

Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee

Monday 06 September 2021, 19:00 – 19:59

Meeting in Person

Held at Eype Church

Minutes

Attendees:

Board Members

Pelham Allen PA

Jenifer Roddy JR

Steve Ralph SR

Paul Hartmann PH

In Attendance:

Public: Mr Martin Langley – Contractor Developer Land West of Watton Lane

There were no other Public or Press in attendance.

Summary of Action Points arising

No	Item	Action
1	6.1-4	PH to generate planning reports.
2	10.1	PA to investigate with the Clerk if there is any way planning applications can be dealt with by the committee when the applications response time falls well before the next appropriate committee meeting.

1. Welcome and apologies:

1.1 Pelham Allen opened the meeting and thanked attendees for coming. There were no apologies received.

2. Declarations of Interest:

2.1 For completeness Councillor Paul Hartmann raised a declaration of interest concerning both applications on the agenda. The interest relates to the proximity of his permanent address being approximately 100 metres to the West across other landowner's property. The proposed development land has no direct relationship with Councillor Hartmann's property and cannot be viewed from it.

3. Approval of the minutes of the July Meeting:

3.1 The minutes of the July meeting were confirmed as an accurate note of the meeting and were approved.

4. Correspondence List (previously circulated)

4.1 There were no correspondence items.

5. DEMOCRATIC HALF HOUR during which members of the public are invited to raise general matters of interest.

5.1 There were no general matters raised. With regards to the projects on the agenda it was agreed that Mr Langley would make initial comments and then respond to any issues requested by the Planning Committee.

6.0 Planning Applications and to consider any other planning/enforcement issues: (public verbal comments limited to 3 minutes per representation prior to committee consideration). Mr. Martin Langley was present and requested to speak to both the applications.

6.1 PA asked PH to comment on the applications.

PH commented that he had visited the site that morning and met with Mr Langley to discuss the two proposals under consideration. PH stated that in considering the applications overall there was a third issue that needed to be considered being a possible piecemeal approach to development on the overall site including land in the same ownership but as yet, not part of any development. Mr Langley commented that the committee should not speculate as to what might happen in the future. PH advised the committee that their consideration was not speculation but rather considering possibilities in line with the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework together with the overall effects on the community of the Parish.

6.2 P/FUL/2021/01675 Location: Land at Watton, Bridport – Application for the construction of a dwelling (Alternative Scheme retrospective application).

In terms of the application there were some issues which needed to be considered.

With reference to the above application, it was noted that the dwelling had been constructed, however, it was not in accordance with the consented plans (Planning ref: WD/D/19/002539). An application for non-material amendments (Planning ref: P/NMA/2021/01052) was refused by Dorset Council. It is clear the intention to build a two storey dwelling was made early in the development process to enable the structural form of the building to accommodate the

additional accommodation. The dwelling was not constructed in accordance with the consented detail (change of location for utility, introduction of second floor accommodation with an increase in floor area and raising of the roof height) and not drawn to the attention of the Dorset Planning departments at an early stage. The application for non-material amendments (Planning ref: P/NMA/2021/01052) was refused by Dorset Council, which led to this full application. The objections from "Foxgloves" to the north, which is the closest property, are noted as well as other local and more distant objectors. However, the as built form does not appear to increase loss of amenity of adjoining properties even though it is not in full accordance with the original consent.

It was not clear how the development will connect to a mains sewer which is located in an adjacent landholding "Little Paddock" to the West and the effect of any connection works on the existing mature hedgerow.

The current building appears to be constructed to a high standard and sits well on the site.

It is also understood that engineering works were carried out to areas of the site to the South and not forming part of development, identified as unimproved agricultural land. The works comprised the excavation of topsoil, the depositing of spoil from the site and recovering with topsoil.

It is clear the full application for this development and the separate application for an additional three dwellings on the adjacent plot, together with the adjacent land in the same ownership (with notes on the planning drawings indicating subject to consent) are linked. As such it is appropriate to consider whether the applications need to be considered as a comprehensive development.

Mr Langley made the following comments:

- a) He commented that he met Councillor Hartmann on the site that morning to discuss the proposals.
- b) He confirmed that contrary to the planning statement regarding the ridge height of the dwelling the overall building had been lowered by approximately 800mm meaning that the ridge height was 50mm lower than the design proposals.
- c) A window had been included in the west elevation and additional in roof plane windows to the South. He confirmed that these did not create any worse conditions than the original design.
- d) The internal layout had been adjusted. (it was noted that the main changes were the utility room on the west elevation had been relocated within the building on the eastern side and additional accommodation identified at first floor within the roof space).
- e) The private road and access to Watton Lane had been constructed in accordance with the design proposals and were not to adoptable standards. There were no street lights etc.
- f) He confirmed that he had been in dialogue with the immediate neighbours during the construction of the dwelling.

Conclusion: Dorset Council may wish to consider the current application ref:

P/FUL/2021/01675 and application ref: P/FUL/2021/01762 as a comprehensive development to address the potential of "piecemeal development". In addition, further details should be sought on the effect of the foul waste pipe connection through the hedgerow between the site, the adjacent development site and "Little Paddocks" in the connection to the main

sewer, to ensure an appropriate approach and minimising damage. The matter of engineering works on the adjacent land in the ownership of the developer should be brought to the attention of Dorset Council. The dwelling in application ref: P/FUL/2021/01675 should remain as built which is generally in line with the consented scheme and as considered, does not meaningfully increase loss of amenity or privacy.

No Objection.

6.3 P/FUL/2021/01762 Land West of Watton Lane, Bridport – Application for the construction of 3 dwellings.

In terms of the application there were some issues which needed to be considered.

PH confirmed that with reference to the above application, it was noted that the application is for 3 dwellings on the site where previously an application for two dwellings was refused by Dorset Council. The refusal decision on the previous two dwelling application was overturned following a successful appeal (Planning ref: WD/D/19/002178).

It was noted that the further application for 3 dwellings (Planning ref: P/FUL/2021/01762) had been lodged on land adjacent and in the same ownership as a dwelling which has been constructed on an initial plot at the entrance to the land and which shares the drive access. The development on this initial plot within the same landholding is now contemporaneously the subject of a new full retrospective planning application as mentioned in 6.2 above.

In addition, and on the application ref: P/FUL/2021/01762 it was noted that a private access drive is proposed to the boundary of a further plot of land in the same ownership.

From the above it is considered that the development approach may be piecemeal considering the whole of the landholding. As such it is appropriate to consider whether the applications need to be considered as a comprehensive development.

Notwithstanding the inspectors comments the proposed development is becoming considerably denser than the existing established dwellings and will need to be considered holistically with land to the East and South of Watton Lane. The denser proposals may have an effect on the long distance view of the AONB from the public rights of way as well as the short view being detrimental to the setting. This could be considered to degrade the available green open space that characterises the Bridport area and links the established developments. It was generally felt that the previous application for two dwellings gave a more acceptable positioning of buildings with a single dwelling to the South in a larger plot.

Notwithstanding the proposals are denser, it can be considered they still relate to the existing residential dwellings by infilling a portion of unimproved grassland between “Little Paddock” to the West and Watton Lane to the East.

In terms of the environment there is no mention of how a net positive biodiversity gain outcome will be achieved. In addition, it is also not clear how the development's foul water drain will connect to a mains sewer, which is understood to be located in the adjacent property of "Little Paddock", without a detrimental effect on the landscape and in particular the hedgerows.

From a highways perspective it was suggested that the combined vehicular and pedestrian access may need parking/passing spaces.

In terms of the dwelling design the proposals are a standard modern approach and the materials used are stated in the application forms as stone for the walls and slate for the roof. However, the drawings appear to show only a plinth of stone and the access statement confirms brickwork for the remainder of the walls. This needs to be clarified.

As in 6.2 above it is understood that engineering works were carried out to areas of the site to the south and not forming part of development, identified as unimproved agricultural land. The works comprised the excavation of topsoil, alteration of the subsoil, the depositing of spoil from the site, compaction and recovering with topsoil.

Mr Langley made the following comments:

- a) He felt that the additional dwelling made little difference to the development as viewed from a distance and was in line with the inspector's comments in the successful appeal for the previous application.
- b) He confirmed that he had no intention of developing any of the additional land to the South and the driveway was private and not constructed to adoptable standards.
- c) His intention was to construct good quality residential dwellings and felt the scheme was appropriate to the site.

Conclusion: Dorset Council may wish to consider the current application ref: P/FUL/2021/01675 and application ref: P/FUL/2021/01762 as a comprehensive development to address the potential of "piecemeal development". In terms of the BANP the following are relevant.

It is considered that the proposals form a denser urban settlement which affects the interface with the rural setting. The proposals can be considered to further degrade the holistic setting of the site in terms of the AONB however they still relate to the existing residential dwellings on the ridge area by infilling a portion of unimproved grassland.

There is a loss of this unimproved grassland which plays an important part of linking the developed areas of Bridport to the World Heritage areas the importance of which is outlined in the BANP.

Further details should be sought on the effect of the foul waste pipe connection through the hedgerow between the site, the adjacent development site and "Little Paddock" in the connection to the main sewer, to ensure an appropriate approach and minimising damage.

In terms of the environment there should be consideration of how a positive biodiversity gain outcome will be achieved.

From a highways perspective it is suggested that the combined vehicular and pedestrian access may need parking/passing spaces.

The materials proposed for use on the dwellings should be clarified on the drawings.

The matter of engineering works on the adjacent land in the ownership of the developer should be brought to the attention of Dorset Council.

However notwithstanding the above comments the Committee were split on the merits of the scheme and on balance felt they could only state a no objection comment.

No Objection

6.4 General review: A general review of the overall development landholding at Land West of Watton lane and local environs.

PH commented that as identified in 6.1 above there was a duty to consider the potential of piecemeal development in relation to Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework together with the overall effects on the community of the Parish.

Notwithstanding the comments concerning the specification of the driveway to the applications being considered in 6.2 and 6.3 above the driveway does connect with the boundary of land in the same ownership to the South. There is potential for applications for this land to be developed in the future and with potential additional access, albeit difficult, to Watton Lane, further South. It was acknowledged that the driveway may only be taken to the boundary of this additional land to ensure the additional land is not landlocked, however if that was the case then a turning head would be appropriate.

Mr Langley made the following comments:

- a) He stated that he was not interested in developing more than the applications currently being considered.
- b) He confirmed that any access to Watton Lane at the boundary with the land to the South of the current proposals would be extremely difficult as there was an approximate "9 foot" level drop to the Lane.
- c) He confirmed that he had discussions with the landowner, Mr. Copp, to the South West of the additional land to make the sewer connection through a parcel of land in Mr. Copp's ownership however as the landowner wanted to connect to the new development road this was not acceptable to Mr. Langley.
- d) He confirmed that he had agreed terms with the owner of "Little Paddock" to connect to the main sewer within that property.

Conclusion: It is clear there are multiple applications for the development land West of Watton Lane. Notwithstanding the statements from the Contractor/Developer, additional land could come under pressure for more and possibly denser development which the Parish Council feels is inappropriate in respect of the BANP, the Emerging Local Plan and the NPPF. As such Dorset Council should to be made aware of Symondsburys Parish Council Concerns regarding the potential of "piecemeal development".

7.0 Projects: All reports to be submitted to the clerk in writing at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

7.1.1 There were no Projects reported.

8.0 Vearse Farm:

8.1 It was confirmed that a Foundry Lea working group meeting would take place on Friday the 10th September 2021 at 14:00.

9.0 Items for inclusion at the next meeting.

9.1 There were no items for inclusion.

10.0 AOB

10.1 SR highlighted the planning application ref: P/FUL/2021/02253 which required a response by the 24th September which is two weeks before the next planning committee. PA commented that to apply for an extension for this length of time appeared excessive. PH agreed and added that occasionally this time scale would occur and a solution to deal with applications that fell into this timescale was needed.

It was agreed to review the application in principle as there were no written comments on the planning portal at the time of the meeting. SR confirmed that he had reviewed the application and knew the site. He commented that the proposed extensions were in keeping with the chalets adjacent and in fact other chalets were larger. PH commented that he had also viewed the application and noted that there was little effect on neighbouring properties and that the extensions were still within the overall footprint of the decked areas. The car parking space to the east of the chalet was unaffected and no views were disturbed. It was agreed that the application could be considered for approval. PA commented that he would speak with the Clerk to see how these applications can be legally dealt with outside of the formal Planning Committee meetings.

12.0 Next Meeting

12.1 The next Planning Committee meeting will be on Tuesday the 5th October at 19:00. The venue will be Eype Church unless otherwise informed.