

MUDFORD PARISH COUNCIL

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

Tel: 07874 220140

E-mail: clerk@mudfordparishcouncil.gov.uk

Website: www.mudfordparishcouncil.gov.uk

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY 22 February 2016 at Mudford Village Hall at 10am

PUBLIC SESSION

454	<p>Attendance and to receive any apologies for absence and to consider acceptance of the reasons.</p> <p>Present: Stephen Bartlett SB, Tony Cavalier TC, Phil Sargent PS, June Lydon JL, Nick Lanigan NL, Diane Vaughan DV, Geraldine Mabey GM</p> <p>In attendance: Sue Graham (Clerk) Nick Whitsun Jones NWJ (CPRE,) Mike Lewis ML County Councillor, Simon Fox SF, Dave Norris DN, James Divall JD, Paul Wheatley PW, Linda Pincombe LP, Alison Cameron AC.</p> <p>Apologies: RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to accept apologies from Tony Capozzoli</p>
455	<p>Declarations of interest. There were no declarations</p>
456	<p>Yes To Yeovil Greenbelt Campaign – hear presentation from CPRE about this campaign and agree and actions arising.</p> <p>Nick Whitsun Jones from CPRE attended the meeting to talk on the above subject. He noted that a briefing paper had been circulated to Councillors in advance of the meeting. He hoped to gain an in principle agreement from the Parish Council to support the campaign to persuade South Somerset District Council to designate a Green Belt area around Yeovil as part of their review of the Local Plan. He drew Councillors' attention to the online petition and the opportunity to comment on this proposal via the online petition. He noted that Yeovil had faced significant growth in the last few years and that further growth was planned. A Green Belt would help SSDC resist inappropriate development while ensuring that this landscape could continue to be enjoyed by everyone in Yeovil and the surrounding villages. It was too early to be definitive about where the greenbelt would go, this will be a matter for discussion with and decision by SSDC as the Local Planning Authority.</p>
457	<p>NWJ invited invited questions / observations. SB wished to point out that Mudford had highest concentration of sunken medieval villages and ancient monuments in Somerset. He wished to stress the importance of the historical landscape as well as the visual landscape. This was important in Mudford's history and needed to be protected. Despite this being a heritage feature SB felt it could not be separated from the landscape issue and would wish for this factor to be considered in any greenbelt considerations. Mudford Parish Council had an obvious interest in provision of a greenbelt and would remain interested and supportive of this campaign. RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to support the CPRE campaign to develop a Greenbelt around Yeovil.</p>
458	<p>Potential Gain from Up Mudford Development. Consider S106 proposals associated with Up Mudford development. Discuss and agree proposals. Representatives from SSDC will attend for this item.</p>
459	<p>DN (SSDC Development Manager) reported that SSDC had requested a meeting with the Parish Council to consider the potential gain for the Parish from the Up Mudford development. He appreciated that the PC would remain opposed to the urban extension but hoped that in the event that the development did go ahead there could be some planning gain for the Parish. The purpose of the meeting was therefore to discuss the potential gain.</p>
460	<p>Simon Fox (Planning Officer) outlined the scope of the potential gains as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Affordable housing• Highway infrastructure• Community Health and Leisure Facilities• Employment Land• Education (Mike Lewis wished to clarification about the location of the school and community hall, noting that it had been originally planned that school and community hall would be on Wyndham Park. SF reported that the current plan was for a 7 class school on each site. The only viable location for a hall would be on the Up Mudford site.• Ancilliary items- e.g. signage, street lighting, public art.
461	<p>An early exercise referred to as a 'wish list' had been developed some time ago, and some of the items met the criteria associated with the s106 agreement tests. Of these, the following were potentially viable – 2 bus shelters (Councillors stressed the need for appropriate safety measures to enable access to the bus shelters); a car park extension; cemetery extension; highways – traffic calming; alleviation of flood risk. SF suggested that these could form off site community gains.</p>
462	<p>It was also likely that new facilities would be delivered on site including a community hall; play areas and playing fields. It was noted that SSDC would not be adopting and managing these facilities and as such the community would be asked to take responsibility. This could be via a management company or via the Parish Council (which would be provided with a commuted sum.) Concern was raised about the potential maintenance responsibilities associated with the 40% greenspace that was required on the site including playing fields, playing pitches, community hall etc. which could potentially fall to the PC.</p> <p>TC and SB wished to note that achieving 40% green space would be challenging and because of this the Parish Council would be</p>

pushing for a full planning application to be submitted showing how this would be achieved. SF noted that SSDC would be working with developer to influence the detail of the outline application, ensuring that safeguards were included and more informed reserved matters applications. SB reiterated the importance of knowing sufficient information about the likely extent of the PC responsibilities before it made a decision about whether to manage the areas or to pass on to a management company.

463 SB wished to consider the potential planning gains individually.

464 **Cemetery.**

It was noted that there was also an issue with space at Yeovil cemetery. SB noted that Mudford Cemetery had been developed in 1918 with a forward plan for burial spaces for 200 years. This remained viable for 320 houses, but not with the proposed increase in the number of houses. The PC had approached a landowner who was willing to sell land for the cemetery. SF agreed that a contribution towards procurement of land for extension of cemetery, and associated landscaping could be included in a s106 agreement. A sum of £50k was suggested which would be passed to parish to negotiate with landowner.

465 **Sports Facilities, Playing Pitches etc.**

Linda Pincombe explained that SSDC had to work within National Planning Policy Framework, and Section 106 obligations would be based on needs assessment. The facilities falling within the scope of a s106 agreement included local facilities -playing pitches; youth provision; playgrounds; community halls. There was also scope for contributions towards strategic offsite facilities – e.g. swimming pools / theatres etc.

With the site generating an estimated 1700 people (could change once know mix of houses) many facilities would be onsite.

Alison Cameron explained how the needs associated with a site were assessed and outlined the provisions the Up Mudford site would generate including –

- Large play area provision 3400msq (within greenspace) 2 large equipped play areas on site,1 large equipped play area on school site
- Youth facilities – a MUGA was potentially planned as an onsite facility
- Playing pitches and changing rooms and associated car parking. 24,000msq pitch space plus ancillary facilities – car parking, changing rooms were planned on site.
- Community Halls - the site location was still to be confirmed (this would be a joint hall shared with Wyndham Park) SB queried the size / provision of the community hall –there was likely to be a main hall, meeting room, kitchen, toilets, designed to meet community need.

Councillors asked about the possibility of sports pitches (e.g. cricket) and associated facilities (e.g. changing rooms / pavilion) in Mudford village. LP wished to note that it was unlikely that this would be possible. However, improvement to existing facilities, including resurfacing and lighting the existing tarmacked area would be feasible.

466 **Parish Office**

Councillors raised the likely need for a Parish Office. It was suggested that this could be secured via a s106 agreement.

467 **Car Park Extension**

It was likely that the new development would increase village hall usage, creating a demand for a larger car park at the existing village hall in Mudford village. SB noted the possibility that an area of Hales Meadow might be made available in the future for recreation / car parking, he hoped that this could be agreed via a s.106 agreement. SF indicated that a case could be made for an extension to car park in Mudford Village due to increased use from the new development, an agreement with flexible wording could accommodate this.

468 **Flood Risk**

SB wished to raise the issue of how the developer could provide assurance regarding run off from the development – this could only be accurately calculated when the actual layout was confirmed, including car parks etc. SF noted that the layout was changing and he was working with the developer to reach a position where sizes are confirmed.

469 SB noted that Mudford was not currently included in dredging which currently only went as far as Ilchester, despite the need for the river to be cleared. SF challenged the implication that development would make the situation worse, suggesting that there was not a clear link. He highlighted the fact that others were responsible for the state of the river, including local landowners. ML asked would it be possible to require the developer to ask the inland drainage board about their responsibilities in this area. Discussion took place about the problem created by the location being on the Somerset / Dorset boundary. SF agreed that SSDC would facilitate some investigations to assess this problem.

470 Ponds: SB queried location of the attenuation ponds – and noted that these were not included in EIA at the moment. SF pointed out the fact that the ponds formed a separate application but that the two applications running parallel. SF noted that a new EIA was being prepared to take account of comments made to date.

471	<p>SB noted concerns about the management of ponds, and the run off route, this needed to be included in the plans and the impact on flooding further down the river taken into account.</p> <p>PS also wished to raise the issue of risk assessment with safety being a major concern for the Parish Council. Discussion took place about risk and responsibility and the PC wished for it to be noted that this would be a factor influencing whether it took responsibility for the ponds.</p> <p>Youth Facilities</p> <p>SB reported ongoing problems with youth in Mudford Village and ideally the PC would like to request trim trail / outdoor gym equipment as part of an agreement.</p> <p>Access / link between sites</p> <p>Councillors felt it was important to facilitate proper integration of the two sites via accessible links between Mudford Village and the new development SB noted that Primrose Lane was in a poorly maintained state and that the PC would like a cycle route to link Mudford Village and the new site. This would also double up as better route to Yeovilton which was likely to be a large employer. Improvements to footpaths and bridleways would also be desirable including kissing gates which were required to improve access for the ageing population. .</p> <p>Traffic Calming</p> <p>The Parish Council expressed a wish for more physical traffic calming – possibly islands / other restriction to width of road / pelican crossing. SF suggested that SSDC would look to commit sum of money to carry out feasibility study.</p> <p>Councillors raised concern about the maintenance associated with 40% greenspace. SF reiterated that this could be taken on by the PC with a commuted sum designed to last for 10 years, or by a management company specifically designed for such purposes. The PC queried whether there would be buffering between the existing and new development. This was confirmed. PW urged caution with quoting 40% greenspace and suggested that the inspectors wording needed to be clarified in this respect.</p> <p>James Divall wished to note that many of the PCs aspirations could be met by working with the Community Development Officers via a refresh of the parish plan. He urged the Parish Council to consider this as a means of assigning future precepts and setting aspirational projects for the village. There was grant funding available not only for the refresh itself but also for subsequent projects arising as a result of the refresh.</p> <p>It was agreed that a follow up meeting needed to take place. All to provide availability and clerk to arrange. SSDC officers were thanked for attending and left the meeting. <i>JL left meeting having a pre-arranged a commitment</i></p>															
478	<p>Community Infrastructure Levy – receive consultation, consider and agree response.</p> <p>It was noted that the consultation would close on 24th March. The clerk was asked to put a link and details of the consultation on the Parish Council website.</p> <p>RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to respond to the consultation as follows: Mudford Parish Council supports the introduction of CIL, but it is disappointed with the recommendation that CIL will not be applied to the Yeovil urban extensions.</p>															
479	<p>FINANCIAL MATTERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To approve the following accounts for payment and two signatories for cheques:- <p>RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to approve the following payments. Tony Cavalier and Stephen Bartlett to sign cheques.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="145 1570 1329 1749"> <tr> <td>Salaries</td> <td>February 2016</td> <td>£489.56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lightatouch</td> <td>Internal Audit and Financial Risk Assessment 01/04/15-31/12/15</td> <td>£191.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Information Commissioner</td> <td>Data protection registration</td> <td>£35.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FE Atwell and Sons</td> <td>Maintenance to Cold Brook</td> <td>£1080.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P S Services</td> <td>Cemetery Caretaker</td> <td>£75.00</td> </tr> </table>	Salaries	February 2016	£489.56	Lightatouch	Internal Audit and Financial Risk Assessment 01/04/15-31/12/15	£191.25	Information Commissioner	Data protection registration	£35.00	FE Atwell and Sons	Maintenance to Cold Brook	£1080.00	P S Services	Cemetery Caretaker	£75.00
Salaries	February 2016	£489.56														
Lightatouch	Internal Audit and Financial Risk Assessment 01/04/15-31/12/15	£191.25														
Information Commissioner	Data protection registration	£35.00														
FE Atwell and Sons	Maintenance to Cold Brook	£1080.00														
P S Services	Cemetery Caretaker	£75.00														
480	<p>Challenge to development at up Mudford – To resolve 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. A short discussion took place on this subject.</p>															
481	<p>Next Scheduled Parish Council Meetings:</p> <p>Thursday March 31 2016.</p> <p>Further meetings will be called as necessary usually on the last Thursday of the month.</p>															
482																