Y E T M I N S T E R & R Y M E I N T R I N S E C A

**P A R I S H C O U N C I L**

**MINUTES**

For Meeting Held At St Andrew's School On

**Tuesday 1st December 2015 At 7.00pm to discuss**

**PLANNING APPLICATION NO: WD/D/15/002425**

**PROPOSAL: Erection a detached two storey dwelling.**

**LOCATION: LAND AT CROSS FARM, HIGH STREET, YETMINSTER.**

Present: Cllr Gould, Cllr Perelejewski, Cllr Torrance, Cllr Kellar, Cllr Knight, Cllr Parfitt, Cllr Hentley, Cllr Plaice, Cllr Torrance (late), DCllr Lawrence, the Clerk and approximately 37 members of the public.

|  |
| --- |
| Apologies: Cllr Goater |
| Cllr Gould opened the meeting with a historic perspective of the planning application and issues that had been raised previously. He informed the meeting that he had met with the Developers and directly interested parties to mediate an agreement that could be put forward in an application that would then be reviewed by the Parish Council and West Dorset District Planning Department.He asked members of the public for comments and questions which would be received without prejudice. Cllr Gould informed the group that there were 2 meetings scheduled, one to discuss the Gladman’s planning application on the Ryme Road for 98 houses which was due for review. A public meeting would be organised and he hoped that there would be as good a turn out as this meeting.The second meeting would be to discuss the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, which would need support from the community and would have a direct impact on planning decisions.  |
| Mr P Lawrence asked for the application to be circulated, Cllr Gould hoped that everyone had reviewed it previously and that they did not have the facilities to provide plans for the whole meeting. |
| Mr Bugler circulated some historic photographs of the field. |
| Mr H Drake reported that this application had been in the making for a decade. The historic criteria for objecting to the application had not changed since 1994. Parts of the 1994 inspectors report were read out highlighting the Conservation Area protections, that the area should not be sub divided and that it should be kept as a rural open, historic space. This is a speculative build that does not contribute to the conservation area. The scale of the build is the same mass as the previous application which was rejected.He was concerned that the Chairman of the Parish Council had met in private with the developer and felt that the removal of the Leylandii was not a sufficient reason to allow the build to take place. He felt that the Chairman and his comments had indicated that the Parish Council had already made their decision.Cllr Gould indicated that he had made clear that his opinions were his and not that of the Parish Council.  |
| Mr Smith informed the meeting that the Leylandii could be taken down legally.  |
| Mr Rice objected to the application he felt that it disregarded the fundamentals of the conservation area. The Conservation Area was a vital part of the community and it should be protected. |
| Mr Brown reported that 40 people had objected to the last application. The impression is that the Parish Council are happy to reverse their decision from their previous objection based on some minor changes in design. He felt that the substantive objections to this new application remain the same. The Leylandii removal in exchange for planning permission is not appropriate and requested that the Parish Council continue to oppose this development. |
| Mr Woodhead, (The Developer), introduced himself, he was happy to answer any questions. He explained that the area of land though in the Conservation Area was considered an area for development by the Planning Department. He explained the history of the planning application the appeals and inspectors decisions and how they had attempted to accommodate all concerns. The recent planning application had been refused on neighbourly concerns not that of conservation area. Hence the present scheme incorporated changes that dealt with the inspectorates concerns. He felt that a unilateral agreement could be put in place to deal with the Leylandii problem and potentially to prevent further development on the land. |
| Mr Drake responded with arguments from the reports. He felt that the 1994 report was being eroded. |
| Mr Sparks as a directly involved, interested party spoke on his knowledge of the application. Though he still objected to the development and had been formative in the original arguments against such a development, he felt that the risk involved in this application succeeding had increased. The recent inspectors report appeared to be negate the concerns of the 1994 inspectors report regarding the Conservation area. He therefore agreed to meet with Mr Woodhead to lesson any impact should the application be successful. The new plans do lessen the impact on the neighbours however he is still strongly opposed. |
| Mrs Symons – will be overlooked by the development. She felt the property was far too large and not in keeping with the rural area. It was more suitable for a suburban development. The impact on the visual aspect would be artificial. She emphasised that this was a rural community not suburbia. |
| Mr Bugler pointed out that 3 houses in the High Street were directly affected by flooding from the field, they already have permanent flood defence provision within the houses. Any further concrete or building within the field would impact considerably on the level of water drained off the field. He has witnessed a lake behind the wall previously. Any development on the field will stop soak away and add to flooding problems on the High Street.  |
| Mr Rice agreed with Mr Bugler and if there was any development agreed then the building would have to have a sustainable drainage system. |
| Mr Woodhead indicated that if sustainable drainage system was required this would be demanded by the authority. |
| Mr Reek asked - What can the Council do? |
| Cllr Gould reported that the Council could do nothing regarding the Leylandii. He has looked into removing them and as they are not around a house the legislation that Mrs Symons referred to earlier does not apply. He has inquired from John Greenwood regarding further development of the site and he understands that they could ask for a planning condition that the plot can have no further development |
| Mr Pyke indicated that there appeared to be no support for the development. |
| Mr Brown felt that the Parish Council should stick to the principals of the Conservation Area and the land being the historic heart of the village. There may be a new inspector who may consider the 1994 report valid. |
| Mr Woodhead reported that the plans were very specific and that no development could take place on the strip of land up to the church at present. |
| Cllr Gould asked for comments from Councillors. |
| Cllr Perl objected to the application on the grounds of impact on the local people and flooding. |
| Cllr Kellar abstained. |
| Cllr Knight objected on neighbourliness and flooding. |
| Cllr Torrance abstained. |
| Cllr Parfitt objected on flooding, traffic, and conservation and potential for future development.  |
| Cllr Plaice objected due to potential future development and flooding. |
| Cllr Hently objected based on historic objects which have not changed. |
| Cllr Gould was in support of the planning application. |
| It was resolved “THAT THE PARISH COUNCIL WOULD OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION WD/D/15/002425.”Subsequent to the Meeting the following objection was lodged with WDDC.The Parish Council continues to object to this development. Whilst recognizing that the Developer has made significant efforts to improve the overall effect of the dwelling; it is still a large dwelling badly orientated in relation to the remainder of the High Street and the overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings remains. Development of even part of this significant open space with its views of St Andrew’s Church would be to the detriment of the Conservation Area.Furthermore the Development is in contravention of the WDDC Local Plan adopted in October 2015 which does not allow for any development in Yetminster at least in the short term.The Developer does not appear to have made sufficient efforts to mitigate the extra flood water in the High Street which may occur as a result of this development The Council is still concerned that insufficient notice has been taken of their concerns regarding the traffic danger at the access to the High Street  |