ABBAS AND TEMEPLECOMBE PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of the Meeting held on the
17th October 2018

PRESENT Councillors R Cave (Chairman), Sarah Webb (Vice Chair), C James, Paula Batchelor, Rachel Badger, S Badger, A Kerry, J Grierson

22 Parishioners, 3 representatives of Thales, Chris Hey (Cushman and Wakefield)

1. APOLOGIES A Haskell, G Wilson, Mr Hayward Burt (District Councillor), Mr William Wallace (District/County Councillor)

Chairman welcomed everyone and opened the meeting. He explained that if the public wished to speak they would be allowed three minutes

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS
Chairman referred to clause 13 of the Member's Code of Conduct as to disclosure of an interest which relates to a financial interest of a friend, relative or close associate.
The following interests/dispensations were declared:-
R Cave declared an interest due to having two family relatives working at Thales. S Badger declared an interest due to his daughter working at Thales. Paula Batchelor declared an interest due to her son working at Thales. A Kerry declared an interest due to his son working at Thales. Rachel Badger had a disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) as an employee of Thales. Chairman asked the remaining Members if it would be in order for them to take part, speak but not vote. Two Members were in favour with one abstention.
Sarah Webb declared her dispensation in respect of Slades Hill as she has no financial interest.

3. PLANNING
1) Application no 18/02738/FUL – Erection of manufacturing building (Use Class B2) and associated development including construction phase access/roadway (temporary), car park/yard area, perimeter security fencing, external plant and landscaping works – Land at Slades Hill Templecombe

Parishioners comment – objection due to a huge building situated 50 metres from her property that should be on a brown field site. Development would create light/noise pollution and loss of privacy. Thales has included screening but this is unfit for the purpose as it would not be present all year round.

Parishioners comment – he endorsed the previous comments. Commented that no planning officer was present and queried date for comments to be received by. Felt that Thales may have made enquiries with the Planning Office before purchasing land.

Councillor C Hukins joined the meeting at 7.12 pm

Parishioners comment - Felt strongly that consultation response should come from the whole of the Village. He had concerns as to the impact on the Village and especially as to how many employees at Thales actually come from the Village. Chairman reminded the Parishioner of the time allowed to speak.

Due to his conduct at this point the Chairman adjourned the meeting and the Parishioner was asked to leave the meeting.

The open session re-commenced and the following comments and concerns were expressed by the Parishioners:-

- Devaluation of properties resulting from the proposed industrial unit
- Comments made by residents had yet to appear on the planning portal
- Growth on what is a Greenfield site. Excessive number of houses proposed for the outline application
- It is estimated there are approximately 900 vehicle movements pass the Primary School each day. Now Thales have acquired the land there is an opportunity to have an alternative access to reduce the vehicle movements
- No Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on industrial unit
- What benefits will the Village gain – it was noted the application would still give land to the School for additional playing field and the Parish Council would benefit from land for future additional burial space
- How many of the envisaged jobs would go outside of the Village
- It was noted that contamination had been found, thought to be a high level of lead. Action had been taken to remove the soil.
- Could the industrial unit be moved on to the Thales car park and the area behind Blackmore Vale Close used for the car park
- Thales currently allows the Primary School to park vehicles along the entrance to the site. It was felt the volume of traffic in this area was only busy for 30 minutes twice a day. The introduction of the traffic calming had made the junction more dangerous.
- It was considered the industrial unit is too big, too high and in the wrong location

The Parish Councillors were asked to make any comments they may have.

Rachel Badger – reported on the number of employees presently at Thales, 820 personnel, with 51 coming from the BA8 area. Employment is not just centred on engineers there are on site facilities, canteen staff and opportunities for apprenticeships.
C Hukins – no comments
A Kerry – Application could only be considered when paperwork is received and he felt there was not long enough to look at it or to properly consult the Village. The public consultation carried out by Thales was inadequate; comments were received from 60 people out of a total of 1500 parishioners i.e. less than 4%. The traffic assessment states a 13% increase in traffic movements does not merit a relocation of the site entrance. He considered that a 13% addition to an already unacceptable situation was not sufficient ground to dismiss the installation of a new site entrance due to 'operational reasons'.

He felt Thales should take this opportunity to reconsider the site access as this may be the last opportunity they would get to create an alternative access. They had been given the opportunity previously but they did not take it up.
The proposed additional houses would put more pressure on the School and traffic issues. He did not think it realistic to expect Thales to put the building elsewhere on a brown field site but did feel the building is out of place in a rural environment and the colour and style could be changed.
J Grierson – Referred to the history of the site, when it was Marconi, and in particular when they submitted a proposal to County to cut a road into the site direct from the A357. They were going to contribute towards the project which was given a time span but changes in site ownership meant that the project was never carried out and monies offered have been forfeited. He considered that the proposed contractor's road, on completion of the building, should be engineered to be the main entrance into Thales. This would alleviate the passage of vehicles past the School, especially at the busiest times of the day. There is a benefit to the Village of the creation of jobs and the potential of low cost housing. If Thales were to consider other sites and move the whole of the business operation away it would have a devastating effect on the Village.
S Badger – He felt that if permission is not obtained there is a threat that Thales may well look at other places.
C James – Commented that Thales has been supportive to the Village Hall and Parish Council but he objected to the building's close proximity to Blackmore Vale Close and School. He also felt there had been a lack of consultation and the thought should have been given to the formation of a roundabout at the entrance to the site.
Paula Batchelor – Welcomed more jobs to the Village and affordable houses but did have concerns as to the situation with regard to the road and problems encountered with only having one entrance to the site. This would be the only time two entrances could be achieved and the chance will be lost if the land is sold.
Sarah Webb – pointed out that from a planning perspective the previous application, submitted by Meads, has been used as an example and if this application proceeds it could also be used in the same way. The proposed building, due to its height, would overlook and overshadow the Blackmore Vale Close, Village Hall and School including the Forest School. It was not appropriate in a rural village. It was noted that buffer area would now be subject to the new development, resulting from the outline application, and could be changed. The option to reduce the traffic movements by the School should be encouraged. Noise from the air conditioning can be heard night and day and peaks at 4.00 am. Light pollution is also a concern. Thales is a rural business, providing employment, but is self contained. The original planning application from Meads included a 106 Agreement which provided funds for the Village Hall and Changing Rooms. Also allotments, teenage area and football pitch for the School. The loss of the 106 Agreement and as there is no CIL, from the development of an industrial unit, would decrease the benefits to the Village. The consultation had not been dealt with as robustly as it could.
A Haskell – in his absence the Chairman read out his statement. He wished to make the point that this will be the one and only chance to divert the majority of traffic away from the school. He felt the application should be rejected until the main entrance to the Thales site is reconsidered.
Rachel Badger – Also agreed an additional entrance would be good for the Village. Thales is promoting car sharing and making available four electric hook ups.

Sarah Webb had read the Traffic Plan but felt the car sharing was irrelevant as there seems to be a lot of cars with only one occupant and this only leads to blocking up the road at School times.

Chairman brought the Members comments to a close and the following response would be submitted:-

Application no 18/02738/FUL – Erection of manufacturing building (Use Class B2) and associated development including construction phase access/roadway (temporary), car park/yard area, perimeter security fencing, external plant and landscaping works – Land at Slades Hill Templecombe

Members discussed the above application and made the following comments:-

- Not in line with current local planning policy namely SS2 and EP4 both relevant to any development in a rural settlement such as Templecombe
- Not in keeping with the character of a rural settlement in terms of scale, dominance, design or materials
- Would contribute to an already unacceptable level of traffic movements past the school. Consideration should be given to an alternative entrance
- Concerns over loss of privacy, overshadowing, scale and dominance of building on the landscape, design and appearance of proposed development, noise, dust and pollution
- Not sustainable development as negligible benefit to the Village in terms of direct economic contribution to the economy of the Village

A vote was taken with three members against the application, one Member abstaining and five Members with declared interests unable to vote.

Parishioners at the meeting were concerned that their submissions had not appeared on the planning portal.

2) Application no 18/02739/OUT – Outline application for residential development comprising up to 70 dwellings and associated open space, landscaping works and area for school expansion together with new access and drainage infrastructure – Land at Slades Hill Templecombe

Members discussed the above application and made the following comments:-

- Traffic issues – provision has been made for the parking of two vehicles per dwelling but it is felt there is not sufficient parking for any additional vehicles
- Is there a need for more housing, do we need another development? - There have been smaller developments in the Village. There is a need for affordable housing.
- The number of houses is almost the same as the original Meads proposal. Housing density is too high, over development of a rural village. Companies have looked at the site over the last 5 years – is it economically viable?
- Development will have an impact on properties in Blackmore Vale Close if the property owners wished to sell they could be facing a loss of 10 to 20%
- Conditions would have to be placed on site working hours
- Proposed properties too close to the School and Blackmore Vale Close, causing overshadowing.

- All properties are two storeys, no bungalows and no buffer around the Blackmore Vale Close or the Hamlet to protect and allow maintenance of the Gabion walls.
- Impact on services i.e. School, Doctors, also the Village as a rural settlement

- The planning application with Meads still stands (in relation to the 106 Agreement). Should the Parish Council support an application with little benefits? Thales could sell the land with the current planning application.

Application no 18/02739/OUT – Outline application for residential development comprising up to 70 dwellings and associated open space, landscaping works and area for school expansion together with new access and drainage infrastructure – Land at Slades Hill, Templecombe

Members discussed the above application and made the following comments:-

- As a result of subsequent development, since the original consent for the 75 houses, the Village runs a risk of overdevelopment and loss of its identity as a rural settlement
- Loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, overlooking of properties in particular the school, pre-school and Village Hall
- Protection of boundary walls in the Hamlet and Blackmore Vale Close
- Impact on the community and services
- No proof of need as the development has not progressed since planning consent originally given
- Does not meet current need. There is a need for affordable housing
- Loss of previous benefits to the Village (via 106 Agreement) which was a consideration in getting previous planning consent

A vote was taken with seven Members against the application and two Members in favour of the application.