**MINUTES OF A LYMPSTONE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING HELD IN**

**THE YOUTH CLUB AT 7.30PM ON TUESDAY 21ST DECEMBER 2021.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PRESENT: | |
| **Councillors** | D Atkins, D Beatty, C Francis, K Hill, L Staddon and D Tyrrell |
| **Clerk** | Miss L Tyrrell |
| **Public** | 3 members |

**Public session**

The Chairman invited members of the public to speak on any planning application as it was discussed.

**21/133** **Apologies**

Cllr Linfoot, Cllr Payne and County Cllr Scott had other commitments.

Cllr Atkins proposed to approve the apologies. Cllr Hill seconded. Unan.

*RESOLVED that the Apologies were approved by the PC.*

**21/134 To receive any Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Staddon declared an interest with 21/3077/FUL.

Cllr Tyrrell declared an interest with 21/2433/FUL.

**21/135** **Planning applications**

**21/3077/FUL** Demolition of three stable buildings and construction of new dwelling at Higher Stables, Meeting Lane

The Applicant was present and spoke about the planning application. He explained that the site and stables would be developed and wanted the best for the site. He asked the Councillors for any questions.

Cllr Atkins asked why the footprint of the building had been turned. The Applicant explained that this was to improve the aesthetics, light (now SW facing) and the footprint did not change dramatically. The height of the ridge was minimal and the design was sympathetic with timber cladding and metal roof. The modern materials chosen would improved insulation. The applicant valued the neighbouts privacy and would screen the build for themselves and others. There would be a decent hedge planted and a timber argricultural type gate hung. Cllr Beatty asked if the property would be a single storey to which the applicant said it would. Cllr Hill asked if the site was in a conservation area. The applicant explained it was not. Cllr Atkins asked if the access and visibility splay would be improved to which the applicant explained it would. Cllr Tyrrell shared his concern of the change in the existing profile and how the property would be extended in future. Cllr Hill asked how many bedrooms were proposed. The applicant explained that the property would be a four bedroom property. Cllr Hill added that the building would be a substantial size so would not need increasing in the future. Cllr Beatty approved of the single storey. Cllr Atkins added that he believed the building would be in keeping with the surroundings.

Cllr Hill proposed to support the planning application. Cllr Beatty seconded. Cllr Francis and Cllr Atkins also supported. Cllr Tyrrell abstained.

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

**21/2433/FUL** First floor extension at The Workshop

Cllr Hill had viewed the plans and strongly objected to the planning application. Two immediate residents were present and spoke on the application. They made the following points of objection:

The increase in height of the proposed build would impeade their privacy and restrict light to their property.

The language in the application was misleading, it was not an extension but construction of another level.

The building falls in the green wedge, flood plain and outside BUAB.

Immediate neighbours already have damage to vehicles passing their properties using the footpath for vehicular access. The footpath is unsuitable for traffic. It is a footpath with a busy footfall of many pedestrians including children.

The proposed building is detrimental to the area and not in keeping.

The residents also read another letter of objection from another immediate neighbour and the Cllr Atkins referred to and highlighted points raised in Mr Stone’s email of objection.

Cllr Atkins believed that EDDC had failed in their duty regarding this building from the very beginning.

The resident queried why EDDC were looking at this application when the applicant had failed to rectify two other planning applications refused by EDDC. Cllr Atkins added that planning could continue even with outstanding issues.

Cllr Atkins proposed to strongly object to the application and stated the following reasons:

* Plans are not in keeping with the surrounding area and spoil the street scene.
* Overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbour’s dwellings and gardens.
* The planning application would create a third floor as the seemingly single storey building already has windows in the roof.
* During the wintertime, the trees lose their leaves so the area can be clearly visible from a large area.
* The Conservation area, close to the Eastern edge thereof land area 60m property boundary.
* Failure of EDDC to provide information to planning committee on initial application.
* EDDC have not followed up and enforced the refused planning applications still in situ regarding the hard standing area, polytunnels and installation of Klargester sewage treatment plant and outflow to Wotton Brook and out to the Exe Estuary.
* Slight ingress to green wedge.
* Conversion of garage/workshop single storey amendments over to first floor over part, including treatment plant – cheaper option than to main sewage.
* Width of access over footpath No.1 no refuge for large numbers of foot users.
* The footpath access is a no man’s land, and any ownership needs to be proved.
* Klargester sewage treatment plant has no access for a tanker to empty. No tanker to date has emptied the plant. Alleged pollution remains in Brook.
* Concerns of misleading statements made and anomalies in documents provided by the applicant and architect which should be challenged.
* This model of growing planning applications on this site is preposterous. From a garage to a workshop to a bungalow then extended and now a potential three-bedroom property.
* LPC has considerable concerns regarding the planning process and the handling of the large irregularities and confusion regarding the applications of this site from the very beginning.

Cllr Hill seconded. Unan.

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

Cllr Hill added that he questioned why EDDC even considered this application. He added that there were so many anomalies in the application and economical with the truth in the statements made by the applicant and architect. He believed that all these comments should be challenged by EDDC. He added that there were considerable concerns about the handling of the large irregularities and mishandling of the application by EDDC from the very beginning of the first application. He added that LPC would take this up with DALC and SLCC.

**21/2582/FUL** - Change of agricultural land to domestic garden incorporating area of land within the existing curtilage of the old dairy dwelling at The Old Dairy, Jubilee Grove

Cllr Francis explained that this pocket of land was land locked and discussed land. Cllr Atkins shared concerns of why it was necessary to change the use from agricultural to domestic use. Cllr Tyrrell added that as the site owners ran a bed and breakfast this area could be used to extend accommodation.

Cllr Hill proposed to object due to no significant reason to change agricultural land to a domestic garden. Cllr Tyrrell seconded. Cllr Atkins also objected. Cllrs Beatty, Cllr Francis and Cllr Staddon abstained. The Chairman used his second vote to propose to object.

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

Meeting closed **8.45pm**

Chairman: