

Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee

Tuesday 07th December 2021, 19:00 – 19:45

Meeting in Person

Held at Eype Church

Minutes

Attendees:

Committee Members

Pelham Allen PA Chairman

Steve Ralph SR

Paul Hartmann PH

In Attendance:

Public: There were three members of the public present, Mr C Pell, Mr P Colclough and Mr. S Holmes. No press in attendance.

Summary of Action Points arising

No	Item	Action
1	6.1	PH to generate planning reports.
2	8.1	Clerk to request an extension of time to review Vearse Farm Reserved matters
3	9.1	Clerk to request an extension of time to review Saxlingham House West Road Bridport Dorset DT6 6AA.

1. Welcome and apologies:

1.1 The Chairman opened the meeting and thanked attendees for coming. Apologies were received from Jenifer Roddy, who had been required to isolate following contact with a family member who had tested positive for Covid. The Chairman confirmed that with three councillors present, the Committee was quorate.

2. Declarations of interest:

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3. Approval of the minutes of the November Meeting:

3.1 The minutes of the November 2021 Planning Committee Meeting were confirmed as accurate notes 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 Public were present but they did not raise any general planning matters.

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).

6.1 P/HOU/2021/04705 Location: Gatesmead, Seaview Lane, Eype – Application for the retention of a Garden Room.

6.1.1: The chairman asked for any comments from the Public.

Mr. C Pell: Mr. Pell confirmed that all the relevant information regarding the project was on the planning portal. He commented that he bought the property from his late grandfather's estate in order to provide a long term home and keep the property in the family. The original garden room had an asbestos roof with solid walls and had fallen into disrepair. He confirmed the garden room would be retained as that and the intent was to make it fit for purpose for use in the current and future times. He had no intention of using the garden room as an "Air BNB" or similar but rather as a games room or as a work area linked to the house. The garden room currently under construction is within the footprint of the existing although is of a different form, reflecting a more traditional approach. He understood there may have been some confusion over whether the planning approval for the works to the main dwelling of Gatesmead included the regeneration of the garden room. As such he felt it was appropriate to apply for a retrospective planning consent to confirm planning approval.

Mr. P Colclough: Mr Colclough commented that he had made a written objection which is lodged on the planning portal. He confirmed that in his opinion there were a number of issues to be considered. Although it appeared the building was on the same footprint as the previous the new terrace area was substantially bigger. He felt the timescales identified in the planning application were totally incorrect as the building works were commenced some months earlier in May 2021. He also stated that the connection of the foul drain to the mains sewer was not identified on the application. With regards to this there was very little notice given before works commenced especially the drainage works. In addition, the noise and vibration from the works were in his opinion excessive. This together with the covid restrictions operating, causing windows to be left open etc, had badly affected both his and his wife's health. He was concerned that the inclusion of drainage together with power and water connections could make the garden room a habitable structure that could be later enlarged, detrimentally affecting their immediate environment. He maintains the building is different to that which was planned and wanted confirmation of what it would be used for.

Mr. S Holmes: Mr Holmes confirmed he was an adjacent neighbour to Gatesmead. He commented that he had no objection to the building or the garden room. He understood the garden room as constructed was on the same footprint as the original and to a similar height. He added that there was a covenant in place governing a restrictive height of the garden room in relation to his property. His main concern was the speedy completion of all the building works.

6.1.2 The Chairman asked PH to outline the applications and the considerations.

Application and considerations: PH commented that the committee members present had visited the site together and viewed the current position from the public footpath with a clear view of the works. In addition, PH had reviewed both the original application WD/D/19/003169 of 2019 for the main works as well as the current retrospective application. It is clear the garden room is identified within the WD/D/19/003169 application with specific drawn and written references to its regeneration. In his opinion the garden room regeneration received consent with the original application WD/D/19/003169. Notwithstanding this and as identified both on the drawings and the site visit, the new construction was built on the existing footprint of the original building. PH commented that there might be a minor increase in size to accommodate the current requirements of wall and roof external fabric however the basic structural form is on the original building footprint. PH recognised that the original intent was for an “A” frame prefabricated building however the current built form replicated the original and was felt to be appropriate and acceptable.

PH did comment that there were other issues that did need to be raised regarding the project currently under construction. Firstly, the contractor’s method statement required by condition 10 of the original consent for the protection of the brick wall separating the public footpath right of way from the property could not be found. Secondly, and following on from this it is clear there has been continual access by vehicles on the public footpath. The supporting bank of the footpath to the east has been excavated to provide a vehicle route suggesting substantial destabilisation of the bank in the future and damaging tree roots which are exposed. There is no evidence of consent or licence for this work, any temporary closure consent or risk profiling. It is recognised that access is required to carry out the works and it is hoped that evidence of due process is available or can be provided. At the very least and going forward the public using the footpath must be protected and must be advised of any hazards. It is essential that on completion of the works the footpath is reinstated to its original form with no vehicle access.

Conclusion:

The Committee decision was unanimous. The Chairman summarised by saying that the Council had no basis for objecting to the Garden Room being built, and no reason to object to the way in which it had been constructed. The inconvenience caused to Mr Colclough was regrettable, but was not a planning issue. The Charman therefore proposed, with the agreement of the Committee, to approve the application and note the comments with reference to the contractor’s method statement and the reinstatement of the Public Footpath in its original form.

Conclusion: Approve

6.2 P/NMA/2021/0502 Location: Land at Vearse Farm, Bridport – Amendment to Outline Planning Permission reference WD/D/17/000986 to increase the footway on the western side of the western access to 3m.

6.2.1 PH noted that this application was identified by Dorset as for information. He felt it was acceptable however any comments could be made when the reserved matters were fully submitted, especially on the relationship of this access with the main West Road.

6.3 P/TRC/2021/04338 Location: Shutes House, Shutes Lane, Symondsburry, Bridport – Oak Tree, Fell, outgrown location.

6.3.1 PH noted that the planning authority had already made a Tree Decision Notice on this application. A provisional tree preservation order has been applied to the tree which prohibits the felling of the tree. The committee felt this was the correct decision and supported the same.

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 by the Chairman that the reserved matters application for the project had been lodged with Dorset Council. The information provided was considerable in size and content. PH confirmed that he had undertaken a preliminary review of the information and would attend the Vearse Farm zoom working group meeting, together with PA, on the following day Wednesday the 8th December. PH commented that here were some issues that he considered warranted further questioning but overall the application was as expected.

The deadline date for comments was considered quite short considering the size of the application and it was agreed an extension of time should be requested.

Action: Clerk to request an extension of time to review application.

9.0 Items for inclusion at the next meeting.

9.1 The Chairman raised the recently received reserved matters application of Saxlingham House West Road Bridport Dorset DT6 6AA. PH commented that he had already reviewed the application and it would be beneficial to have an extension of time so that it could benefit from a site visit and be discussed at the next planning committee meeting in January. This was agreed.

Action: Clerk to request an extension of time to review application.

10.0 AOB

10.1 There was no AOB.

12.0 Next Meeting

12.1 The next Planning Committee meeting will be at 7 pm on the 4th January 2022 . The venue is to be confirmed.