

**SYMONDSBURY PARISH COUNCIL**

Phone: 07967 683897 Email: [clerk@symondsbury-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@symondsbury-pc.gov.uk)

**Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Tuesday 01<sup>st</sup> March 2022, 1900 – 20:25**

**Meeting in Person**

**Held at Eype Schoolroom**

**Minutes**

**Attendees:**

**Committee Members**

**Pelham Allen PA Chairman**

**Steve Ralph SR**

**Jenifer Roddy JR**

**Paul Hartmann PH**

**In Attendance:**

**Public:** There were two members of the public present, Mrs A Reeves and Mr. M. Ashford.  
No press in attendance.

**Summary of Action Points arising**

No	Item	Action
1	6	PH to generate planning reports.
2	6.3.1.3 & 9	PA to arrange further planning meeting to review application.
3	8	PH to contact Will Austin of Bridport re Miles Cross and reserved matters.

**1. Welcome and apologies:**

1.1 The Chairman opened the meeting and thanked attendees for coming. There were no apologies received.

**2. Declarations of interest:**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**3. Approval of the minutes of the December Meeting:**

3.1 The minutes of the January 2022 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 The Public present did not raise any general planning matters.

**6. 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 Application No: P/FUL/2022/00457** Location: Cliff Cottage, West Cliff, West Bay, DT6 4HS Proposal: Erect 1 No. sustainable new build single storey house.

**6.1.1** The Chairman asked for any comments from the Public.

The Chairman then asked PH to outline the application and the considerations.

Application and considerations: PH commented that he and the Chairman had jointly visited the application site on Monday the 28<sup>th</sup> February. PH made the committee aware that one letter of comment had been submitted by the neighbouring property which overlooked the proposed dwelling from the South-West. The letter identified concerns relating to the height of the buildings, the mass and height of the chimney and the loss of view to the farmland to the North-East. This also affects the view from the public footpath. However, the letter also explained that the owners of the neighbouring property contacted the Applicant & his architect to better understand how they could avoid a formal objection/comment. The Architect offered to try & help amend the design to address the issues and it is understood there are discussions with the applicants to try and mitigate some of the concerns.

PH commented that the two bedroomed dwelling design is a series of linked single storey pavilions, The detail of the design suggests a very sustainable approach. From the plans and site visit it can be seen the proposed buildings will be within the defined development boundary of West Cliff. PA commented that notwithstanding the height

of the proposed pitched roof pavilions, the level differences between the higher single storey neighbouring property and the pavilions suggests that the proposals would be acceptable within the existing environs and features. However, consideration should be given to sinking the building further into the site to reduce the impact of the pitched roofs of the pavilions. The public footpath adjacent to the site boundary has an established hedgerow on its North-Eastern side that will screen the development to some extent. The boundary between the public footpath and the neighbouring property on the North-Western side is formed of a timber boarded fence with a height of approximately 1800mm. This will screen the majority of the development from the neighbouring property. PH commented that the use of natural materials such as sedum foremost of the roof surface will allow the buildings to sit comfortably into the garden landscape noting that some of the roof material is suggested as photovoltaic tiles (which to date are not as fully tested as other photovoltaic panels). The lightwells to the lantern areas of the pitched roofs do give some concern over light pollution in the AONB which may need further resolution. The approach to landscaping and planting will require a sensitive approach to maintain a rural feel.

**Conclusion:** The committee felt that the approach to the design and positioning of the proposed dwelling was sustainable and acceptable. However, it was noted that there were still areas that could be improved to mitigate the concerns of the adjacent neighbour to the South-West. The committee was unanimous in its decision of no objection.

**Decision: No Objection.**

**6.2 Application No: P/TRC/2022/00974** Location: Symondsby Manor, Mill Lane, Symondsby, DT6 6HD Proposal: T1 Willow – pollard to maximum height of 5 metres.

**6.2.1** The Chairman asked for any comments from the Public.

The Chairman asked PH to outline the application and the considerations.

PH commented that the application was to pollard the tree leaving the monolith. This in plain English is to remove all the growth areas of the tree down to the main trunk and in some cases major boughs. JR commented that she was aware of the tree together with its issues. She added that the willow tree needed attention by a tree surgeon and was in fact leaning over buildings.

**Conclusion:** The Committee unanimously agreed that the pollarding was justified and acceptable.

**Decision: Approve.**

**6.3 Application No: P/FUL/2022/01179** Location: Lower Eype Farmhouse, Barton Lane, Eype, DT6 6AW Proposal: Erect Agricultural Barn.

**6.3.1** The Chairman asked for any comments from the public.

**6.3.1.1 Mrs Anna Reeve addressed the committee.**

Mrs Reeve commented that she had not planned to present the application to the committee and was attending to clarify any points together with answering any questions. She stated that the barn had been reduced in size and altered in form to suit the position. The hard standing would be of sustainable material. In addition, she did comment that a pre-submission consultation had taken place with the planning department which was available on the planning portal.

**6.3.1.2 Mr M Ashford addressed the Committee.**

Mr. Ashford commented that this was now the third planning application for the same barn on the site. (The Chairman observed that it was the 2<sup>nd</sup> application for planning consent with the last application submitted to appeal), and all had been refused). He stated that nobody in the village wanted the barn but he was still expecting the Parish Council to support the application, as they had done in the past, even though they had no professional experience to review the proposals and were not representing the residents of Eype. (PH observed that the Parish Council did have the necessary professional expertise on the Council. The Chairman observed that in all cases the opinions of all residents were taken into consideration).

With regards to the proposal, Mr Ashford argued that siting of the barn so close to the residential village, close to the garden of the neighbouring property and conservation area and within the AONB was unacceptable. The barn was too big for the acreage of land being about 8 acres and had not changed in size since the original application. (The Chairman observed that the barn had been reduced in size and altered in shape since the first application) Based on a standard "New Holland" tractor the barn would be large enough to house in excess of 20 tractors. The enterprise of producing cider and hay for sale would not be sustainable. A much smaller barn would be more appropriate.

Mr Ashford felt the position of the barn as shown being 2 metres from the boundary at one position was unacceptable and was not appropriate in the residential village. The barn would be too imposing, destroying the views from his garden, including from the external swimming pool, and creating noise and dust.

Mr. Ashford produced a not to scale sketch photomontage of the view from his garden which he suggested represented the position of the barn and its impact. (Mrs Reeve produced a photograph of the position of the area the barn would have been located from her landholding to counter the suggestion that the barn would be too imposing). Mr. Ashford commented that a reduced barn size might be acceptable.

Mr Ashford also commented that the content of the pre-application advice from the planning authority did not support the position of the barn or its design. The Chairman observed that he had not understood that inference from the pre-application advice. The pre-application advice document was then briefly reviewed by everybody present. PH explained that pre-application advice would only normally relate to factual

planning comments and not suggested planning outcomes which would be subject to a final submitted proposal.

**6.3.1.3** The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal.

PH advised the meeting that the application for the barn was the third application with the other earlier applications being refused, one at appeal. He noted that the barn size had been reduced from the previous applications, by creating an “L” shape form as suggested in the pre-application advice. The reduction in size and bulk together with the alteration of the massing, with differential roof heights, substantially assists in the visual acceptance of the barn in the landscape. The pre-application advice also confirmed that the positioning of the proposed functional barn closer to the listed farmhouse (a point previously discussed with Parish representative PH on a site visit for the earlier scheme) would not be an unexpected feature, given the historic use of the farmhouse. In addition, the advice also commented that the proposed siting of the barn would have a limited effect on the setting of the conservation area and the longer views of the church. PH noted that the replacement of damaged and rotten timber poles carrying electrical supply cables and the raising of the height of the cables to improve clearance of trees had created the opportunity of positioning the building closer to the listed farmhouse which was not available previously.

However, PH did note that Mr. Ashford’s point regarding the proposed barn being close to the boundary was relevant. He added that the plan submitted showed the eastern corner of the barn being only 2-3 metres from the boundary. This in his opinion could lead to a loss of amenity for Mr. Ashford’s neighbouring property. At this point Mrs. Reeve apologised and commented that she had made a simple mistake on the drawing and in fact the barn was substantially further away from the boundary, at least 10 metres. She confirmed she would amend the drawings and submit them again.

**Conclusion:** The Chairman summarised the discussion and said that on the basis of the information currently available, in anticipation of submission of amended plan information by the applicant showing the siting of the barn further away from the boundary, and based solely on planning considerations, the Committee would have no objection to the proposals. However, the Chairman observed that the review of this planning submission was early in the process of public consultation. As such he suggested that a final decision should be deferred to a further meeting to fully consider consultation comments from all parties before the deadline for submission of the Parish Planning Report to Dorset Council. The Committee unanimously agreed. The details of this meeting would be confirmed at the next full Council meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

**Decision: Deferred to a further meeting.**

- 7. Projects: All reports to be submitted to the Clerk in writing at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.**

7.1 There were no Projects reported.

**8. Vearse Farm:**

8.1 With regards to Verse Farm PH commented that he had not received any further information on the progress of the detailed design of reserved matters or their approval. The matter of the detailed design of the Miles Cross roundabout was important due to the footpath/bridleway proposed link to Chideock and a safe crossing position at the roundabout. PH commented that he would again contact Will Austin to enquire about any new information.

**9. Items for inclusion at the next meeting.**

9.1 Further review of **Ref: P/FUL/2022/01179** Lower Eype Farmhouse requires an additional planning committee meeting before the next scheduled meeting.

**10. AOB**

10.1 Nothing to report.

**11. Next Meeting**

11.1 There will be an additional meeting to further consider the barn at Lower Eype Farmhouse, provisionally on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> March at 7pm in the Eype Schoolroom. Arrangements will be confirmed at the full Council meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March.

11.2 The next scheduled Planning Committee meeting will be at 7 pm on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The venue will be Eype Church.