

## MUDFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Sue Graham. Sun View, Babcary Lane, Keinton Mandeville, TA11 6DR

Tel: 07874 220140

E-mail: [clerk@mudfordparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@mudfordparishcouncil.gov.uk)

Website: [www.mudfordparishcouncil.gov.uk](http://www.mudfordparishcouncil.gov.uk)

### MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL

Held On Tuesday 15 March 2016 at Mudford Village Hall at 7pm

#### PUBLIC SESSION

The following was reported:

- The letter box that had been removed by the Post Office / Royal Mail had now been replaced.
- The damaged manhole cover close to the village hall had been reported again, and would be inspected by Highways.
- A query had been raised by a member of the public about the signs displayed at the garage. The Chairman would look at this.
- Tony Capozzoli reported that he had a longstanding idea about how to restrict HGV vehicles through the village.
- Councillors had been made aware of an incident the previous weekend at which the police had attended. It was reported that residents of Hillview were anxious and fearful. The police had not been able to provide further information to the Parish Council but had confirmed that they had attended an incident, and reported that enquiries were ongoing.

483	<p><b>1.Attendance and to receive any apologies for absence and to consider acceptance of the reasons.</b>  Present: Stephen Bartlett SB, Tony Cavalier TC, Phil Sargent PS, Nick Lanigan NL, June Lydon JL.  In attendance: Tony Capozzoli TCo(District Councillor) Simon Fox SF(Planning Officer) Lynda Pincombe LP (SSDC Community Health and Leisure)  RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to accept apologies from Diane Vaughan, Geraldine Mabey, Mike Lewis.</p>
484	<p><b>2.Declarations of interest</b>  Phil Sargent personal and prejudicial interest item 5. Planning 16/00943/FUL  Tony Cavalier personal interest item 5. Planning 16/00943/FUL.</p>
485	<p><b>3.To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Parish Council Meetings held on 22 February 2016</b>  RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to approve the minutes as a correct record of the meeting held.</p>
486	<p><b>4.Potential Gain from Up Mudford Development.</b> Consider S106 proposals associated with Up Mudford development. Discuss and agree proposals. Representatives from SSDC attended for this item.</p> <p>Linda Pincombe presented a summary of proposed planning obligations from community health and leisure. In summary this included provision for on-site equipped play areas; youth facilities; playing pitches; changing rooms; community hall. There was the possibility of off-site provision for enhanced youth facilities in Mudford Village.</p>
487	<p>There would be no contribution to swimming pools off site. SB queried why this was the case. LP explained that this was because of the rules surrounding off site contributions - once 5 pooled contributions had already been made (as was the case here) further contributions could not be sought.</p>
488	<p>Disappointment was expressed because it appeared that the only gain for Mudford village from the list was a <i>possible</i> enhancement to youth facilities. Councillors referred to their understanding of comments made by the planning inspector that the development needed to enhance the lives of local residents, it appeared questionable whether this would be the case. It was stressed that in the event that the development went ahead, the Parish Council would be concerned with securing the best outcome for the people of Mudford Village.</p>
489	<p>LP noted that she would be happy to receive comments / observations on the s106 proposals after the meeting. This was ongoing work which would develop as details of the development become apparent.</p>
490	<p>SB asked for updates on issues raised at previous meeting.</p>
491	<p>Cemetery: TC wished to reiterate the need for further work on securing land for the cemetery. He stressed the fact</p>

	that the need for cemetery land had been brought about purely by the proposed development. SF agreed that he would look at this again, especially in the context of the shortage of Cemetery land in Yeovil. He was asked to engage with surveyors for a valuation of the land.
492	Feasibility study re traffic calming: SF confirmed that this was still viable
493	Bus shelters – SF confirmed that this was still viable
494	Parish Room on site – SF confirmed that he would be looking at feasibility of this, initial thoughts were that a parish room could be incorporated into the village hall design.
495	Improvement of footpath facilities, Primrose Lane. SF suggested that signage and improvements could be negotiated with developer, SB explained that this was necessary from Sock Corner to Up Mudford. SF had not looked at Rights of Way issues to date but he confirmed that he would look at this in more detail if this would improve access to the wider countryside.
496	Cycle Path: PS noted his grave concern about splitting village and suggested that a cycle path at the side of the road would be a more effective way of linking the development with the village. SF noted that he was awaiting comments from developer on a cycle route but that this would be subject to a cost benefit analysis. SF questioned whether the residents of the Up Mudford site would need to be linked to Mudford Village, SB noted that with the proposed facilities it was likely that Mudford Village residents would want to access the new site.
497	Landscaping. SB reiterated that there would need to be proper consideration of the arrangements for management of landscaped areas and ponds. In addition to on site landscaping issues, landscaping outside of the development zone would be necessary for the development to blend in to the countryside, and be integrated ( tree planting along the river bank was suggested.) TC reported that the lack of this in previous developments was well illustrated by the view of Wyndham Park from Trent. SF indicated that if such planting this would ease some of the landscaping concerns then there was no reason why it shouldn't be put forward as part of a scheme, but the topography would not allow the impact to be mitigated completely.
498	Flooding: TC asked if new rules had been introduced regarding run off rates from new developments, this had been suggested following the recent flooding. SF was not aware of new rules and with regard to flooding and he considered that the new development was not going to make it worse.
499	Drainage: Councillors wished to stress that the existing pumping station was under pressure, and at over capacity. With the new site relying on these pumps it was likely to exacerbate the problem. SF noted that he relied on the advice of the statutory undertakers with regard to drainage (Wessex Water in this case.) SB wished to stress that the local experience was the system could not cope.
500	Carpark extension: Further discussion needed to take place with James Divall, it was not clear if this would be included in a s106 agreement or whether it would be a joint PC/ SSSDC project.
501	Councillors expressed general concern about previous developments in the Yeovil area and that the promised planning gains had not materialised. Questions were raised about trigger points for developer contributions. SF explained that the normal trigger points were when 25% of the site was occupied. The play areas would be phased. Off-site contributions were more flexible, but dependent to a certain extent on cash flow. PS asked what would happen if the developer for any reason could not fulfil the obligations? SF noted that if unforeseen circumstances arose, agreements would be renegotiated.
502	Councillors asked about SSSDC liability if the development had a detrimental effect (increased RTAs, flooding etc.) SF noted that planning decisions were made on the best evidence provided by experts. If the PC considered that there was a negative impact, the onus would be on the PC to prove that this was caused by the new development.
503	Councillors asked SF when the revised EIA would be available. SF hoped that this would be available within a month, and this would then be consulted. SF was asked to speak to developer about providing a detailed plan of the 765 houses and 40% green space.
	SF and LP were thanked for attending and left the meeting.

504	T Capozzoli – urged caution about how to respond to this application, suggesting potentially less favourable impact of it being granted on appeal. He indicated that he would be happy to support the Parish Council view. TC asked T Capozzoli his opinion on the recommendation not to apply CIL to the proposed Yeovil urban extensions. T Capozzoli felt that this was not appropriate. Discussion took place about the democratic process that was required to agree CIL.												
505	<p><b>5 Planning:</b> Consider the following applications:</p> <p>16/00943/FUL Erection of a side extension and loft conversion. Construction of a retaining wall to the front of the property (retrospective) Fairview, Main Street, Mudford.</p> <p>The applicant was asked to explain the application. He explained that he had been informed verbally by the planning department that planning permission was not required for the wall, but at a later date was informed that where the wall was adjacent to the highway it should not exceed 1 metre in height. The wall was 1.2 m away from highway and 1.75m at its highest point. Councillors asked about the colour of featheredge boarding / render for the proposed extension. This would be natural wood / cream, in keeping with the existing. The ridge height had been kept low to lesson impact.</p> <p><i>Phil Sargent left the room.</i> <i>Tony Cavalier did not take part in the meeting</i></p> <p>SB invited observations, comments were made as follows:</p> <p>No objections.</p> <p>RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend approval.</p> <p>T Capozzoli was thanked for attending and left the meeting</p>												
507	<p><b>6. FINANCIAL MATTERS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>To approve the following accounts for payment and two signatories for cheques:-</b></li> </ul> <p>RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to approve the following payments, TC and SB to sign cheques.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="181 1137 1238 1279"> <tr> <td>Tony Cavalier</td> <td>Mileage</td> <td>£68.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communicorp</td> <td>Clerks and Councils Direct Subscription</td> <td>£12.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clive Miller Associates</td> <td>Planning Consultancy advice – re Up Mudford Development</td> <td>£96.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Tony Cavalier	Mileage	£68.80	Communicorp	Clerks and Councils Direct Subscription	£12.00	Clive Miller Associates	Planning Consultancy advice – re Up Mudford Development	£96.00			
Tony Cavalier	Mileage	£68.80											
Communicorp	Clerks and Councils Direct Subscription	£12.00											
Clive Miller Associates	Planning Consultancy advice – re Up Mudford Development	£96.00											
508	<p><b>7. Challenge to development at up Mudford</b> – Resolved: to exclude the press and public under <i>s1 (2) Admissions to Public Meetings Act 1960 as publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.</i></p> <p>Planning Application 14/02554/OUT. Receive update on legal advice and consider any actions arising. TC reported on legal advice since the last meeting.</p> <p>Queen Throne Parish Council had agreed to donate £2500 during the next financial year.</p>												
509	<p><b>8. NEXT SCHEDULED PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS:</b></p> <p>Thursday March 31 2016.</p> <p>Further meetings will be called as necessary usually on the last Thursday of the month.</p>												