

Minutes of a Planning Meeting held on 21st September 2023 at Sandford Parish Hall.

Present Cllrs S Miles, M Snow, J. Stephens. J Crooke, and P Larcombe

Parishioners - 6

1) Election of Chair – Cllr J Stephens was proposed by Cllr M Snow, 2nd Cllr P Larcombe, and then took the Chair

2) Apologies – Cllrs R Ward and P Sandys.

Cllr Stephens explained that the Meeting was to discuss the responses to outstanding issues in respect of the Weavers Way planning application.

Whilst there was not Open Forum, he was happy for the Parishioners present to join in with the Discussions.

3) 22/02220/MFUL Land at NGR 283084 102432 (Fanny's Lane) Sandford Devon

Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission 21/00276/MFUL - Erection of 13 dwellings to include associated landscaping, public open space and infrastructure - Substitution of agreed drawings to incorporate revised site drawings

To consider the replies received by the Parish Council to outstanding issues from: -

a) Adrian Devereaux (MDDC Planning) commented – “I am writing further to your email whereby Sandford Parish Council has raised a number of matters where an update is requested. I can confirm that I have provided Belfield Developments Ltd with a copy of the list of matters raised and I am still awaiting a response. However, in the meantime I would comment as follows”.

Belfield Developments - “Further to your recent emails to Justin, please find **our** responses below”.

Q1. Creedy View ‘former’ pedestrian permissive access through wooden gateway.

This access is specified in the plans and will cross ‘Public Open Space’.

The path then joins to a “Private Road” in Weavers Way (green on plan).

For the avoidance of doubt, we require confirmation, from Bellfield, that the community will be able to use the private road to access the public open space as previously agreed with Adrian Devereaux (MDDC Planning Officer).

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) - As discussed on site, the public open space whilst to be maintained by a private Management Company would need to remain open for use by members of the public with the footpath linking up to the existing footpath. I note that Sandford Parish Council request confirmation from Bellfield that the community will be able to use the private road.

The house numbers has not been included with the relevant drawing and caused confusion,

It was felt that the promise of the Public Open Space needed to be in the public domain and access details be recorded.

b) **Belfield response** - As mentioned in Adrian's recent email, this will be a public open space and maintained by the Management Company. It is part of the planning stipulations that this will be a public open space.

- **It was not felt that this was an adequate response.**
- **It was felt it was necessary for the final agreement to be written into the Legal Deeds.**

Q2. Creedy View Public pedestrian access

We appreciate a footpath “dedicated and recorded on the definitive map of public rights of way” has been agreed with Richard Spurway (DCC Public Rights of Way and the legal work for this is currently being dealt with by DCC (PROW)).

Who will own the strip of “no man’s land”, on the boundary against Park House, which was suggested at one time as a footpath but was discounted due to levels.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) commented -

- i) I have attached the managed land plan for ease of reference. The blue hatched area identifies the land to be maintained by the Private Management Company.
- ii) With respect to the strip of “no man’s land” on the boundary against Park House where levels fall, parts of the land adjacent to Park House is to be maintained by the Private Management Company as shown but the plan also indicates that the area directly adjacent to Plot 6 would remain within the control of Plot 6. This is shown by the fact that they would be required to maintain the boundary.
- iii) b) **Belfield Developments** response - Access through the site goes through the public open space, down the road and connects between plots 1 and 2, which is a level and more accessible path.

A number of questions arose from these responses: -

- **Who would be responsible for the tree?**
- **E Trick asked whether he would have machine access, over this land, to his Meadow?**
- **It was felt that a Site Meeting was needed to discuss these and other issues with MDDC (Planning) and Belfield.**

Q3. Public Open Spaces

Belfield is required to confirm the timetable for the bank to be removed, and the Public Open Space levelled.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) - I have attached the managed land plan for ease of reference. The blue hatched area identifies the land to be maintained by the Private Management Company. With respect to the strip of “no man’s land” on the boundary against Park House where levels fall, parts of the land adjacent to Park House is to be maintained by the Private Management Company as shown but the plan also indicates that the area directly adjacent to Plot 6 would remain within the control of Plot 6. This is shown by the fact that they would be required to maintain the boundary.

b) Belfield Developments - The public open space will become a public open space when the development is complete, we are expecting the site to be completed by the end of the year.

Q4. Earth Mounds below Weavers Way

There is on-going concern from SPC, and local walkers and residents', over issues of subsidence into Meadowside and their unsightly nature.

Confirmation requested from Bellfield and the timetable for the removal of the earth mounds from the Weavers Way Site. Former ground levels to remain unchanged.

a) Adrian Devereaux (MDDC Planning) - Points 3 – 6 (POS, Earth Banks/Mounds, Raised Manhole I have asked Bellfield to provide a timetable for remaining works to be undertaken.

SEE RESPONSE TOP OF PAGE 4

b) Belfield Developments - We are expecting the site to be completed by the end of the year.

Q5. Earth Bank adjacent to PROW

Earth bank on the southern boundary of the development parallel to PROW.

This is unsightly and not per the development plan. SPC has understood from Bellfield that the bank would be of lower height and landscaped as previously agreed and linked to Planning. Can Bellfield confirm the timetable for this work.

Assurances are requested from Bellfield that the bank is significantly lowered and sloped as per Artistic Impression Plan. Points 3 – 6 (POS, Earth Banks/Mounds, Raised Manhole):

a) Adrian Devereaux (MDDC Planning) - Points 3 – 6 (POS, Earth Banks/Mounds, Raised Manhole) and I have asked Bellfield to provide a timetable for remaining works to be undertaken.

b) Belfield Developments - Works have not been completed in this area; they will be carried out as per the plans. We are expecting the site to be completed by the end of the year.

SEE RESPONSE PAGE 4

Q6. Raised Manhole

This manhole is raised above the ground and was installed by Bellfield as an interim measure during the construction of the development. This is intended to be reduced in height. Can Bellfield confirm the timetable for this work.

We request that Bellfield lower the manhole as early as possible since this forms a H&S hazard.

a) Adrian Devereaux (MDDC Planning) - Points 3 – 6 (POS, Earth Banks/Mounds, Raised Manhole) and I have asked Bellfield to provide a timetable for remaining works to be undertaken.

b) **Belfield Developments** - Manhole works will be completed alongside the drainage works for the development. We are expecting the site to be completed by the end of the year.

SEE RESPONSE PAGE 4

Q 3, 4, 5 & 6

A general discussion took place to these responses: -

There was an urgent need for the Raised Manhole cover to be removed and replaced.

Removal of the earth Mounds – This was not acceptable, the mounds needed to be removed as a priority.

Parishioners from Meadowside also agreed that this should not be left until the completion of the Site as both the earth mounds, and any surplus water problems escaping from the Ponds, was causing Safety concerns.

It was understood that the Management Committee would be responsible for the Ponds.

Q3 It was thought that the site map Plan number needs to be shown so as to confirm the exact location, time and which plan was being referred to for reference.

Q7) Footpath access from Weavers Way estate into the PROW -

Confirmation is needed on how drainage is to be dealt with.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) - Points 7-8 appear to relate to drainage. I have attached a couple of plans which show final site levels and position of drains and gullies within road ways where surface water runoff would be caught.

b) **Belfield Developments** - Adrian's email addresses this point.

The Meeting accepted these responses.

Q8) Public access to PROW from Weavers Way

SPC was advised that this access will be suitable for disabled users. There is concern over drainage water from the road entering the PROW.

Assurances are requested from Bellfield how they will manage run-off from Weavers Way.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) - Points 7-8 appear to relate to drainage. I have attached a couple of plans which show final site levels and position of drains and gullies within road ways where surface water runoff would be caught.

b) **Belfield Developments** - As per point 7.

Q9. Creedy View Road Access to Weavers Way

Clarification from Bellfield is required as to the layout of this access.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) – Not responded to.

b) **Belfield Developments** - The access will be provided as per the planning. Please see the drawings provided as part of the planning.

It was agreed that this needed to be “flagged up again” as the reply was inadequate.

Q10. Other topics for consideration: -

A) Weavers’ Way sale particulars specify Annual communal maintenance fee: £500 per annum? It was felt that this is far too low an estimate to cover all that needs to be included. Does it include, for example, Indemnity against land slippage on to properties below at “Meadowside”.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) - Other matters appear to be directed to Belfield in terms of annual communal maintenance fees and additional requests regarding gateways, so this will need to be addressed by the developer. I will be in contact once I have heard back from the developers of the site.

b) **Belfield Developments** - The maintenance fee has been proposed by the managing agents. The management company will carry the required insurance.

B) We request that the footpath between the gate below the “Ha-ha” to the gate, at the end of Meadowside, be wide enough to take cycles as Sandford Parish Council intend to create a cycle way to Pedlars Pool and we insist upon a 3m width please.

a) **Adrian Devereaux** (MDDC Planning) - Other matters appear to be directed to Belfield in terms of annual communal maintenance fees and additional requests regarding gateways, so this will need to be addressed by the developer. I will be in contact once I have heard back from the developers of the site.

b) **Belfield Developments** - As Sandford Parish Council will know from our previous meeting with the PROW officer on site, this would be for the PROW to determine, rather than Belfield Developments.

The 3-meter width of the Footpath that had been asked for had been over looked.

It was agreed this also needed to be “flagged up again” especially if the suggested Foot/Cycle Path to Pedlars was to happen in the future.

OTHER MATTERS RAISED

Could a fence be provided along the Footpath below the Development?

There was a need for Building Control at MDDC to consider the issue of the earth mounds and maybe Enforcement was necessary?

Maybe Mel Stride M.P, should be asked to assist?

The Chairman sympathised with the Residents of Meadowside and felt that SPC were trying as hard as they could to resolve all the outstanding issues and urged them to write a letter to Mel Stride M.P.

There being no other business the Chairman closed the Meeting at 9.15pm.

