**Minutes of Brixton Parish Council (BPC) Extraordinary Meeting**
**held on Wednesday 2nd September 2026 at 7.00 pm in the Brixton Community Room,**

**Present:** Cllr Liz Hitchins (Chair), Michael Wills (Vice Chair), Cllr Terry Clegg, Cllr Neil Hawken, Cllr Ian Martin and Cllr Stuart Nix
**In attendance**: District Cllrs Alison Nix and Julie Carson and Kirstie Aldridge (Clerk)

Members of the public in attendance: 32

Cllr Hitchins welcomed everyone to the Extraordinary Meeting of BPC that had been arranged to ensure that BPC complied with the SHDC planning timescales for planning application 2135/26/FUL. She explained the format of the meeting.

**Open Forum**

**Guest Speaker - Graham Clark, GRC Planning Ltd regarding planning application 2135/26/FUL Development Site at SX 549 521, Brixton**

Graham Clark explained that he was the planning consultant for this application and the applicant, who had been in the building trade for over 25 years, had acquired the site 18 months ago, and has now submitted this planning application to SHDC.

This application is for "ten detached dwellings including six 'affordable' 2 and 3-bedroom detached bungalows and four open market houses with garages, estate road, foul and surface water drainage, biodiversity and landscaping." Graham Clark explained that there was a clear need for a mix of open-market homes and affordable homes. The proposal is for low-density, discreet housing that would be appropriate for the character of the area. A key reason for the proposal is the lack of new bungalow development. Bungalows are no longer being built as frequently as they once were, despite there being a significant need for this type of accommodation. There is a particular need for affordable bungalows which could provide suitable accommodation for a range of people, including younger people, older people, and families with children who have disabilities. Purpose-built, accessible homes can allow people to remain in their community and live in a property that meets their needs throughout their lives. This would help address specific housing needs within the local area.

He explained that the need for affordable housing is threefold, with demand coming from different groups within the community.

The three different options are:

- Discounted open-market housing.
  These properties would be sold at approximately 80% of their open-market value and would be in perpetuity. The open-market value would be determined in accordance with the council. This is an accepted form of affordable housing under NPPF

- Affordable self-build housing plot.
  The plot would be provided with the necessary services, including access, electricity and water, making it ready for construction. The application would be accompanied by a design code and the purchaser would be required to build in accordance with this design code. Would be sold at approximately 80% of open-market value.

- Developer-led approach.
  Developer would construct the shell and external elements of the building, while the purchaser would be responsible for completing the internal fit-out. This approach would provide savings on the overall construction cost, as the purchaser would undertake the internal works themselves.
  30–40% of open-market value.
  The plots would be offered at a reduced sale price (there would be 6 of these)

The proposal has been carefully considered in relation to the relevant planning policies.
Planning policy can be complex, particularly given the recent changes to the NPPF, however, these recent changes do not affect this proposal.
SHDC does not currently have a five-year supply and are therefore favourable when considering new housing proposals.
The site is considered to be sustainably located, being close to existing services and facilities and benefiting from access to bus routes towards Kingsbridge and Plymouth. The site is also surrounded by development on three sides, helping to ensure that the proposal would form a logical extension to the existing settlement.
Although the site is technically located outside the settlement boundary identified in the Brixton Parish Neighbourhood Plan, the Examiner specifically stated that an exception site providing affordable housing could be acceptable within this gap.
This proposal benefits from support under the relevant policies, particularly ENV6 and TTV27, which allows for exception sites where there is an identified need for affordable housing. The proposal would provide four open-market homes and six affordable homes.
The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies, including ENV6 and TTV27.

Various questions and comments were raised by members of the public:

What are the local qualifying criteria and how will the principal of 'in perpetuity' be managed
Graham Clark confirmed that this would be through a covenant and every purchaser would have to go through the council to quality

Would the proposal comply with TTV27 if the affordable housing is required to remain affordable in perpetuity? There is some ambiguity around how this requirement would apply to the self-build option, particularly in relation to mortgage availability and the eventual resale of the property.
For a self-build property, any future owner would still need to meet the relevant affordable housing and local connection requirements. This would be through Devon Home Choice ensuring that future purchasers are assessed against the appropriate criteria.
The precise process would need to be established through the planning process.
The planning committee would determine whether the affordable housing requirement has been secured in perpetuity, the use of s106, mortgage ability and how the local occupancy and affordability requirements will be managed and enforced in the future.

Date: 30th September 2026 Signed: E Hitchins
Mrs E Hitchins – Chair Brixton Parish Council

Why are there the three different options?
There are currently no self-build plots available within South Hams, so the proposal provides an opportunity to introduce this type of housing to the area.
Would provide discounted open-market housing, homes would be built and finished by the developer and the other options would provide opportunities for purchasers to become involved in the construction of their own homes. The three options provide flexibility.

Resident spoke in support of the application stating that the village has a strong community spirit. However, there is concern that there is not enough social and affordable housing to meet the needs of local people. There is also a strong desire to protect the environment and maintain the character of the village. Without careful and appropriate development, within the next ten years Brixton could cease to feel like a village and could instead become something like a "mini Sherford". The question is why we should not appreciate and protect what we already have while allowing appropriate development that supports the community.
Brixton is a wonderful place to live, with a good school, a local pub and a fish and chip shop, as well as a strong sense of community. Need to find an appropriate balance between necessary development and protecting the character of the area without objecting to everything all the time.

The self-build units sound positive in principle, but there are some practical concerns about how this would work in practice. What happens if a plot is left undeveloped for an extended period. There needs to be a clear end date or timescale for completing the construction of each property?
A maximum period of approx. 18 months was stated.

Concerns about the impact of construction traffic and additional vehicles using the existing road. The road is already very narrow, and additional vehicles travelling up and down the road could create difficulties, particularly during the construction period. Graham Clark stated that DCC Highways have asked for the entrance to be widened in line with the county standard for road width, which is 4.8 metres. This will allow two vehicles to pass.

How will the proposed drainage for the road will be sufficient to manage surface water runoff and not flood existing properties? Graham Clark stated that this is a minor technical matter, and the drainage design will meet DCC Highways requirements for road drainage, as well as the local Flood Authority's standards for drainage. It has been designed to include an additional 50% for climate change, plus a further 10%. Overall, the design provides approximately 60% more drainage capacity than the existing Popplestone Park provision. The flood consultation has recently been updated and will be on the SHDC portal.

Clarification was sought as to which part of the road would be extended?
Graham Clark confirmed that the section of road to be widened is the entrance to Popplestone Park. It will be increased from 4.2 metres to 4.8 metres which will require the footpath to be reduced from 1.8 metres to 1.2 metres.
The standard footpath width is 1.8 metres; however, DCC Highways has accepted the proposed reduction to 1.2 metres and has requested the road widening to meet current DCC Highways standards .Only one side of the road and footpath will be amended as part of the works.

The drawings show the proposed sewerage arrangements with a new tank and pump, with a pipeline connecting to the main public sewer. This would involve demolishing a shed and patio.
At present, all five properties at Popplestone Park are connected to a private treatment tank and drainage field.
Graham Clark explained that all 5 properties could be given the opportunity to connect to the public drainage system, should the residents wish to do so. This has been raised as a possibility, and

discussions would need to take place with the five residents to establish whether they would wish to connect. The proposed drainage system could potentially accommodate these connections if the residents choose to proceed.
No foul drainage will pass through the gardens.

There are relatively few elements of the proposal that are mandatory, with the footprint being one of the key requirements. The development will need to comply with the relevant Design Code. The detailed design is a matter for the developer, although SHDC is keen to ensure that the Design Code is followed. If the site is developed as a self-build plot, the final design would be a matter for the individual developer or purchaser. However, any planning application would still need to comply with the relevant Design Code and planning requirements.

The interpretation of the affordable housing policy is that the development should be mixed, with Policy TTV27 requiring 40% affordable housing. The provision of private housing would need to be justified as part of the overall development, as it is necessary to help fund the development of the site and the affordable housing. It was noted that there is no requirement for the affordable housing to be delivered in a particular sequence, provided that the overall policy requirements are met.
The development would not necessarily be built or occupied all at the same time. This can be controlled through planning conditions and the s106 agreement.
Heads of Terms will be submitted setting out the proposed trigger points for the delivery of the development. For example, a certain number of open-market properties may not be occupied until work has commenced on the affordable housing element. These requirements and trigger points would be secured through the legal agreement.

Resident explained that Popplestone Park and Lodge Lane have already been developed and are now considered part of the village. As this is currently a greenfield site, consideration has been given to how the proposed layout will fit within the existing village and the surrounding area. The proposal also includes affordable bungalows to provide suitable affordable housing within the development.

Another resident spoke about whether a refusal of the current application would prevent the developer from submitting another application in the future. It was explained that this would not necessarily prevent future development of the site.

The direction of travel within national planning policy is increasingly towards supporting and encouraging sustainable development, particularly development that is located close to existing services. The new NPPF places greater emphasis on sustainable locations for housing development. He continued that with the village plan due to expire in 2034, at which point some of the existing protections may no longer apply. Graham Clark explained that the Neighbourhood Plan technically has a five-year period, and the current plan was originally intended to cover 2020–2025. The 2024 modification does not create a new five-year period, meaning that the plan is technically expired. However, its policies still need to be taken into account when considering planning applications. The resident acknowledged that meaningful objections may carry relatively little weight in the planning process. The main opportunity in this case is being able to influence what the development becomes and to ensure that, if development does take place, it is carried out to an appropriate standard. The view was expressed that by supporting the current proposal may represent the best way of influencing what could otherwise become a less favourable development in the future. The objective is to ensure that the details agreed through the planning process are properly followed and reflected in what is built. What protections can be put in place to preserve the interests of the community in the future?

Date: 30th September 2026 Signed: E Hitchins
Mrs E Hitchins – Chair Brixton Parish Council

Graham Clark explained that planning controls are intended to ensure that developers deliver what has been approved. If a development is built differently from the approved plans or fails to comply with planning conditions, this can constitute a breach of planning control and enforcement action can be taken.
S106 is particularly important as it secures specific obligations and requirements. If the development is built differently from what has been agreed, this could constitute a breach of the planning permission or legal agreement. The planning process will ensure that developers build what they have received permission to build.
Requirements relating to external materials can also be secured through planning conditions. For example, the development may be required to use specified types of bricks or other materials to ensure that the appearance is consistent with the approved design.
Timescales can also be imposed. For example, where a property is being constructed as a self-build, there could be requirements for the external appearance or street-facing elements to be completed within an agreed timeframe. This would help to ensure that the overall street scene is completed to an acceptable standard within a specified period. If the requirements are not complied with, there can be consequences and enforcement action may be taken to require the development to be brought into compliance.

Cllr Hitchins brought this part of the open forum to a close and moved onto the next planning application on the agenda - still in the open forum

**Planning application - 2109/26/VPO**
Cllr Hitchins read out the email from Tom French, SHDC Planning Officer, which stated that 'this proposed variation would rebalance the delivery of affordable housing across the development. Of the 550 affordable homes required under the existing S106 Agreement, 404 have already been delivered, alongside additional dwellings secured through Registered Provider purchases. The revised distribution would provide a more even and integrated spread of affordable housing across the site. Following discussion with the Sherford Consortium, it was considered that the proposal would continue to secure the required overall level of affordable housing, and no objection was raised in principle to the proposed variation.'

There was some confusion regarding this application and the following proposed stopping up order - District Cllr Alison Nix clarified the position.

**DRAFT ORDER: SW/6351**
**Proposed Stopping Up of Highway at Wiverton Lane, Plymouth PL7 5AA**
District Cllr Alison Nix explained that the proposed works involve a technical change to the existing verge. The proposal is to alter the verge to provide improved access, rather than formally stopping up the verge or closing the road. The verge will be taken back slightly to provide the required access. There is currently no proposal to stop up or close the road.

Cllr Hitchins invited comments and questions from residents:
Concerns were raised regarding the width of the road and whether the works would result in the road being narrowed. It was confirmed that there is no plan to narrow the road, despite concerns about the potential increase in traffic. The works are therefore primarily a change to the verge to facilitate access. There will also be temporary diversions required while the gas and electricity services are diverted as part of the works.

Residents requested that in the future could there be a sufficient notification period regarding these types of proposals. District Cllrs Alison Nix and Julie Carson will feed the comments and concerns raised back to the relevant parties, and this feedback will be taken into consideration.

Date: 30th September 2026 Signed: E Hitchins
Mrs E Hitchins – Chair Brixton Parish Council

Query regarding where the full masterplan could be accessed any subsequent amendments to the planning? Resident was directed to the Sherford website https://sherford.uk/

Cllr Hitchins brought this part of the open forum to a close and moved onto the next item on the agenda - still in the open forum

**Traffic Regulation Tranche 3 Order 6307 [DPS:NL:DEV001/1743:B**
**BRIXTON: No Waiting At Any Time on specified lengths of A379 Chittleburn Hill to Red Lion Hill and Old Road**

Cllr Hitchins explained that this was not a BPC consultation and that this was a plan produced by DCC following concerns regarding parking in the village. BPC had organised two public consultations to gather residents' views . Residents attended and shared their opinions which were forwarded to DCC Highways. DCC has subsequently considered the feedback and developed the current proposal which is out for public consultation.

Cllr Hitchins invited comments and questions from residents:
Resident stated that as a village, the impact of reducing parking along the main road needed to be considered. Understand that there is no parking around the zebra crossing and bus stop areas, but there are significant concerns about where residents and visitors will be able to park.
There is very little, if any, off-road parking for many properties, meaning that residents have no choice but to park on the road. With a minimum of two cars per household, where are these vehicles expected to go if parking is removed?
The changes could also have an impact on weddings, funerals and other events in the village, when additional parking is needed. There could be a significant knock-on effect, with parking being pushed onto Winstone Lane, Red Lion Hill and Woodland Drive. In reality, every road in the village could be affected.
There are also serious concerns about the impact on our local businesses. The section of the main road affected by the proposal is outside the only two hospitality businesses in the village. Over the last five years, these businesses have become increasingly important to the community, and Brixton is very fortunate to have both a pub and a fish and chip shop.
Both businesses rely heavily on passing trade and provide an important service to the village. They also support the community by providing employment, including part-time opportunities for younger people. If parking is removed and passing trade is reduced, there is a real concern that we could lose one or both of these businesses.
The consequences of these proposals need to be carefully considered. The impact is not just about parking; it is about the wider effect on the village, its residents, businesses and community.
There does need to be a way to accommodate people with prams, pushchairs and wheelchairs but motorists need to take responsibility for where they park and ensure that they do not obstruct pavements, Any changes need to take into account the fact that there is limited off-road parking available. Need to consider the wider consequences of the proposal as every road in the village will be impacted.

Resident endorsed the comments made by an ex-policeman who stated 'never complain about the parking' as parked cars can actually provide an effective form of traffic calming. In Yealmpton, for example, parking along the road naturally slows traffic down – one of the best traffic calming measures available, as drivers have to slow down.

Another resident raised concerns about the parking around the pub and fish and chip shop. More vehicles are being parked in locations that are not ideal, Around The Green, especially in the mornings and evenings, it can be very difficult to get out safely due to the amount and positioning of parked vehicles. Resident stated that the parking was fine. However, Cllr Hitchins explained that the issue of parking was raised with BPC and was brought forward as a concern that needed to be considered.

Another resident conveyed her support for the proposal because there are areas where pedestrians currently have to walk on the road due to vehicles being parked on the pavement. There is available parking in the village, and this should be used.
However, enforcement is also a concern. If parking restrictions are introduced, they will need to be properly enforced to ensure that they are effective and that vehicles do not continue to park in restricted areas.

Cllr Hitchins brought to an end all the areas that were included in the agenda, that residents wanted to discuss in the open forum and returned to the original planning application 2135/26/FUL.

Cllr Hitchins stated that the original site meeting was held on Saturday 29th, which was well attended but if the community wanted another site meeting, with representatives from the application, then this could be arranged.

**Open Forum Closed**

**60. Welcome and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Carson, Gillard and MacLennan and accepted by all Councillors.
Apologies were also received from County Cllr Tony Carson

**61. Declarations of Interest** 'Members are invited to declare any personal or declarable pecuniary interests, including the nature and extent of such interests, that they may have in any items to be considered at this meeting.'

There were no declarations of interest

**62. Planning application received from SHDC during August 2026**

**2135/26/FUL**

Ten detached dwellings including six affordable 2-bedroom detached bungalows and four open market houses with garages, estate road, foul and surface water drainage, biodiversity net gain and landscaping.

**Development Site at SX 549 521, Brixton**

Following the presentation from Graham Clark and representations from members of the public it was discussed whether BPC should be formally involved with another site visit, given that BPC is a consultee, Cllr Martin proposed that BPC should facilitate another site meeting.
This will take place on Saturday 19th September at 10:00am, meeting at the entrance to the site, and all councillors to attend. Cllr Martin stated it would be useful to have a site visit on site so that residents and councillors can see the area first-hand. Seconded Cllr Clegg, all others in attendance were unanimous.
Clerk will contact SHDC to obtain an extension for BPC recommendation until Friday 2nd October, therefore BPC will make its recommendation at the BPC September meeting (30th September)

**2109/26/VPO**

Application for modification of Section 106 Agreement on 0825/18/VAR

**Sherford New Community Land south west of A38 Deep Lane and east of Haye Road Elburton Plymouth, PL9 8DD**

Tom French, SHDC Planning Officer stated that 'this proposed variation would rebalance the delivery of affordable housing across the development. Of the 550 affordable homes required under the existing S106 Agreement, 404 have already been delivered, alongside additional dwellings secured through Registered Provider purchases. The revised distribution would provide a more even and integrated spread of affordable housing across the site. Following discussion with the Sherford Consortium, it was considered that the proposal would continue to secure the required overall level of affordable housing, and no objection was raised in principle to the proposed variation.'

Cllr Hawken proposed that BPC submit a recommendation of 'support' for this planning application, seconded by Cllr Nix. All others in attendance were unanimous.

**63. Traffic Regulation Tranche 3 Order 6307 [DPS:NL:DEV001/1743:B**

**BRIXTON: No Waiting At Any Time on specified lengths of A379 Chittleburn Hill to Red Lion Hill and Old Road;**

Following extensive work by BPC with Devon County Council (DCC), details have now been released regarding the proposed traffic regulation changes and the plans that have been developed for The Green and along the A379.

The proposals were formally advertised in South Hams Gazette on Thursday 20 August 2026

This is the start of the public consultation. The consultation will run from 20 August until 11 September 2026.

The consultation information includes the draft Traffic Regulation Order, plans and a statement of reasons explaining the proposed changes.

To make an objection or submit comments, these should be made through the consultation form available at: https://devon.cc/alwrp

DCC proposals include the following:

A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill, Brixton

(i) the north side from a point 4 metres west of its western junction with A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill (Spur To St Marys Church) in an easterly direction to a point 3 metres east of its junction with Old Road including the traffic island

(ii) the north-west side from a point 34 metres south-west of its junction with Orchard Road to a point 65 metres north-east of that junction

(iii) the south side from a point 174 metres north-west of its junction with Winstone Lane for a distance of 60 metres in a westerly direction

A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill (Spur To St Marys Church), Brixton

(i) the north side from its junction with Old Road for a distance of 4 metres in a westerly direction

(ii) the south-east side from its western junction with A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill for a distance of 3 metres in a north-easterly direction

(iii) the south-west side from its eastern junction with A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill for a distance of 5 metres in a north-westerly direction

(iv) the west side from its western junction with A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill for a distance of 3 metres in a northerly direction

Old Road, Brixton

(i) the north side from its junction with A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill (Spur To St Marys Church) for a distance of 4 metres in an easterly direction
(ii) the south-east side from its junction with A379 Chittleburn Hill To Red Lion Hill for a distance of 8 metres in a north-easterly direction

BPC identified that there was a possible omission in the list above in relation to the map. Clerk to follow up with Nick Colton, DCC Highways.

Following discussions in the open forum Cllr Hawken proposed that BPC ask DCC to reconsider the 'no waiting at any time' lines along the A379 – either side of Orchard Road. Seconded Cllr Martin. All others in attendance were unanimous.

**Cllr Hitchins used her Chairmans prerogative to add the following agenda items:**

**64. DRAFT ORDER: SW/6351**
**Proposed Stopping Up of Highway at Wiverton Lane, Plymouth PL7 5AA**

Following discussions in the open forum and clarification from District Cllr Alison Nix, Cllr Nix proposed that BPC do not submit any objection to this 'stopping up order', seconded Cllr Hawken. All others in attendance were unanimous.

**65. Cofflete Information Board**

BPC has received the final draft of the Cofflete Information Board and Cllr Hawken proposed that BPC accept the final version and ask that this is now progressed, seconded Cllr Clegg. All others in attendance were unanimous.

Cllr Hitchins closed the meeting at 8.58 pm

Next meeting: Wednesday 30th September 2026 in Brixton Community Room
Kirstie Aldridge, Clerk, Brixton Parish Council

Date: 30th September 2026 Signed: E Hitchins
Mrs E Hitchins – Chair Brixton Parish Council