

Parish Council of Langton Matravers

www.langtonmatravers-pc.org

Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of Langton Matravers Parish Council held in St George's Church on Thursday 23rd June 2016 at 7 pm., to consider the Council's formal response to the Purbeck District Council Partial Review Options Consultation.

Present: Cllr W Knight in the Chair, Cllrs P Christie, P Loudoun, P White, C Drayson, Cllr Lovell, Cllr Sheppard.

There were 57 members of the public present.

The meeting was audio-recorded.

1. Apologies for Absence. Cllr Turner, Cllr Lucas.

2. Declarations of Interest. Cllr Lovell is on PDC's PRAG group. He will listen to discussion but not vote.

3. Chairman's Opening Remarks. Cllr Knight set the context for the Partial Review of Purbeck's Local Plan. The original 2012 plan had been approved by a Government-appointed Inspector with the proviso that there must be a review, on the grounds that there was insufficient housing planned. If PDC does not increase new housing numbers they have been told that their plan will be rejected, and it will leave Purbeck open to uncontrolled development. PDC is now asking for Purbeck's response to these revisions to the plan. Cllr Knight stressed that everyone has an opportunity to make an individual response through the consultation process, and explained the aims of the meeting; to take parishioners' views, and for the PC to form its own view of how to respond. He thanked Revd. Gaynor Burrett and the PCC for the use of the church.

The meeting was adjourned for Public Discussion.

4. Public Discussion:

a) Langton Matravers Specific. ('Site 8', 40 houses at Spyway Orchard/South Hyde, p.40/41 of Options document)

i) **Ian Vaughan-Arbuckle, resident**, reiterated his concerns about the increased traffic, assuming that the proposed development would not have access via the Hyde. The development would increase vehicle movements by 30%, creating additional pressure in Durnford Drove and on its junction with the B3069, leading to a risk of further serious accidents. DCC have not so far taken concerns seriously enough.

ii) **Barry Mayes, resident**, challenged the formula used to arrive at the housing numbers (the 'Cambridge method') which is based on several 'unknowns'. He thinks that PDC see their role as doing what they are asked by the Government, when they should be a voice for us, the ratepayers.

iii) **Sarah Anderson, Property Manager, Langton House (HPB)**, explained that Langton is a popular destination for HPB members with 96% occupancy, and 4,300 visitors in 2015. HPB employs 12 local people and HPB visitors bring c. £1 million p.a. into the local economy. She is concerned that the proposed development will severely impact on this, both in the construction phase and afterwards, leading to redundancies and reduced occupancy.

iv) **Judith Priddle, resident**, noted that there is a surface water flood risk, not acknowledged in the PDC document; there has so far been no indication as to how this will be managed. Sewage overflow is also an issue not addressed. PDC statistics are misleading; she quoted an informal survey suggesting 37% second homes in Langton. If this trend persists, the village will die.

v) **Nicky Glassock, resident**, also expressed concern about traffic using Durnford Drove, warning that, in particular, child safety is at stake in area close to the school. There are better sites for housing elsewhere in the village.

vi) **Martin Kirby, resident**, quoted a figure of 41 homes as the current housing need for Langton. No other new sites had been offered. He noted that even if this site came forward as an 'allocated

site' it would still offer 50% affordable housing in perpetuity under an S106 agreement, meeting some of Langton's housing need.

v) **Mark Hill, resident of Worth**, said that Langton is a strong village. Worth faces similar challenges re; housing. We need to fight imposed developments. Even if a site is an RES there is no guarantee that it will remain affordable in perpetuity.

vi) **Bridget Mayes, resident**, noted that the present sewage system is already overstretched and inadequate. This inadequacy has caused a recent sewage flood at her house in the High Street.

vii) **Marjorie Glassock, resident**, echoed concerns that flood mitigation measures already planned for the Spyway Orchard part of the site would not work, and asked that other sites for affordable housing be explored. She also asked that children's lives be put before profit.

b) General Issues.

i) **Martin Kirby, resident**, explained that PDC are trying to ensure that new builds are not sold as second homes. S106 agreements are between the landowner and a Housing Association (the builder) and cannot be broken.

ii) **Peter Bowyer, resident of Studland and Chair of the Pan Purbeck Action Council**, said that at an inaugural meeting of PPAC on 25th May 2016 to discuss PDC's Partial Review, key areas of concern identified were: a) Top-down imposed housing numbers of 5,600 homes., b) Unsustainability of the developments proposed, owing to lack of infrastructure and employment, c) An absence of local solutions – we must demand solutions to eg Second Home problem. d) 'Affordable' is not, e) 'Profits before people' – PDC are putting economic returns first. f) Reform of the NPPF and g) Our representatives must speak out and represent our local communities. There is a meeting at Wool on 29th June to discuss these issues further; please support.

iii) **Mark Hill, resident of Worth**, said that an application for housing on an RES at Worth had recently been granted, where the S106 agreement was 'pliable'. Residents of Worth are taking PDC, the builder and landowner to a Judicial Review.

iv) **Gary Suttle, resident, Leader of PDC**, explained that the housing figures were generated by consultants. He had expressed concern about these figures to the Housing Minister and the Secretary of State, who are leading the national housing policy, and been told to 'go away and get on with it'. He said that PD Cllrs needs local communities' support to respond negatively to the proposals in the Partial Review, and that they will fight to support local communities' views and change the proposals.

v) **Mandy Shanks, resident of Worth**, said that if the new housing proposed at Worth can't be sold to local people within the S106 agreement, then it can be sold to anyone in the UK, and could end up as second homes. Therefore PDC's RES policy won't work, as houses will not remain affordable.

vi) **Barrie Mayes, resident**, welcomed Gary Suttle's request to local communities to challenge the Partial Review proposals. The SHMA (housing figures) are not based on sound principles and must be challenged. Purbeck has one of the biggest Second Home problems, and the Government must be told that these proposals do not meet Purbeck's needs.

vii) **Charles Miller, resident of Wareham**, condemned the 'Cambridge formula' for devising housing numbers (SHMA) as undemocratic. He urged PDC to ask the electorate to make its views clear.

The meeting was reconvened.

5. Council's Response to Consultation Form.

The Council agreed the following responses, after discussing each area in turn:

Page numbers refer to pages in Consultation response form. Text in Roman type is LMPC response.

Page 2. Preferred Option 2 – Meeting Objectively Assessed Housing Needs. Do you agree with the proposal to meet our objectively assessed needs of around 3,080 additional new homes between 2013 and 2033 ? NO

The Cambridge Model which produced the 'Objectively Assessed Need' figures for Housing in the Purbeck area (SHMA) is seriously flawed as a way of assessing housing need. It does not address the **real** need for housing in the area.

Page 3. Alternative Option 1 – delivering more than the objectively assessed housing need.

Do you think that the Council should plan to deliver more than our objectively assessed needs of around 3,080 additional new homes between 2013 and 2033 ? NO

Issue 1 – Impact of Second Homes; Please list any positive impacts of second homes in your community.

Some minor economic benefits **when second homes are occupied.**

What evidence do you have to support the impacts ?

Some increased use of local shops, tradesmen.

Page 4 - Impact of Second Homes (contd.)

Please list any negative impacts of second homes in your community.

Serious reduction in truly affordable housing for local people.

What evidence do you have to support the impacts ?

The centre of the village is becoming empty.

Local house prices.

See comment on p.22 at end of document re ‘St Ives or similar’ approach to Second Homes.

Page 9. Site 8 – Langton Matravers.

Do you agree or disagree with the Council’s proposals for this settlement ? DISAGREE

Comments:

This proposal will not provide the Affordable Housing that we need. Concerns about the proposed development include: infrastructure, flooding, drainage and surface water management, including sewerage, transport and AONB. We disagree with moving of the settlement boundary to make this an ‘Allocated site’.

Page 13. Alternative Option 3: Langton Matravers.

Do you agree or disagree with the Council’s alternative proposal for this settlement ? DISAGREE

Comments:

All comments on Site 8 apply to Site 13.

Page 14. Possible Additional Option – Rounding off settlement boundaries.

Do you think the Council should explore rounding off settlement boundaries further ? NO

Comments:

It is disingenuous to call this ‘rounding off’; it will **not be ‘rounding’, but an excuse for extension, leading to urban-style sprawl.** This would be a licence for PDC to extend villages as they wish, for the benefit of developers, and is totally undemocratic and unacceptable.

Page 18. Policy AH – Affordable Housing.

Do you agree with the proposed updates to the policy ? NO

Comments:

We want ALL Affordable Housing **to remain affordable in perpetuity** (i.e. not be sold off), not just the housing on RES sites.

Policy RES – Rural Exception Sites.

Do you agree with the proposed updates to the policy ? NO

Comments:

Houses built on RESs should be 100% Affordable.

Policy AHT – Affordable Housing Tenure.

Do you agree with the proposed updates to the policy ? NO

Comments:

We disagree with this policy while the official definition of ‘affordable’ housing does not reflect what is **actually** affordable for local Purbeck people on local wages.

We support Affordable Self-build projects, which are an important way of providing truly affordable housing on the area.

Page 22.

Issue 3 – Other planning issues.

Are there any other planning issues the Partial Review should address that are not covered in the document ?

1. This Council agrees that a St Ives or similar approach towards the issue of Second Homes should be adopted :-

a) New builds should ONLY be a permanent residence, not a second/holiday home.

b) Existing houses should have change of use + CIL fee attached if they are sold on as Second Homes.

2. The Council notes that the words ‘sustainable’ ‘affordable’ and ‘need’ should be removed from throughout the Partial Review document, as they do not reflect the true meaning of these words. As noted by Cllr Ezzard recently, the actual housing need in Purbeck (those on the Council’s Housing list) is for 570 homes, not 5,600. The Partial Review is undemocratic and does not reflect the needs and concerns of Purbeck communities.

End of Council’s response.

As Cllrs did not wish to discuss any other points on the consultation form at that time, the Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and input and declared the meeting closed.

Meeting closed 9.10pm.