

BRAUNTON PARISH COUNCIL



Minutes of the Braunton Parish Council meeting held on Tuesday 24 October 2023 at 7pm in the Parish Hall, Chaloners Road, Braunton.

	<u>Present</u>	Cllrs: M Shapland in the Chair, E Spear, D Spear, R Shapland, L Childs, R Byrom, A Bryant, M Cann, V Cann, T Kirby and G Bell.
	<u>In attendance</u>	Officers: T Lovell, Parish Clerk & RFO. County and District Cllr Pru Maskell. District Cllr Simon Maskell 200+ members of the public
156/2023/24	<u>Apologies</u>	Apologies received from: Cllr David Relph – away
157/2023/24	<u>Items not on the agenda, which in the opinion of the Chairman should be brought to the attention of the Council</u>	<p>The Chairman explained that the Parish Council is a statutory consultee on planning applications it is not the determining authority. The determining authority is North Devon Council (NDC) and there will be an opportunity for members of the public to address NDC's Planning Committee when it considers planning application 77576.</p> <p>The Chairman moved and it was unanimously agreed that agenda item 6(b) - planning application 77023 be deferred until a future meeting to enable members to give it due consideration.</p> <p>All members of the public present wished to address the Council regarding planning application 77576. The Chairman moved and it was unanimously agreed to move agenda item 4 - public participation until after the presentations from the Parish Council and Flotation Energy Ltd had been received under agenda item 6(a).</p>
158/2023/24	<u>Declarations of Interest</u>	<p>Cllr E Spear declared an Other Registerable Interest in Minute Ref:161/2023/24(a), as she is a member on the Braunton Internal Marsh Drainage Board.</p> <p>Cllr M Cann declared a Non-registerable Interest in Minute Ref: 161/2023/24(a), as he is a member of the Saunton Golf Club.</p>
159/2023/24	<u>Public</u>	RESOLVED: That public participation be moved to later in

	<u>Participation</u>	the meeting following presentations from the Parish Council and Flotation Energy Ltd under Minute Ref: 161/2023/24(a)
160/2023/24	<u>Request for Dispensation</u>	There were none.
161/2023/24	<u>Planning</u>	<p><i>Cllrs E Spear and G Bell in their capacity as North Devon Councillors, stated that any opinions expressed during discussions on the following planning application represent a preliminary view and that they will naturally reconsider the application fresh when presented all the facts at principal level.</i></p> <p>(a) 77576 Proposed: Full planning permission for the construction and installation of onshore electrical infrastructure required to export electricity from the White Cross Offshore Wind Farm to the national distribution network; including installation of 132kV underground electricity transmission cable(s) from landfall at Saunton Sands Car park to a new substation at East Yelland. Construction of temporary facilities required during construction to include haul road, vehicular access, compounds, associated works areas and a permanent substation access road. Construction of a new substation under the Rochdale Envelope Approach with additional information regarding architectural form and silhouette, design code, scale and layout, landscaping, lighting, and appearance and materials. Location: White Cross Offshore Windfarm (Onshore Project) Applicant: White Cross Offshore Windfarm Ltd</p> <p>The Council received a presentation from Cllr M Cann outlining the details of planning application 77576. He thanked the Chairman of the Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for the work that she had done preparing the presentation for the Parish Council.</p> <p>The Council received a presentation from the applicant Flotation Energy Ltd.</p> <p>Moved by the Chairman and unanimously agreed to suspend Standing Orders to allow public participation.</p> <p>The Chairman explained that she would ask those that had registered to speak in the order that they were received. If any other members of the public wish to address the Council, there will be an opportunity to speak following those who had registered prior to the meeting.</p> <p>A member of the public expressed his support for green energy and the need for the Export Onshore Cable to reach landfall. He had enquired with technical experts who had confirmed that the estuary route is simply not a practical solution as it has huge engineering risks. He</p>

requested why this project and the Morocco Xlinks project were not making landfall at the same point at Cornborough? We have two competing projects that need to be brought onshore by a coordinated approach to minimise disruption to our beautiful coastline. If it were to share this infrastructure, it would be possible for the White Cross route to diverge off towards the Yelland National Grid entry point with the Morocco Xlinks project going to Alverdiscott.

The applicant confirmed that they had looked at several cable routes coming onshore in the southern area but the cable route length would be significantly longer, and there would be greater environmental and cultural heritage impacts. The applicant understood the benefits of sharing a route with the Morocco Xlinks project but this would not be possible as the timeline for the projects are very different. The Morocco Xlinks project is much further behind and now they are a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project this will result in further delays.

Sharing this route would also mean more commercial and legal aspects to overcome. They are starting to build this in through the Holistic Network Design, a government project working with the National Grid, but unfortunately it is still in progress and will not be available in time for the White Cross project. The Crown Estate have given consent for the White Cross OWF and it must be delivered within the timeframe awarded. From a policy perspective it would make more sense to share the route but unfortunately the processes to allow this to happen are just not there yet.

A representative from Love Braunton addressed the Council. Love Braunton supports sustainable renewable energy generation including offshore wind farms. We object to this planning application 77576 as it cannot be described as sustainable given the impact it will have on our economy, environment and social well-being. The application is driven solely by the applicant's agreement for a grid connection to Yelland having requested either Yelland or Alverdiscott. It is not clear why either of these connections were requested given the location of the offshore site. Nor is it clear as to why the applicant is progressing the Yelland substation given its capacity limitations. This would be a significant constraint on the applicant given that the Crown Estates Celtic Sea has three project development areas each capable of generating 1.5GW.

As this is a pilot project what will happen when the pilot is deemed successful? Will the applicant seek to increase the energy and revenue generation capacity? It is likely that given the development cost implications not being unreasonable, that the applicant will look to develop further the proposed onshore infrastructure.

The applicant is using a Project Design Envelope – an approach used where the nature of the proposed development means that some details of the whole project are not confirmed when the application is submitted. This approach is more commonly used for designated nationally significant infrastructure projects which this project is not. Planning advice guidance states that where this approach is used it should be explained clearly for the purpose of consultation and publicity at the pre-application stage. This approach was not made public or raised in public consultation during the pre-application stage. It was agreed by the applicant with the Local Planning Authority which would mean that many aspects of the proposal are in effect an outline application. Outline applications seek agreement in principle to a proposed development so there is no certainty at this stage as to what will be constructed. There are no detailed designs of:

- the proposed substation at East Yelland.
- pre-construction drainage activity.
- the construction of the proposed haul route from Saunton Road to the White House with its numerous cable link pits.

The applicant states that the impact of all aspects of construction activity is minimal or negligible. From the submitted online response and views being expressed tonight it is clear that the proposal does have significant adverse impacts. It is naive to accept that the numerous potential impacts being identified could be managed through planning conditions and enforcement.

For our Parish this application does not meet the criteria of sustainability given its impact upon our economy, environment and social well-being during the construction period of more than 24 months, with the potential for further construction activity should the offshore pilot project be successful. We ask that this application is refused.

A member of the public expressed their view that this project should be done as part of the national infrastructure rather than piecemeal. The determining Local Planning Authority probably do not have the ability or expertise to be able to adequately determine this planning application. The applicant has engaged with stakeholders but why haven't they engaged with the community, are we not a stakeholder? There is only one opportunity to get this right and negotiating benefit to the community after planning permission has been granted is not the right way. What compensation would there be for the village if planning consent is granted? How would the level and management of the compensation be agreed? Braunton has identified a need for a Braunton to Saunton cycle path, a larger pharmacy and affordable housing.

The applicant confirmed that community benefit would be discussed following planning consent being granted. It

cannot negotiate community benefit before as this would look like they are bribing the community.

A resident asked what the consultation process had been regarding the impact the project would have on the roads, specifically the impact on the roads to Saunton and the knock-on effect to the communities of Croyde, Georgeham and Ilfracombe. Also, has the applicant assessed the economic impact? Local businesses in the area are reliant on tourism, have local businesses been contacted? Have the risks to non-vehicle road users such as pedestrians and cyclists been considered? Between Lobb and Saunton there are no pavements and no cycle route. The proposed number of additional HGV traffic would surely be classed as high risk. There are multiple bends with poor visibility along this stretch of road with no alternative route available. The road is regularly used by pedestrians and cyclists. Have the police and Devon County Highways been consulted?

The applicant confirmed that economic impact for loss of earnings has only been identified at the Saunton Beach Car Park, as they will be directly impacted by the landfall and cable route. The traffic and transport mitigations include dedicated routes for HGVs, speed limits on HGVs and there will be identifiers on each vehicle so the public can contact the Community Liaison Officer if the mitigations are being breached.

A member of the public requested what plans are in place to compensate local businesses for loss of earnings? Are there any mitigation measures for damage to the local road network? The Saunton Beach Car Park will be directly impacted will there be any compensation for the disruptions to business? The local community have identified the need for a Braunton to Saunton cycle path could this be considered as an option once the final route for the onshore cable has been agreed.

A resident expressed their support in principle for the offshore wind farm project but could not support the chosen landfall Export Cable route. What are the impacts on local businesses, the North Devon Surf Reserve, the local economy and tourism. The Environmental Impact Statement is incredibly detailed and although it proposes a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), the project will result in more than 30% loss in existing biodiversity. We have not heard from any authority who should be protecting our natural environment. Requests to the North Devon Biosphere, the AONB and Natural England have been unsuccessful. In their defence they have responded that they are not permitted to speak about the application until after planning had been submitted but we want to hear from them now.

The applicant clarified that it will be 10% BNG on top of the

loss. Everything will be reinstated to the condition that it was. The applicant apologised for not having more information on the social-economics impact and promised to provide additional information to help clarify the detail in the submitted application. This was challenged as it would be new information in the public domain during the consultation period. The applicant confirmed that it would not be new information, it would only be clarifying information in the existing application.

A member of the public requested if the Parish Council agrees that, should this application be accepted by NDC, once construction begins it is highly unlikely to be halted whether the mitigations proposed work in practice; or if the construction and landscape repair is completed in the suggested timescale.

This application will destroy the area for residents and tourists. Our beaches drive the tourist economy, the significant reduction in parking spaces at Saunton Beach Car Park due to the location of their compound will be detrimental to our local tourism trade. Braunton is renowned for its traffic congestion issues. The impacts on our traffic and subsequent air quality will be significant near a primary school. Caen Street is a narrow Street with inadequate pavements the proposed number of additional HGV movements daily is unacceptable. The application is vague and it is unclear how the HGVs, possibly up to 92 a day will access the compound. It can only be assumed that access off of the B3231 will be via the Saunton Beach Car Park slip road. This could have significant consequences for Braunton and Croyde due to queuing traffic trying to access the beach for the entire construction phase of 263 days, as stated in the applicant's Environmental Impact Statement.

The applicant claims that the North Devon Surf Reserve will not be impacted but that is irrelevant as the surfers will have restricted access to the Saunton Beach Car Park for the duration of the works. The applicant has concluded that the impact on our local tourism will be negligible but their conclusion is based on national level data and not on our local Parish data. Our local economy is reliant on tourism and if people can't access the beach, and those holidaying in Saunton have a massive compound outside their chalet, this would have a significant impact on our tourism and economy.

The public consultation carried out by the applicant has been chaotic and it fills the public with no confidence that the project will go smoothly if planning consent is granted. What powers will the Parish Council have to ensure that the promised mitigations will be implemented and what would be the consequences if the project overruns?

The Chairman of the Parish Council assured the public

that the Parish Council will be on the ball. If planning permission is granted it will do everything within its power to ensure that the mitigation measures are correctly carried out throughout the duration of the project.

A local business owner requested where the energy generated from the proposed offshore wind farm would end up? His hospitality business is reliant on tourism and has only just recovered following the covid pandemic. His business has also been subjected to extortionate energy prices for the past 18-24 months. If we lose our tourism trade again due to the disruption that this application will cause, local businesses will struggle to recover. What incentive is there for the local community, this not bribery there should be incentives and protections in place for the community.

The applicant responded that the energy generated from the White Cross OWF will come into the East Yelland distribution substation and the energy will stay within the UK. The applicant could not be specific regarding where the energy will end up but it would be stored in the local National Grid distribution and not transmission which is distributed nationally.

A member of the public stated that he was not against the offshore wind farm if a more favourable route for the Onshore Export Cable corridor could be found. He was confident that the applicant would have overwhelming support in the community for this project if a more direct route for the onshore cable could be found. He requested why the cable could not be bored under the seabed to avoid soft settlement and the rocky seabed floor. This has been done by Elon Musk in Las Vegas why can't this method be used for this project?

The applicant explained that the estuary route would also have mitigation measures. The cable would need to go under soft settlement and be armoured over the rocky seabed floor. The applicant reassured the public that all routes have been considered by Natural England and they would not enter into discussions regarding a different route. Horizontal Direct Drilling (HDD) from offshore to onshore has never been done it has always been done from onshore to onshore or from onshore to offshore. Also, the maximum you can drill is approximately 2km making this route not technically feasible.

The Chairman of the Braunton Marsh Drainage Board addressed the Council. Although the Marsh Drainage Board will not be directly impacted they are concerned for the livelihoods that rely on the fresh marshes. Many local farmers will be affected by these proposed works and the traffic disruption will have an even greater impact on the community and the local economy. The Marsh Drainage Board has written to Flotation Energy on several occasions

and has not received a response. The applicant apologised for not replying but unfortunately the correspondence received from the Braunton Marsh Drainage Board had been lost. Flotation Energy are now in discussions with the Marsh Drainage Board.

A member of the public requested what community benefits were delivered as part of the Kincardine OWF. Also, was this project delivered within the allocated timeframe or did it overrun. The applicant responded that there were firm deadlines in place which were met. There were many different community benefits delivered and details of these can be found on the Planning Inspectorate and the Marine Management Organisation website.

A member of the public requested that if going up the estuary is not possible, how can the Onshore Export Cable corridor go under the estuary from Braunton to Yelland? The applicant responded that the proposed estuary crossing is a much shorter route and we can go onshore to onshore. The cable will be HDD 10 meters under the seabed. There are complications with going directly down the estuary, the cable corridor would need to be ploughed through soft settlement and settlement shift could risk the Export Cable becoming uncovered.

The Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately review and compare the alternative routes for the Export Cable corridor. It is unclear why the alternative routes have been dismissed. There is a lack of transparency in the submitted documents supporting the planning application. The programme of works were very difficult to find. There is insufficient evidence regarding the impact on local tourism and businesses. It is not clear why alternative routes have been disregarded. There is a requirement for a certain amount of information to be in the main body of text and non-technical summary.

A resident expressed her support for the renewable energy but was unclear as to whether the applicant had adequately assessed the impact these works will have on local schools. There appears to be no mitigations included for the additional HGVs to avoid the school drop off and pick up times. Caen Primary School is in Caen Street which is also a declared Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Have the developers assessed for increased risk of accident due to the number of people on the narrow pavements in Caen Street during school drop off and pick up time, or the increased risk to air quality and our children's health. There appears to be no traffic management plan or risk assessment.

The applicant thanked the resident for making this point and confirmed that it would be possible to build in further mitigations by scheduling HGVs to avoid these peak times during school drop off and pick up.

The proposed offshore wind farm site is 52km off of the Saunton coast is it possible to consider South Wales for the Onshore Export Cable corridor? South Wales have the infrastructure, motorways, green energy capacity and ports to be considered as an option for the Celtic Sea offshore wind farm cable corridor instead of Braunton.

South Wales is being considered as an integration assembly and tow out port among others such as Ireland and Northern France. The Onshore Export Cable corridor has to go through Braunton as the connection grid point is East Yelland.

There are no mitigation measures to repair or improve our local road network. The proposed number of HGVs daily for two years will have a damaging and detrimental impact on our roads, why are there no mitigation measures? Who will end up paying to repair the roads? The applicant confirmed that as part of the planning conditions, if granted, they would be expected to repair any damage caused to the local road network.

As the applicant is a renewable energy company, surely you advocate the use of electric vehicles and it is assumed that all your vehicles, except for the HGVs, are electric. There appears to be a missed opportunity for the applicant to install electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The applicant replied that as part of the commercial contracting aspect there will be sustainability elements which we expect to include electric vehicles but the plan has not yet been made so we cannot commit at this stage.

There is going to be significant damage to our road network will the applicant be responsible for repairing any damage? Road condition surveys will be done prior to the project and if there is significant damage that can be attributed to the project then the applicant will be required to repair any damage.

A landowner on Braunton Marsh expressed her concerns as she uses her land to grow vegetables for her family. Have any assessments been carried out regarding the exposure to electromagnetic frequencies from the buried Export Cable. There is the potential for electromagnetic frequencies to have a detrimental impact on human health and the wildlife habitat. The applicant will adhere to the governments electromagnetic field polices and requirements, all cables buried will be shielded with appropriate material.

The applicant summed up that it was apparent from the mood of the meeting that there is a significant amount of public interest in this application. The majority are in favour of the offshore wind farm but have grave concerns regarding:

- environmental impact
- traffic, and
- social-economic impact.

A member of the public agreed with the applicant's summary of the meeting and noted that other concerns include: -

- restricted use of Saunton beach and its car park.
- traffic regarding the additional number of HGVs on our local road network and safety of pedestrians and air quality.
- detrimental impact on our surrounding communities caused by traffic tailbacks to Croyde, Georgeham etc.

Basically, another little village gets rolled over by a big company. We want to know what community benefits there will be, these should be part of the legal planning application. Whatever benefits are offered they will not outweigh the negative impact on our community. The applicant has the ability to directly bore the Export Cable corridor for the entire route the only reason why this has not been considered is due to cost. We do not accept that there are no alternative routes for the cable corridor or alternative traffic routes to access the site.

The communications regarding this project have been dismal. The community is pro green energy but due to the lack of consultation carried out by the developer the community cannot support this application. It is understood that the applicant carried out public consultations earlier this year but where were the posters, leaflets drop etc. to let the public know that these consultations were happening.

The applicant confirmed that it is not about cost. All routes have been carefully considered; this route has the least protection. The applicant explained that every decision is based not only on cost but also environmental and social-economic impacts. An alternative route for the traffic to access the site had been considered but the land is owned by the MOD, and there are wider distances of protections which exceed the 2km HDD capabilities.

The application claims that it will deliver 10% BNG but it does not account for the huge loss of existing BNG. How long will it take for the existing biodiversity loss to recover? The applicant explained that it depends on habitat, grassland will recover quicker than woodland. To ensure successful biodiversity recovery the applicant is proposing a 30 year commitment to oversee and manage recovery plans.

How does the developer propose to protect what it does not know is there. Our community has recently uncovered a heritage artifact. The applicant reassured the community that they are working closely with the County

Archaeologist. There will be archaeological watching briefs and unexploded observations (UXO) throughout the project anything uncovered will be recorded appropriately and reported to the County Archaeologist.

It is obvious that this is an application for outline planning consent as it lacks information and material detail. We need more information before this application should be considered. It should be refused, and the applicant be permitted to resubmit with appropriate information included.

I am hearing the most profound corporate arrogance it is so disappointing. We are real people, we live here, our children use our natural environment daily as part of their lives. The developer does not know the local area, they have not familiarised themselves with our local community. The application inadequately assesses the social-economic impacts. There have been no risk assessments carried out. There has been an appalling lack of communication with no leaflet drops to adequately inform or consult the public. The consultation from the outset has been flawed and the applicant has used this to their advantage to play down public participation. The application lacks sufficient mitigation measures, the developer is proposing HGV movements through the centre of Braunton on Saturdays from 7am to 1pm. They have obviously never visited Braunton on a Saturday morning. The applicant responded that they had not visited the area on a Saturday morning as the assessments have been carried out by traffic transport experts. The applicant has carried out three rounds of public consultation there were no leaflet drops but there were adverts in the local newspapers, on social media and put up close to the venues.

The consultation process is flawed, there has not been adequate communication with the local community. The EIA states 'negligible' impact to the community but the applicant has dulled the impact down in their submitted planning application. The residents of Braunton are informed and articulate people we want green energy but the applicant's approach to engage with the local community has created barriers due to the lack of information and transparency.

The Chairman stated that the only reason why the public were now aware of this planning application and why the applicant is here tonight is because of the Parish Council.

The Chairman thanked everyone who had spoken at the meeting. She explained that the Council would now close public participation, members are not permitted to speak but are welcome to remain in the meeting to hear the Council's discussion and decision.

Moved by the Chairman and unanimously agreed to reinstate Standing Orders.

Cllr M Cann declared a non Registrable Interest and left the meeting.

Cllr E Spear declared an Other Registrable Interest.

Moved by Cllr R Shapland, seconded by Cllr T Kirby to recommend refusal.

The Council is fully supportive of renewable energy technology but as this application stands it cannot support the proposed onshore cable route. The Council recognises the need for renewable energy generation but this should not be achieved at the detriment to our valued protected natural environments within our community. The proposed cable route would have a significant detrimental impact on the community in terms of loss of tourism, disruption to local social-economics, adverse effect to the natural environment including the Northern Devon UNESCO Biosphere and Buffer Zone for the core dune system. The development will also potential negatively impact recognised Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Site of Special Conservation (SAC), the AONB and Braunton Marsh, which are all within close proximity to the proposed Onshore Export Cable Corridor.

RESOLVED: That the Council recommends refusal on the grounds, as follows:

- The proposed development would adversely affect the intrinsic environmental value and character of the landscape, and damage the natural environment and delicate ecosystems through the unique UNESCO Northern Devon Biosphere. Concerns regarding potential ground contamination from waste material specifically bentonite during Horizontal Direct Drilling, and the consequent pollutant effects this may have on the land, water courses and drainage ditches. This area is rich in wildlife and there are concerns regarding the negative impacts this development could potentially have on wildlife and important habitats for migratory birds.

Contrary to: -

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE1 – Locally Valued Sites of Biodiversity

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE8 – Water Courses and Drainage

- The site is within close proximity to a known bat roost. The potential loss of trees and hedgerows would adversely impact on foraging habitat for bats. The construction lighting that will be installed will disrupt the foraging and community habitats of bats, especially as

this area is largely undisturbed and there is little evidence of existing lighting. The developer has not complied with Policy BE13 as there is no Light Impact Assessment carried out in relation to construction lighting.

Contrary to: -

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE2 – Protection of the Caen Valley Bats SSSI and Parish Bat Population.

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy BE13 – Protect and Promote Dark Skies

- The development would result in a loss of more than 30% biodiversity in relation to hedgerow loss, 3% of biodiversity in watercourses, and more than 20% loss in broad habitat. This will leave a legacy of damaged landscapes, in particular to landscapes 2, 3 and 7 in the Neighbourhood Plan. Taking many years, in some cases longer than the projects lifetime to recover. The developer has agreed to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain off site but there are no details of what the Section 106 Agreement would contain. As the application stands it would not be compliant with the following Neighbourhood Plan policies due to the lack of detail provided and the fact that the 10% biodiversity net gain is to be delivered off site and not within close proximity to the development.

Contrary to: -

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE3 – Protecting and Increasing the Parish's Biodiversity.

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE4 – Protecting Devon Banks, Hedgerows and Trees

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE7 – Protection of Parish's Strategic Nature Areas

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE6 – Protection Landscape Character

- The onshore cable route will result in significant adverse effects to the landscape character, wildlife habitats and biodiversity. The developer has not demonstrated that the impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. The loss of local amenity and impact on the South West Coast Path and public rights of way along the proposed Onshore Export Cable Corridor throughout the duration of the construction phase is unacceptable.

Contrary to: -

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy BE4 – Adoption of Appropriately Scaled Renewable Energy.

- During the construction phase this development will result in a significant loss of off-street car parking spaces due to the siting of the works compound. This

will have a negative impact on the local tourism and detrimental effect on the local economy, which is primarily reliant on tourism. The significant loss of car parking spaces will also have a negative impact on visitors and local residents and potentially cause displacement of parked vehicles. Which in turn would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. There are no mitigations for the loss of parking which will potentially cause increased congestion along the B3231 impacting the communities of Braunton and Croyde.

Contrary to: -

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy BE11 – Protecting Existing Car Parking Capacity for Public Use.

- The proposed construction traffic access route through the centre of Braunton, which has a declared Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) adjacent to a primary school, with the Council identifying the main source of air pollution to be from traffic. The construction traffic of 92 HGVs daily during the commencement of the construction phase, and 36 HGV daily movements thereafter would drive directly through the AQMA and deteriorate air quality in close proximity to a primary school playground. The developer has not carried out a risk assessment with regards to the impact that these additional HGV movements would have on the health of school children, pedestrians and businesses within the AQMA.

Contrary to:

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy BE12 – Protection and Improvement of Air Quality

- The additional traffic movements on the A361 and B3231 will exacerbate congestion in the centre of Braunton. The developer has not complied with Policy BE9 and provided mitigation measures with regards to the cumulative highway impact the additional traffic movements will have on our existing road networks. Nor has the developer adequately considered the impact that this additional traffic will have on the safety of pedestrians and other road users within the community, particularly construction traffic accessing Saunton Beach/car park.

Contrary to: -

Braunton Neighbourhood Plan Policy BE9 – Vehicle Movement Assessment

- The developer has concluded that there would be no significant adverse effect on the local socio-economic disruption, and the impact on tourism and recreation are assessed as 'negligible'. The developer has based

its evaluation on district level data sources and not used information directly relating to the local Parish area. The developer's assessment therefore cannot be substantiated and the Parish Council would disagree with the developer's assessment as having a 'negligible' impact on the local economy, tourism and recreation. The proposed onshore cable route would have a significant adverse influence being in close proximity to the local Coastal Zone, Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Northern Devon UNESCO Biosphere and the AONB, which are key natural capital assets and have a value to the local community and its economy.

- The application contains no evidence about the characteristics of employment being created for local people. There appears to be no benefits to the local economy or the community of Braunton or its surrounding parishes. There is no evidence of compensation being offered to local businesses whose livelihoods will be adversely affected by the proposed development.
- This application does not stand up to the four pillars of sustainability considering there is no evidence of local employment, social or economic benefit and the environmental harm that the proposed development will cause results in this application being unsustainable and unacceptable.

(9.0.1abs)

Cllr G Bell requested that his reason for abstaining from voting be recorded in the minutes. He had been advised by medical experts to abstain from voting due to ill health and the risk that his judgement could be called into question.

77023

Proposed: A new development of 10 dwellings with associated parking and gardens and a new access road (amended proposal, layout & plans)

Location: Candar Nursery Exeter Road Braunton Devon EX33 2BJ

Applicant: Mr Andy Wreford

RESOLVED: That this be deferred to a future meeting.

162/2023/24

North Devon
Council
Planning
Decisions

77297

Description: Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (outline planning permission 72392 for self build/custom build residential dwelling, removal of field shelter and formation of access track)(amended plans)

Site Address: Plot 1 The Stables Saunton Road Braunton Devon EX33 1HG

Applicant: Mr Pete Caswell

Decision: APPROVED
Decision Date: 05/10/2023

77480
Description: Proposed erection of single dwelling
Site Address: Wedgehill Ash Road Braunton Devon EX33
2EF
Applicant: Mr Ray Hanson
Decision: REFUSED
Decision Date: 06/10/2023

The meeting closed at 9.25pm.

Signed by the Chair:
(Cllr M Shapland)

Date: