**SYMONDSBURY PARISH COUNCIL**

**P**hone: 07967 683897 Email: clerk@symondsbury-pc.gov.uk

**Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Thursday 13 July 18:30 – 19:05**

**Meeting in Person**

**Held at Symondsbury School**

**Minutes**

**Attendees:**

**Committee Members**

**Steve Ralph SR Chair**

**Amanda Streatfeild AS**

**Paul Hartmann PH**

**Steve Evans SE**

**In Attendance:**

**Public: There was one member of the public present and no press in attendance.**

**Summary of Action Points arising**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Item  | Action |
| 1 |  6 | PH to generate planning reports except for item 6.1. |

1. **Welcome and apologies:**

1.1The Chair opened the meeting and thanked attendees for coming. 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 June 2023 Planning Meeting:**

 3.1 The minutes of the June meeting were confirmed as accurate notes and were approved.

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

4.1 Selwyn Holmes confirmed he wished to speak on the matter of “Gatesmead”. The Chair confirmed that as this was an agenda item it would be beneficial if he spoke when the item was discussed.This was agreed.

**5. Planning Applications and to consider any other planning/enforcement issues:** (public verbal comments limited to 3 minutes per representation prior to Committee consideration).

**5.1** **Application No: P/FUL/2023/03091** Proposal: Surfacing of an existing unsurfaced car park, including the provision of surface water drainage. Location: Bridport Football Club Car Park, Skilling Hill Road, Bridport, DT6 5LA.

**5.1.1** The Chair asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the application was within Bridport itself however was of considerable interest to Symondsbury residents. The proposal concerns a popular car park close to St Mary’s School and Bridport Football Club. It proposes that the existing gravel car park is upgraded by providing drainage and a tarmac finish to falls, allowing water to drain away via a petrol interceptor. The final drain will flow into the river.

The current car park suffers from a very uneven surface and many potholes and a drained solution will be beneficial. It was hoped a more pourous surface could be used however given the amount of vehicular traffic the only real answer is a tarmac solution. The scheme will provide disabled spaces as well as normal car parking and areas for larger vehicles. It is not clear if electric car charging points will be provided.
**5.1.2 Consideration:** Given the poor state of the current car park the proposal to provide a drained surface that will assist parking is to be welcomed. It is suggested that the drop off facility for St Mary’s School will still be available.
**5.1.3 Conclusion:** The Committee felt that the proposal was acceptable.
**Decision: No Objection.**

**5.2** **Application No: P/NMA/2023/03386** Proposal: Non-material amendment to planning permission P/HOU/2023/01809 (Demolition of existing conservatory and rear extension, erection of extensions to east and west and associated remodelling) - amend Condition 3 on decision notice to correct error -Timber roof tiles included in error. Location: Maywind, Meadway, West Bay, DT6 4HP.

**5.2.1**  The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. This is a simple application to correct an error on the previous submitted plans. The decision by Dorset has already been given and consent granted. This is a tectbook way of adjusting the consent already granted by consultation.

**5.2.2 Consideration:** The committee recognised the mistake to the already consented scheme and the correct method of correcting the formal consent.

**5.2.3** **Conclusion:** The committee unanimously agreed with the decision. It was felt no response was required given consent was already in place.

**Decision: Approve.**

**5.3 Application No: P/HOU/2023/03654** Proposal: Erect Detached Garage/Carport. Location: Land West Of Watton Lane, Watton, Bridport.

**5.3.1** The Chair asked PH to outline the proposal**.** The proposal is for a new building to be erected which consists of a single enclosed garage and two car port parking areas to the rear of a newly erected house which already has a double garage. The building uses a timber frame and cladding with roof to match the eisting new house. The access uses the existing with hard standing past the already constructed garage and hard standing in front of the new building. Members of the planning committee were reminded that this site was one which they opted to object to the original scheme and the planning authority lost at appeal due to the housing numbers not being reached across the county.

**5.3.2 Consideration:** It was felt that the requirement for 5 car parking spaces for this size of development was excessive. The proposal provides for a substantial increase in hard standing area for the existing site and a substantial negative impact on the immediate environment suggesting over development. The additional vehicle use will have a detrimental affect of the amenity of neighbouring properties. In addition the landscape will be detrimentally affected by additional built fprm on the plot. It should not be forgotten that this area is important in maintaining a grren link into the more densely developed area of bridport.

**5.3.3 Conclusion:** The Committee felt that the additional building and hard standing was overdevelopment of the plot. It added substantial vehicle movements to the immediate environment and created loss of amenity to the surrounding dwellings.

**Decision: Object**

**5.4** Application No: **P/HOU/2021/04705** Concern: Replacement of Earth Bank. Location: Gates Mead, Eype.

**5.4.1** **Comment:** Mr Holmes commented that the current width of the public right of way and access to the rear of Gatesmead was probably not far from the original width which was originally used by horse and cart. There is a gateway part way down the boundary with Gatesmead that was used to access the rear garden. He further added that at one time it was difficult to walk down the access footpath due to it being overgrown. He felt that there needed to be a compromise from the width at the time of planning consent and the original width.
**5.4.2 Consideration:** The chairman commented that the bank and hedgerow on the left was currently left with roots exposed and feared the existing hedgerow would be detrimentally affected should nothing be done. In addition complaints has been received that during the heavy rainstorms large amounts of soil had been washed down the footpath affecting the dwellings further down the footpath.
PH commented that in planning terms the footpath needed to be returned to its previous use and dimensional parameters with the hedgerow protected. In addition any building hardcore used to reinforce the footpath need to be removed and an appropriate hardstanding suitable as a footpath reinstated. He agreed that the best way forward was to agree a compromise on the width of the accessway with the proviso that the hedgerow was protected and the bank stabilised.
**5.4.3 Conclusion:** It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the planning officer and Enforcement team to highlight the issue and ensure that appropriate works were undertaken to stabilise the bank, ensure the hedgerow was protected and the footpath was of an appropriate width.

**5.5** **The Barn:** Concern: Erection of large timber accommodation, representations by residents: Location: Eype Village.

**5.5.1 Comment:** The Chairman commented that the council had received numerous complaints from residents within Eype Village concerning the timber building being constructed in the garden of the Barn. The building is of a substantial size and can clearly be seen as well as being close to a listed building. In addition residents had commented on the swimming pool and the noise created by AirB&B visitors affecting the amenity of the immediate environs.
**5.5.2 Consideration:** PH commeted that he felt the timber building should have been submitted for planning consent due to its size, it close proximity to the listed buildings and being within the conservation area of Eype Village. In addition there was the possibility of loss of amenity for neighbouring properties. As such the locl residents should have had the opportunity of commenting on the proposals under the planning policy guidelines.
**5.5.3 Conclusion:** It was agreed that the clerk would write to the planning officer and enforcement team to highlight the issues and recommend action be taken.

**5.6 Pump Cottages:**

**5.6.1: Comment:** The Parish Council had received further complaints form the local residents regarding the AirB&B use of the facility in the garden of 3 Pump Cottages. The Committee was reminded that the applicants had withdrawn the application for retrospective consent however they have continued the use as a holiday let detrimentally affecting the day to day life of the surrounding local residents.

**5.6.2 Consideration:** It was agreed that the current use of the facility in the garden was not appropriate as was the impass on the planning position. It was agreed that a definitive action was required.
**5.6.3 Conclusion:** It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the planning officer and Enforcement Team to highlight the issues and recommend action be taken.

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

**6.1** Consideration of how best to deal with the non material and material changes at Vearse Farm when the project commences construction.

**7. AOB**

**7.1** No Comments

**8. Next Meeting**

**8.1** Thursday 10 Augusy, 6.30pm, Symondsbury School