

MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF KINGSLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Held on Thursday 30th. July, 2015, at Kingsley Village Hall

Present: Cllr. Unwin (Chairman), Cllrs. Fallows, Fowler, Hordern, Lucas, Mycock and Sales, three members of the public.

Apologies: None.

15.121 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr. Lucas declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of SMDC Planning Committee.

15.122 **SITE OPTIONS AND DEVELOPMENT / INFILL BOUNDARIES**

The Chairman Cllr. Unwin outlined the present situation. A meeting had been held on 19th. August 2014 when the initial draft document had been produced by SMDC (Min. ref: 14.132, p/1007) and Council's responses had been forwarded to SMDC. A further document inviting public consultation had now been produced (consultation period ends 12.09.2015). Public events had been held (including Kingsley Village Hall on 29.07.2015) at which documents could be inspected.

With reference to documentation and relevant maps, site options were considered.

A. Whiston (15 Dwellings)

Cllr. Fallows read out a letter from Mr. Ivan Kent (Whiston resident) who had concerns about SMDC housing policy and a number of the sites identified in Whiston.

1. **WH002:** A Brownfield (ex copper works) site just outside the existing village development boundary, but within the confines of the village. Suitable for residential development subject to H & S considerations (10). Carried unanimously.
2. **WH016:** A Brownfield site partially outside the existing village boundary. Suitable for residential development (6). Carried unanimously.
3. **WH009a:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary. No special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements. Too close to the village recreation ground. Carried unanimously.
4. **WH018:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary. No special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements. Carried unanimously.

5. **WH015:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary. No special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements. Carried unanimously.

B. Froghall

Residential development at Froghall is considered in the Churnet Valley Masterplan (CVMP).

Development Strategy - Residential – around 50 high quality units (may include extra care) but a need for flexibility due to the requirement for this to be sufficient to cross-subsidise other uses' (Section 7.5)

Kingsley Parish Council would wish to be advised of any policy developments since the CVMP was finalised in March 2014.

C. Kingsley Holt (15 Dwellings)

A field near to Yew Tree Farm, Shawe Park Road, Kingsley Holt, has recently been granted outline approval for 7 dwellings which will count towards the village quota (7).

1. **KH018:** A Brownfield site within the existing village boundary. Suitable for residential development (8). Carried unanimously.

2. **KH009:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary, but within the curtilage of the village. A section of the site fronting onto Churnet Valley Road is suitable for development, but not the remainder of the site away from the road (6). Carried by majority of 5 – 1 (opposed by Cllr. Lucas).

D. Kingsley (30 Dwellings)

1. **KG024:** A Brownfield (ex haulage yard) within the existing village boundary. Suitable for development (12). Carried by majority of 5 – 1 (opposed by Cllr. Lucas).

2. **KG059:** A Brownfield (farm entrance driveway) within the existing village boundary. Not suitable for development due to highway safety. Carried unanimously.

3. **KG019:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary. A small section of the site fronting onto Hastehill Avenue is suitable for development (4). The remainder of the site is unsuitable for development as there are no special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements. Carried unanimously.

4. **KG042:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary. A small section of the site fronting onto Holt Lane may be suitable for development (2). The remainder of the site is not suitable for development; there are no special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements. Carried unanimously.

5. **KG005:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary, but nonetheless considered suitable for residential development (4). Carried unanimously.

6. **KG026a:** A Greenfield site outside the existing village boundary. A small section of the site fronting onto Barnfields Lane is suitable for development (4). The remainder of the site is not suitable for development; there are no special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements. Carried unanimously.

7. **KG049a** 8. **KG026b** 9. **KG030a** 10. **KG031**

All the above (7-10) are Greenfield sites outside the existing village boundary. Concerns were expressed with regard to the existing infrastructure supporting significant extra development. These sites are not suitable for residential development. There are no special circumstance to justify breaching the Greenbelt arrangements in respect to any of these sites. Carried unanimously.

Meeting rose at 9.38 p.m.