item No. 7) **Planning Application 0253/18 Proposed: Demolition of garages and erection of 3 dwellings and parking together with additional replacement parking on separate land parcel at land between 13-24 Glebelands and land adjacent to 53-56 Glebelands, Buckfastleigh.**

Cllrs Jones, Stokes and Cox had attended a recent site visit.

Member of Public: There is inadequate parking. The area in front of the garages is only for loading, not parking. Residents believe that the existing parking spaces are misused. There are no spare overnight spaces when people return from work. Additional housing will make the situation worse. There are currently 4 registered disabled parking spaces and soon there will be 5. The road is not wide enough for on-street parking in this area. There is concern about the stability of the water main and the drains. Many vehicles regularly mount the pavements for access. There are no footpaths for pedestrians. It is alleged that town centre residents also park on Glebelands and Silver Street. Teign Housing have been asked to permit drop kerbs to allow garden parking but this has been rejected. The garages are being used for storage as they are too small for modern cars. There is concern about the disruption to residents regarding access and contractor parking.

The proposal is to demolish the existing garages and replace with 2 affordable houses and 1 open market dwelling. The development will not decrease the number of current spaces but will limit availability even further.

Cllr Pam Barrett: Provision must be made for blue badge holders during the work.

Member of Public: Residents are not against the development but are against the parking proposals and disruption. Dartmoor National Park have suggested removing part of the play area for parking which is not acceptable.

The Town Council would like to know what plans will be put in place to address contractor parking and activity, location of the site office, installation of utilities etc. and the provision for disabled residents.

Response: The Town Council supports proposals for the development of social housing within our parish, but objects to this application due to insufficient clarity for the following reasons:

- It is not clear if 'Affordable' in this context means for sale, partial sale or social rented. We would not support sale of whole or part at 75%/80% market rent. We do not believe this is an affordable option for local people and we would prefer the development of social housing for rent.

- Access and parking is already limited in this area and clearly the impact of the proposed work will exacerbate this further and cause considerable disruption for existing residents. What plans have been put in place to minimise this disruption including contractor vehicle parking?
- There are 4 registered disabled residents in the affected area as far as we know. There is no plan in place for access to and from their homes during the building period and it is unlikely to be improved after. The area is already difficult to access with narrow roads and no pavements. There needs to be a guarantee in place that access for disabled residents will be prioritised in any development scheme.
- The road is too narrow to accommodate on-street parking.
- We do not support the proposal to remove the existing children's play area to provide replacement parking. The play area is an important and well-used amenity.
- Residents within the square have suggested that some of the houses could be improved with drop kerbs to permit garden parking which we understand has previously been rejected by Teign Housing. This would partially alleviate some of the parking issues already identified in this response.

18/27. Apologies for absence: Cllr Mark Maish.

No apologies received from Cllr Pamela Forbes.

18/28. Declaration of Interests: None

18/29. To approve & sign as correct the Minutes of the Environment and Transport Committee meeting on Wednesday 2nd May 2018.

Signed and approved by Cllr Janet Jones

18/30. Review of actions from previous meeting:

Community Land Trust – Members agreed that further discussion on this proposal should be deferred due to other commitments. Resident support will however, be gauged at the Heart of Buckfastleigh and Lamb Pie Day events.

National Planning Policy Framework – Consultation Draft March 2018 – the Clerk confirmed that a response to this document had been submitted.

'Who Does What' information leaflet for residents – Cllr Andy Stokes and Inga Page are working on a draft leaflet.

18/31. Comments on planning applications received prior to this meeting and after Agenda set:

Two recent applications were noted with no objections:

Planning Application Nos. 0249/18 Proposed: Erection of rear conservatory at Old Coach House, Plymouth Road, Buckfastleigh and 0250/18 Proposed: Front and rear extensions to dwelling, alterations to windows and doors and minor garden works at 5 St Bernards Close, Buckfast

It has been confirmed by DNPA Enforcement that the new temporary overflow car park at the end of Abbey Grange Close installed by Buckfast Abbey is a breach of planning and is not solely for the purpose of one event in September as it has already been used by visitors.

18/32. Discussed under Agenda Item No. 1)

18/33. South Hams Special Area of Conservation: Greater Horseshoe Bats Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Draft February 2018

Members expressed concern that the protected habitat which supports the Buckfastleigh Greater Horseshoe Bats (GHB) at the SSSI Potters Wood site has been excluded from this document. Buckfastleigh is acknowledged as an area of international importance and has the largest known maternity roost in the UK and therefore requires even greater protection.

The document states that: *‘Most urban areas within Sustenance Zones are not likely to provide suitable conditions or opportunities for foraging bats.’*

Buckfastleigh is an urban area with known flight paths through the town centre.

‘Research has shown that greater horseshoes using maternity roosts largely forage within 4km of the roost. Sustenance Zones have therefore been mapped with a 4km radius centred on each designated roost.’

If GHB populations increase they will require larger sustenance zones. Changing the SAC boundaries as proposed in this document would reduce the legal protection to GHB flyways. It also noted that the sustenance zone around Bovey Tracey has been altered.

A particular threat to GHB is light pollution.

The Town Council would welcome the opportunity to host a working conference between all the consultees to this document to look at the appropriate level of protection for our sites which include the Pengelly Caves and Holy Trinity Church

Action: Clerk to draft a response to the consultation.

18/34. Teignbridge Local Plan Review:

There is very little in this document that relates to Buckfastleigh. Once again, no consultation event has been arranged for Ashburton and Buckfastleigh.

Action: Clerk to complain that Buckfastleigh and Ashburton residents have not been given the opportunity to attend a consultation event within their own community.

Response to include concerns about the increase in traffic movements, has this been estimated and what is expected? Will softer road surfaces, sound barriers and mitigation measures be implemented to ease the effects of more traffic? How will increased noise, air and light pollution be addressed? How will further development impact our wildlife?

18/35. Buckfastleigh Neighbourhood Plan Update:

The draft Green infrastructure Strategy document had been circulated to Members for comment. Cllr Simon Rines has summarised these points to submit to the consultant to add to the final draft. Preparation for the next stage of the Neighbourhood Plan process, a public referendum is expected in the near future.

18/36. Correspondence from Highways England re A38 safety:

Members were pleased to receive a satisfactory response from Highways England following a protracted exchange of correspondence. It was agreed that the Council’s persistence in this matter

has contributed to the final decision to carry out works to improve the safety of road users along the Dean Prior to Rattery Hill stretch of the A38.

Action: Correspondence to be published on the Town Council website.

18/37: Community Speedwatch update:

The Chair confirmed that a petition for a 20mph speed limit in the town and 30mph on Strode Road will be available at all public events over the summer.

There is still no response from Community Speedwatch. Cllr Pam Barrett has contacted the local PCSO to request contact from a Speedwatch representative.

Evidence needs to be gathered for the proposal to change the speed limit on Strode Road.

18/38. To discuss the planning, management and communications issues for projects which are within the remit of this committee:

Parking – A Freedom of Information request has been submitted to Teignbridge District Council, no response has been received as yet. Members agreed that the use of each car park in the town centre should be examined for eg. Station Road car park should be re-designated to residents only and not used by commercial vehicles which restrict access. Use of the Globe car park should be extended and not restricted to a short stay. Visitors need to be directed to Woodholme car park which is underused. A car sharing initiative and a resident's only car park at the Devonia site should be revisited.

Action: Members agreed that they would like to have a working discussion with Cllr John Nutley as the Chair of the Teignbridge District Council (TDC) car parks review group and Tonya Short, TDC Car Parks Manager.

18/39. Correspondence: None

18/40. Items requiring urgent attention: None

Meeting closed at 9.08 pm