

Minutes
Berrick Salome Parish Council Meeting
26th April, 2016

The Meeting of the Berrick Salome Parish Council was held at The Innocents, Berrick Salome, on Tuesday 26th April, 2016. Present:

Ian Glyn (Chair)
Hannah Bradley (Vice-chair)
Craig Tribe (Treasurer)
Steve Rhodes (Councillor)
Chris Cussens (Clerk)

1. Ian Glyn opened the meeting by explaining that the SODC deadline for responding to two Roke planning applications was before the next scheduled Parish Council meeting. So this planning meeting was set up to discuss and reach a recommendation on the applications, giving an opportunity for the applicant, Mr Colin Crump, to state his reasons and to hear the views of affected parishioners.
The applications are
 - 1.1. Part demolish and rebuild; conversion existing barn into 3 bed dwelling. SODC ID: [P16/S1028/FUL](#)
 - 1.2. Erection of agricultural buildings. SODC ID: [P16/S1025/FUL](#)
2. Colin Crump introduced his applications.
 - 2.1. The dwelling would be linked to the house, with no chance that it would be separated. It would serve as a starter home for his daughter and her partner. Later, it might be used for Colin and his wife as they get older, or for Mrs Crump's mother.
 - 2.2. The agricultural buildings application is for a final tidy up to replace the unsightly barn which had the mobile homes attached to it. The new buildings would have suitable space for the tractors to be kept undercover and for Mrs Crump's animals. The field (owned by Colin) which will contain the buildings will remain agricultural.
3. Steve Rhodes has canvassed the views of Roke and Rokemarsh residents via email and personal contact where no email is available. He found that
 - 3.1. For the 3 bed dwelling the residents were 8 in favour and 2 against; the latter were due to an agricultural building being converted to a residential building.
 - 3.2. For the agricultural buildings the residents were 6 against and 3 with no opinion. The general view was that the development is too large, out of proportion to the site, with potential for development creep and usage for commercial purposes.
4. Local parishioners were then invited to give their views
 - 4.1. Brian Bull, who lives next door, was in favour of both applications, on the grounds that any new development over what existed before is a plus. It's not animal-intensive, which it has been in the past. Barn conversion will not overlook his house or garden at all. Colin has been round to do some remedial work on the boundary wall they share and it will be good to have the existing tin roof replaced by a clay tile one. Brian also mentioned that the residents from the Garden House, who could not be present, were also supportive of the applications; Steve concurred with this, from his survey.
 - 4.2. Angela Shields was in agreement with Brian Bull on both applications; anything we can do to support young people would get her vote. The large barn which is next to the house has to come down and will then look better from the road or anywhere else. We can't see either barn from our house. She was satisfied that any application for change of use would require a further application.
 - 4.3. Craig Tribe objected to both applications.
 - 4.3.1. The three existing houses at Roke farm are already sited in a location previously only approved for two dwellings and now an application is being made for one more house, with an annexe, making it four and a half in total.
 - 4.3.2. The agricultural buildings are out of proportion with other buildings on the site and would be fully visible from the road and footpath, with a detrimental effect on the way the area looks. It would be much better if the existing barn were developed to hold the tractors and animals and not converted to a dwelling house.
 - 4.4. Pauline Hoad was concerned about the impact on drainage from the applications. Colin Crump reassured her that his properties have their own (unshared 9 person) treatment plant, so will not contribute to the main sewer in any way.

4.5. David Higgs was comfortable with the 3 bed dwelling, but has reservations regarding the size of the agricultural buildings, where he felt that the barn would be quite obtrusive as far as the view from the road and footpath would be.

David asked whether there were any plans for landscaping. Colin has already created a bank because there was an awful lot of material between the stream and the house which had accumulated over the years. This is temporary to put the soil from the back garden somewhere. He said that he could create a shallow bank, four feet back, with some planting on the top, which was considered helpful. This would reach to about half the height of the eaves.

David thought that a covenant against commercial use of the buildings would be helpful and important; any proposal for change would then require a new application. Colin agreed that the application would be modified to say that it would never be used for commercial use.

4.6. Hannah Bradley endorsed the building of the 3 bed dwelling as young people are in urgent need of extra housing. She was concerned about the impact of the agricultural buildings on the surroundings.

4.7. Steve Rhodes thought that the views of the meeting and wider canvassing were predominantly in favour of the 3 bed dwelling and a broad 50:50 split in favour of the agricultural buildings. He felt that the requirement for agricultural buildings is derived from the 3 bed dwelling, so it would be difficult for the PC to support one of the applications without supporting the other. On balance therefore, especially in view of the support of the immediate neighbours of Mr Crump, he thought we should support both. He suggested that some conditions should be applied: on landscaping and a covenant on commercial use.

4.8. Ian Glyn stated an important criterion: the build line should not be moved out towards the fields, to avoid any risk of ribbon development between Roke and the fields. He reminded us that planning creep has already taken place in the area, with three houses being built instead of two.

4.8.1. For the 3 bed dwelling, he liked the idea of converting a barn to a house, which very much got his approval, as he is in favour of housing families together where possible.

4.8.2. He's curious as to why the 4500 sq ft new barn would be put outside the build line into the paddock. Why not put it into the place where the existing barn will be taken down? This would then get over the build line problem. He's thinks the agricultural buildings should be reconsidered, because of the risk of planning creep and the potential for the current or future owners to convert the new barn to a residence.

5. The councillors were then invited to vote on the two applications

5.1. For the 3 bed house, 3 to 1 in favour, with two conditions: (1) there should be no contribution in any way to the main sewer and (2) the new building should not ever be separated from the main house on sale.

5.2. For the agricultural buildings, 3 to 1 against. Ian requested that this is reconsidered.

6. Colin Crump agreed to revisit the application for the agricultural buildings.

FOOTNOTE

Following the meeting, the following response to the agricultural buildings application was uploaded to the SODC website:-

Berrick Salome Parish Council considers that this application should be refused for the following reasons:

1. Over development of site with the proposed development extending beyond the curtilage of the existing farm complex and into the adjacent field.

2. Proposed building is considered excessively large and obtrusive for the village setting.

3. The application refers to intended use to include maintenance of vintage tractors which does not appear to be agricultural use.

4. Parishioners have expressed concern that the proposed location of the barns might encourage future development to the rear of existing houses in Roke -- which possibility would be strongly resisted by the residents of Roke.

5. Proximity to and visibility from the well used footpath, contrary to the application point 24 answer.

6. We note the existence of a barn within the demise that must be removed as a condition of a previous Application and wonder if the required space could not be better provided (or at least partially provided) in a new structure at that location.