

Somerset County Council Planning Department must determine the planning applications in accordance with local plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, Corfe Parish Council cannot see how policy supports these planning proposals. We also cannot see what other material considerations trump the plan policies.

Showing that the proposals are not policy compliant is key here (See below for details). In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which is the Government's national policy for planning, is a material consideration of itself and can be cited in support/in dispute of the planning proposals being made.

No	Residential – ref: 12/24/0003	AirBnB – ref: 12/24/0004
1	<p><b>Loss of a pub / ACV</b></p> <p>We object to the loss of the pub which is an important community asset. The applicant notes that it has no intention of resuming the existing use and it has not been in use as a pub since 2020. Given the applicant has not attempted to run the property as a pub and, in attempting to market it has priced it above the value of a going concern in its current condition, the applicant's position is difficult to comprehend. It suggests in its Planning Statement that the pub's decline is a material consideration in the planning balance, but it gives no credence to the fact that the applicant has made no effort to bring the pub back to life or sell it for a realistic price. Frankly the pub's status is largely the applicant's responsibility.</p>	<p><b>Loss of a pub ACV</b></p> <p>We object to the loss of the pub which is an important community asset. The applicant notes that it has no intention of resuming the existing use and it has not been in use as a pub since 2020. Given the applicant has not attempted to run the property as a pub and, in attempting to market it has priced it above the value of a going concern in its current condition, the applicant's position is difficult to comprehend. It suggests in its Planning Statement that the pub's decline is a material consideration in the planning balance, but it gives no credence to the fact that the applicant has made no effort to bring the pub back to life or sell it for a realistic price. Frankly the pub's status is largely the applicant's responsibility.</p>
2	<p><b>Design and over-development.</b></p> <p>In our view the proposal does not accord with the relevant development plan policies. The proposal is poorly designed and will over-develop the site. It is not coherent in its approach, well-designed or beautiful and is contrary to policy DM4 and para. 8 NPPF.</p> <p>The demolition of the skittle alley – a long-standing recreational facility for the local community to use (when the pub was open) – will be lost to facilitate the development of a new building on the existing car park. This will comprise a single building with x2, 3-bedroom units. This new building is proposed to be set back some distance from the road and is shown to dominate the development (visually and physically) from the road. The design of this building is poor and will introduce an incongruous design element to the locality e.g. in terms of its height</p>	<p><b>Use and amenity.</b></p> <p>Any form of Airbnb-type use or short-term letting will introduce a significantly different nature of use which the community will have to bear. This includes transient visitors usually with no connection to the area. This type of use provides the community with no benefits at all – indeed, they are more likely to put a greater strain on the limited services available to the community.</p> <p>The proposal fails to support the social objectives set out in the NPPF (para. 8) and is therefore not sustainable development as it is not encouraging the community to be strong, healthy, cohesive and vibrant (also contrary to local polices DM1, 2 and 4).</p>

and appearance. It is not clear why this new building is proposed to be set so far back from the road and indeed further back than the frontages of the existing houses neighbouring it to the East. Setting this new building back from the pub and the neighbouring residential properties does not integrate it into the proposed development but sets it apart aesthetically and affects the coherence of the streetscape. This new building (particularly with the addition of skylights) means that it will overlook neighbouring properties and their gardens. This will result in an intrusive, domineering and overbearing development on these existing residential dwellings which will adversely affect their amenity. This new building will also be closer to the field perimeter and closer to the openness of the wider area (which is an AONB). No consideration is given by the applicant to neighbouring properties who will see a currently open gap in the row of properties abutting the field closed by a domineering building. Evidently the proposal will not complement the local vernacular and will result in an incongruous addition to the pastiche of the area.

The former cellar is proposed to be a glass fronted building fronting a public highway. This is a poor and unattractive design, entirely out of keeping with the surrounding area and offers any new occupier limited privacy. The amenity space for this unit is very limited, with most of its outlook being over what will be a car park and towards the new x2 unit building to the South of it. The former cellar building is also very small; it is not clear why the applicant considers this unit – which has functioned for years as a small cellar - is considered a good design or represents quality housing in an AONB. In addition, this building will be in direct view of the new residential building (containing the x2 new units) giving it a lack of privacy and again the new building will have a domineering and overlooking impact on the cellar building, particularly on its outside amenity area. This further demonstrates the poor design of the development. This is not a quality design reflective of its location in an AONB.

Finally, the conversion of the existing pub is not well thought out. The amenity areas for these units are disproportionate

	<p>with one unit appearing to have a larger outside area, whereas the other unit will have no real outside space at all. Also, the size of the units (internally) appears from the plans to be small (albeit no internal m2 figures are provided). It is not clear what the internal configurations will be or whether they meet the Council's internal m2 standards (this is true of the cellar building and the new building too). The White Hart is a small pub with low ceilings and dividing it into two does not look like a reasonable proposition.</p> <p>As such, the proposal is contrary to CS Objective 4 (Housing) as it is not high-quality development, represents an ill-thought out and muddled proposal and does not make best use of the site. It is not an efficient or appropriate use of land and is contrary to policies DM1, DM2, SD1 and the NPPF (policies 128, 131 and 135). Accordingly, on these grounds alone the proposal should be refused in accordance with s.38(6) PCPA and para. 139 of the NPPF.</p>	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Need</b></p> <p>The Council has a demonstrable 5-year housing land supply in its area (we understand that this figure stands at 5.16 years). This accords with paragraph 69 of the NPPF. As such, this site represents a windfall site.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided by the applicant to explain why new housing at full market rate is needed in this rural location. The applicant oddly suggests (in its Planning Statement) that being market price will mean that the units are affordable in the context of the area. It is not clear what the applicant is driving at here, but the fact remains that the units will be sold at full market rate and there is no proposal to support affordable units on the site.</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges that the proposal will "bring a large amount of people to the local community" (para 46 of the Planning Statement). The applicant goes on to state that this will help the local economy. It is not clear how the development will support the local economy given that there are no businesses in Corfe.</p>	<p><b>Need</b></p> <p>The is no demonstrable need for tourist accommodation in Corfe. No consideration is given by the applicant to the inherent changes in land use and those characteristics in its assessment of the proposal. For example, the traffic generation, noise, disturbance associated with change overs etc. All of these are recognised impacts and have been supported before by the Secretary of State (e.g. see the commentary in paragraphs 17-21 of appeal decision ref: APP/G3110/C/19/3239740, particularly in terms of the impacts of occupant turnover and transport/traffic movements and the conclusion that "#37. I conclude that the pattern and nature of the occupation, at such proximity to neighbouring dwellings is, more than likely, materially harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers about noise and disturbance.").</p> <p>There is no evidenced need for any other form of Airbnb type accommodation in the Corfe. The majority who need to stay near Taunton stay in Taunton and those looking to holiday in the Backdown's tend to stay further in the AONB. In terms of other transient occupiers, Hinkley is cited as a possible operation requiring accommodation, but this claim gives no regard to the</p>

	<p>There are also no transport links meaning that all new residents will have to rely on personal car use (which is self-evidently not sustainable and does not support policy CP1 (Climate Change) and CP6 (Transport and Accessibility) and the aim of reducing the need to travel).</p> <p>In short, the site is not in a good location and no consideration has been given by the applicant to other sites following a sequential approach as set out in policy SP1. It does not support a more prosperous or cohesive community and is contrary to CS Objective 5 (Inclusive Communities) or policy CP5 (Inclusive Communities). It is also contrary to NPPF paragraph 83 which notes that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	<p>significant provision of units available to Hinkley workers required as part of the nuclear new build (e.g. at Bridgwater).</p>
	<p><b>Community engagement</b></p> <p>In formulating the proposal, the applicant has undertaken no engagement with the residents of Corfe. To an extent, these proposals came out of the blue and it is no surprise that they are now in receipt of a significant amount of objection. Community engagement is a key plan highlighted in the NPPF (e.g. in para. 131) and it is unclear why the applicant has submitted such ill-thought-out proposals.</p>	<p><b>Community Engagement</b></p> <p>In formulating the proposal, the applicant has undertaken no engagement with the residents of Corfe. To an extent, these proposals came out of the blue and it is no surprise that they are now in receipt of a significant amount of objection. Community engagement is a key plan highlighted in the NPPF (e.g. in para. 131) and it is unclear why the applicant has submitted such ill-thought-out proposals.</p>
4	<p><b>Phosphates</b></p> <p>The Property is in the river Tone catchment area for phosphates. The applicant has provided no detail on the potential impacts from the proposal on phosphate increases and mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Phosphates</b></p> <p>The Property is in the river Tone catchment area for phosphates. The applicant has provided no detail on the potential impacts from the proposal on phosphate increases and mitigation.</p>
5	<p><b>Sequential test</b></p> <p>The applicant relies on policy DM2, 7 (conversion of existing buildings) in support of its proposal. We disagree that this policy helps the applicant and indeed it supports its refusal given that it is not being adhered to. The applicant has not sought to justify this policy as it has provided no evidence that the other uses listed have been considered in any way and that they cannot be achieved. In any event, it is noted that the lowest priority use on the list is "conversion to other residential use" and this is also the only</p>	<p><b>Sequential test</b></p> <p>The applicant relies on policy DM2, 7 (conversion of existing buildings) in support of its proposal. We disagree that this policy helps the applicant. The applicant has not sought to justify this policy as it has provided no evidence that the other uses listed have been considered in any way and that they cannot be achieved. In any event, it is noted that the support for tourist accommodation is some way down the list.</p>

	<p>item listed which should only happen "in exceptional circumstances". The applicant has made no attempt to show such exceptional circumstances, evidently because there are none.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<p><b>AONB</b></p> <p>We note that the Council's landscape officer has provided no comments in respect of the proposal. It is unclear whether the officer realises that the proposal is in the AONB, or what consideration the officer has given to the need to conserve and enhance the AONB (para. 182 NPPF). The demolition of an existing building as well as the introduction of a new building (which will be taller than others neighbouring it) should surely be given some consideration by the officer.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that the scale and extent of development within an AONB should be limited. No consideration has been given to the Blackdown Hills AONB Management Plan 2019-24 nor is it clear whether the Blackdown Hills AONB's team has been consulted on this proposed application. In any event, it is evidently contrary to policies PD1-4 of that plan.</p> <p>In our view the introduction of a new building will harm the AONB.</p>	<p><b>AONB</b></p> <p>The applicant does not appear to have given any consideration to the fact that the proposal is in a AONB. The NPPF is clear that the scale and extent of development within an AONB should be limited. No consideration has been given to the Blackdown Hills AONB Management Plan 2019-24 nor is it clear whether the Blackdown Hills AONB's team has been consulted on this proposed application. In any event, it is evidently contrary to policies PD1-4 of that plan.</p>
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <p>It is not clear how the proposal maintains and enhances biodiversity. No consideration has been given to protected species in the area, how these will be affected and whether the proposal is suitable habitat for species e.g. bats.</p>	<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <p>It is not clear how the proposal maintains and enhances biodiversity. No consideration has been given to protected species in the area, how these will be affected and whether the proposal is suitable habitat for species e.g. bats.</p>
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Given that the proposals do not accord with the development plan, particularly SD1, DM1 and DM2 they should be refused. In addition, and given the significant concern raised by these proposals in the local community, we consider that the application should be referred to planning committee for its consideration.</p>	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Given that the proposals do not accord with the development plan, particularly SD1, DM1 and DM2 they should be refused. In addition, and given the significant concern raised by these proposals in the local community, we consider that the application should be referred to planning committee for its consideration.</p>

Other notes:

The applicant suggests that the proposal supports a prosperous rural economy. This policy cannot be given any weight as neither the existing business nor the proposed use have any relevance to rural businesses.

It is not clear why the applicant refers to the provision of housing numbers in North Somerset as part of its Planning Statement in support of the housing proposal.