

MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL ZOOM PLANNING MEETING OF LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL
HELD AT 2.00PM ON MONDAY 15TH MARCH 2021.

PRESENT:	
Councillors	D Beatty, C Carter, R Eastley, K Hill and D Young (Vice Chair).
Clerk	Miss L Tyrrell
County Councillors	None
District Councillors	None
Public	5 members

The Vice Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained there would be two planning applications discussed. He added that members of the public could speak at the time of the relevant planning application.

The Clerk asked all members of the public to mute themselves and unmute when asked. She reminded all to raise their hand either physical or virtually and wait to be asked to talk, they would have three minutes to speak.

21/23 Apologies

Parish Cllr Atkins and Cllr Rogers, District Cllr Jung, County Cllr Trail and Cllr Scott.

21/24 To receive any Declarations of Interest

Cllr Atkins had previously declared an interest with both 21/0354/FUL and 21/0567/FUL.

Cllr Eastley declared an interest with 21/00345/FUL.

21/25 Planning applications

21/0354/FUL – Change of use of land from agricultural to domestic to provide a driveway to Blue Haze and construction of an agricultural storage building.

The Vice Chair shared the screen online and presented the planning application from EDDCs planning portal. He explained that there had been 7 consultees and 6 objections. He showed photographs of the site to demonstrate exactly where the agricultural store would be built.

Members of the public who spoke on this application raised the following points:

- Access across the field was only granted temporarily during the building of the new development at Blue Haze.
- Future builds could follow this example and set a precedence.
- It was detrimental to the wildlife.
- The agricultural field was in the Green wedge.
- It would change the character of the Green wedge.
- Few Green wedges remained.
- The store on the skyline goes against Green wedge principles.
- This was agricultural land.
- Parking could not be considered.
- The new development was in BuAB but the field was outside the BuAB.
- No proof that the footpath was a community asset.
- Went against EDDC policy.
- The planning application was not valid until ownership of the footpath, and boundary hedge was determined by land registry.
- The site is in coastal preservation zone.
- The proposed store would clearly be visible from the estuary and surrounding area.
- EDDC had asked the applicant for new plans to be submitted but this was still outstanding.
- The word 'domestic' was incorrect terminology on application and should be C3 Residential.
- The current plans were not clear and could not be fully understood.
- Conflicting statements were provided for the removal of the substantial Oak tree of: 'in poor condition' by the applicant and 'should be protected' in the Arboriculture report.
- EDDC tree officer should report on this.

Cllr Hill felt it was an attempt to take agricultural land. He believed the storage building would ultimately become another dwelling. The original track was only allowed during building of the house. Cllr Hill added if permission was granted it would sadly be the loss of another field.

Cllr Beatty reiterated that the original planning application for the new dwelling had the condition to return the field to its original state after the development was completed. She felt that this had never been the owner's intention as she has seen the amount of hard core laid and believed it was not intended to be removed. Cllr Beatty also added that this proposed store was far too big for its intended need. Cllr Beatty proposed to object to this application. Cllr Carter seconded. Unan.

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of object from LPC to EDDC.

A member of the public shared concerns of the number of tents and camping in the field during the past year and felt the site could become a camp site. Cllr Young proposed to find out from EDDC if events and campsites were allowed on an agricultural field. Cllr Beatty seconded. Unan.

RESOLVED that the Clerk find out the rules for the appropriate use for an agricultural field.

Cllr Beatty proposed that Lymestone tree warden should look at the Oak tree under threat and report his opinion back to the PC. Cllr Young 2nd. Unan.

RESOLVED that the Clerk contact the tree warden and request his opinion regarding the Oak tree on the site.

21/0567/FUL - Retention of field access (retrospective application) at Gulliford Close.

The Vice Chair shared the screen and presented the planning application from EDDCs planning portal. He explained that there had been 5 objections. He showed a photograph of the site to demonstrate exactly where the access to the agricultural field would be.

A resident of Gulliford Close spoke on this application and highlighted the following:

- The building developers (KDHomes) of Gulliford Close had informed the residents that this small parcel of land belonged to the applicant but was not to be used as an entrance to or from the Close.
- Horses were already being transported over the section of land to the field and this crossed the footpath there which was illegal.
- It would start a precedence of using any access to land.
- Not safe to use as an agricultural field access as either side the residential area was so close.

Cllr Eastley declared an interest with this applicant due to the architect being a relative.

Cllr Beatty explained that the field was a state with a horse lorry parked in the field falling into disrepair. The stables which were meant to be a temporary fixture were well built and too close to the resident's gardens. She could not see how the stables would be able to be moved regularly to stop them being permanent. Cllr Beatty explained that this access was not necessary to the field when it already had an access from the Highway.

Cllr Hill believed the access here was only for future building. He believed the parcel of land simply needed a fence to separate it off from the Close.

The Clerk explained that Cllr Rogers wanted it known that she supported all the issues raised. Especially the use of a Close having an additional access point which was not allowed, a Close was not a through road. Cllr Rogers also had concerns of the illegal use of a vehicle crossing over a footpath. Cllr Young explained the road surface in the Close would be unsuitable for farm vehicles and machinery. He was very concerned with farm vehicles using a Close where families lived, and children played. Cllr Hill proposed to object to the application. Cllr Beatty seconded. Unan.

RESOLVED that the Clerk send the recommendation of object from LPC to EDDC.

Meeting closed at **2.43pm**

Chairman:

Date:

CONFIDENTIAL:

List of members of the public who spoke at the meeting:

Mrs Diana Letcher
Mr Rob Longhurst
Mr Ian Stratford
Mr Chris Wintrell
Mr Nick Linfoot