

Stoke St Michael Parish Council – OBJECTION to Application 2024/1441/REM Land South of Fairbanks, Coalpit Lane, Stoke St Michael (Yellow Gate Field)
Stoke St Michael Parish Council (SSMPC) formally **objects** to planning application 2024/1441/REM and submits the following comments, concerns and required clarifications:

1. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) – Still Not Provided

Condition 16 of the outline planning consent clearly states that **no development shall commence** without a CEMP approved by the Local Planning Authority. No such document has been submitted.

The CEMP must include:

- Detailed routing of construction traffic – critical due to the 7.5-tonne TRO weight restriction on Coalpit Lane and the continued closure of The Bridge.
 - Plans for importation/exportation of soil/spoil, removal of vegetation, and covered stockpiles.
 - Dust suppression, mud control, and wheel-washing facilities.
 - Noise and vibration mitigation in line with BS 5528 Parts 1 & 2: 2009.
 - No burning of waste on site.
 - Controls on site lighting and on-site compound/facilities.
 - Clear on-site parking provision for construction vehicles – essential due to already problematic on-street parking in the village.
 - A nominated liaison contact, complaint process, and phone number.
 - No noise-generating activities outside:
 - Mon–Fri: 08:00–18:00
 - Sat: 08:00–13:00
 - None on Sundays/Bank Holidays
 - No nuisance noise from radios, alarms, PA systems or raised voices.
- No permissions should be granted until a comprehensive and acceptable CEMP is submitted and approved.

2. Parking

SSMPC echoes the comments of the Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO):

- The application includes 35 tandem spaces for parking out of 47 plots. These are known to cause access issues, discourage use of designated parking, and increase disputes and inappropriate parking (e.g., on pavements or visitor bays).
- The site's steep topography will further discourage tandem parking.
- The existing parking deficit in nearby estates will be worsened. Even with tandem/triple spaces, there's still an acknowledged shortfall in allocated parking.
- Parking courts, proposed in the plan, are unattractive and not typical of the village's character.

3. Site Layout and Density

- The layout is now far more compressed than the outline application, resulting in a density higher than anywhere else in the village.
- Smaller plots, limited private space, and homes close to perpendicular bays add to the development's overcrowded and urbanised feel.
- While open space has increased, this should not come at the cost of habitable quality and parking adequacy.
- The gap in the hedge onto Coalpit Lane has now been removed, which SSMPC welcomes. It posed a safety hazard, encouraging dangerous pedestrian and vehicle behaviour.

4. Overlooking and Gradients

- The storey height plan implies some houses are being built at elevated levels, increasing roofline dominance, especially when viewed from Mill Lane/Partmans Hill.
- Plots backing onto St Michaels Close will be two-storey, directly overlooking single-storey bungalows, causing significant loss of privacy and overbearing impacts.
 - SSMPC recommends reorientation of plots to preserve existing residents' amenity.
- Road gradients within the site are very steep – details are lacking on how these will be made safe or adopted.

5. Children's Play Area – Inappropriate Location

- The proposed play area is at the bottom of a steep slope, surrounded by wet meadow, out of sight, near a waterway and a secluded footpath.
- This raises serious safety and security concerns.
- SSMPC proposes reallocating s106 contributions to improve the existing village play facilities, to improve the existing village play and recreation facilities which are safer and well-managed but nearing end-of-life.

6. Housing Tenure and Mix – Clarity Required

- The affordable housing information is conflicting.
 - Outline permission indicated a 30% affordable provision (80% rent, 20% shared ownership).
 - Pegasus suggested the whole scheme would be affordable through grant funding.
 - Current plan appears to show: 31 Grant Funded Affordable Units, 11 Social Rent, 3 Shared Ownership.
- SSMPC believes a 100% affordable scheme is not appropriate for a rural village with limited transport, employment, and healthcare provision.
- Request clarification on tenure and delivery intentions.

7. Drainage and Utilities – Inadequate Information

- No drainage strategy, environmental report, or civil engineering assessment has been provided.
- Serious concerns regarding:
 - Freshwater and foul drainage capacity
 - Sewage pump station capabilities
 - Flood risk management
 - Unknown treatment of the north bank (steep drop? Retaining wall?)
 - Impact on existing culvert infrastructure where it passes under Partman's Hill adjacent to the pumping station.
- These are essential for an informed decision.

8. Access and Highways – Unresolved

- Coalpit Lane has a longstanding 7.5-tonne TRO since 1977, and no clear access plan has been provided.
- No Highways Management Plan submitted. No consultation response received from Highways.
- The ongoing culvert failure at the Bridge makes access through the centre of the village unviable.
- The proposal lacks a traffic routing strategy, essential given existing constraints.

The proposal lacks a traffic routing strategy which is essential given existing constraints. There is a lack of passing places in the single-track lanes around Stoke St Michael, this coupled with weight limits create some real challenges for construction traffic. Unimpeded access for all residents and the school, particularly during peak times, must be a priority in planning traffic routing.

9. Section 106 Contributions – Requests

SSMPC requests that the following be included in any planning obligations:

- Local school provision – Sufficient capacity for children from this development when looked at in conjunction with the application (2024/0120/FUL) for 38 dwellings at Frog Lane, Stoke St Michael.
- Traffic calming measures – Particularly on Coalpit Lane, Moonshill, and Tower Hill.
- Children's Play Area improvements – The existing play area in the village playing field should be upgraded using developer contributions.
- Priority for local people – SSMPC supports a local connection policy to allow residents to remain or return to the village.
- Development naming – The site has always been known as "Yellow Gate Field". Residents should be involved in naming any roads or the development itself.

10. Final Concerns & Unanswered Questions

- No response to repeated requests for a CEMP, drainage plan, or highways management.
- No clear management plan for:
 - Road adoption
 - Open space maintenance
- Housing "creep" contradicts Planning Inspector to provide suitable landscaping to preserve the setting of the listed buildings.
- The green space near the pond is poorly located, hard to supervise, and unsafe for children.
- The proposal remains largely unchanged, despite feedback.

Conclusion

Until these issues are resolved and documentation provided, **SSMPC maintains a strong objection** to the current reserved matters submission. This is a once-only opportunity to deliver appropriate housing in a rural village. The Parish Council urges the Local Planning Authority to insist on proper scrutiny, robust conditions, and meaningful community engagement before granting approval.