

Minutes of the meeting 10th December 2013 to discuss plan to develop land formerly known as CHER1.

A resident asked why the meeting had been called. The Chair explained that right of access had been asked about and that funds may be made available.

Mr Staniford introduced himself and explained that they had asked for a meeting with the Parish Council. One of 3 sites originally identified in the Draft Local Plan. Mr Staniford represented the landowners and Risby Homes. Original problems were trees and access. Tree officer was happy that the plan would not affect any of the mature trees. The other issue was access. The Sportsfield road was owned by the ERYC and had been the subject to an application for access from the developers. The PC had retained control of the road until 2020. ERYC have indicated that they would be willing to share the funds raised by allowing access. This could be £85,000. Road would have to be adopted and have streetlights. Part of the development site could be given over to further parking. 25% of the units would have to be in affordable housing.

Mr Barrett from Risby Homes introduced himself and outlined the plan to develop 20 houses. He also offered his companies services to develop facilities in the village which would save more money.

A resident expressed concern about the flooding issues and asked where the drainage would go. Mr Barrett explained the issues and how they would be addressed. Another resident brought up the issues about the spring and how it rose last December. He expressed concern about how the water would be stored and the soakaway.

Mr Staniford felt that the issue was not the site, but the drainage in the village. This was disputed by the residents. It was also felt that the run off would not be made any worse by any new development.

He stated that if the Parish Council does not agree then in 2020 the plan would go ahead without all funding going to ERYC.

A resident expressed concern about the parking issues and Mr Staniford indicated the new surface either side of the road that could be used as parking.

Another resident was concerned about the extra cars using the road and concerns were expressed about the safety with extra children using the road to get to the MUGA.

Mr Staniford felt that this application would go ahead in 2020 without consultation but a resident disputed this as there could be a public consultation via the Parish Council.

A resident stated that if the site was not on the current plan, then it may be difficult to develop it in 2020. Mr Barrett stated that the local plan is always being reviewed and the site could be included.

A resident expressed concern about the value of having a local plan if sites were being put across. Cllr Pollard stated that CHER 1 had been rejected.

A resident asked for clarification about the PC's stance that they did not agree with any development in the village until the flooding and sewage issues had been resolved.

A resident suggested that there should be a vote in the village and that more people could be involved.

There was a discussion about the covenant in place from the original owners of the land which the residents felt protected the land from development.

Cllr Smith brought up the noise issues that could result from the new residents objecting to the games. Another resident stressed the safety issues and the children's right to play on the field.

The increase in the number of vehicles in the village was also raised and Mr Barratt responded that it would be addressed by the Highways department in their analysis.

A resident felt that the feeling in the room was against any plan. Mr Staniford felt that the representation in the room was not for the whole village.

Cllr Peirson brought up the sewage and flooding and whether the developers had heard anything from ERYC. They responded that they had not heard anything.