**SYMONDSBURY PARISH COUNCIL**

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

**Symondsbury Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Thursday 9 March 18:15 – 18:50**

**Meeting in Person**

**Held at Symondsbury School**

**Minutes**

**Attendees:   
Committee Members  
Steve Ralph PA Chairman  
Steve Evans SE  
Amanda Streatfeild AS  
Paul Hartmann PH**

**In Attendance:**

**Public: There were members of the public in attendance:  
S.L. Holmes, S. Gardner, R.Dobson and C. Dobson.**

**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. The Chairman reminded the meeting that the public could nominate to speak on planning matters only and the time allowed was 3 minutes. He added that they could contribute further if requested by the Council for clarification purposes. 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 February 2023 Meeting:**

3.1 The minutes of the February 2023 Planning Committee meeting were confirmed as accurate notes of the meeting and were approved.

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

4.1 No points to note.

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

5.1 There were no general 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).

**6.0.1: S.L. Holmes:** Mr. Holmes spoke on the application at Highlands End ref: P/FUL/2023/00384. Hecommented that he had made a full objection which had been posted on the planning website and would not be reiterating the full detail at the meeting. He advised the meeting that the proposal was in the same position as the previous scheme which was rejected by Dorset Planning Authority. He added that this was a further expansion of the holiday park site and was of no benefit to the local community. Further the proposal was detrimental to the local area and cannot be mitigated successfully. There were alternative sites within the already developed area of Highlands End and these should be investigated further rather than use open areas of the AONB and World Heritage site.

**6.0.2: S. Gardner:** Mr. Gardner all spoke on the application at Highlands End. He confirmed his agreement with the statement of Mr. Holmes and stated he would not reiterate his points. He stated the solar farm position was isolated and visible from many public routes in the AONB and Coastal Area not least a public route adjacent to the site. The solar farm will be clearly seen from the coastal path down from Thorncombe Beacon. He added it detrimentally affected the character of the area.

**6.0.3: R.&C. Dobson:** Mr.Dobson spoke on the application at Highlands End. He confirmed the statements of the previous speakers. He stated that this part of the AONB and World Heritage Site is of specific interest and should be protected from further development of this nature. Their house overlooks the site and will suffer from visual loss of amenity. He commented that the solar panels could be located on the caravan roofs or within a different site inside the Highlands End Holiday complex. He felt that the proposal would be detrimental to the residents of Eype and users of the countryside with no overall benefit apart from the Holiday Park.

**6.1** **Application No: P/FUL/2023/00888** Proposal: Retain conversion of owners flat to letting rooms; Carry out alterations and demolish greenhouse Location:Eypes Mouth Country Hotel, Mount Lane, Eype, Bridport, DT6 6AL.  
**6.1.1** The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH said that he had reviewed the proposal and looked at the site. Basically the proposals are for the demolition of the greenhouse (which is in a complete state of disrepair and potential collapse), the removal of the owners’ accommodation turning the space into further visitor accommodation and minor internal amendments to improve the hotel’s running.

The external appearance of the hotel is not affected by the current proposals to convert the existing owners flat into an additional 4 bedrooms. The existing number of visitor bedrooms is 17 making a total of 21. There are 57 car parking spaces in the hotel grounds and the additional rooms will be fully accommodated. The existing bar is closed and even if this opened in the future there is sufficient capacity for visitor cars. The demolition of the greenhouse will add additional grounds to the garden. As such the proposals of the new owners are appropriate.

The proposals are in line with EE1 (protection of existing employment) and EE3 (support of tourism) of the neighbourhood plan together with INT1, ENV1, ENV4, ENV15, ENV16, ECON 2, and ECON 6 which are relevant.

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 wholly acceptable.

**6.1.3 Conclusion:** The committee unanimously agreed the application for as outlined was acceptable.

**Decision: Approve**.

**6.2** **Application No: P/HOU/2023/00481** Proposal: Extend the existing garage to create a secure workshop of a similar design & install 2 windowsLocation:Yeldon, Higher Eype Road, Higher Eype, DT6 6AT.  
**6.2.1**  The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the application was for a minor extension to a garage outbuilding within the demise of the existing garage courtyard area. The application did not appear to have any plans, sections or elevations loaded onto the website which made the consideration difficult. There were aerial photographs identifying the site and the layout together with a written design statement. The extension is suggested as being in keeping with the existing built form and uses the same materials.

**6.2.2 Consideration:** The consideration was that the information provided being lacking in plans, elevations and sections was not in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Authority. However the site was well known to the committee as it was once the home of a previous Parish Councillor. As the extension cannot be seen from the public highway and is enclosed it was felt that the proposals would not be considered contentious.

**6.2.3 Conclusion:** In summary the committee found that additional information should be sought to highlight the detail of the application with reference to plans, sections and elevations. Should these be provided in line with the application verbal description then it was felt there would be no objection to the application.

**Decision: No Objection**

**6.3 Application No: P/FUL/2023/00384** Proposal: Installation 300 groundmounted photovoltaic (Solar Panels) to provide carbon free electricity for Park. Location: Highlands End Holiday Park, Highlands End, Eype, DT6 6AR.

**6.3.1** The Chairman asked PH to outline the proposal. PH commented that the application proposal was in a very similar position to application (P/FUL/2021/03350) which was refused by Dorset Planning Authority and was objected to by the Parish Council. He added that he had visited the site and inspected site A and site B. In the application it is clear that site A is the preferred site. Both sites were inspected together with other areas of Highlands End with the permission of the owners. In terms of practicality for solar arrays it is clear that site B is positioned on a north easterly site and not easily developed in terms of energy production. In addition it is also quite visible but does have the benefit of being close to an existing communications tower and ancillary buildings.

There were a considerable number of objections listed on the website and the main objections were its detrimental effect on the landscape within the AONB and World Heritage Site, its visibility from the Public Footpath routes from a coastal position and from inland with one adjacent to the site, little or no benefit to the local community and other available sites within Highlands End.

In specific planning terms the following clause of the Neighbourhood Plan (CC3, CC4 , EE1, EE3 L1 and L4), the Local Plan ( INT1, ENV1, ENV4, and ENV10) and the NPPF (130,176,177,178, 199,200 and 202) are relevant.

Many of these clauses formed the basis of the consideration of the previous application and equally apply to the current application. Some of these clauses actually support the application such as the protection of local tourism, protecting existing employment sites, a response to climate change and a presumption in favour of sustainable development. However all these will be subject to caveats which are in place to assure that no proposals will detrimentally affect the quality of the landscape, especially in protected areas such as the AONB and World Heritage site and importantly affecting the distinctiveness of the area.

The application suggests that a different configuration of solar arrays and further mitigation of landscape treatment in a similar position will deal with the matters cited in the refusal notice. However it is clear that the proposal does not maintain the visually attaractive sense of place and does not add anything to the overall character of the AONB or Coastal Heritage site. Further it is suggested that the proposals actually detracts from the landscape and beauty of the AONB by eroding the setting of Eype Conservation Area and loses the local identity and distinctiveness, detrimentally affecting the Heritage Asset in this coastal area. As such it is clear that the harm created is less than substantial but does not outweigh the public benefits from the proposal.

**6.3.2 Consideration:** The consideration was that the current proposal was very similar to the previous application that was refused by Dorset Planning Authority. The new proposals including the mitigation and reworking of the position of the solar array did not offer any discernable public benefit whilst detrimentally affecting the landscape on the AONB and Heritage site together with the setting of Eype Conservation Area.

**6.3.3 Conclusion:** As such the committee felt they could not support the application.

**Decision:** **Object.**

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

**7.1** No items noted.

**8. AOB**

**8.1 Tuckers Cottage:** The enforcement team contacted the parish council following an update request. There is now an agent working on behalf of the developer of the land. The agent has recently been in contact with the Dorset Planning Enforcement Team. They are in early stages of communication and Dorset have advised that if the changes to and around the dwelling are to be retained, a full planning application will be required, as the changes are material.  
Once there is significant news on the enforcement investigation,the Enforcement team will update the Parish Council.

**9. Next Meeting**

**9.1** The next scheduled Planning Committee meeting will be advised, prior to the main Parsih Council Meeting. The venue will be Symondsbury School.