

EASTON ON THE HILL PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Office
Hibbins Cottage
The Green
Ketton
Stamford
PE9 3RA

E-mail: clerk@eastononthehill-pc.gov.uk
Tel 07889669550
Web www.eastononthehill-pc.gov.uk

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Easton on the Hill Parish Council Held on Monday 5th June 2019 at 19.00 in the Easton on the Hill Village Hall

Present

Councillors P Bates, A Cutforth, W Davies, I Forman, E Hanson, J Rawlinson (Vice Chair) & D Sharpe
Clerk J Rice
Others 46 Members of the public were in attendance.

19/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Simpson (Chair), Ward, O'Grady and Stokes

Resolved That the apologies be received and noted

19/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made in any matters on the agenda

19/09 PRESENTATION

To receive and note the presentation from Johnson Mowat on Planning Application 19/00798/OUT Residential development of up to 115 dwellings at OP7200 TF0003 Stamford Road, Easton on the Hill

The Vice Chair chaired the meeting in the absence of the Chair. He introduced the meeting, explaining the reason for the extraordinary meeting and said that in the circumstances there would be an extension to public time to a maximum of one hour.

Mark Johnson introduced himself as the Planning Consultant for this outline planning application for up to 115 houses (not a fixed amount). He explained the process whereby developers put in speculative applications at this stage, and until a safe and sound access can be secured, there is no application. The house builders are not involved at this stage and therefore there is no more detail past what is in the application.

He confirmed that it is not unusual to apply for sites not in the system as an allocated site and he explained that the developers are of the opinion that ENC have not allowed for enough housing land supply allocated to meet the 5 year plan requirement. The application could be 1-3 years before realised. The application is about whether it can get principal approval for development of the land at this stage. The technical reports are all there for this purpose, ie waste, impact on wildlife, flood risks, minerals, noise etc.

19/10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION extended to one hour. Questions and answers session

A resident asked about the 40% affordable housing. He confirmed that there would be no change to the 40% stated affordable housing. The builder builds them and they are forwarded to housing associations for their "stock" for shared equity and social housing.

The Section 106 money is part of the process and if granted permission will be available to the village. If there is a specific requirement then the council can ask that this is taken into consideration and a discussion held with ENC if/when permission is granted. Mr Johnson was asked why they are optimistic given that in the report it says the council has not met its quota allocation of 300k. He reported that this application is to meet a wider district supply. There will be other, similar applications around the area. He was asked what the benefits are and in response said it creates/enhances vitality, improves by investment in facilities, brings more money to the village and provides useful, future family housing.

A question was raised about the 40mph speed limit remaining, however this was not in his remit to answer. A resident raised about the loss of footpaths and open space currently enjoyed by walkers and residents. He said there would be a circular path route around the housing development but also changes would depend if Council wanted another footpath. A resident queried if the sewerage system could cope and he said again that this was something for technical experts who have been consulted and provided a report to say yes.

Initials

A resident asked if EOTH currently has a local plan that restricts development to infill only, why would ENC approve it. Mr Johnson re-iterated that they believe there is a shortage over the 5 year housing land supply currently allocated by Planning. This challenge will go to the planning inspectorate if it is refused. More information was given about S106 monies – developers only contribute to on site facilities, not off site when there are already on site play space. The Chair of the playing fields working party calculated it was worth 500k to 750k which would be useful for the playing field regeneration project. We could after all get a development anyway on another field he commented.

A resident asked if another vehicular access point could be added, however he said not at this stage, only walking one, as it would then require a whole new application. It is also expensive to create access points and only one is required for 115 houses.

A resident asked about maintaining the site and he explained that it would probably go to a management company for green spaces unless the PC do it.

A resident asked if an alternative site could be considered but he said it would need to be for sale. Normally the owner is in an option agreement with a developer. House builders are appointed post approval. He explained that whatever permission is given the commitments go with the land.

On discussion of the local plan, he said it is down to interpretation of the policy if the site sits outside the development plan. There is nothing stopping other developers doing the same and each application is taken on its own merits, looking at impact on the village, the view overall. The village has been developed overtime and ENC has to have an up to date plan to allow for the housing supply needed. Part 2 is being developed and due to be adopted.

A discussion took place over the SSSI and he confirmed that Natural England are involved as a statutory consultee.

He confirmed the process for ENC will be to make their decision mid-July, earlier than need to (probably due to August holidays) and advised residents who wished to make comments/objections to do so in a constructive way.

We thanked Mr Johnson for his time and he left the meeting.

19/11 To discuss and take into consideration the presentation, resident views, ENC planning note, planning policy, the village plan and any other relevant information, in order to formulate a response to the application

A further discussion took place following the presentation.

Cllr Rawlinson read out the email via Mike Burton when asked if their view had changed on large scale development in the village. The planning policy officer's view is unchanged in that they believe it to be contrary to current local plan policy and completely disproportionate to a village of this size. They re-iterated that if villages want to promote the land then it should do through a neighbourhood plan. They confirmed that they would not support the application.

Cllr Rawlinson stressed the importance of submitting responses on line or by letter to ENC Planning, regardless of whether residents have already sent responses to Johnson Mowat directly. He also stated that if we didn't send anything as a council or a village then it would not be approved, given the ENC position. **It was stressed that the S106 position needs to be clarified** asap as we do not want to lose out if it is approved. A leaflet drop to capture all resident to make them aware of the application was suggested but after discussion decided it was not worth it. Those interested would be aware. It was stressed that it is important to engage well with ENC regardless and if necessary ensure that promises are legally binding and fulfilled by developers.

There was concern shown that if we want to object and still make mention of S106 monies in our response that we are sounding like we support the application, so a carefully worded response is needed.

An informal show of hands showed that 22 were against the development and 12 were for it, 2 abstained.

19/12 To resolve to formulate the Council's response either at this meeting or defer to the council meeting on 10/6/19.
It was decided to defer the response from the Council until the meeting on Monday 10th June 2019 and clarify the position with regards the detail required for S106 monies at this stage.