**SYMONDSBURY PARISH COUNCIL**

**P**hone: 07967 683897 Email: [clerk@symondsbury-pc.gov.uk](mailto:Symondsbury@dorset-aptc.gov.uk)

**Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Wednesday 3 May 19:00 – 19:40**

**Meeting in Person**

**Held at Symondsbury School**

**Minutes**

**Attendees:   
Committee Members  
Steve Ralph PA Chair  
Amanda Streatfeild AS  
Paul Hartmann PH**

**In Attendance:  
Public: There were no members of the publicor press in attendance.**

**Summary of Action Points arising**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Item | Action |
| 1 | 6 | PH to generate planning reports. |

1. **Welcome and apologies:**

1.1The Chairman opened the meeting and thanked attendees for coming. The apologies of Cllr Evans were accepted for his non attendance. The Planning Committee would only consider the application before them and not consider any speculation.

1. **Declarations of interest:**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

1. **Approval of the minutes of the April 2023 Meeting:**

3.1 The minutes of the April 2023 Planning Committee meeting were confirmed as an accurate note of the meeting and were approved.

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

4.1 No comments on the correspondence list.

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

5.1 No Matters were 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/LBC/2023/01161** Proposal: Repair of Outbuilding. Location: Oakhayes, Shutes Lane, Symondsbury, DT6 6HS.

**6.1.1** The Chair asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that he had reviewed the proposal and the outbuilding was part of the listed building group associated with the main house. The position of the outbuilding was away from the main house and its existing condition required considerable remediation including structural improvements. The remediation suggested was necessary and in keeping with the building form. The materials were appropriate including many reused. The alteration of moving the window opening to create an improved structural solution was found acceptable.There are currently no objections from local residents.

**6.1.2 Consideration:** The Committee debated the proposals and the consideration was that the proposals were acceptable and in line with the Local Plan and Neighbourhood planning policies.

**6.1.3 Conclusion:** The Committee agreed the proposal.

**Decision: No Objection**.

**6.2**  **Application No: P/OUT/2023/01341** Proposal: Outline Erection of 1 Dwelling and Create Access (Outline application). Location: Watton Farm, Watton Lane, DT6 5JZ.

**6.2.1**  The Chair asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the application is an outline application for a single dwelling on land adjacent to Watton Lane which is classed as agricultural and which is outside of the development boundary. Clause 5.7.1 of the local plan clearly states that residential development in the countryside outside defined development boundaries is not generally considered sustainable. Importantly under SUS1 and SUS 2 of the Local Plan there is sufficient housing within the forward plan and additional speculative housing of this type are is required. The site is some distance outside of the development boundary and located in an area of Symondsbury which is within the AONB and Heritage Coast. The proposal will detrimentally affect the noted requirement for green gaps between settlements and create coalescence of development. The site is part of an area with of strategic importance in preserving the green interface between Symondsbury and Bridport.

Notwithstanding the landscape and biodiversity plan submitted there are contradictions within it and it is clear there will be no positive biodiversity outcome. In consideration of its location there is no public transport to local amenities and importantly no safe walking or cycle routes. Watton Lane itself is extremely narrow and does not have any street lighting. It is fact that local schools deem that Watton Lane and Broad Lane is unsafe and dangerous for school children and provide a vehicle pick up for them.

The site itself is still deemed agricultural and slopes quite steeply from north to south. Over the depth of the proposed position of the dwelling the level difference is about 2.5 metres which is in excess of a storey height, severely restricting the development potential as described. The proposed siting of the dwelling is detached from any adjacent buildings and will be noticeable from close and distant public footpaths.

The design and access statement is weak, flawed and places incorrect. The site to the North did obtain consent through appeal however the later applications were refused. It also states that local facilities can be reached without the need for a car, however it fails to mention how difficult this would be.

**6.2.2 Consideration:** The Committee felt that the application was speculative and did nothing to enhance or protect the vital green gaps at the interface of Symondsbury and Bridport. In addition it was felt the site would **not** be suitable for residential development and confirmed it was not appropriate to create additional built form outside of the development boundary. The Following Local Plan policies are relevant INT1, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3,ENV8, ENV 16, SUS1, and SUS2. The following Neighbourhood policies are relevant: CC1, AM1, AM2, AM5 D1, D4, D8, D10, L1, L2, L4, and L5.

**6.2.3 Conclusion:** The Committee commented that the proposal was against the requirements of both the local and neighbourhood planning policies and would create substantial harm to the area. The Committee also commented that they felt uncomfortable with the location of the dweiiling on such a challenging topographical site. It was felt the only course of action was to object to the application.

**Decision: Objection**

**6.3 Application No. P/HOU/2023/01809** Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory and rear extension, erection of two extensions to east and west and associated remodelling. Location: Maywind, Meadway, West Bay, DT6 4HP.

**6.3.1** The Chair asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the application is for a complete renovation and extension of an existing chalet style single story dwelling, used originally as a holiday home. The location of the site is on the north eastern boundary of the West Cliff Estate and faces open fields and a caravan park to the east. It is at the head of a cul de sac. The site itself is steeply sloping and the original development used piers to form an undercroft and keep the floor area level. The proposals respect the typology of the original design together with the type of materials used.The extensions are felt within keeping with the plot ratio of built form and importantly are not higher than the existing roof line. The layout makes use of some of the undercroft area and importantly brings the dwelling up to contemporary standards. The proposals respect its position on the site and also the effect on the limited neighbouring properties.

**6.3.2 Consideration.** The Chair commented that he had visited the area that week and noted its position at the head of the cul de sac. It was felt that the application documentation was of a good standard and described the complex changes to the existing dwelling well together with its affect on the site. It considered the use of materials sympathetic to the original acceptable together with keeping the height of the proposals well within the ridge line of the existing house. The following Local plan policies are relevant, INT1, CC1, D1, ENV12, ENV15 and ENV16. The following Neighbourhood policies are relevant: D1, D5, D8 and D9.

**6.3.3 Conclusion:** The Committee felt the proposals were acceptable.

**Decision: Approve**

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

**7.1** No items noted.

**8. AOB**

**8.1 Vearse Farm:** PH confirmed that there was still no conclusion as to the safety audit on the new roundabout at Vearse Farm. The latest amendments to the reserved matters application were considered as minor and acceptable apart from the food alleviation ponds. It was noted that these had been adjusted at the request of the environment agency. Generally the ponds had altered in shape and capacity with further flood storage being included below grond. The only negative element was the increase in depth of one of the ponds which would lead to the potential for fencing off due to the design depth of water being increased byond recommended levels. It was felt this could be acceptable but would make public access in dry periods difficult due to the increase in slope angles to the pond in question.

There was no news as to the request to National Highways on the requirement for a safe pedestrian, equine and cycle crossing at Miles Cross. The Chair, who lived on Eype Down Road, requested that the Parish write again to National Highways and their agents reminding them of the need to restrict access to Eype Down Road during the construction works of Miles Cross. He reminded the Committee that when traffic builds up people attempt to use Eype down Road as an alternative route with the resultant gridlock. This is because Eype Down Road is a very restricted, very narrow single track route with limited passing places. PH commented that he would prepare a letter for the Parish to forward.

**8.2 West Cliff Farm:** It was noted that the Parish had investigated the storage units to the recent application in a meeting with the owner. Their use and position was found acceptable and a letter confirming the same had been prepared and forwarde to the Parish Council with copies to the Planning Officer.

**9. Next Meeting**

**9.1** The next scheduled Planning Committee meeting will be Thursday 8 June t 19:00. The venue will be Symondsbury School.