

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF KINGSBRIDGE TOWN  
COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, QUAY HOUSE AT 6.00 P.M. ON  
TUESDAY 31 MAY 2016**

**Present:** Cllr Chris Povey (Chairman)  
Cllr Anne Balkwill  
Cllr Tom Coulthard  
Cllr Martina Edmonds  
Cllr Barrie Fishman  
Cllr Sandy Gilbert  
Cllr Robin Griffin  
Cllr Irene Jeeninga  
Cllr Chris Povey  
Cllr Graham Price  
Cllr Jim Romanos

**In Attendance:** County Cllr Julian Brazil  
County & District Cllr Rufus Gilbert  
District Cllr Keith Wingate  
Mark Donald & Chris Hughes (H2Land)  
Five Members of Public  
Sam Acourt, Kingsbridge & Salcombe Gazette  
Martin Johnson, Town Clerk

**16/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies.

**Public Open Forum**

Members of public made statements at Annex A.

**16/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**16/25 REVIEW – PLANNING APPLICATION ALLOCATED SITE K4**

Council's (KTC) recommendation for planning application 28/1560/15/O had been called-in for review, in accordance with Standing Orders 7(a), given the receipt of new information regarding draft planning obligations under Section 106.

Proposal: Readvertisement (revised plans) Outline application with some matters reserved for residential development scheme for 32 no. dwellings at allocated site K4  
Location: Proposed development site at Sx 7392 4386, Allocated Site K4, Garden Mill, Kingsbridge  
Applicant: H2land  
KTC's original recommendation (Resolved at full council meeting 8 March 2016) was Approval with the following conditions:

- low level lighting to be installed on the pedestrian footpath through the Recreation Ground from Derby Road to Embankment Road, and
- the hedge bordering Derby Road to be retained or enhanced.

Members noted statements made by local residents and the applicant H2land during the Public Open Forum and were mindful of local and national planning policies. A full discussion took place and it was then **RESOLVED** to reverse the above decision and recommend Refusal on the grounds that the provision of 4 affordable homes at circa 12% was a considerable reduction from the strategic target of 55% for Kingsbridge.

*The meeting closed at 6.50 p.m.*

..... Presiding Chairman .....Date

Annex:

A. Public Open Forum.

## Public Open Forum

Brian Taylor, David Kirk and Colin Sutton (all Hillside Drive) made several comments which included:

- There was a lack of detail in the plans.
- There appeared to be a vacant land area between the site and the rear gardens of adjacent properties.
- The disparity between original proposed 50% affordable homes and current 12.5% was not understood.
- If the hill was too steep to build on then the development should not go ahead.

Mark Donald and Chris Hughes (H2Land) presented the application and answered Members' questions:

- The application had been submitted in accordance with SHDC policies i.e. Development Planning Document (DPD), allocated site and affordable housing viability up to 55%.
- A site economics/viability study had been independently assessed. The company had been open and transparent with the assessor and all elements had been broken down.
- A Heads of Terms for planning obligations (Section 106) had been submitted which had been based on the steep and challenging topography of the site.
- Drawings showing the current contour levels and amount of land to be taken out/new retaining walls were displayed.
- The development represented a high risk for the company.
- The application had been carefully reviewed by SHDC planning officers and had received a recommendation for approval.
- The costings of lighting through the Recreation Ground had been included within H2Land's viability study.
- The company had not been disingenuous; the concept of the development had to be completed before the closer detail was realised.
- The site would deliver houses in accordance with the Kingsbridge DPD.
- Section 106 planning obligations would have to be delivered notwithstanding any additional risk encountered by H2Land as the development progressed.

District Cllrs Gilbert and Wingate stated:

- Both intended to speak at SHDC's Development Management (DM) Committee on 8 June when the application would be received and considered.
- Both had attended a DM Committee site visit that day.
- They did not support the planning application.
- If approved with such a low percentage of affordable housing it was likely to set a dangerous precedent.

County Cllr Brazil stated:

- He sat on the DM Committee and did not wish to make comment.
- The site viability assessment was pivotal with profit margins for the developer and land value had to be factored in.