

CHILD OKEFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of an EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of Child Okeford Parish Council held on 3rd. JULY 2018 at the Community Centre, Station Road, Child Okeford DT11 8EL at 8pm.

Attendance and approval of Apologies for Absence

Present: Cllr Martin Rudd (Chairman), Cllr. Kirsty Baird, Cllr Sylvia Holdeman, Cllr. Sherry Jespersen and Cllr Robert Smith

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr. Michael Hepburn Cllr. Mary Giles

In Attendance: Parish Clerk – Mal Derricott
16 Members of the public were present

Declarations of Interest in Matters on the Agenda

There were no declarations of interest

18/42 Planning Matters

a) Planning application: 18/0595 (OUTLINE)

Dorset Self Storage Company, Gold Hill Business Park, Gold Hill, DT11 8HF

Develop land by the erection of 68 dwellings, form vehicular accesses, public highway improvement, parking, landscaping and open spaces (Outline application to determine access).

An objection to the outline plans was proposed by Cllr. Rudd and seconded by Cllr. Jespersen

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATION: OBJECTION

For the Council's summary of reasons for objection See pages 85 - 88

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.30pm.

Signed Dated

Please note that the foregoing does not become minutes until approved by Council and signed to that effect by the Presiding Chairman at the next meeting

**CHILD OKEFORD PARISH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMENTS – JULY 5TH. 2018**

**Planning Application: No:2018/0595/OUTLINE
Dorset Self Storage Company, Gold Hill Business Park,
Child Okeford DT11 8HF**

Proposal: Develop land by the erection of 68 dwellings, form vehicular accesses, public highway improvement, parking, landscaping and open spaces. (Outline to determine access).

Child Okeford Parish Council Observations

Child Okeford Parish Council Objects in Principle to any housing development in this location as it is outside of the settlement boundary which is contrary to policies in sections 1,2,8 and 20 of the Local Plan and the NPPF and the site is not sustainable for the reasons given below.

The location was rejected from the North Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as unsustainable, with reference to its rural location, (the distance is 2.5km to the centre of the village) and the unsuitability of the roads and pavement absence and the reliance on cars. Child Okeford has other more sustainable locations for housing, including sites for over 30 homes identified on the SHLAA. A proposal for 25 homes on a site inside the settlement boundary and we believe is in the pre-application planning process.

The site is not adjacent to the settlement boundary and would therefore create a separate satellite development.

This is an agrarian setting located away from the built-up area of the village and surrounded by farmland. There is no evidence of local need for housing in this location. Child Okeford has more suitable sites identified in the SHLAA closer to village amenities and accessible on foot and this site has already been rejected by SHLAA.

Whilst the Parish Council oppose housing development of this site in principle, the outline proposal for 68 properties is far too large to maintain the overall and individual sustainability of a depth of services, transport infrastructure and amenities of the village. The unsustainable nature of this proposal is discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of the Parish Council's response.

Likewise, the access proposed is on a road leading into the existing 30mph zone on which DCC Highways have recently undertaken a speed survey. The results of this survey lead to DCC Highways recommendations and actions on improving road safety. Moving the 30mph zone would place the proposed access to the development directly onto a long straight part of the road prior to the entrance to the village.

In the considered view of the Parish Council the housing in this location would not be sustainable for the following reasons:

1. Roads

The road is characterised as being, fast and straight, no pavement, no streetlights and narrows significantly upon entry to the village to the point of single file passing on a blind bend and on an upward gradient. The access points to the development are off this very busy stretch of this

straight road. The road is unsuitable for pedestrians, parents walking with children or pushchairs and impaired mobility users. It has no pavement or safe area which means there is simply nowhere for a pedestrian to step out of the line of traffic in either direction.

The draft revised NPPF in March 2018 states that development should be prevented or refused “on highway grounds if the residual cumulative impact on the road network or road safety would be severe”, In June 2017 DCC Highways undertook a speed survey including this section of road and found that it was endemically unsafe due to excessive speed within the 30mph limit zone. DCC has requested that the underlying data should not be made public, however its recommendation was to implement safety measures on this section of road. Extending the current 30mph zone will have little or no impact and if this development went ahead there would be several new accesses and 8 properties fronting the road with drives. DCC’s Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) Policies A-1 and A-3 for reducing private car travel will be contravened as per one of the current reasons in the SHLAA.

2. Traffic

The PC view that this road is heavily used and any increase in local traffic is unsustainable. Our local speed watch group report that the average number of vehicles per hour was recorded at 182 and at its' highest it was 245, on 18 occasions it exceeded 200 vehicles per hour. This data was gathered over 15 separate speed watch dates taken over 2015/2016. The traffic is not just cars, there is a higher than average number of large vehicles including tractors and it is a regular route for HGV contractors including Bartletts and Moggeridge. We know of 1 fatal collision when a car travelling at high speed hit two horses, resulting in 1 horse being killed at the scene and the other left with serious life-threatening injuries, fortunately on that occasion the driver and passenger of the vehicle were not seriously injured.

3. Flooding

The site is in flood zone one. However, local knowledge confirms that it is prone to flooding as a result of rising ground surface water and indeed has been flooded on several occasions. The residents living next to and around the existing storage units experience flooding as a result of rising surface water in their gardens. There used to be a watermill on the site which utilised the watery conditions which confirms that it has traditionally been a very wet site and an integral part of the Stour flood plain management.

4. Area of Natural Outstanding Beauty

The development is within the landscape buffer of the Cranborne Chase AONB and is visible from Hambledon Hill. The existing build consisting of a block of low level agricultural buildings has a low impact on the view and sits well alongside other buildings in the area. The potential impact of 68 homes with the associated light pollution, colour and signage to this broken outline will be significantly more harmful to the

AONB.

5. TPO's

There are several trees that have TPO's on the site including an important row of mature oak trees on the northern boundary of the site and are a significant feature on the approach to the village and a prominent statement landmark when approaching the entrance to the village. This development will be prejudicial to the long-term future of the trees on the site.

6. Demographics

The Local Plan emphasises that development in villages should be driven by local need. There is no evidence to suggest that this is the case with this development. The GP surgery in the village is already severely stretched and serves a wide catchment area outside of the village. Likewise, the school is similarly stretched.

A further concern of the Council is the loss of an employment site and possible jobs for local people.

In addition to the concerns expressed about local infrastructure the possibility of overstretching of the broadband service by adding 68 more dwellings on to the existing Gold Hill Green Cabinet it could slow up the broadband coverage for homes and businesses furthest away from the cabinet.

7. Footway

In section 3.1.2 the Transport Statement acknowledges that access to the proposed development on Lower Common Road is:

- On a road without any street lighting
- Located on the only route out of the village the north (to the towns of Sturminster Newton, Shaftesbury and Gillingham)
- On all regular bus routes going to Sturminster Newton, Shaftesbury, Gillingham, Yeovil and Sherborne as well as the two school buses.

Gold Hill and The Hollow follow an extremely winding, narrow and steep route (often greater than 6% incline) to the centre of the village 1.3km away. Walking this route would be entirely unsuitable and pose significant difficulties for older people, unaccompanied children, mothers with buggies or toddlers. The steepness from the Hollow to the village centre is so much so that cycling is difficult if not impossible requiring dismounting and pushing the cycle up the hill along the carriageway, with high hedging on one side. As the applicant's transport assessment states there is no cycle infrastructure on this route and recommends it would only be suitable for 'confident cyclists'.

There are a number of pinch points along this route where the road narrows to a single lane with high hedged and walls along significant sections offering no safe place for pedestrians to avoid vehicles.

There are two agricultural contractors located at opposite ends of the village and frequently driving large farm machinery through (and almost continually during the summer and autumn harvesting months) the extra footfall on the road from the proposed development would be extremely dangerous to pedestrians and road traffic alike. These farm vehicles often deposit mud on the road and as discussed with the steepness of the road when it rains the dips are muddy for a significant time afterwards before the road becomes clear again. This wet mud is hazardous both to walk on and for cars to brake sharply on.

The Applicant's Transport Assessment itself points out in section 4.3 this is also the route the three local bus services and school buses take. These vehicles frequently have to stop while oncoming vehicles back up and manoeuvre out of the way serves to illustrate the points made about the danger to pedestrians on part of this road.

Due to these factors, we would challenge the assertion within the Applicant's Transport Assessment that the proposed development is no more than the 15 minutes' walk from the services located in the centre of the village and beyond (such as the doctor's surgery).

We strongly contest any view that the site is well placed to give access to the village. On the contrary, it is our view that it is unreasonable to assume that anyone other than the fit and nimble would

walk to the village along this route. Certainly, older people, unaccompanied children or mothers with buggies or toddlers would be unlikely to do so for several reasons given here. The nearest footpath is not passable for much of most of the year due to a combination of flooding and deep mud.

The Parish Council's view is that the overwhelming majority of journeys to and from the residences in this site - to the village or anywhere else - will be made by car. This is supported in the applicants transport statement and as such directly contravenes DCC's Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) Policies A-1 and A-3.

7. Fauna

Pipistrelle and a number of other bat species use existing buildings on the site for roosting.

8. Foul Water Issues

From a previous proposal for 50 properties on this site that was rejected robustly by the NDDC Planning Committee it was noted that the current infrastructure for foul water is not suitable for the proposed development. This proposal is for more properties than previously.

In conclusion the Child Okeford Parish Council oppose this proposal in principle for reasons including that it is:

- 1) a satellite development not adjacent to or within the settlement boundary**
- 2) Rejected as sustainable by the SHLAA**
- 3) Proposing access on a road with DCC Highways-documented safety concerns**
- 4) The numerous other sections detailed in this response**