

MILFORD-ON-SEA PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the 451st Planning Committee Meeting held **31 January 2011** in the Village Hall, Park Road at 6.30pm



PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES

MEMBERS

Brian Giles (Chairman)	p	James Read	p	Julian Davis	p
Bob Bishop		Susan Whitlock		Paul Noble	
Maureen West	p	Mark Owen		Sophie Beeton	p
Peter Jennions (Vice-Chairman)	p	Gary Watkins			

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs D Le May (Asst Parish Clerk)
Jane Etheridge (Resident)
Rebecca Webb (Resident)
Mr M Bailey (Resident)

The Chairman, Cllr B Giles, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr J Read declared a **personal** interest in application no. 96505 – Crinian, West Road, Milford-on-Sea

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were no members of the public present who wished to address the meeting.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr M Owen (work), Cllr G Watkins (work), Cllr P Noble (work), Cllr B Bishop (holiday) and Cllr S Whitlock (unwell).

The Chairman asked the meeting if he could make a statement as a result of an anonymous note to the residents of Manor Road referring to the Sites Development Management Development Plan (SDMDP) document. He said the SDMDP document was not on the agenda and therefore not for discussion at this meeting. The Parish Councillors will be attending the public presentation, which all residents are welcome to go to, on Thursday 3 February between 3pm and 9pm. When the Councillors have seen and talked to Officers from NFDC they will form an opinion. He asked that the Parish Council be copied in on any letters sent to NFDC to record feelings about affordable homes sites. The Parish Council wanted to gather public opinion.

Cllr Davis said the Parish Council had not taken a view on the sites as yet. When they were ready to do so the SDMDP document will be put on the Agenda.

4. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held on 10 January 2011

The Minutes were proposed by Cllr J Read and seconded by Cllr M West. Approved.

It was agreed that the Minutes were a true record of the meeting held on **10 January 2011** and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chairman requested that Tree Works Application No. 11/0020 – 31 Shorefield Way, Milford-on-Sea be brought forward as the Applicant, Mr M Bailey, wanted to address the meeting.

The application was for felling a tree to which a Tree Preservation Order was attached. Mr Bailey said the description of the work to be done on NFDC website did not really cover the situation. The tree was in his front garden which was a fairly average sized plot with two TPO trees which impacted on the house. The pine tree he felt was suppressing the oak tree and they were intertwined at a low level. The pine tree was also stopping him carrying out renewal works to the drainage system which had failed. Mr Bailey had consulted neighbours and had written support from them. He said there were plenty of trees around and felling the pine he felt would have no impact. Mr Bailey showed the Planning Committee photographs of the tree. The Tree Warden's report was read out by the Chairman. He asked if Mr Bailey had spoken to the NFDC Arboculturist. Mr Bailey said the Arboculturist had visited and was of the opinion that the pine tree should stay. The Chairman advised Mr Bailey not to do anything until he has permission. Mr Bailey must take account of the Arboculturist's assessment.

Cllr Davis said the tree has been untouched for many years, was now quite overwhelming and it should come down. The oak tree should then be carefully looked after. Cllr Davis was very keen that the applicant contribute to a tree being planted elsewhere.

Cllr Jennions agreed there was a very good case for the tree to be felled but even if the Planning Committee support the application Mr Bailey must still have permission from the Arboculturist.

Cllr West asked whether the tree was a Monterey pine as NFDC were keen to keep them. Mr Bailey said it was a Scots pine but with weeping at the lower levels.

The Committee asked Mr Bailey to request the Arboculturist to put his notes in writing and that he give careful consideration to putting another tree somewhere else. Milford-on-Sea wanted as many trees as possible. Mr Bailey said he was happy to plant a replacement small native tree in his front garden.

SUPPORT and would not accept the decision reached by the District Council's Tree Officer

The Tree Warden's report was read out on TWA 11/0003.

Application No. **11/0003**
Shorefield Cottage, 35 Shorefield Road, Milford-on-Sea
Oak – remove stunted stem
SUPPORT but would accept the decision reached by the District Council's Tree Officer

The Tree Warden's report was read out on TWA 11/0016.

Application No. **11/0016**
12 Sharvells Road, Milford-on-Sea
T7 Oak – crown thin by up to 20%, crown clean and remove branch overhanging adjacent property
SUPPORT but would accept the decision reached by the District Council's Tree Officer

Application No. **11/0020**
31 Shorefield Way, Milford-on-Sea
See page 1815

The Tree Warden's report was read out on TWA 11/0022.

Application No. **11/0022**
Cheyne Lodge, New Valley Road, Milford-on-Sea
x2 Sycamore – reduce by 30% (3m)
Small Oak – reduce by 15% (1.5m) and balance
x2 Sycamore – crown reduce by 40% (4m)
T7 and T9 Oak – crown thin by 15% and deadwood
Poplar – crown clean

The occupants of Cheyne Lodge told the Tree Warden when she visited that they knew nothing about the application that had been submitted to carry out work to their trees. The Committee could not therefore make any comment and would refer the matter back to the Arboculturist.

No comment made

Application No. **96554**
49 Sea Road, Milford-on-Sea
Single-storey rear extension; outbuilding

The Committee were concerned that the outbuilding could be used as a holiday let. The Chairman read from the Case Officer's notes and it was agreed that the last sentence of the report was very important - "This unit does not appear to be fully self-contained and given its size would not indicate that this would be the case, however it would be necessary to condition the planning decision so that it is not used as a self-contained unit". Cllr Jennions said it was overdevelopment and this was generally agreed by the Committee.

OBJECT and would not accept the decision reached by the District Council's Officer under their delegated powers if contrary to the Parish Council's observation

Application No. **96505**
Crinian, West Road, Milford-on-Sea
Single-storey rear extension; roof and window alterations
SUPPORT but would accept the decision reached by the District Council's Officer under their delegated powers

6. TO RECEIVE PLANNING DECISIONS

The following applications have been **Granted:**

- a. **96423** **Lymore End, Lymore Lane, Milford-on-Sea**
Detached garage
- b. **96288** **35 Shorefield Way, Milford-on-Sea**
Two-storey side extension; rear conservatory
- c. **96426** **31 Shorefield Way, Milford-on-Sea**
Outbuilding

- d. **96226 Ravenshurst, Ravens Way, Milford-on-Sea**
Use as 2 bungalows

The Assistant Parish Clerk was asked to circulate a copy of the Decision Notice to all Councillors. The Chairman said a letter should be sent to the Head of Planning & Transportation reiterating that the Parish Council should be in possession of all of the relevant papers before making observations. The Case Officer's notes should either be sent with the applications or be available on the website. The site now had change of use for residential use and opened the way for further applications to develop.

Application No. 96435 The Croft, 29 Downton Lane was also a case in point and demonstrated that the Parish Council need to have everything on the table. A letter needed to be sent asking for an extension in time to make an observation. The decisions were very important to people submitting applications.

The Committee agreed that a letter should be sent and were happy for the Chairman to sign the letter.

7. UPDATE ON APPEALS

- a. **Application No. 95680 - 21 Manor Road, Milford-on-Sea**
New chalet bungalow with double garage at rear of 21 Manor Road; demolition of existing garage to 21 Manor Road; alteration to existing access; new access no. 21.

This appeal was allowed.

8. TO CONSIDER RAMIFICATIONS ARISING FROM THE APPEAL DECISION ON 21 MANOR ROAD

The general feeling of the committee was that the Inspectors Appeal Decision had been poorly judged. Members were reminded that the previous application for the same site had been refused by NFDC. The applicant subsequently went to appeal and the decision reached by NFDC to refuse permission was upheld by the Inspector. The latest scheme was objected to by both the Parish Council and NFDC and had again been taken to appeal by the applicant. This time the Inspector had allowed the appeal, which raised various concerns.

The Planning Committee expressed the view that they were concerned at how the Inspector had interpreted PPS3, which was there to stop 'garden grabbing'. Members felt that the Inspectors latest decision might open the door for more applications to build two properties where there was previously only one. It was noted that a developers contribution of approx. £30,000 would be received once the development went ahead (£22,950 for affordable housing, £3,745 for transport infrastructure and £3,504.90 for public open space) but members were equally concerned that this contribution would not benefit affordable housing in Milford-on-Sea.

Cllr Giles suggested that the Inspector might not have been given all of the information required and that the Parish Council should send District Cllr Pemberton a copy of the Inspector's decision notice and ask him to tackle NFDC on the Committee's concerns.

Cllr Read suggested that Policy PPS3 had been 'blown out of the water' by the Inspectors decision and that the Parish Council should ask NFDC what actions would be taken by them to address this matter. It was agreed that a letter be sent to the Secretary of State pointing out that in the Parish Councils view, the Inspector had misinterpreted or ignored the principles of PPS3 and that if this was found to be the case, a lot of time, effort and tax-payers money had been wasted.

9. PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING 12.01.11

Nothing to report.

10. TO RECEIVE UPDATE REPORTS ON ENFORCEMENTS

a. Milford Baptist Church – Notice Board

The Planning Committee had been advised by NFDC Enforcement that the Baptist Church would submit an application for permitted advertisement consent but notice of such application had not yet been received. The Assistant Parish Clerk reported that, on speaking to the Enforcement Officer, she had been told that one side of the board had been removed bringing it almost within permitted advertisement consent but there was a small signboard hanging underneath which she needed to take a view on. The Enforcement Officer rang later to say that it was not in the public interest to pursue the matter. Cllr Davis said that the redundant pole was still there. The Assistant Parish Clerk said she would report his comment to Enforcement.

b. Little Compton, Pless Road, Milford-on-Sea

The Planning Committee were advised by Enforcement on 23.11.10 that the owners of the property had been given 28 days to submit an application or alter the fence. Nothing had been heard since. On chasing this up, the Assistant Parish Clerk was told that the NFDC Officer originally dealing with the matter had left. An application had been received on 17.12.10 but was declared invalid because of lack of information. Enforcement wrote to the occupants on 10.01.11 asking for the missing information and giving 14 days to produce it. Nothing further has been received and Sarah Barnes, the Officer, now dealing with the matter will follow up and report back to the Parish Council.

11. EMBRACING LOCALISM

This was not discussed.

12. SOUTH EAST DORSET TRANSPORT STUDY

It was agreed that a Notice be placed on the village notice boards asking residents for their comments, if any, and advising that leaflets were available from the Parish Office. The routes under review are all in the Bournemouth area but could have a knock-on effect.

13. TO CONSIDER LICENCE APPLICATIONS

None.

14. DISTRICT COUNCILLOR'S REPORT

District Councillor Pemberton said he had three documents that Councillors could have a look at after the meeting.

- Site Development Management Development Plan Documents
- A Plain English Guide to the Localism Bill
- The Cabinet Meeting Agenda showing the Governance Arrangements for National Parks as an item for discussion

15. TO RECEIVE CORRESPONDENCE

None.

16. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION:

- a. Cllr Beeton circulated the comments she was proposing the Parish Council submit to DEFRA in respect of the review of the Governance Arrangements for National Parks. Cllr Davis said they were excellent.
- b. Cllr Davis said he was still very concerned about state of roads. He had seen the Clerk,s email about the amount of money being spent on repairs but thought there must be a level at which the roads would not be allowed to go. The Government were trying to encourage cycling but the roads were dangerous.

- c. Cllr West reported on the SDMDP meeting which she and the Assistant Parish Clerk had attended at Appletree Court on 27.01.11. She said it had not been very well attended, no introductions were made and the microphones were not working making it quite difficult to hear. Generally, the meeting was just to go through the content of the document with questions being taken and answered. Cllr West did not feel that the coastal areas were being given as much attention as others.

The next Planning Committee Meeting will be held on Monday 21 February 2011 at 6.30pm in the Village Hall, Park Road.

The meeting closed at 7.55pm.

.....
Chairman, Planning Committee

Date: