**SYMONDSBURY PARISH COUNCIL** Email: [clerk@symondsbury-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@symondsbury-pc.gov.uk)

Website: symondsbury-pc.gov.uk

**Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Thursday 11 April 2024, 1830 – 19:00**

**Meeting in Person**

**Held at Symondsbury School**

**Minutes**

**Attendees:   
Committee Members**

Steve Ralph SR Chair

Steve Evans SE

Paul Hartmann PH

Amanda Streatfeild AS

**Public:** There were no members of the public or press in attendance.

**Summary of Action Points arising**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Item | Action |
| 1 | 5.1 | PH to generate planning reports. |

1. **Welcome and apologies:**

1.1 The Chair opened the meeting and thanked attendees for coming. The Chair confirmed that with the four Councillors present, the Committee was quorate.

1. **Declarations of interest:**

2.1 There was a declaration of interest from Cllr Hartmann regarding item 3.4 of the agenda, Tuckers Cottage and he confirmed he would take no part in the consideration.

1. **Approval of the minutes of the November Meeting:**

3.1 The minutes of the March 2024 Planning Meeting notes (incorporated in the Main Parish Council Meeting) were confirmed as accurate notes of the meeting and were approved.

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

4.1 There was no public representation present and no general planning matters were raised.

**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 P/HOU/2024/01390 Proposal: Replace LPG heating with air source heat pump. Location: 3 Foundry Knapp, West Road, Bridport, DT6 5JU.

5.1.1: The application is for the removal of an LPG heating system and replace it with an air source heat pump system.

The reason for the replacement is that the applicant wanted to upgrade the heating system using an acceptable sustainable form. In addition, there are suitable grants for conversion to air source heat pumps through Dorset Council.

The application is required due to the close proximity of the air source heat pump unit to a neighbouring property. The air source heat pumps can produce unacceptable noise and vibration, dependent on installation quality and as such neighbouring properties can suffer loss of amenity. This issue has been suggested by the environmental team at Dorset.

It must be remembered that the risk of this can be reduced by the provision of calculations by specialist consultants or the installers which are pertinent to the exact location of the unit proposed and acceptable to the planning authority.

Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and Dorset Local Plan clauses are relevant:

**Consideration:** The Committee were advised that the Environmental Department of Dorset Council had received acoustic calculations from the applicant which showed the noise level at 42 decibels. This was found to be acceptable by them and they suggested acceptance for the proposal from the noise perspective. The replacement of the LPG system with and Air Source Heat Pump was found to be in accordance with sustainability requirements and the conclusion was to support the application.

**Conclusion:** The Committee voted to support the application.

**Decision:** Support

5.2 P/HOU/2024/00858 and P/LBC/2024/00859 Proposal: Demolish garage and erect single storey extension. Demolish outbuilding and erect 'potting shed' annex. Location: Lushays, Brighthay Lane, North Chideock, DT6 6JZ

5.2.1The application is for the demolition of a detached garage and the erection of a new garden room attached to the existing listed dwelling East Elevation with a lean to covered glazed walkway on the North Elevation. In addition, the application is for the demolition of an existing outbuilding and the erection of a detached annex with potting shed on the site of the demolished building.

This development has been in various forms over recent time. The original house is grade 2 listed which incorporates the outbuilding. The current submission has been commented on in detail by the Dorset Conservation department.

The removal of the garage and the proposal of the Garden Room on the East Elevation will provide additional space and is suggested as acceptable. There is no direct access from the main house which for an ordinary grade 2 listed building where the access would eventually be internal is a missed opportunity. However, the reasons given by the Conservation Department are understood. The covered walkway in its current form is also suggested as acceptable. There has not been any mention of the flue to the wood burning appliance and its relationship to the existing house, however as it is purely a stainless steel pipe this will be inconspicuous.

With regards to the separate annex on the site of the existing outbuilding the proposal provides additional space in a building that maintains separation from the main listed house and which can contribute to the grouping by the use of similar sensitive materials. The Conservation Department comments, around original concerns about the form and mass of the building are understood and they are now in support of the design subject to conditions.

The closest neighbour has been visited and whilst there is no objection by them for the proposal there is one issue that has been raised which is the foul water drainage into an existing septic drain system. The application forms although with different references are identical. Reference should be made to the drainage provision especially as there is a substantial addition of utility, bathroom and WC most likely connected to the existing system. It would be beneficial for this to be investigated further to ensure compliance and no effect on neighbouring properties below the application site.

Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and Dorset Local Plan clauses are relevant:

**Consideration:** The Committee acknowledged the length of time to arrive at the current proposal. They noted the listing of the building but felt the solution could have been improved if an internal route to the garden room attached to the house had been allowed. They acknowledged the poor condition of the outbuilding together with its mix of materials. Overall, they felt the proposal provided an acceptable solution and noted the Local Authority conservation architects support for the current scheme. However, they felt that the existing septic tank drainage system need to be investigated to ensure it was capable of accepting the additional drainage from the utility and bathroom of the new annex. As the tank was within the property boundary but on a slope leading to a neighbour’s property it would be prudent to ensure no release of egress from the tank could pollute the ground beyond the boundary.

**Conclusion:** The Committee felt that the solution was acceptable but wished the comment about the septic tank to be noted in the condition in the planning response.

**Decision:** No Objection.

5.3 P/HOU/2024/01526 Proposal: Erection of garden room to include shower, WC and sauna and formation of pool. Location: Venlan, Denhay Lane, Broadoak, DT6 5NN

5.3.1 The application is for the erection of a garden/pool room, the erection of a shed, the relocation of an existing shed, the construction of a swimming pool and the construction of a new paved area linking to the existing house. The position of the swimming pool, garden room/pool room and new shed are within the existing garden area of the house and the garden slopes slightly from north to south. The main garden/pool room is of a simple design and uses natural materials which fit the location. The overall proposals appear not to create any loss of amenity issues. However, for the sake of completeness, there are some issues that require comment.

The swimming pool appears quite shallow at 1200mm and there is no indication where the pump and filtration room will be located. This can be below ground or in a building above ground dependent on whether the pool is a package installation or independently constructed on site. There is also the matter of whether the pool will be heated and whether drainage is required for backwashing etc.

There should be a positive requirement for biodiversity especially due to the loss of trees and hedgerow on the site. This attracts minimal consideration in the design statement.

The positioning of the shed behind the new garden/pool room appears to follow the line of the boundary causing an awkward and close relationship with the pool room.

Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and Dorset Local Plan clauses are relevant:

**Consideration:** The committee felt that the application overall was very thin and lacked detail to be expected of a full application. It was concerned that there was no information on where the pool room or housing for the filtration plant, the pump mechanism and water treatment would be located. In addition, there was no detail on where the drainage for the shower, sauna, and WC in the Garden Room together with the backwash from the pool would be located or treated.

However, it felt there were no amenity issues and felt that the detail could be included as conditions on any approval should this be given.

**Conclusion:** The Committee suggested no objection and suggested relevant conditions to ensure the full detail of the proposal especially the drainage and pool room/housing was covered.

**Decision:** No Objection.

5.4 P/FUL/2024/01341 Proposal: Retain dwelling (amended scheme) Location: Tuckers Cottage, Watton Lane, Watton, Bridport, DT6 5JZ.

5.4.1 The application is for an amended scheme for the retention of a nearly completed dwelling not constructed in accordance with the planning consent following a recent refusal of permission for the retention of the property.

The amended scheme results from the discussions between the applicant, their agent and Dorset Council Planning Department to resolve the current constructed dwelling form as built and provide a close interpretation of the consented outline and reserved matters consent.

It was necessary to again highlight fundamental issues that have not been addressed by those discussions. It was also necessary to highlight those matters in fairness to all applicants of planning submissions within the area who abide by the planning protocols and the basis of the planning requirements under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Having reviewed the amended scheme it appears the key issues, which were the subject of the previous refusal, have not been successfully addressed in the current amended scheme.

In brief the current nearly completed scheme was still fundamentally different in site boundary position together with building position on the site, land take, scale, mass, roof pitch, elevational treatment, vehicle parking and vehicle access as outlined in the previous planning comment by the Parish Council. The councillors were reminded of the comments made previously which are as below.

1) The site area has been substantially increased to the original consent and has been built over a bridleway.

2) The scale and mass of the building has substantially increased, especially the rear element.

3) The roof pitch has changed from approximately 35 degrees to approximately 45 degrees.

4) The height of the building has increased.

5) The detail of the rear element has changed from a hipped end to a gable end.

6) All elevations have been considerably changed with many new openings not shown on the applicant’s drawings.

7) The design and access statements are flawed.

8) The nearly completed building does not comply with the Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan or the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework requirements.

It is important to note that from the original outline consent the specific condition (condition 6) relating to the requirement for the floor levels to be related to an ordnance survey datum or an agreed permanent datum, agreed in writing with Dorset Council, does not appear to be covered in the reserved matters consent. Confirmation of the agreement in writing is key to this constructed development.

It is clear by inspection of the information and the physical built form, the conditions of the consented reserved matters application, the conditions set at outline consent, have not been adhered to and the current amended scheme does not address the strong reasons for refusal of the previous application to retain ref: P/FUL/2023/02732 which were noted in the planning decision as below.

“By reason of its mass, scale and bulk (over and above the dwelling as approved), the dwelling 'as built' has a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and is an unduly striking, dominant, and incongruous form of development at odds with the character and appearance of this rural landscape (notwithstanding the approved dwelling) which comprises an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB,).”

It is suggested that to reflect fairness to residents, the NPPF and the local planning process, further substantial rectification to the existing project will be required.

Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and Dorset Local Plan clauses are relevant:

**Consideration:** The Committee discussed again the proposal to retain, acknowledging their objection to the last application to retain the building which they objected to. They commented that the amended scheme did not address the fundamental reasons for refusal stated by Dorset Council in the refusal to retain the building of the last application. They noted that the amendments following the consultation with the Planning Authority were extremely minor and in no way addressed the fundamental planning breaches. In addition, the Committee felt that the approach of the applicant in ignoring the planning requirements of the consented scheme set a dangerous precedent to other applicants in the Parish who had already commented detrimentally on the approach taken. They felt that the building, as constructed, had a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, was too dominant, and was an incongruous form of development at odds with the character and appearance of the rural landscape.

**Conclusion:** The Committee felt strongly that the proposal as constructed together with the approach of the applicant to planning regulations was unacceptable.

**Decision:** Object

5.5 P/HOU/2023/04785 Description: Retain and alter ancillary building Location: 3 Pump Cottages West Road Bridport DT6 6AE – 18 April meeting notification.

5.5.1 The application is for the retention and alteration of a garden room. The letter from the Planning Authority is a note informing that the application will be heard at the full Planning Committee on 18 April.

**Consideration:** The Committee commented that there was no change to their previous comment and they did not need to attend the meeting however the neighbours should be informed of the Committee meeting. Cllr Hartmann would email them with the details.

**Conclusion:** The Committee voted to inform the residents.

**Decision: N/A**

5.6 P/PABA/2024/01763 Proposal: Erection of polytunnel Location: New House Farm, Paddocks Cross To Boarden Bridge, Broadoak, DT6 5NR – Dorset Council to determine whether or not Prior Approval is required.

5.6.1The pre-application is for the erection of a polytunnel for agricultural reasons. This is a pre application consideration. In considering the details there is no need for a panning application as the requirements fall into allowed development.

**Consideration:** The Committee were advised that the requirement for the Polytunnel was acceptable under the planning requirements for the agricultural provision. Further the planning department had confirmed that the application does fall under permitted development for the requirement and no application is required.

**Conclusion:** The Committee voted to confirm the application.

**Decision:** Support

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

6.1 None.

**7.** AOB

7.1 None

**8.** To confirm date and time of next meeting.

8.1 To be confirmed