

**Appendix 9 – Minutes of MPC Public Meeting**

## MODBURY PARISH COUNCIL 20<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2026 - PUBLIC MEETING

To discuss the application by Bloor Homes for 75 homes on land adjacent to Palm Cross

Planning Ref: 4116/24/OPA

### SUMMARY NOTES

#### Attendance:

Parish Clerk plus 6 MPC councillors

District Councillor

65 residents of Modbury

1 other (camera operator)

**Representations:** Two written representations from persons unable to attend.

The meeting opened with an introduction from Cllrs Barbara Price and Ann Turner outlining the proposal, the decision of SHDC planning committee and the position of Modbury PC.

Handouts summarising the process and current situation were distributed to those attending.

#### Access

- a. There were numerous concerns about access, both vehicular and pedestrian.
- b. Exiting and entrancing the A379 at Lanveoc Way is already hazardous. Visibility is poor with parked cars when entrancing the estate and speed of traffic when joining the main road.
- c. At least three recent incidents were referenced but members of the public recounted many other incidents and near misses. The entrance sign to Lanveoc Way was damaged by a lorry.
- d. There was discussion about how to record incidents to reflect the actual experience of residents. Police will only attend if there is injury or obstruction, but other incidents are not recorded.
- e. The amount of traffic is already too busy for the entrance and narrow roads within the site. A Bloor representative said that the roads are narrow to serve as "traffic calming".
- f. Children should be able to play safely on the green. The area is already busy with cars flying around. More traffic will increase the risk. A serious incident is certain to happen.
- g. We could perhaps ask the bus company drivers what their issues have been. Note that Bloor promised to put up that bus stop but didn't do so.

#### Emergency Access

- a. Access for emergency vehicles was a general concern. Emergency access was supposed to be in place for Phase 1 of the Palm Cross development. This was not done.
- b. A member of the audience who is an ex Fire Service Officer stated that with the current layout, the fire service would struggle to attend the site.

### **Pedestrian Access**

The proposed pedestrian access onto Sheephams Road and to the QE11 Recreation Ground is very dangerous. Children are most likely to use this route to get to the recreation ground.

Vehicles come at speed up to the brow of the hill, this is particularly an issue in the summer with increased holiday traffic and farm vehicles.

### **Construction Traffic.**

- a. Where is the plan for managing construction traffic? This is something which could go on for around 3 years. The roads are poorly laid, that is why they have not been adopted. How are they going to stand up to heavy construction vehicles?
- b. What about provision for residents parking during the construction phase?
- c. There will be issues for residents with pollution and keeping children safe.
- d. House values at Palm Cross 1 & 2 will be affected.

### **Performance of Bloor Homes**

- a. After nearly 6 years, the poorly laid roads have still not been adopted.
- b. Bloor do the bare minimum of essential work and that is poorly done. They should not be given the opportunity to repeat the failure of previous schemes. GENERAL APPLAUSE
- c. Why should we trust Bloor to do anything they promise, they have still not completed the undertakings on the previous developments. GENERAL APPLAUSE
- d. Pedestrian access from Palm Cross to the school is inadequate and dangerous.

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

- a. There was general unhappiness that after so much effort a key part of the NP was being discarded.
- b. Proposals for the number of affordable homes was not kept for Phase 1 and 2 The proposal is for 30% affordable homes on the new site. If the NP boundary counted, it would be an exception site so would have had a higher percentage of affordable homes.
- c. Why was this site even considered since it is outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary? On a vote of 9 councillors for only 2 to vote for, one of whom used their casting vote, there were questions about a failure of process. GENERAL APPLAUSE.

- d. Is there redress against SHDC for not making it clear that the changes to the NP boundaries no longer counted?
- e. **Point of information:** MPC have communicated this issue to the rest of the Councils within SHDC.

### **Decision making process**

- a. Unhappiness about the procedure of the SHDC committee hearing was a recurring theme (see comment above). The voting numbers showed how divided the committee was. Were two votes a fair representation of the committee?
- b. As the purpose of the meeting was to discuss access, DCC Highways Officer should have been there to answer questions. If he couldn't be there, the hearing should have been deferred.
- c. The point was made that MPC should challenge the decision AND process.
- d. Is there an option to contact the Local Government Ombudsman re the conduct of the meeting
- e. A separate highways report by MPC would be useful... So far, comments are made by those accepting that this will happen, but it has not yet been approved. Pedestrian safety is more important than traffic.
- f. There is a petition circulating to be sent to SHDC.
- g. Every resident has the power to individually lobby the councillors.
- h. **Point of information:** Representations should be sent to SHDC quoting the Planning Reference Number at the top of the page. Specific issues about traffic and road safety should be directed to DCC Highways Officer.

### **Infrastructure:**

- a. What are provisions for water & sewage to the new site as the current water treatment plant is inadequate? Point made that it can't cope! The holding tank at Palm Cross does not function properly. The impact on the existing system has not been thought through.
- b. The health centre is already at full capacity.
- c. To afford any homes, most families will have to work, meaning that most houses will have two cars – will there be sufficient parking spaces?
- d. A proposal for homes suitable for retired people should be made but has not.
- e. MPC should put up on its website details, or at least a link, to the relevant SHDC councillors and the minutes/video of the planning meeting.

At the conclusion of the meeting there was GENERAL APPLAUSE to show appreciation to MPC for organising the meeting.