

Melchet Park & Plaitford Parish Council

Minutes of Planning Meeting held at Plaitford Village Hall on 15th August 2011

Present

K Curtis (Chairman)
N Curtis
BW Trimmer

JA Bowles
WA Porter

S Bowles
CS Stacey

38/11 Apologies

No apologies were received.

39/11 The minutes of the July 2011 meeting were agreed and signed.

40/11 Interests

Cllr Porter declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 41/11 a) as he owns the neighbouring farm.

41/11 Planning Applications

a) Melchet Court Farm, Melchet Park – dirty water lagoon (TVBC ref: 11/01451) – “**Support**”

The construction of the lagoon is an integral part of the whole farm and in particular the new dairy complex. The proposed location is well away from both human habitation and any ditches, and therefore it will be a big improvement on the present arrangements.

b) Melchet Court – replacement oil storage tanks and enclosure (TVBC ref: 11/01619) – “**Support**”

It is desirable that the boundary wall in the vicinity of the proposed works is undamaged by them.

c) Yew Tree Farm, Plaitford Green – replacement dwelling for bungalow (TVBC ref: 11/01547) – “**Object**”

i) In the proposed location the new dwelling would be clearly visible from a public footpath and would appear as a new dwelling in an area where new dwellings are considered visually intrusive and are not permitted (SET 03 and SET 11 2.b i). The bungalow being replaced is set much further back into the site and by maintaining this location the replacement dwelling would appear more integrated with Yew Tree Farm itself.

ii) The revised location is almost identical to that in application 06/02393 for a 4-bedroomed house which was refused. As in that application it is stated in this application that an advantage would be the demolition of the kennels: however the kennels could be demolished at any time irrespective of any planning application outcome. If the revised location were permitted there would be no intrinsic need to demolish the bungalow which could continue to be used for residential purposes.

iii) The kennels were part of the farm activity (dog-breeding) and as such would not be part of the domestic curtilage. To permit a dwelling in the proposed location would thus result in agricultural land being converted to domestic curtilage and in addition to the house it might reasonably be expected that a garden would be developed, although no such details have been provided. This proposal should be considered as an application for a change of use of the land from agricultural to domestic. As an example of “domestic creep” into the countryside it should be resisted.

iv) It is noted that foul water is to be disposed of by a package treatment plant, although this method was discounted in 06/02393. It is also stated that soakaways would not be a problem as “The Geological Drift Map indicates that the substrates are outcrops of pebble beds and sand.” This identical sentence occurs in the earlier application and shows that the “local engineer” has not actually dug a hole in the ground. If he had he would know what everyone in the vicinity knows: **the sub-soil is clay**. Making any soakaway (foul or surface water) function is problematic in this area. The water from the proposed location will simply find its way to the pond by the public footpath and then into the ditch system.

Date of Next Meeting

19th September 2011

15th August 2011