

# CANEWDON PARISH COUNCIL



Clerk to the CPC: Mrs Kelly Holland  
33 Rowan Way  
Canewdon  
Essex  
SS4 3PD

Tel: 07596 747873  
Email: canewdonparishcouncil@btconnect.com

**Members of the Council are hereby summoned to attend the extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council at Canewdon Village Hall on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2010 at 7.30pm.**

**Present:**

<u>Chairman</u>	Cllr. N. Wallace	
<u>Vice Chairman</u>	Cllr. V. Newby	
<u>Councillors</u>	Cllr. R. Kirton	Cllr. P. Merrell
	Cllr. J. Smith	Cllr. M. Thorne
	Cllr. E. Toleman	Cllr. L. Van Houten
<u>Members of press and public</u>	Approx 200	

**10/24 Apologies for Absence.**

24.1 Cllr. N. Storer – apologies received and accepted.

**10/25 To receive member's declaration of interests in items on the Agenda.**

25.1 All members declared a personal interest as they are residents of the village.

**10/26 Presentation from Sam Hollingworth, Velda Wong and Natalie Hayward from the planning policy team of Rochford District Council regarding proposed sites for housing within Canewdon.**

- Sam Hollingworth introduced himself as the planning policy manager for RDC.
- RDC have been instructed by government to take 4600 dwellings before 2021 then 1000 from 2021 to 2025.
- The Allocations and Development Plan Document (ADPD) sets out the site specific options for Canewdon. However, alternative sites can be considered. The ADPD is part of the overarching document, the Core Strategy.
- A Government Inspector is currently looking at RDC Core strategy to ensure it is legally sound.
- The Core Strategy states that the village will take 60 dwellings between 2015 & 2021; this may be extended to 2031.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies sites for housing within next 10 – 15 years and will be reviewed annually.
- The call for sites from landowners and developers was held from January 2007 until April 2009. Over 200 sites were put forward and are detailed in Appendix 1 to the ADPD.
- This is the first stage of consultation and community involvement is an important part of consultation document. The ADPD also sets out uses for community, leisure, educational, wildlife sites & public open space.

**Chairman:** N. Wallace

**Vice Chairman:** V. Newby

Councillor R. Kirton  
Councillor M. Thorne

Councillor P. Merrell  
Councillor E. Toleman

Councillor J. Smith  
Councillor L. Van Houten

Councillor N. Storer

### Specific Sites for Canewdon

**Option SC1** is located south of Anchor Lane and extends as far east as the natural boundary just past the junction with Sycamore Way. The site is bounded to the north and west by roads (Anchor Lane and Scotts Hall Road) to the east by a residential dwelling. To the south of the site are agricultural fields.

**Option SC2** is located to the north of Lark Hill Road, at the junction with the road leading to St Nicholas Church. The site is bounded to the west by a residential dwelling, to the south by Lark Hill Road, to the north by agricultural fields and to the east by a road.

**Option SC3** is as SC2 but the site does not extend so far westwards, and incorporates land to the east of the road leading to St. Nicholas Church.

**Option SC4** incorporates aspects from all three of the previous options.

#### **10/27 Public participation session.**

*There will be 45 minutes available for public question time.*

- RDC - If RDC do not identify sites for new housing as instructed by the Government, then the Secretary of State will decide where the allocation will go.
- RDC – The Greenbelt boundary in Canewdon has not been touched since 1988.
- Public – *The rest of Canewdon has not been looked at. Site SC3 damages 9 houses to make room for 60 new ones.*
- RDC - Cannot develop land that has not been agreed by landowner. Final site will not be decided until the end of 2011.
- Public - *Lorries and buses cannot pass down Lambourne Hall Road at the moment; the roads will need to be widened. The village will cease to be a village once the new houses appear, such as Great Wakering. The implementation of 60 houses will equal approximately 120 cars and 20 children.*
- Public - *There are already sites within the district where another 100 houses would go unnoticed. Other areas have the infrastructure, Canewdon does not.*
- Cllr. Keith Hudson of RDC reiterated that Central Government instructed RDC to take more houses. If RDC refuse, then Central Government will enforce it.
- The numbers are excessive. Government designed the procedure for housing. Every community should look after its own. We need to provide for our own children. People are living longer so new homes are needed.
- Cllr. Hudson advised that RDC decided, by a huge majority, that they would share the burden with every settlement. It is democratic that every area takes a settlement. All 60 dwellings will not be built in one go, it will be phased. To put it into context, Canewdon will have 3 additional homes every year until 2031.
- Cllr. T. Cutmore, Cllr. K. Hudson and Head of Planning at RDC, Shaun Scrutton have put the case to the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) through Essex County Council (ECC) and, subject to Government agreement, the timescale may be extended from 2021 to 2031.
- RDC – RDC are only dealing with the deallocation of green belt to building land.

**Chairman:** N. Wallace

**Vice Chairman:** V. Newby

Councillor R. Kirton  
Councillor M. Thorne

Councillor P. Merrell  
Councillor E. Toleman

Councillor J. Smith  
Councillor L. Van Houten

Councillor N. Storer

## Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting held on 20th April 2010

- *Public - Will the sites in appendix 1 be re addressed?*
- *RDC - There would be another public consultation if SC1 – SC4 are refused. Detailed assessments of specific sites will not be carried out until public consultation has been completed.*  
South West of Canewdon has been addressed so that extra traffic does not go through the village.
- *RDC - No sites have been suggested for travellers in Canewdon.*
- *RDC - All responses will be gathered in by RDC. When the Secretary of State considers RDC's decision, RDC have to show that they consulted residents before the decision was made.*
- *Public - What allocation has been made to additional education, health provision, public transport, sewerage, water, policing, traffic?*
- *RDC - RDC will tell Anglian Water, ECC etc. that financial contributions will have to be made if the Core Strategy is accepted by the Secretary of State.*  
The education situation was discussed with ECC school services who advised that if the numbers did not improve, there may be an issue in 15 years time whether the school would stay open.  
The Primary Care Trust (PCT) want to insist that when developers make applications, they complete a health impact assessment, to ascertain the impact on the local health infrastructure and then make a financial contribution. This is RDC's decision, not the Governments.
- *Public - Will the housing be social housing?*
- *RDC - 35% will be affordable housing either run by a housing association or shared mortgage scheme. Cllr. Keith Hudson advised that it not all 60 dwellings would be council houses. Developers will have to compete for the right to build on green belt land. Once the land is released it is down to the developer to decide what type of housing. Low density uses less greenbelt or high density uses more green belt.*
- *Public - Can the empty houses in Rochford or Ashingdon be used instead?*
- *RDC - This has knocked the figure down to a degree but alternative sites are still required.*  
If developments like Coombes Farm are agreed by government, then the total (300+ houses) can be taken off of the RDC allocation for the Core Strategy.
- *Public - How are you going to get people to come to Canewdon?*
- *RDC - Developers believe that they will be able to sell the homes. They will not be built if developers don't think that they will sell them.*
- *Public - If dwellings are taken, could a section 106 agreement be put in place for the rebuild of village hall?*
- *RDC - Developers will have to contribute towards to village facilities.*
- *Public - Current properties will be devalued as view will be spoiled by new houses.*
- *Public – Authorities used to defend the green belt under PPG2, now this is not the case.*  
*RDC - If RDC could, then no greenbelt would be released. However, this is not an option.*
- *Public - How long would Brownfield sites be used before greenbelt released?*
- *RDC – Brownfield sites will take 1100 dwellings throughout whole district. Brownfield would be used first where possible; however, some sites cannot be released yet.*

Chairman: N. Wallace

Vice Chairman: V. Newby

Councillor R. Kirton  
Councillor M. ThorneCouncillor P. Merrell  
Councillor E. TolemanCouncillor J. Smith  
Councillor L. Van Houten

Councillor N. Storer

**10/28 Members of the parish council to formulate responses to Rochford District Council regarding sites put forward in the Allocations Development Plan document.**

- Sam Hollingworth advised that most of the sites had been put forward to RDC. It may be that sites have been put forward to RDC and there may be some legal barriers in place preventing any development.
- All sites would probably have vehicle access through Anchor Lane. This needs to be discussed with ECC highways.
- Sam reiterated that it is not just about the 4 sites, RDC are keen to hear of other sites that should be considered.
- Sam advised that the CPC should make a 2 tier response. Firstly, advise that the CPC reject to the housing, and secondly advise that if a site must be agreed then this site is preferred.
- The Chairman, N. Wallace advised that from the responses received, most people do not want any development.
- The infrastructure is not in place and cannot cope. If the village is to accept 60 dwellings then conditions should be put forward to RDC.
- Concern was expressed about the affordable housing and new people coming into village, but it was advised that there needs to be a balance because of children wanting to stay and elderly wanting to remain.
- First tier approach – The CPC do not want this many houses enforced upon the village but accept that this needs to happen for the needs of parishioners.
- Some of the sites are contentious as they will block view and the owners of some of the land may not want to sell.

The Councillors considered each of the sites.

- SC1 – Anchor Lane (2.6 hectares) – If houses were built here the enjoyment and view of residents on north side of Anchor Lane would be impaired. It was noted that there is no right to a view. This option has a visual impact of the village when you enter. Some recreational land has been suggested for this site, could be a wildlife site or a public open space.
- SC2 – Land to the west of church lane (2 hectares) – This is not such a big site but would the density of housing be greater? The land causes great problems to the Church as new residents of the development would use the Church as a public right of way when it is not. The site is not as easily defensible. There is also an impact on the landscape, as it is on a hill this will be seen from far away.
- SC3 – Land to the east of Church Lane (2.3 hectares) – There were some doubts whether the land is available? The piece of land identified to the west of Church lane is a small band and it would be hard to enforce any infringement into the greenbelt.
- SC4 – 3 small pieces of land incorporating SC1 – SC3 (2.6 hectares) – There were some concerns whether all of the land is available. This option is piecemeal and would not be aesthetically attractive to the village. If allowed to go ahead, the sprawl could continue.

**Chairman:** N. Wallace

**Vice Chairman:** V. Newby

Councillor R. Kirton  
Councillor M. Thorne

Councillor P. Merrell  
Councillor E. Toleman

Councillor J. Smith  
Councillor L. Van Houten

Councillor N. Storer

**Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting held on 20th April 2010**

The Councillors voted by a show of hands on the sites put forward:

SC1 – Unanimous in favour for the site.

SC2 – 3 Councillors voted in favour for the site.

SC3 – All against.

SC4 – All against.

When considering all of the options presented, it was decided that site SC1 would have the most easily defensible green belt boundary in order to prevent further planning development and sprawl.

It was **RESOLVED** by a unanimous show of hands that if a preference is necessary, the CPC would prefer site SC1 for the new housing development.

The Chairman, N. Wallace and the Vice Chairman, V. Newby agreed to review the questionnaire responses and formulate a formal response to RDC.

**10/29 The next Parish Council Meeting is on Wed. 5<sup>th</sup> MAY 2010 at 7.40pm.**

The meeting was closed at 9.20pm

Chairman's Signature

Dated



5<sup>th</sup> May 2010

**Chairman:** N. Wallace

**Vice Chairman:** V. Newby

Councillor R. Kirton  
Councillor M. Thorne

Councillor P. Merrell  
Councillor E. Toleman

Councillor J. Smith  
Councillor L. Van Houten

Councillor N. Storer