SEATON ROSS PARISH COUNCIL- PLANNING MEETING

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Monday 10th July 2023 7:30pm |
| **Location** | Seaton Ross Village Hall |
| **Attendees** | Jane Henley (Chair) Ward Councillor Paul West, Councillors Claire Hunt, Rachel Underwood, Paul Johnson, Geoff Gardham. 2 members of the public, Gemma Storer (Clerk) |

|  | | **To Action** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1/23 | **Declarations of Interest** | n/a |
| None |
| 2/23 | **Apologies** | n/a |
| None |
| 3/23 | **Suspension of meeting to allow comments from the public.** | n/a |
| The meeting was suspended for 10 minutes whilst the members of the public put forward their opinions and asked questions. |
| 4/23 | **Planning Application** | Clerk to post on planning portal |
| Several points were put forward by the councillors and are summarised as follows in the comments to be published on the planning portal. At this stage the Council **objects** to the plan. Seaton Ross Parish Council appreciates the importance to the village of keeping the pub but has significant concerns for several reasons about the developments being proposed in this planning application. The Council objects to the application on the following grounds and requests that the plans be sent to the Western area planning committee:  Seaton Ross is a linear village, with built development sitting to the front of plots, facing the road.  This frontage type of development contributes positively to a clearly rural village with a distinct identity: see the pattern of housing on either side of the pub.  The proposed location would be wholly uncharacteristic of the established pattern of development in the area.  In addition, it would introduce a multi-tiered pattern of development that would exude a distinctly more urban quality, at odds with the rural nature of the village.  See the Planning Inspectors decision in an appeal 20/03977/OUT made for another property in the village and also DC/13/03233/PLF/WESTWW  For this application There are five, with planning for a sixth, (non-permanent) holiday lets at the rear of the business, separately owned and accessed on the shared drive. Emergency services access to these would need to be kept accessible for the emergency services at all times - particularly due to the nature of the materials used in building them, any delay to the fire service could prove to be devastating. Bin lorry access to Owlet Hideaway will also need to be maintained as there is an agreement for bins to be kept at the lets.  The pub currently has 2 holiday let units, only one of which is fully fitted out, and planning  permission for two more, passed in 2019. Why are these not in use if there is such a demand? Is there sufficient demand to be creating a further holiday let within the pub as well as these?  Regarding the 2019 application for two holiday lets which is referred to in the application: Have the correct conditions of this planning application been achieved i.e. has there been made a scheme for the discharge of surface water from site: It is condition 6 of the planning for the two holiday chalets and the development cannot be started without it. The design and access statement for this current proposed development states (page 3) that the roof water “will discharge to a soakaway in the same manner as the two timber lodges approved under 19/02851/PLF.”  There are not adequate parking spaces for the dwellings. Although the plan is outline only it suggests that 2 3-bed properties are proposed. In a village so isolated from public transport it is not unreasonable to suggest that 2-3 parking spaces be the minimum requirement. The plan says that a garage could be classed as a parking space but would need to be 3x6 metres in size. This is also necessary for the accommodation above the pub and for the extra holiday lets as they are two- bedroom so could be booked by two couples travelling separately. They also need to be large enough parking spaces with more turning spaces which is a problem because the buildings are so crammed in together.  Allocated parking needs to be clearer on the plan as it is not clear what is allocated to the holiday lets and the public house.  Access road to the car park – is this sufficiently wide to allow two cars to pass- if not this could lead to blocking the flow of traffic past the public house as cars will be left obstructing the main road whilst waiting for someone to leave.  Removing the beer garden at the rear leads to usage of the garden down the side and front of the pub and could lead to noise complaints from either residents of the village or users of the holiday let. Also, to access the garden means going out of the pub onto an inadequate public roadside footpath and through a gate, which could be dangerous for children.  The building of houses reduces the viability of the pub as a business and vice versa the appeal of the houses, being built in a pub car park. One of the houses also appears to be in very close proximity to the current holiday let and for future occupants, this could be considered undesirable. |
| 5/23 | **Planning Notices** | NOTED |
| Ref 22/03848/VAR Land North East of Stockton House- approved |
|  |
| The meeting closed at 8:30 pm |