

**SYMONDSBURY PARISH COUNCIL**

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

**Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022, 1800 – 19:00**

**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 no members of the public present. No press in attendance.

**Summary of Action Points arising**

No	Item	Action
1	6	PH to generate planning reports.

**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 Councillor Hartmann declared an interest in the application for Little Paddock as he was a direct neighbour.

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

3.1 The minutes of the 4th April 2022 Planning Committee meeting were confirmed as accurate notes of the meeting and were approved.

**4. Correspondence List (previously circulated)**

4.1 No correspondence had been received.

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

5.1 There were no matters raised.

**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/HOU/2022/02093** Location: Tredewi, Second Cliff Walk, West Bay, Dorset, DT6 4HJ.

**6.1.1** The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the proposal maintains the same footprint of the existing conservatory and provides for the enlargement of the existing kitchen area. The proposals will provide for a raised new roof which in turn will improve in thermal environment of this area of the property, especially in this exposed position. The new roof pitch fits within the existing parameters of windows on the south elevation and on the East elevation is stopped by a new parapet wall. The existing door access on the East elevation to the existing conservatory will be removed and replaced with a new window.

**6.1.2 Consideration:** The form of the extension, the materials suggested and building element typology were considered appropriate for the dwelling. The proposals were in keeping with the immediate environs and were not considered detrimental to the AONB or Heritage Coast.

**6.1.3 Conclusion:** The committee felt the application shows a sympathetic approach to remodelling the conservatory into an enlarged kitchen area. The alterations will provide a small improvement to the insulation value of this part of the dwelling. The proposals are in line with the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and emerging Local Plan. The form of the building is not detrimentally affected by the remodelling and maintains a balance.

## **Decision: Approve**

**6.2 Application No: P/HOU/2021/00546** Location: West House, West Road, Bridport, Dorset, DT6 6AE Proposal: Planning Appeal, Replace and erect fencing.

**6.2.1** The Chairman advised that the original planning report from Symondsburry was not uploaded onto the Planning Portal and that this had now been corrected. The decision from the Symondsburry Planning Committee was to approve the application. As this was an appeal procedure the Planning Committee could not comment further unless approached by the Inspector.

**6.2.2 Conclusion:** The Planning Committee confirmed it was unanimous in approving the original application.

## **Decision: N/A**

**6.3 Application No: P/HOU/2022/01350** Location: Journeys End, Barton Lane, Eype, Bridport, DT6 6AW. Proposal: Erection of Garden Studio and shed and extend parking area.

**6.3.1** The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the property lies within the Dorset AONB, close to the Heritage Coast and within the Eype Conservation Area. The planning history confirms that on the 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2001 consent was granted for the erection of a single storey extension to the house together with the erection of a studio/workshop building (Planning Ref: 1/W/01/001398). The single storey extension was completed but the studio/workshop was not commenced. As such there is an extant planning consent for the studio/workshop. **It is important to note that the schedule of conditions of the original consent state that the studio/workshop building can only be occupied for its design purpose and as an integral part of the single dwelling unit of Journeys End.**

The application requests consent for a similar studio in a slightly different position from that already granted, including the removal of a substantial Cypress tree, together with an extension to the parking area and as a requirement of that a new timber shed in a new position.

### **6.3.2 Consideration:**

**Studio:** The proposed studio is of a similar plan size and height to ridge of the original proposed and consented studio/workshop. However, the site position has been amended with its south-east corner angled away from the southern boundary rather than the whole building being parallel to it. The proposed building has also been lowered into the site slightly and moved closer to the northern boundary, necessitating a new retaining wall element into the existing bank together with the

removal of the Cypress tree. This repositioning may require further consideration of the in-plane roof windows to the north roof slope as there is a suggestion of loss of amenity and privacy to the garden of Dairy Cottage. The level of the garden of Dairy Cottage is substantially higher than the general ground floor level of the proposed studio which on one hand is beneficial in terms of perceived massing however also creates a more direct visual site line into the neighbouring garden. This risk would be reduced if the building was moved further towards the western boundary.

The proposed materials are similar to the extant consented scheme with timber windows/doors, ground floor walls in rendered finish with upper walls clad in horizontal timber boarding and a roof finish of slate. These will reflect the rural nature of the building as well as providing visual texture and improve the perceived massing.

**Extended Parking Area:** The proposal to extend the current parking in line with the existing, adjacent to the southern end of the existing building, to create additional space is really the only place that is appropriate.

**New Timber Shed:** The extension of the parking area necessitates the replacement of the existing shed. The position of the new shed moved through 90 degrees but in the same area as the existing is appropriate.

**6.3.3 Conclusion:** It is clear the new proposals are very similar to the extant consent. The proposals are sympathetic to the rural village location together with the detailing of the building. The only key issues are as below:

- 1) Consideration that the Studio building is moved closer to the western boundary to reduce the risk of overlooking and loss of amenity and privacy.
- 2) That the original condition restricting the use of the building (condition 5 of the extant consent ref: 1/W/01/001398) and the site for use as only one single dwelling unit, forms part of any new consent.

**Decision: Subject to summary items 1) and 2) above the above the proposals are found acceptable and approved.**

**6.4 Application No: P/VOC/2022/02411 Proposal: Change of use of Land to form extension to the existing camping site with 4 No. additional touring caravan/motorhome pitches (removal of condition 3 of planning approval WD/D/20/002785 – 28 days restriction).**

**Location: Land at Miles Cross, West Road, Bridport.**

**6.4.1** The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that this application requests the variation of the original consent by the removal of a condition and replacement with a less restrictive condition already relevant to the existing pitches.

**6.4.2 Consideration:**

**General:** The proposal maintains the same additional pitches previously granted. The existing wording of condition 3 of the consent appears to restrict the use of the pitches to only 28 days per year. The proposed wording of the condition restricts the use of the pitches by one tent/campervan/touring caravan to one continuous 28 day period after which they should be removed from site with no units staying on a pitch for more than 28 days. The new wording would bring the parameters for the use of all pitches into line.

**6.4.3 Conclusion:** In summary the application will bring the control of the use of the pitches into the same format without being detrimental to the land use and neighbouring environment.

### **Decision: Approve**

**6.5 : P/HOU/2022/02375 Proposal:** Erect single storey rear and single and double storey front extension.— Location: Little Paddock, Broad Lane, Bridport, DT6 5JY.

6.5.1 The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the property lies within the Dorset AONB and close to the Heritage Coast Area. The planning history confirms that on the 11/06/2021 outline consent was granted for the erection of a single storey dwelling house in the original garden of Little Paddock to the east of the existing house (Planning Ref: WD/D/18/002739).

The application requests consent for a single storey extension to the southern elevation of the existing property, with a very large single storey garage extension to the northwest, with a two- storey office extension in the north-west corner and all linked to the existing property. The extension to the northwest requires the removal of 2 No large fruit trees and an existing hedge.

At this Point PH withdrew from the debate.

### **6.5.2 Consideration:**

**General:** The planning application forms and the drawn information do not fully tie up. There are three key points.

The application forms state that the site can be viewed from the road or public land, this is not the case. The forms state that no trees or hedgerows will be removed, again this is not the case (the trees are large fruit trees and there is an internal hedgerow in the way). The design and access statement does not fully promote the size of the development and particularly the two storey element together with the final storage and work use.

There does not appear to be a site layout plan/survey plan as existing with which to compare the proposals. This would clearly show the existing topography, site features and landscape, together with the size of the development on the plot.

The proposals do not show the proposed soft landscape and future hard landscape features which should be an integral part of the submission.

In consideration of biodiversity there is no mention of how the development deals with biodiversity and the national requirement for an overall increase.

The overall development can be considered as gross overdevelopment of the site when considering the existing building floor area compared to the proposed. Within the local plan and neighbourhood plan the normal allowable increase is up to 40% of the existing area. The proposals appear to be over 100%. The design statement suggests that the garage can be consented under permitted development. This is not the case in terms of its size, the double storey element being higher than the existing building and the fact the site is within the AONB. It is also relevant that generally permitted development needs to conform to strict requirements of the NPPF latest amendment with reference to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

**Single storey extension to the south elevation:** The single storey extension to the southern elevation appears to be appropriate and in balance with the existing building, providing good open plan living space.

**Large garage extension and second storey office extension:** The garage area is very large and appears to be of a commercial scale (this may be considered as a different use class). It is understood from the applicant that the garage will be used to house a collection of vintage cars. However, this is a residential area and site, with the large garage area dominating the site. The massing of the proposed buildings appears to be out of balance with the new two storey element out on the north-western extremity. In addition, the proposed building is sited close to the existing north and west boundaries and considering the two-storey element this has two roof windows and a large feature window in the southern elevation. This gives rise to potential loss of privacy and amenity for neighbours.

**Materials:** Generally, the materials suggested would be appropriate for the residential element. However, with regards to the change in timber boarding direction from vertical to horizontal, this appears arbitrary and does nothing to hide the mass of the building.

**6.5.3 Conclusion:** In conclusion the application appears to show two distinct elements. The pure residential extension which is appropriate, and the large garage single and two storey extension which is questionable. Overall, it is suggested that the proposals are gross overdevelopment and in conflict with the Local Plan and Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan. The size of the development is not in accordance with the requirements of the AONB and would provide sustainable harm. The position of the two-storey office above the garage will lead to loss of privacy and amenity to neighbours on the northern and western boundaries. The massing of the garage element of the development is out of balance.

## **Decision: Object**

**6.6 : P/FUL/2022/02492 and P/LBC/2022/02495 Proposal:** Extend and convert old cow shed to form staff accommodation annex.– Location The Old Rectory, Shutes Lane, Symondsburry, Bridport, DT6 6HF.

6.6.1 The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposals. PH commented that the property lies within the Dorset AONB and the Symondsburry Conservation Area with the original main house being Grade II listed covering the curtilage of the site.

The application requests the demolition of the existing large tree house to reveal the existing stone built cow shed and the conversion of the cowshed with a large extension to form a new dwelling house.

It was noted that the Chairman and Councillor Roddy undertook a site visit.

### **6.6.2 Consideration:**

**General:** The proposal demolishes and removes the large timber construction used as a tree house. Following demolition, the remainder of the old cow shed is remodelled into domestic dwelling accommodation and with the single storey contemporary extension provides a 2 bedroom dwelling house. The new property will be used by the owners of the existing listed dwelling house, which according to the design statement has a substantial part used as a holiday let. The existing 5 rooms of the listed property used by the owners will then be given over to the holiday let business. (see informative note below).

The form of the building and sensitive conversion of the old cow shed is simple and appropriate to its setting. The building within the curtilage of the Listed Building is subservient and forms a sensitive development within the Conservation Area. The proposals will sit down in the site and the simple suggested landscaping approach, including the reprovion of hedgerows, lends itself to the rural environment.

The proposals do conform to the BANP in many areas including EE1-3, H7, L2, L5, D1, D5, D7-9. As well as the local plan.

**Summary:** In summary the application provides appropriate reuse of an existing structure together with the provision of domestic living accommodation.

## **Decision: Approve**

**Informative note:** It is noted that the domestic full time living accommodation within the existing Listed Building will be converted to allow the whole building to be used as a holiday let. This may well change the use class of the Listed Building. The owners are advised to check with the Planning Authority with regards to this issue.

**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 Vearse Farm and especially regarding Miles Cross Roundabout, PH confirmed that he had arranged a further meeting with Will Austin to discuss Vearse Farm. PH commented that he would again contact National Highways to see if there is any progress on Miles Cross.

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

9.1 No items noted.

**10. AOB**

10.1 Steve Ralph and the Committee thanked the Chairman, Pelham Allen, for his considerable contribution to the Planning Committee and wished him well for his future move to Alresford in Hampshire.

**11. Next Meeting**

11.1 The next scheduled Planning Committee meeting will be at 7 pm on 31st May 2022. The venue will be Eype Church.