

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING OF BROADHEMPSTON PARISH COUNCIL
THURSDAY 28 MARCH 2019 AT BROADHEMPSTON VILLAGE HALL

Present: Cllrs Dowson, Head, Hoyle, Isaacs, Sutcliffe and Wright

Apologies: Cllrs Southwood and Stevens

Also present: Rachel Avery (Clerk), 1 member of the public

No	Subject	Comments
1	The Chair will open the meeting and receive and approve any apologies.	Cllr Dowson opened the meeting at 19.04. It was RESOVLED to APPROVE the apologies of Cllrs Southwood and Stevens.
2	To declare any interests arising at this meeting and to consider any dispensation requests relating to this meeting.	There were no interests declared.
	<i>The Council will adjourn for the following item:</i>	
3	<u>Public Question Time:</u> A period of 15 minutes will be allowed for members of the public to ask questions or make comment regarding the work of the Council or other items that affect Broadhempston.	No members of the public wished to speak.
	<i>The Council will reconvene to conduct the following business:</i>	
4	<p>To consider the following planning applications:</p> <p>19/00320/NPA Application for Prior Approval under Part 3 Class Q (a) and (b) and paragraph W of the GPDO for change of use of an agricultural building from agricultural use to a dwelling (Ambrook Farm, Torbryan)</p> <p>19/00426/FUL Replacement single storey conservatory (Ashwick House, Road from Poole Cross to Ashwick House)</p> <p>19/00427/LBC Proposed replacement rear single storey conservatory with minor internal alterations (Ashwick House, Road from Poole Cross to Ashwick House)</p>	<p>Neighbour objections submitted to TDC online had been noted. It was generally accepted that TDC's responsibility is to decide whether the building itself has been used agriculturally in the past for it to be suitable for development under Class Q.</p> <p>Under the current legislation, Cllr Sutcliffe suggested that there are no material reasons to refuse.</p> <p>Cllr Isaacs explained that proof should be requested in terms of the Class Q planning applications, on the basis that it makes a mockery of the planning system.</p> <p>The following comments would be made in addition to the original comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional evidence to prove previous agricultural use of the building must be provided as part of the application to qualify as a Class Q development - The Parish Council requests evidence that the existing timber framework is sufficient to support the construction of a new dwelling - That any work to the exterior ensures that the dwelling remains of a similar design to the current barn. <p>No objection.</p> <p>No objection.</p>
5	<p>To approve the comment on the following planning application:</p> <p>19/00141/FUL Replacement garden room (Slades Linhay, Broadhempston) – No objection.</p>	It was RESOLVED to APPROVE the comment.

6	To discuss concerns regarding planning applications at Torbryan Road.	<p>The following email from TDC had been received: <i>Thank you for your email.</i></p> <p><i>I'm afraid that it won't be possible for one of planning officers to attend the meeting.</i></p> <p><i>We are planning a Development Management focused planning café following the elections and we would be happy to include part Q applications as part of this.</i></p> <p><i>TDC stance re Part Q / fallback positions:</i> <i>The headline is that it is our view that a realistic, practical and implementable Part Q approval (Change of use of agricultural building to residential) can represent a "fall-back" that could be a material consideration in determining subsequent planning applications. This is in part based on appeal decisions and government guidance.</i> <i>The weight to be given to the fall back will though depend on site specific circumstances and does not give carte blanche for large replacement buildings to be used as dwellings in the countryside.</i> <i>The starting point for determining any planning application would be the Development Plan and there is generally a clear conflict that needs to be overcome in the planning balance – a strong fall back may be part of this.</i> <i>As part of this balancing exercise, seeking to achieve betterment overall is likely to be our goal. This may include visual enhancement but could also include other sustainability matters including building performance and wider environmental enhancement – a lesser impact on protected species for example.</i> <i>Agricultural structures usually sit well within their context – in many instances having been through a prior approval or planning application process to minimise the impact of the barn on the landscape. Traditional agricultural buildings can also have considerable design merit themselves and this would weigh against their replacement.</i> <i>Proposals would clearly need to be policy compliant in other respects– such as biodiversity, heritage, access, flooding etc, although many of these matters may have been addressed through the Part Q process, at least superficially.</i></p> <p><i>In summary, taken in the round, Part Q approvals are capable of being a material consideration in subsequent planning applications but the starting point for a determination remains the Development Plan and so in order for new dwellings to be successful on application, there will need to be a strong case of betterment demonstrated as to why we should support something that conflicts with our Development Plan overall.</i></p>
7	To note the date of the next meeting: Thursday 11 April 2019.	This was NOTED. The meeting was closed at 19.48.