

# DRAFT

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** of Buckland Monachorum Parish Council held at **CLEARBROOK VILLAGE HALL** on **MONDAY** the **27th FEBRUARY 2017** at **8.00pm**

**Present:** Cllrs Cheadle (Committee Chairman) (RC), L Wood (LW), S Britton (SB), D Butland (DB) and M Fowler (MF)

**In Attendance:** Mr Greeno (representing Lubricants SW, Sol Comfort and Valves Online)  
Mr Wood (representing opponents to both Planning Applications)  
Mr Liesching (representing Plymouth Brethren Christian Church)  
Approx. 60 members of the public  
Kelly Johns (Parish Clerk)

RC explained about the various planning guidance which applies to the 2 planning applications being discussed at the meeting. They are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), developed in 2014 and WDBC's own Development Plan (Our Plan). WDBC's plan is currently being updated to bring it in line with the NPPF, therefore there may be some conflict between it and the NPPF. He went on to explain how the two separate planning applications would be discussed by the Committee. The first would be to discuss the cumulative impact of the two developments together, then the planning committee will consider each separate development in turn.

During the public part of the meeting RC invited Mr Greeno to represent the three applicants for the industrial units (4005/16/FUL). He stated that his company has been on the business Park for 16 years.

1. They have received no complaints about the business during this time and it has now grown to bursting point.
2. The situation of the business on the Business Park is central to their customer base.
3. There are no other suitable units in the locality to which would enable the business to grow.
4. The expansion of the business will mean fewer deliveries and less traffic as a result on the local roads.
5. The three industrial units are not proposing a speculative development, they require the expanded business units now.

Mr Wood representing the opposition to planning application for 4005/16/FUL then spoke to outline the main points for their objection to the planning application. They are as follows;

1. There is no need for this type of development.
2. Local employment is high and people live in Crapstone to avoid industrial conurbations.
3. There will be a visual impact and loss of amenity to the residential houses surrounding the site due to increased noise, traffic etc.
4. The development will draw lorries onto inadequate roads, presenting risk to local residents and grazing animals.
5. Water run-off from hard standings caused by the development will present a risk of further flooding to villages downstream.
6. It will have an impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
7. It fails the test of WDBC's Core Strategy and four tests in the NPPF.
8. There is a lack of evidence for community and economic need for the development.
9. It contravenes the WDBC's Development Plan.
10. The development is deemed to be a major development and there are no arguments given for exceptional circumstances.
11. The application is knowingly premature. This is because planning guidance will be changing in the near future and the application has been made at this current time to avoid conflict with the new guidance.
12. All statutory consultees are opposed to the application.
13. There is case precedent for a recent planning application in Green Lane which would guide the application to be refused.
14. There have been 144 objections to this planning application.

Mr Liesching spoke on behalf of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church. They have put in the application for the development of a new meeting hall for their church (4006/FUL/16). Mr Liesching gave the following reasons for the application being necessary;

# DRAFT

1. It will provide a church facility for members of the church who currently reside in the Yelverton locality and to prevent elderly churchgoers driving into Plymouth.
2. It will also form a base for their rapid response team who deal with emergencies such as flooding in local areas. Equipment for the purpose of the rapid response team will also be stored on site.
3. The development is in line with a number of WDBC’s Strategic Planning guidance.
4. The issue of the development causing a flood risk further down-stream, has been dealt with by the installation of holding tanks and soak ways which will deal with all the water run-off from the site.

Mr Wood then spoke on behalf of all the opposition against the development. The 11 reasons they gave for their opposition of the development of the meeting hall where as follows;

1. The development will present a loss of amenity and a visual impact to neighbouring properties.
2. The development will impact on the flood risk to villages downstream of it.
3. There is lack of evidence for community and economic need.
4. There are a number of suitable other buildings in the locality which the meeting hall could use.
5. The application contravenes WDBC’s Local Development Plan.
6. The application is premature to avoid WDBC’s incoming revised Development Plan, which would go against being proposed development.
7. All of the statutory consultees have opposed the application.
8. There is case precedent for a recent planning application in Green Lane which would guide the application to be refused.
9. The public consultation response has been hostile. There have been 112 objections to the development.
10. There is real public anger about the continued applications made by the developer on this site.
11. Approval by the Local Authority of either of these developments would set a precedent. Approval would enable other applications to be made in the AONB.

The four Councillor’s who declared a non-pecuniary interest in both applications were invited to speak by RC before the start of the Planning Committee Meeting. LL asked for the increased flooding risk in Milton Combe to be taken into account by the PC and SW asked that the PC listen to the local opinion about the applications.

RC announced that the Planning Committee would now start their discussions and that no persons other than Committee Members would be able able to speak.

**056/17** | **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** None

**057/17** | **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS** Cllrs S Challiss (SC), V Bolitho (VB), L Larkin (VB) and S Woollacott (SW) declared a non-pecuniary interest in both planning applications and took no part in the Planning Committee Meeting discussion or vote.

**058/17** | **ITEMS OF GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE AND PLANNING MATTERS**

RC has read all 43 letters of objection to both planning applications (4405/16/FUL & 4006/16/FUL). They have been noted by the Parish Council.

**a) Planning Applications**

<a href="#">WDBC 4006/16/FUL</a>	Meeting Hall (152 sqm – for Plymouth Brethren Christian Church) and associated access, parking and landscaping at land adjacent to Yelverton Business Park, Yelverton Business Park, Crapstone, PL20 7LS by The Trustees of the Compton Meeting Hall (The Plymouth Brethren)	Object*
<a href="#">WDBC 4005/16/FUL</a>	Three business units, 960 sqm (1 x 384 sqm & 2 x 288 sqm – 576sqm), Use class B1 (c) light industrial/ Use Class B2 (general industrial)/ Use Class B8 storage & distribution, together with associated access, parking and landscaping at land adjacent to Yelverton Business Park, Yelverton Business Park, Crapstone, PL20 7LS by Sol Comfort/ Lubricants SW & Valves Online	Object*

\*The Parish Council made the following comment to the Planning Authority regarding its objection to both planning

# DRAFT

applications:

BMPC's Planning Committee considered the applications on 27th Feb. Hours before the meeting, the WDBC case officer informed the PC that the applications had been mis-advertised and were being re-advertised as major applications, given that the site exceeded 1Ha and breached the criteria set out in the Town & Country Planning Order (2015).

First, the Committee considered the cumulative impact of the applications. It considered that the impact of the proposed development, which doubled the physical size of the current business park would have a significant impact on the village of Crapstone and the AONB, and in NPPF terms, should therefore be designated as major development for which no exceptional circumstances were either presented or apparent. The proposals singularly failed to either 'preserve' or 'protect' the AONB landscape. The Committee noted that this view was shared by the TVAONB Planning Officer in his response dated 20th Feb. On these grounds the Committee recommended that, in principal, the applications, if considered cumulatively, should be opposed.

The Committee then considered each application in turn.

#### **4005/16 - 3 business units**

The Committee felt that the application failed in respect of 'conserving and enhancing' the AONB and that none of the businesses (a distributor of industrial lubricants, a manufacturer of industrial blinds and an industrial valve procurement business) had any valid connection with the local community nor provided any services on which the community would derive benefit. There was no justification for building on an unallocated green field site within the AONB when such businesses would be better located closer to transport routes and within sites allocated for such use. In short, the application failed on all relevant Policies within the extant Development Plan in particular, Policy SP17, and paras 14 & 115 of the NPPF.

#### **4006/16 - meeting hall for Plymouth Brethren Church**

The D&A Statement states that this application would be a 'modest addition to the proposed expansion of the Business Park'. The Committee were of the view that the two applications had been submitted separately to constrain development of each to less than 1000 sqm (960 sqm and 152 sqm) in the mistaken belief that this would obviate the need to consider the application as a major development (thereby mis-understanding the difference between 'major' in respect to the T&C PO and 'major' in respect of the NPPF). On its own, as a single building in the open countryside, within the AONB on an unallocated site outside the Settlement Boundary, the Committee had no hesitation in opposing the application. The Committee had no objection to the establishment of a facility to suit the needs of the applicant but considered such a facility would be inappropriate in this location and that no meaningful alternatives had been explored. It therefore failed in respect of relevant Policies within the extant Development Plan and in particular Policy SP17.

The Committee's views were unanimous in all respects.

**059/17**

#### **Date of future meetings:**

Weds 8<sup>th</sup> March: Planning Committee at 7.30pm at Buckland Monachorum Village Hall (Committee Room)

Tues 21<sup>st</sup> March: Planning Committee at 7.00pm and Full Council Meeting at 8.00pm at Yelverton War Memorial Hall

Meeting finished at 8.58pm