

HP2014.03.18

At a Meeting of the **HIGHWAYS & PLANS COMMITTEE** of COLEHILL PARISH COUNCIL held at the Memorial Hall on **18 MARCH 2014**.

PRESENT

Cllr Graeme Smith, Chairman
 Cllr Susan Cowsill, Vice-Chairman
 Cllrs David Barnes, Susan Davies, Sue Gretton, Mike Huntriss, KD Johnson, Dave Mitchell, Barry Roberts, David Packer (R) and John Warren.

APOLOGIES

Cllrs Gary Adams and Tony Holloway.

IN ATTENDANCE

Cllrs Janet Dover and Peter Scriven.
 Mr A Spencer.

399.14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

400.14 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings held on 4 and 25 February 2014, having been circulated, were taken as read confirmed and signed.

401.14 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

402.14 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following applications were submitted and comments were recorded as follows:

PA NO	DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
3/14/0016/OUT	<p>Land to the east and west of Cranborne Road, Burts Hill Residential development, a new local centre, a replacement and extended Wimborne First School, public open space and new allotments together with new access, streets and other related infrastructure.</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>1: Local opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to developing the site known as WMC5 and certainly on the scale proposed.</p> <p>2: Local Housing Need The proposed development is excessive and does not reflect actual local need for housing. The proposals are at least three times the requirements based upon EDDC's own calculations, 720 market and affordable within the CS period, as opposed to the 2490 planned within the CS of which 1300 are to be built on Green Belt.</p> <p>3: Affordable Housing No guarantee has been given to the number of affordable/social housing planned for WMC5. The CS speaks of targets for each site but no proportions are alluded to in the Outline Plan nor does it speak of the timing of delivery of social housing.</p>

4: Green Belt The development is planned on protected Green Belt and does nothing to avoid coalescence with Dogdean or between Colehill and Wimborne. Developing both the East and West side of the Cranborne Road will urbanise the rural Northern approach to the historic market town of Wimborne and will result in what can only be described as urban sprawl. There are no guarantees that the proposed new Green Belt boundary will not be further eroded in the future.

The Plan appears to ignore the objectives of the NPPF and the stated objectives of the CS itself. The NPPF states that ‘inappropriate building in the Green belt can only be authorised in exceptional circumstances’. Building in excess of what is needed in the immediate area of Wimborne and Colehill over the next 15 years is more than LOCAL requirement and in our view inappropriate. When taken together with other developments in the CS for Wimborne and Colehill it makes the scale of this plan totally inappropriate and not in accordance with the NPPF. Since nothing has changed since the submission of the EDDC to the Secretary of State in 2009 when it said that the site was unsustainable, there were serious environmental dangers together with serious flood risk and potential traffic chaos one must assume that the development to this extent in the Green Belt is inappropriate. There is admission in the NTS (para 41 and 45) that the development will present a moderate to significant adverse effect upon the town setting. So why ignore alternative potential sites in the area?

5: Flooding is a real risk and no results have been forthcoming from the developers with regards to sequential tests, flood management strategy, groundwater source protection and abstraction, pollution protection of the River Allen, protection of existing properties etc. The proposed bridge over the River Allen linking the southern SANG to Stone Lane will be rendered unusable for several weeks each year due to inevitable flooding. Little, if anything, can be done to mitigate this natural annual occurrence and again, local knowledge has been completely disregarded. The NPPF at Para 100 to 103 specifies that development should only take place in areas of minimum flood risk whether this be surface water, natural flooding or ground water. (NPPF para 100 to 103)). Has nothing been learnt from this past winter? Since the CS acknowledges that part of the western area lies within flood zone 1 more attention should be paid. It is not enough, or indeed correct, to say that only the SANG will be affected. There is potential for an increasing risk rather than one that is diminishing. The dismissal of the problem by Bloor Housing as being consequential is not supported by the CS Sustainability Report (SA Objective 3, para 124) and this was written before the 2013/14 winter.

6: Transport and traffic congestion appears to have been dismissed and local knowledge and experience not taken into consideration. It is apparent that data used in the CS is compiled from out-of-date reports and statistics. The number of units planned for WMC5 will add at least an additional 1000 vehicles to already congested roads. The development is planned on the “wrong” side of town, furthest from any places of employment. All residents of working age moving to WMC5 will almost certainly have to leave the New Neighbourhood to go to their place of work. Public transport is totally inadequate and little is planned to improve this situation resulting in 1000’s of additional traffic movements each day. There is a real danger that Burts

Hill, Smugglers Lane and Middlehill Road through Colehill will be used as a rat-run for vehicles trying to access the A31. All indications are that the Plan has been drawn up relying upon the data of the 2009 RTF. This has been superseded by the RTF 2013 which predicts 'a significant increase in volume in 2015 and serious consequential congestion in and around Wimborne. The added growth rate of other parts of Colehill and Wimborne will add to contemplated gridlock.

7: Schooling Moving Wimborne First School to this site in Colehill will remove a valuable school from the centre of town to an isolated location. Taking into consideration the fact that the children using this school and its attached pre-school will be aged from 3 years, youngsters that would normally have walked to school will now almost certainly be taken to school by car because of the considerable increase in distance. This will further add to the congestion experienced on a daily basis in the Walford area because of all the extra car journeys. Families living further afield (eg. Cuthbury) will be seriously disadvantaged. Little consideration appears to have been given to the increase in danger to children having to cross Burts Hill from the Allenview area. Opportunities to extend Wimborne First School on either its existing site or an adjacent site on School Lane have not been explored.

The proposed new school will add an additional class in each year group increasing the capacity of the school by approximately 100 pupils. However, no plans have been made to either provide a new Middle School or increase the rolls of the two existing Middle Schools, both operating at capacity.

The current upper school, QE at Pamphill, despite only opening in 2012, is already operating at capacity which could result in senior school pupils having to travel out of catchment for their secondary education, resulting in even more traffic congestion. The view from County that a new school in Verwood will not be considered until "critical mass" is reached is totally unacceptable.

8: Employment opportunities created by the development at WMC5 will almost certainly be just a few low skilled, retail appointments in the proposed outlet in the community centre. There is no evidence that measures have been put in place to encourage/increase private sector employment opportunities in either Colehill or Wimborne. Skilled and professional jobs are located out of town and the vast majority of working people will commute out of the area.

9: Healthcare: There are no plans for either medical or dental practices to be part of the New Neighbourhood. Local facilities are already running at capacity with existing patients often having to wait over a week to see a GP. An increase in the local population of as many as 1500 people, many being youngsters, many being older, retired with associated medical needs, will put even more strain on already creaking services. Residents in the existing neighbourhood of Colehill are already disadvantaged because there are no healthcare facilities in the community: all have to go into Wimborne to use the doctors and dentists. Serious consideration should be given to providing a doctors' practice in the existing Colehill community. Our own enquiries indicate that the impact of the new neighbourhood plus other new developments have NOT been taken into consideration on the question of

the supply of medical facilities. This is a part of the infrastructure that MUST be in place before the housing becomes occupied.

10: Other Matters No convincing evidence has been provided to guarantee the sustainability of the proposed development with regards to low carbon emissions, energy saving measures, materials to be used.

No visuals or artists impressions have been produced indicating the height/style of the housing or the real density of the units planned.

Wimborne is an old market town and the street scene must be protected.

It appears that EDDC believe it acceptable that existing local residents could be subjected to 10 years or more of building and disruption, noise and pollution and almost certain gridlock on a daily basis. WMC5 is just one of three major building projects proposed under the CS. The traffic movements of HGV's delivering building materials to the sites and the many hundreds of workers moving in and out on a daily basis, will cause chaos with many inappropriate roads being used by these heavy vehicles. Will the developer be responsible for re-instating the road surfaces on the many country lanes that will almost certainly be torn up during these extensive construction periods? The quality of life of all living in Colehill and Wimborne will be severely compromised and the effect on local businesses could be devastating, many never recovering from years of disruption.

Colehill Parish Council is not made up of members who want to see no change. We acknowledge the need for housing and we also accept that the site at WMC5 is suitable for new housing. What is not acceptable is the scale of the plan, the density of the plan and the potential for social and environmental damage. Since 1960 Colehill has accepted continual development and expansion and will continue to do so in a properly measured and regulated manner but this plan is neither of those things.

There are other sites in the areas of Colehill and Wimborne that could and should carry some of the housing burden but it is unacceptable for the EDDC to assume that it is right for the entire needs of the EDDC (with a few exceptions) to be put on the doorstep of Colehill and Wimborne and in particular for this vast development to be allowed to dominate future planning.

3/14/0017/COU	<p>Land to the east and west of Cranborne Road, Burts Hill Change of use of agricultural land to form Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).</p> <p>Objection – Please refer to the comments for PA 3/14/0016/OUT.</p>
3/14/0112/FUL	<p>95 Hayes Lane Erection of one and a half storey, three bedroom, detached dwelling. New vehicle access for new dwelling and number 95 stop-up existing access.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>Please ensure that during the development there is provision for the builders' vehicles to park off road so that they do not obstruct the road.</p>

3/14/0088/FUL	35 Canford Bottom Replacement dwelling – amended design to that approved under planning permission 3/12/1014/FUL. No objection.
3/14/0157/FUL	Land adjacent to 6 Leigh Lane Demolish existing barn and replace with dwelling. No objection. Please ensure that during the development builders' vehicles do not obstruct the road and that contaminants do not pollute the Common.

403.14

PLANNING DECISIONS

(a) The following applications had been APPROVED by EDDC:

PA NO	DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
3/14/0005/FUL	Adj 7 Parmiter Drive - Variation of Condition 3 for minor material amendment to 13/0753 to reposition rear conservatory and insert additional kitchen window.
3/14/0035/HOU	55 Wimborne Road - Two storey side extension to form shower room and stair access to new loft conversion.
3/13/0793/HOU 3/13/0794/LBC	17 Beaucroft Road - Demolition of defective mid 19 th century single storey extension and replacement with new extension of similar scale on similar footprint. Erection of detached car port and store with home office above.
3/13/1162/FUL*	Land south of Colehill Lane at OS 8248 Colehill Lane - Erect agricultural barn (retrospective).
3/13/1178/FUL	8 Park Homer Road - Demolish existing dwelling and construct one detached dwelling with integral garage.
3/13/1229/FUL*	14 Beaucroft Road - Erect dwelling with integral garage (demolish existing).
3/14/0033/CPO	Beaucroft School, Wimborne Road - Retention of one double temporary classroom.

(b) The following application had been REFUSED by EDDC:

PA NO	DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
3/13/1216/FUL	147 Cutlers Place Erect two storey dwelling house with associated parking.

* Decision not in accordance with Parish Council comments.

NOTED.

404.14 **TREE MATTERS**
PERMISSIONS FOR TREE WORK

(a) EDDC had granted permission for tree surgery work as follows:

ORDER	DETAILS
CO/18	Grant consent to raise the crowns of all Oaks to above ground level at 18 Kyrchil Lane.
CO/150	Grant consent to crown lift canopy of English Oak (T1) at 142 Bridle Way.

(b) EDDC had refused permission for tree surgery work as follows:

CO/150	Refuse consent to crown lift English Oak (T2) at 142 Bridle Way.
--------	--

NOTED.

405.14 **APPEAL**

APP/U1240/D/14/2214089 – Mr and Mrs Yapp

Raise ridge to form first floor living accommodation with single storey side and rear extension at 81 Leigh Lane.

The Appeal was against the decision by the Local Planning Authority to refuse consent for the proposal.

NOTED.

406.14 **STREET NAMING AND NUMBERING**

The property at 62 Beaucroft Lane would be known as Beaucroft Lodge and the property known as Adj 7 Parmiter Drive would become 5 Parmiter Drive.

NOTED.

407.14 **BURTS HILL – REDUCTION OF SPEED LIMIT**

A request had been received from Dumpton School that the speed limit of 60mph on Burts Hill be reduced.

RESOLVED that:

(a) DCC would be asked to attend a site meeting to discuss what measures could be taken.

(b) The SNT be made aware of the School's concerns regarding traffic on Burts Hill.

408.14 **PUBLIC BENCHES**

There were no faults to report.

NOTED.

409.14 **WAR MEMORIAL/BUS STOP**

There were no faults to report.

NOTED.

410.14 **PLAY AREA**

DCC would be replenishing the bark. A new camel had been ordered.

NOTED.

411.14 **SPEED INDICATOR DEVICE**

The Speed Indicator Device was still with Holt Parish Council.

NOTED.

412.14 **GRIT BINS**

The Members NOTED that the next inspections were due in April.

413.14 **HIGHWAY MATTERS FOR REPORT**

- (a) Cllr Mitchell reported on the outcome of the site meeting with DCC regarding the entrance to Bytheway. DCC had advised that the Parish Council needed to inform EDDC of the problem and ask them to apply to DCC for signage.
- (b) Cllr Huntriss reported the large pot hole on Smugglers Lane, 50m from the brow of the hill on the left. DCC to be informed.

414.14 **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND FUTURE AGENDA**

Cllr Johnson advised that the landlord of the Horns Inn public house was leaving the tenancy.

The Meeting ended at 21:07 hrs

CHAIRMAN