

**THE MINUTES OF THE CROSSWAYS PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE SPORTS PAVILION, DICK O' TH' BANKS ROAD, AT 7PM ON MONDAY 12<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2006**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** There were no members of the public present.

**Present:** Cllr Brewer, Cllr Chubb, Cllr Manuel, Cllr Peacocke and Cllr Bradley

**GENERAL AGENDA**

Chair: Cllr Brewer took the Chair in the absence of Cllr Russell

**ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** Apologies were received from Cllr Russell, Cllr Connor, Cllr Stenning, Cllr Round, and Cllr Harriss

**ITEM 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** There were no Declarations of Interest

**ITEM 3 DECLARATIONS OF PREDETERMINATION** There were no Declarations of Predetermination.

**ITEM 4 CONFIRM DATE OF NEXT MEETING** – Monday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2006

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Chair: Cllr Chubb

**ITEM 1 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (8<sup>th</sup> May 2006)** The Minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true record and duly signed.

**ITEM 2 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES** There were no matters arising.

**ITEM 3 CHAIRMAN’S REPORT** Cllr Chubb reported the following planning applications which have been approved:

- 1/E/06/000633 Erect 25m monopole with 3 antennas at Moigne Combe
- 1/E/06/000565 Change of use ground floor room to physiotherapy treatment room – 10 Green Lane
- 1/E/06/000660 Erect conservatory – 10 Woodsford Close

**ITEM 4 REPORT LETTER RECEIVED FROM BROADWAY MALYAN – CLLR CHUBB** Cllr Chubb reported that Broadway Malyan has taken legal advice in response to the WDDC’s refusal to concur with the government inspectors recommendations to allow further limited development on Woodsford Fields.

**ITEM 5 CONSIDER RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT STATEMENT IN THE MATTER OF PLANNING APPLICATION 1/E/2005/0742 WOODSFORD FARM MINERAL EXTRACTION** Cllr Chubb advised the Committee of his concerns regarding this statement. It was agreed that Cllr Chubb’s response be forwarded to DCC. Copies will be sent to Councillors. Copy attached to the main and library copy of these minutes. It was agreed that copies of this response is sent to neighbouring Councils to advise of these concerns.

**ITEM 6 RECEIVE PROPOSALS FOR HOUSE/STREET NAMING DEVELOPMENT AT HEATHFIELD HOUSE** The Committee has no objections to the proposals for this development.

AGREED/ACTION CLERK

**ITEM 7 CONSIDER MEMBER/MEMBERS TO RESPOND TO CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH WEST 2006 – 2026** Cllr Chubb agreed to read, précis and report to the Council on this very large document.

ACTION/CLLR CHUBB

**ITEM 8 CONSIDER SUBSCRIPTION TO LaMIS – MAPPING AND INFORMATION SERVICE FOR PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS** The Committee agreed no further action on this agenda item.

**ITEM 9 ANY LATE URGENT ITEMS FOR INFORMATION** Cllr Brewer advised the Committee that further complaint had been received in the unacceptable amount of dust emitting from the Woodsford Fields development. It was agreed that Cllr Smy would be asked to intervene and the Clerk would speak to John Loosemore at Betterment Properties and Environmental Health.

ACTION: CLERK

Signed ..... (Chairman) ..... 2006

CROSSWAYS PARISH COUNCIL – OBSERVATIONS IN RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION  
1/E/2005/0742 – ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Reference A: AWJ/1/e/2005/0742 dated 24<sup>th</sup> May 2006

Reference B: Crossways Parish Council CPC/0/0506 dated 30<sup>th</sup> May 2006

---

Traffic Para 4.6 (page 5)

Para 4.6 states “The majority of the traffic generated by the proposal will “replace” rather than “add to” the existing movements”.

This statement is unsustainable since only the landfill has terminated and this was served, to a large extent, by the Warmwell Road access.

The access to the site appears to be of too small a radius for HGV’s to enter and leave the site without crossing the centre line of the road and disrupting other traffic.

If access and egress for the site is from the east the traffic on the B3390 through Crossways, Warmwell and Affpuddle will increase and removal of the dip east of the railway crossing, before the current quarry entrance, is a necessity.

The state of the B3390 and its classification are under discussion. It would be far better for all residents of the area if site access/egress were limited to a western direction only.

Cycleway Para 5 (page 5)

The proposed cycleway running alongside the railway is not acceptable, although preferred by the County, for the following reasons.

1. When a route alongside the railway to the west of the level crossing and away from the road was proposed it was discounted as being “away from the road”, “unsafe for unaccompanied cyclists”, “unlit and open to vandalism”, by County.

All these points now apply to a proposal “preferred by County”!

2. A 1,300metre straight is a charter for motorcycles, mini motorcycles, trail bikes etc. to have speed runs and will encourage under age motorcycling.
3. The egress of a cycleway directly on a level crossing or alongside a road used by HGV traffic is extremely dangerous. How will a Heavy Goods Vehicle driver see a cyclist, waiting on his left, from the driver’s seat? Cycling towards Dorchester would probably be safer on the existing road! At least there are decent sight lines before and after the level crossing for drivers to see cyclists.
4. The current routes used by weekend cyclists, via lanes through Woodsford and Moreton or via Higher Woodsford, Crossways and Moreton, are far safer and much more picturesque. The original route alongside the existing road to the level crossing was far better for a “Cycle to work” route.
5. Cyclists still have to cross the railway at Higher Woodsford, a narrow country lane.

In summation the proposed cycleway along the railway has been drawn-up with little, if any consideration as to the problems it brings. The disadvantages far outweigh the advantages, if any. This proposal must be dropped and the money spent on road improvements for all road users.

Rights of Way Para. 6 (page 6).

The proposals put forward in appendix 4 are not acceptable to Crossways residents. The current paths allow access to Woodsford via a choice of footpaths across farmland, These are being removed with NO replacement. A path should be provided directly to the West of the extraction site to replace those destroyed.

Plan number 91077/FP/1 shows the loss of 3 footpaths, one not involved in this project and one replacement that is already a permissive path.

The statement at para. 6.3 “The proposed routes are show on plan 91077/FP1/1 which achieve the objective of an improved right of way network” is a blatant misrepresentation (Crossways PC Rights of Way officer was not consulted on this).

In Conclusion

The document is inaccurate in that its appendices are out of date, not showing the proposed cycleway and its effects. (Drawing number 6021–01 dated April 03). Revised Plant Site layout (91077/PS/3 dated 15.05.06).

Plan 90177/CO/W/1 dated 30.08.05 as supplied to Network Rail does not include a cycleway and the supporting letter does not warn of this development or the possibility of access to, and vandalism of, Network Rail property.

THESE  
MINUTES  
ARE  
UNOFFICIAL

UNTIL  
SIGNED