

**LYME REGIS TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 2 DECEMBER 2020**

Present:

Chairman: Cllr G. Turner

Members: Cllr B. Bawden, Cllr J. Broom, Cllr B. Larcombe MBE, Cllr M. Ellis, Cllr C. Reynolds and Cllr S. Williams

Officers: Mr M. Green (deputy town clerk)

19/138/P Public Forum

There were two members of the public present who wished to speak in respect of application number **WD/D/20/002278**. The chairman agreed to let them speak when that application was considered and to take that application first.

19/139/P Apologies

There were no apologies for this meeting.

19/140/P Minutes

Proposed by Cllr B. Larcombe and seconded by Cllr C. Reynolds, the minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2020 were **ADOPTED**.

19/141/P Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were none.

19/142/P Dispensations

There was no grant of dispensations made by the town clerk in relation to the business of this meeting.

19/143/P Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 5 August 2020

There were no matters arising.

19/144/P Update Report

There were updates.

19/145/P Planning Applications

Planning applications were considered in accordance with the details circulated.

- 1) **WD/D/20/002278-FULL** (Received 11 November 2020)
Mella – Erection three storey extension and alterations to existing dwelling, demolition of garage – Hythe cottage, Pine Walk, Lyme Regis, DT7 3LA.

The applicant's agent explained the sustainable design philosophy behind the application and ran through the layout of the proposed development. He talked about the applicants and their connections with the local community and emphasised that there had been no neighbour objections. He referred to other nearby properties whose roofs had been raised by between 1.00 and 1.4m and explained that this application involved raising the roof height by a maximum of 1.2m.

He felt there were no material planning or policy issues on which to not support the application. In response to member concerns about ground stability, he explained that PCRM Ltd had been instructed to carry out an up-to-date report based on the current application, but that work had not yet been completed because the company were extremely busy.

In response to a question from Cllr B. Larcombe, he advised that pre-application discussions had not taken place.

The applicant also spoke in support of the application and advised that the proposed extension was timber-framed, thus reducing its weight and its impact on ground stability.

Members were generally concerned about the potential impact of the application on ground stability in an area of the town where there had been a history of ground movement. It was noted that the ground report submitted with the application was a pre-purchase report based solely on the existing dwelling. It was noted that a new and comprehensive report based on the current application had been commissioned, but there was a unanimous view that the application could not be supported without sight of that report and its conclusions/recommendations.

Members were also generally concerned about the scale of the proposed extension, questioned comparative floor areas as between what was existing and what was proposed and felt that the extension was not subservient to the scale and mass of the existing dwelling or in keeping with its character. There was a general view that it constituted overdevelopment of the site.

There was some discussion about whether consideration of the application could be either deferred or the application withdrawn to allow the new ground stability report to be considered. The deputy town clerk advised that the application could only be withdrawn by request to the planning authority and Dorset Council's deadline for receiving this council comments was very

tight, so deferment until this council's next scheduled meeting was not practical. In any event, if members had concerns about matters in addition to ground stability, those concerns need to be reflected.

After further debate, members recommended that the application be refused because:

- 1. Of the absence of an up-to-date and relevant ground stability report.*
- 2. The scale and mass of the proposed extension constitutes an overdevelopment of the site and a built form which is not subservient to and in keeping with the existing dwelling.*

- 2) **WD/D/20/002207-FULL** (Received 29 October 2020)
Wright - Conversion of single storey wing to rear of grade II listed Georgian terrace from retail use to one bed self-contained flat – 54 Broad Street, Lyme Regis, DT7 3QR.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 3) **WD/D/20/002208-LBC** (Received 29 October 2020)
Wright - Conversion of single storey wing to rear of grade II listed Georgian terrace from retail use to one bed self-contained flat – 54 Broad Street, Lyme Regis, DT7 3QR.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material listed building considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 4) **WD/D/20/002249-FULL** (Received 4 November 2020)
Wallwork – Remove roof from existing garage and construct first floor home office with pitched roof, to be accessed by Cantilevered external staircase – 9 Barfleur Rise, Lyme Regis, DT7 3QY.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 5) **WD/D/20/002270-FULL** (Received 4 November 2020)
Cope – Install window to front elevation and erect cladding to match existing – Tanglewood, Avenue Road, Lyme Regis, DT7 3AE

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 6) **WD/D/20/002365-FULL** (Received 10 November 2020)
Hewins – Erection of pitched roof extension to rear, and associated alterations to form loft conversion including new casement and velux windows – Camellia House, Colway Lane, Lyme Regis, DT7 3BG.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 7) **WD/D/20/002383-FULL** (Received 25 November 2020)
Mansergh – Works to create loft extension – Orchard Cottage, Sidmouth Road, Lyme Regis, DT7 3ES.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 8) **WD/D/20/002491-FULL** (Received 7 November 2020)
Porter – Removal of roof, dormer and chimney and replacement with new roof, chimney, extended dormer and roof light – 15 Pound Street, Lyme Regis DT7 3HZ.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 9) **WD/D/20/002492-LBC** (Received 7 November 2020)
Porter – Removal of roof, dormer and chimney and replacement with new roof, chimney, extended dormer and roof light – 15 Pound Street, Lyme Regis DT7 3HZ.

*Members recommended that the application be **approved** because there were no material listed building considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

- 10) **WD/D/20/002550-VAR OF COND** (Received 19 November 2020)
Ashton – Demolish existing chalet and erect a replacement, (Variation of condition 1 of planning approval WD/D/17/002443 – plans list) – 7 Bowling Green Lyme Regis, DT7 3LG.

*Members recommended that the application for variation of condition 1 of planning approval WD/D/17/002443 be **supported** because there were no material planning considerations that would warrant its refusal.*

19/146/P Amended/Additional Plans

There were no amended/additional applications to be considered at this meeting.

19/147/P Withdrawn Applications

There were no withdrawn applications to be considered at this meeting.

19/148/P Planning Decisions

The decisions of the planning authority were received and **NOTED**.

19/149/P Correspondence from Dorset Council regarding planning related matters.

There was no correspondence to be considered at this meeting

The meeting closed at 8.02 pm.